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Abstract


This program evaluation, which used the context-input-process-product program evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003, 2010), was implemented within a suburban elementary school. The problem addressed through the evaluation was that the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b), which was implemented as the character education program at the study site in the 2008-2009 academic year, had not been evaluated. By conducting the study, the researcher evaluated the program to determine its effectiveness in promoting academic achievement and appropriate school behaviors.

By conducting the evaluation, the researcher identified 4 findings suggesting that the (a) need exists to ensure the fidelity with which the intervention is implemented, (b) academic performance of students in Grades 3 and 4 improved while the intervention was ongoing, (c) behavioral performance of students in kindergarten through Grade 3 improved during program implementation, and (d) viability of sustaining and implementing a character development program with integrity will require the concerted effort of all staff members. Recommendations for educational practice are to (a) continue implementing the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b), (b) include members of the support team and parents in a training event during the present school year, and (c) provide ongoing training to teachers as well as recognition of related practices noted through supervisory observations. It is further recommended that the school principal identify a viable approach for assisting members of the school leadership team in the development of skills for recognizing and managing the conflict presently occurring among teachers. It is also recommended that members of the leadership team address the stated concerns of teachers in their questionnaire responses. Two recommendations for future research were identified. First, it is recommended that additional research on Habits of Mind at nearby elementary schools be conducted to determine the integral processes through which the program is implemented within other settings. Second, it is recommended that the level of student understanding involving the 16 components of Habits of Mind be identified and then the findings be used to guide future program development.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of a program evaluation. Through the study, the researcher evaluated the Habits of Mind character education program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). According to the creators of the program, the Habits of Mind are dispositions employed by successful individuals when they are confronted with problems for which solutions are not immediately apparent (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Within this introductory chapter, the researcher identifies and develops the problem that was addressed through the program evaluation. In addition to describing the program, as well as the school setting, the text introduces the professional evaluation standards (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014). The purpose of the investigation, as well as the definitions of major concepts and terms, is also provided. The chapter establishes a descriptive foundation substantiating the importance of conducting this program evaluation within the public elementary school serving as the research setting.

Statement of the Problem

The problem this evaluation study addressed was that the Habits of Mind program, which was implemented as the character education program at the study site at the beginning of the 2008-2009 academic year, had not been evaluated. Because a program evaluation had not been conducted, members of the school leadership team had no data for use in determining the impact of the program and its overall effectiveness. The researcher anticipates that recommendations from this program evaluation, which were based upon findings acquired through the investigation, may assist school stakeholders in continuing the program.

The topic. This study was conducted to determine the effectiveness of the Habits
of Mind character education program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). During the 6 years of program implementation, leaders of the school district had used Title I funds to purchase related professional development for all stakeholders, literature for all teachers, and program kits for all homeroom classes. The superintendent of the school district, who began serving as the chief administrator during the 2013-2014 school year, was interested in ensuring that an effective character education program was used throughout the district. An evaluation of the program, to determine its effectiveness in promoting academic achievement and appropriate school behaviors, was thus necessary.

**The research problem.** Since the inception of the Habits of Mind character education program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b), an evaluation had not been conducted to determine whether the program was effective in promoting academic achievement and appropriate school behaviors. At the onset of this program evaluation, the researcher believed that results would provide data-based recommendations to the superintendent of the school district, the school principal, and the school leadership team for maintaining, improving, or eliminating the Habits of Mind program. This study was designed to provide substantial information regarding the overall effectiveness of the program in the areas of academics and discipline. The results derived from this program evaluation are essential in the decision whether to continue, expand, or eliminate the program.

**Audience/stakeholders.** The school community consists of individuals and groups who have an ongoing interest in the Habits of Mind character education program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Stakeholders include parents; the superintendent of the school district; school administrators; teachers; students; support staff; community members; and representatives of local, state, and federal agencies.
The setting of this program evaluation is a suburban elementary school located in the southeastern United States. The school is surrounded by an area that is quickly expanding in terms of population and economic opportunities. The school was established in 2000 and is one of 16 elementary schools within a 10-mile radius.

At the time this program evaluation was conducted, the enrollment of the school was approximately 650 students when including prekindergarten through Grade 5. A total of 83 staff members were employed at the school, and 45 of the 83 were classroom teachers. Before the initial implementation of the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b), a high rate of teacher turnover had occurred each year. An additional challenge was that five different principals had served as instructional leaders since the school was opened in 2000. During the fourth year of implementing the Habits of Mind program, a new principal was appointed to the school.

When this program evaluation was conducted, approximately 90% of teachers at the school had advanced university degrees, and 46% had acquired 10 or more years of teaching experience. Just over 98% of students were African Americans and qualified for participation in the free or reduced-price meal program. The attendance rates of the teachers and students were 94.5% and 96.9%, respectively.

**Program**

**The Habit of Mind program.** As explained by the school principal, educators at the school implemented the Habits of Mind character development program as a way of bringing unity and instilling a common language among all stakeholders. The program was initially developed with the idea of promoting a vision and mission to transform schools into learning communities (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). The learning communities were expected to be places wherein thinking and related habits were taught,
practiced, and valued. With the passage of time, these habits become infused into the school culture and create a more thoughtful, cooperative, and compassionate generation of people who are skillful in resolving social, environmental, economic, and political world problems (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). This research-based program, which incorporates 16 habits within the daily lives of students and teachers, has been implemented within schools throughout the United States (Costa & Kallick, 2009b). The habits were derived from studies of effective, skillful problem solvers and decision makers from many walks of life (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

The intent of the program is to help educators teach the Habits of Mind; the habits are broad, enduring, and essential lifespan learning opportunities (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). The school vision similarly involves creating learners who have the self-confidence, independence, and high-technology proficiencies to continuously learn. Dimmitt, Carey, and Hatch (2007), however, additionally reported that a character development program must be useful in meeting the challenges in innovative and creative ways.

**Professional evaluation standards.** Members of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation initially created program evaluation standards in 1975 and recommended that researchers use the standards as a basis of quality for all program evaluations involving educational practices (Yarbrough, Shulha, Hopson, & Caruthers, 2011). Although committee members limited the initial program evaluation standards to four components, they were later updated to include five: (a) utility, (b) feasibility, (c) propriety, (d) accuracy, and (e) evaluation accountability (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014). When used collectively, the evaluation standards provide flexibility, integrity, credibility, and validity to program evaluations.
Utility, the first component, establishes expectations involving the usefulness of findings derived from a program evaluation to assist program administrators in making decisions (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014). The second component, feasibility, establishes expectations regarding the manageability of a program evaluation and the ability of an evaluator to provide results to stakeholders in a timely and efficient manner (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014). Propriety, the third component, establishes expectations that an evaluator will consistently practice ethical standards while conducting a program evaluation (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014). The fourth component, accuracy, establishes the expectations that results of an evaluation will be dependable and ethical (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014). The fifth component, evaluation accountability, establishes the expectation that the researcher will include adequate documentation during the evaluation process in an effort to increase accountability for the program evaluation.

**Purpose of the Evaluation**

The purpose of this program evaluation was to evaluate the Habits of Mind program as implemented within one elementary school in the southeastern United States to ensure the program was effective in promoting academic achievement and appropriate school behaviors. The researcher evaluated the program using Stufflebeam’s (2003, 2010) context-input-process-product (CIPP) model. The CIPP model is strongly oriented to involve and serve the stakeholders of an enterprise (Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Using the CIPP model, the researcher intended to (a) identify the key elements for judging the effectiveness of the program, (b) collect data from current
stakeholders, and (c) apply the identified key elements to determine the overall effectiveness of the program (Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms are applicable to this study and are defined to provide clarity for readers.

**Character education.** As defined by Sojourner (2014), character education is an ethical and caring school culture resulting in a way of life that builds respectful relationships among students, teachers, and administrators.

**Formative evaluation.** Implemented either during the development phase of a program or while the program is ongoing, this research approach is designed to identify ways to improve the target program (Mertler & Charles, 2011).

**Response to intervention.** A three-tiered, research-based approach consisting of ongoing assessments and increasingly intensive interventions used within the general education setting, response to intervention is equally beneficial for students with disabilities (Bowllan, 2011).

**South Carolina Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test (PACT).** This assessment, which is based on the South Carolina State Standards, was administered to South Carolina students in Grades 3 through 8 during Years 2006 to 2008. The test is a standardized instrument measuring student performance in the core subject areas.

**Palmetto Assessment State Standards (PASS).** This assessment, which also is based on the South Carolina State Standards, was administered to South Carolina students in Grades 3 through 8 beginning in 2009 and continuing through 2014.

**Summative evaluation.** This research approach is typically implemented at the completion of a target program, or after the program has been in place for several years,
and is focused on the effectiveness of the program (Mertler & Charles, 2011).

**Triangulation.** Through triangulation, researchers include “multiple data collection methods [and] sources . . . as corroborative evidence for the validity of qualitative research findings” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2009, p. 640).
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The following review of the literature begins with a discussion of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006), the theoretical framework of this program evaluation. The remaining text investigates numerous facets involving character education in schools and then describes two evaluations of other character development programs. From a broader perspective, the discussion incorporates the subject of teacher response to educational initiatives. The remainder of the text is dedicated to the subject of evaluation: (a) program evaluation standards, (b) the rationale for conducting a program evaluation, (c) available evaluation models, and (d) the evaluation framework of this investigation.

The purpose of this program evaluation was to evaluate the Habits of Mind program as implemented within one elementary school in the southeastern United States to ensure the program is effective in promoting academic achievement and appropriate school behaviors. The evaluation was designed to (a) identify the key elements for judging the effectiveness of the program, (b) collect data from current stakeholders, and (c) apply the identified key elements to determine the overall effectiveness of the program. This investigation was a formative evaluation utilizing the CIPP evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003, 2010).

Theoretical Framework

The researcher selected social cognitive theory as the theoretical framework of this program evaluation. Bandura (1986, 1997, 2006) developed the theory in the early 1960s when convinced that other learning theories, such as the conditioning theories supported by behavioral psychology, did not completely explain the learning experience. Through his writings, Bandura emphasized that earlier theories often excluded the effects
of human agency and environmental influences, two significant contributors in the learning process (Erlich & Russ-Eft, 2013). Bandura emphasized that human action involves continual reciprocity among human agency, the social setting, and the structural environment. Information, whether negative or positive, a person perceives from the environment is processed through the influences of interests and intrinsic purposes of the person. The individual then either maneuvers the information or, as another alternative, endeavors to alter the information (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006).

Social cognitive theory includes the concept that individuals are active contributors to the circumstances of their lives. Through the theory, Bandura (1986, 1997, 2006) additionally identified four properties of human agency: (a) intentionality, (b) forethought, (c) self-reactiveness, and (d) self-reflectiveness. As Bandura postulated, individual actions are rooted in personal intentions based upon identified goals. Furthermore, individuals are self-regulatory in adjusting courses of action as they reflect on the negative or positive effects of their own as well as others’ actions (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006). These four properties of human agency can be applied to character development and school behaviors and serve as a fundamental structure on which an effective character development program can be implemented.

Three circular constructs are also central to social cognitive theory: (a) information acquisition; (b) self-efficacy, or the belief that a particular behavior will result in a favorable outcome; and (c) mastery, or personal achievement (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006). Central to the social cognitive theory, self-efficacy and mastery are interrelated, in that persistence in tasks produces mastery which, in turn, increases self-efficacy (Afflerbach, Cho, Kim, Crassas, & Doyle, 2013). Also according to Bandura (1986, 1997, 2006), self-efficacy is further developed through four sources of
information: (a) personal success or failure; (b) observing the practices, successes, and failures of others; (c) the influences of others; and (d) both positive and negative emotions related to specific experiences.

Mastery provides important levels of information that an individual uses to determine self-efficacy; consequently, failure to achieve a task typically causes negative self-efficacy (Afflerbach et al., 2013; Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006). Although the amount of time may differ for each individual, mastery of a skill is a process that occurs over a period of time (Holzberger, Philipp, & Kunter, 2013). Bandura (1986, 1997, 2006) promoted the belief that successfully achieving a highly valued goal is the most powerful influence on self-efficacy.

In addition to personal experiences of mastery or failure, individuals learn through observation of others; furthermore, Bandura (1986, 1997, 2006) suggested that individuals rapidly learn the behaviors that are effective by watching others model those behaviors. The fact that individuals emulate the successful behaviors of others also is supported through findings of educational research (Holzberger et al., 2013; Webster-Stratton, Reinke, Herman, & Newcomer, 2011; Wiggins, 2013/2014). Based on results of the literature review, the modeling of positive personal behaviors by classroom teachers encourages similar behaviors among students and ultimately results in higher levels of self-efficacy among students. Moreover, the successful mastery of the positive behaviors by students reinforces their continued character development.

**Character Education**

**The importance of character education.** As defined by representatives of the Character Education Partnership (2010), character education is the deliberate effort to develop virtues that are good for both the individual and society. For almost a decade,
researchers have underscored the belief that the provision of character education within public schools becomes more important with the passing of time (Beachum, McCray, Yawn, & Obiakor, 2013; Britzman, 2005; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). According to representatives of the National Center for Education Statistics (2011), a high level of concern exists regarding the need for character education in schools. This concern is based upon a continual increase in the rates of juvenile delinquency and specifically involves reports of bullying in schools over the past few years (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011).

Survey results involving school crime and safety within the United States for the 2011-2012 academic year indicated that bullying occurs daily in the majority of elementary schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). Related activities often cause significant challenges for both bullies and victims. Engagement in bullying is often predictive of future criminal activity (Obermann, 2013). Moreover, victims of bullying are at a high risk for low self-esteem, depression, and suicide (Pornari & Wood, 2010). According to Obermann (2013), bullying also may predict future criminal activity.

The rise in inappropriate school behaviors developed due to a lack of shared values (Character Education Partnership, 2010). Britzman (2005) similarly reported that many Americans believe young people are not learning core values such as responsibility, honesty, and respect through specified common language. In earlier research, Bulach and Butler (2002) underscored the concept that, if educators continue to create limitations when it comes to a deliberate definition of character education standards, individuals will continue to perceive character education as a nonessential program. Over time, stakeholders may then provide no support for related education (Bulach & Butler, 2002).
The role of common language within character education. The reality is that all facets of character education cannot be defined as a course that delivers quick-fix lessons; nor can the subject be taught by just changing the décor of the classrooms and halls within a school. Instead, character education must become an integral part of school life through a common language (Costa & Kallick, 2009b). According to representatives of the Character Education Partnership (2014), schools can become communities in which virtues such as responsibility, hard work, honesty, and kindness are taught, expected, celebrated, and continually practiced. Through character education programming, the production of lifelong learners is promoted throughout the school community by promoting and modeling a common language involving all facets of character (Character Education Partnership, 2014).

The history of character education. Since the earliest recorded history, character education has played a pivotal role in the education of children (Glanzer & Milson, 2006). For example, Socrates spoke with Plato regarding a city-state in which the cultivation of virtues such as temperance, wisdom, justice, and courage in all children was essential (Milson, 2000). Much later, in early colonial America, the character of a child was often formed on a combination of classical and Christian views based on various Biblical examples of morals (Glanzer & Milson, 2006). However, as separate states were formed and the concept of self-governance was adopted through the U.S. Constitution, no specific reference was made involving character education (Glanzer & Milson, 2006).

John Dewey regarded character education with a certain degree of skepticism. “According to Dewey, moral education was not a matter of teaching students what to do or not to do, but it was to be a method to help them decide what to do” (Murphy, 2005, p.
Dewey’s philosophy, based on the process rather than the content, in combination with the Kantian principle of duty and obligation for moral people, led to a values clarification and developmental approach which still influences American education (Murphy, 2002).

Two opposing views dominated public schools of the early 20th century; the first was traditionalism and the second was personalism. While one took the form of the more traditionalist approach based upon established values of the time, the other was designed to mark the beginning of the progressive movement based on the more global aspect of social improvement. According to Nieto and Bode (2011), who opposed the more traditional social movement, the personalism of the 1960s was central to celebrating the autonomy of the individual and advancing a notion of freedom from responsibility and commitment. As Lickona (1996) stated, “The personalism of the 60s and 70s gave birth to values clarification where teachers were told not to teach values but rather to help students learn how to clarify their own values” (p. 10).

Since personalism and the onset of the values-clarification methodology of the 1960s and 1970s, the adherence to moral standards within educational settings has been largely out of fashion (Milson, 2000). To counter what was seen as a growing trend of disenchanted youth, a number of researchers, state government officials, trustees serving on boards of education, and members of professional organizations called upon the educators of the nation to reinstitute character education (McClellan, 1999; Milson, 2000). Bennett, Secretary of Education under President Reagan, called on educators to focus their attention on teaching the basic values, such as respect, responsibility, honesty, cooperation, and perseverance (McClellan, 1999). Out of this concern by the government to reinstitute character education came two national organizations, the Character
Education Partnership (2010, 2014) and the Character Counts program (Josephsen Institute, Center for Youth Ethics, 2014), with leaders of both organizations seeking ways to promote character education throughout the nation.

Professional discourse involving character education immediately began to increase. At first, character education was defined by educators and researchers based on morals, values, and other definitive objectives (Smith, 2013). In their early work, Dimmitt et al. (2007) defined character education as programs specifically designed to teach students responsibility, self-control, cooperation, teamwork, respect, and appreciation through diversity. Smith (2013) further reported that character education is a lifelong developmental process through which children learn and apply core ethical and shared values to their lives and in their interactions with others.

According to Dimmitt et al. (2007), the introduction of character education programs was an attempt to assist students in discussing and understanding basic core values which are not automatic in nature. Instead, character is developed from the day-to-day interactions with people in various avenues of life. In addition, Dimmitt et al. indicated that the use of numerous character education programs has been credited with decreases in disciplinary problems. Although numerous specific definitions of character education have been promoted over time, agreement exists that character education represents efforts to teach values and ethical behaviors in school. As Nieto and Bode (2011) reported, the goal is to develop moral character by teaching effective problem-solving and decision-making processes.

Through No Child Left Behind legislation (U.S. Department of Education, Elementary and Secondary Education, 2010) public educators are faced with the challenges of producing well-educated students while also preparing students for making
moral and ethical decisions. This legislation supports an added emphasis on instructing students through character education programs by embedding related topics within the teaching of core academic subjects. Legislation from these federal reports is underlying the mandates for members of state departments of education to evaluate the effectiveness of character education programs within schools. In order to cope with this challenge, formal character education programs have been reinstituted within schools (Milson, 2000). At that time, the Character Education Partnership (2010, 2014), which is a national project, moved to the forefront of the character education movement (Dimmitt et al., 2007).

A leading researcher in the field of character education, Lickona (1996) identified three reasons why it is important for educators to engage in some type of character education. First, it is essential for people to grow and change into fully aware human beings. Second, schools are better places for young people when they have atmospheres of goodness and caring. Third, building character in students through highly effective educational programs leads to a more moral society in which individuals have the capacity to think and act morally. For these reasons, Lickona accentuated that it is imperative for educators to step to the forefront and address the subject of character education.

Initially, representatives of the Character Education Partnership (2010) created a plan for educators for use in promoting a safe educational environment. While all states are encouraged to participate in character education, this component is mandated in South Carolina through South Carolina Law (South Carolina Legislator, 2013). Moreover, each local school board of trustees within the state must develop a policy addressing character education. Any character education program implemented within a school district must,
to the extent possible, incorporate character traits including, but not limited to, the following: respect for authority and respect for others, honesty, self-control, cleanliness, courtesy, good manners, cooperation, citizenship, patriotism, courage, fairness, kindness, self-respect, compassion, diligence, good work ethics, sound educational habits, generosity, punctuality, cheerfulness, patience, sportsmanship, loyalty, and virtue (South Carolina Legislator, 2013).

Trustees of local school boards also must include all sectors of the community in the development of a character education policy and in the development of any program implemented as a result of the policy (South Carolina Legislator, 2013). As additional parts of any related policy, all school officials must adhere to two standards when implementing a character education program. First, the program must be incorporated within the regular school curriculum. Second, leaders must include an evaluation component within the character education program in order for the program to be adopted by trustees serving on the school boards.

**Understanding character education.** According to Pearson and Nicholson (2000), the roles of stakeholders in any character education program must be clear, concise, and consistent. Character education programs must support the development of positive character traits in children and adults while also providing effective violence-prevention curriculum (Holtzapple, 2011). The purpose of related curriculum is to improve prosocial competencies and reduce negative behaviors in students by enhancing protective factors and targeting modifiable risk factors (Holtzapple, 2011).

Comprehensive character education and violence-prevention programs implemented within schools are affecting those schools as communities (Character Education Partnership, 2014; Josephsen Institute, Center for Youth Ethics, 2014).
Berkowitz and Bier (2006), however, found that the successful implementation of a character education program requires clear guidelines and expectations for all stakeholders. Even if a consensus for defining character education can be reached within the school community, often stakeholders provide no clear commitment and only limited support for implementing a character education program (Feder, 2007). Often overwhelmed, educators find that they already have a plethora of concepts to teach in the classroom, and many regard character education as yet another burden or task (Berkowitz & Bier, 2006). If character education programs are not integrated into the curriculum and if stakeholders do not collaborate on facets of the programs and methods for integration within classroom instruction, no commitment exists for the program and it ultimately will not succeed (Pearson & Nicholson, 2000).

Assessing character education. It is difficult to judge the effectiveness of a character education program in the absence of standard criteria (Benninga, Berkowitz, Kuehn, & Smith, 2006; Character Education Partnership, 2014). Instead, unrelated benchmarks, such as test scores, school attendance, and school behaviors, which are reported on report cards, are typically used to measure the effectiveness of a character education program. Using inappropriate benchmarks can give a misleading indication of the program's efficacy. While Feder (2007) found that the goals of character education and those of academic achievement have no relationship to each other, Benninga et al. (2006) and Beachum et al. (2013) cited the belief that an effective character education program can promote academic achievement while decreasing the frequency and severity of school misbehaviors.

Evaluation of similar programs. A review of the literature enabled the researcher to determine ways in which other character development and social skills
programs have been evaluated. Through the review, the researcher noticed that none of the program evaluations were conducted using the CIPP evaluation model. Two of the evaluations are described in the following text.

The first study was designed to identify the effects of Positive Action (Purvey & Novak, 1984), a social-emotional and character development program (Washburn et al., 2011). The evaluation, which was based on randomized trials in three geographically diverse elementary school settings, was conducted using data acquired from self-reporting student surveys. Although the researchers did not identify the number or ages of participants, the study involved students enrolled in a total of 42 public elementary schools. Results indicated that, although students in the control and experimental groups reported a decline in the number of positive behaviors during the 3-year study period, those in the experimental group reported statistically significant lower rates of decline in positive behaviors (Washburn et al., 2011). Although the study supports the use of the program, self-reporting is a form of data collection with innate weaknesses threatening internal validity (Creswell, 2012). Moreover, the data represented only the perceptions of students and were not triangulated with data from teachers or school administrators or with disciplinary records. A comparison of the study with the CIPP program evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003, 2010) demonstrates that use of the CIPP model would have provided a research-based method for conducting a more thorough evaluation.

The second study was designed for identifying the effect of a music therapy social skills program on the social competence of 45 children and adolescents spanning 6 to 17 years of age (Gooding, 2011). The evaluation was conducted in a combination of (a) elementary and secondary schools, (b) residential care facilities, and (c) after school settings. Findings were based upon an analysis of pre- and posttest data acquired from
participants, caregivers, and observations conducted by trained researchers. Results indicated that significant improvements in social functioning were achieved among participants (Gooding, 2011). The study design was one of strong internal validity, as Gooding (2001) triangulated the data with multiple sources over an extended time period. A comparison of the study with the CIPP program evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003, 2010) demonstrates that the CIPP model would have provided the opportunity to investigate various facets of the program and, overall, may have enabled Gooding to conduct a more thorough evaluation.

**Professional development involving character education.** As with other types of school initiatives, professional development is essential to the success of any character education program (Berkowitz & Bier, 2006). Researchers have found a direct correlation between effective character education and improved student achievement, with the effectiveness of the teachers as pivotal to that improvement (Beachum et al., 2013; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). Researchers also have affirmed that the amount of time teachers are engaged in effective training programs correlates to student improvement in character qualities (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Hough, 2011; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2009). Questions exist, however, concerning the necessary elements and the best approaches of a teacher training program (Hodgman, 2012). Darling-Hammond and Richardson (2009) proposed that effective professional development for the implementation of a character development program includes (a) a focus on student learning, (b) the implementation of collaborative learning environments, and (c) integration of the program with the overall goal of school improvement. In addition, effective professional development must be part of an entire school culture of learning, with character education as one part of a whole (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin,
Program fidelity is defined as the extent to which the implementation of a program adheres to the original model (Berkowitz & Bier, 2006; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). The integrity of the intervention of character development is connected directly with desired student outcomes in designated character traits, and related outcomes become the evidence of implementation fidelity (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Hough, 2011). Low or non-existent student achievement demonstrates either inadequate implementation of the character development program or that the intervention plan was poorly designed (Berkowitz & Bier, 2006). Researchers have reported that poorly conducted teacher training and insufficient training time results in little or no change in teacher classroom practices (Marzano et al., 2009; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). Including (a) effective school leadership, (b) supervisory observations of program implementation, (c) constructive feedback, and (d) full teacher support following the training further improves the effectiveness of implementing the character education constructs within the classroom (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Hodgman, 2012; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011).

A number of elements common to effective programs are included in the literature on professional development. This researcher focused on three elements applicable to character education: (a) learning communities, (b) mentoring and feedback, and (c) action research and reflection. In addition to these three elements, the design and scheduling of the teaching strategies within the classroom and in the overall school culture was also of concern.

First, and for various reasons, most teachers work in isolation (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011). The literature supports the belief, however, that educators learn
more effectively when collaborating with colleagues sharing a similar commitment to character development in the students (Caskey & Carpenter, 2012; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Stewart, 2014). Within a learning community, leaders serve only as facilitators while drawing on the knowledge and skills of each member of the team (Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). Teachers who work together with their colleagues have reported an increase in the successful use of effective teaching strategies and an improvement in student mastery of desired outcomes (Caskey & Carpenter, 2012; Stewart, 2014). Moreover, teachers are much more responsive to constructive criticism and to learning new teaching practices when invested in the learning community (Caskey & Carpenter, 2012; Stewart, 2014).

Second, professional-development programs not followed by mentoring and feedback are less effective than those programs that include these components (Hodgman, 2012; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). Researchers have suggested that professional development that includes implementing a character education program in a school should begin with members of the school leadership team selecting several experienced teachers who serve as models for the other teachers (Berkowitz & Bier, 2006; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). Teachers learn new approaches to classroom strategies better when experienced colleagues provide effective and ongoing feedback related to the active participation of the teachers (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). For that reason, Webster-Stratton et al. (2011) suggested that mentors (a) model the character education strategy one at a time with teachers, (b) encourage teachers to practice the target skill during training, (c) observe teachers as they practice the skill within the classroom, and (d) provide constructive feedback.
Third, a loop relationship between action research conducted by the teachers and teacher self-reflection on the effectiveness of the character education strategies employed within the classroom is also an integral part of an effective approach to professional development (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Hodgman, 2012; Stewart, 2014). Action research within the character development literature is defined as a systematic study of the implementation process and of the student outcomes in improved character traits (Berkowitz & Bier, 2006; Trauth-Nare & Buck, 2011). Through reflection, teachers consider how personal teaching practices affect student performance as well as how to improve those practices (Trauth-Nare & Buck, 2011; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011).

The integration of character education within the overall spectrum of the learning communities of teachers should be phased in by school administrators at the beginning of the school year and should include all stakeholders within the school environment (DeRoche & Williams, 2001). An effective professional-development program has a specific timeline with ample time for teachers to integrate the constructs of character education into their beliefs and practices (Marzano et al., 2009). Because teacher time is limited, the time designated for professional development must use the most effective approaches to acquire and maintain teacher engagement (Hough, 2011; Marzano et al., 2009). Hough (2011) also indicated that the implementation of character training should be gradual, proceeding in well-defined steps that are coherent and that work toward specific goals. Character education, however, cannot be isolated from the entire spectrum of teacher learning inside of a collaborative community; related factors must be included as one part of a culture of learning (Beachum et al., 2013; Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Stewart, 2014).
Teacher Response to Educational Initiatives

Teachers are professional educators who utilize personal experience, including former experience as a student along with present teaching experience, in order to implement new educational initiatives in the classroom (Theriot & Tice, 2009). After engagement with professional development, educators facing the reality and challenges of the classroom often rely on teaching styles and methodology that have been successful in the past rather than to implement the new educational initiatives (Pedersen & Liu 2003; Theriot & Tice, 2009). Before any alteration of teaching practices can occur in the classroom, teachers must perceive a high level of self-efficacy through their experiences within the shared community of educators (Caskey & Carpenter, 2012; Stewart, 2014).

The reform initiatives of the present day require a complete rethinking by teachers of their teaching practices and expectations of student outcomes, as teachers are often required to teach in ways never before experienced (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011). Wide agreement exists among researchers that any new educational initiative must be part of a schoolwide policy that includes teachers working together as learning communities (Caskey & Carpenter, 2012; Hough, 2011; Stewart, 2014). The model of professional development that consists of top-down instruction with the expectation that teachers immediately implement what has been taught them, however, is no more effective than using the same model in the classroom (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Stewart, 2014; Theriot & Tice, 2009).

Teacher beliefs. The beliefs teachers hold about effective teaching and how those beliefs influence classroom practices is an important field of study (Pajares, 1992). Developing awareness of the belief structures of teachers is crucial when implementing a new initiative and is also vital to improving instructional practices (Theriot & Tice,
2009). Theriot and Tice (2009) additionally stated that even teachers who desire to adopt new teaching methods often resort to prior practices because of the challenges faced in the classroom. Teachers working as isolated individuals sometimes find it difficult to reconstruct the strategies and expectancies in the classroom that reflect educational beliefs the teacher has already adopted (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011).

At the beginning of the learning experience, teachers must first believe that implementing new teaching strategies, including the constructs of character education, results in improved student achievement (Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). Built on the ideas proposed by Bandura (1986, 1997, 2006), teacher self-efficacy is the bridge between new ideas and successful implementation of learning within the classroom (Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). Bandura stated that self-efficacy is the personal belief that desired outcomes can be achieved through specific actions. Teacher beliefs, then, can be included as part of embedding character education within the school culture. At the same time, researchers have stated that school reform, essential to implementing character education, can proceed only from relationships of respect that include the teacher self-beliefs of (a) participating in a shared professional competence, (b) mutually respecting self and others, (c) sharing the task of education, and (d) committing personally to the new educational initiatives (Hough, 2011; Liljedahl, 2014). Liljedahl (2014) also reiterated that, considering what teachers want from professional development in character education, rather than emphasizing only what the program requires, is essential to actual school change.

**How teachers learn.** Primary factors central to educational improvement are that teachers believe professional growth is part of being a teacher and that teachers are agents in their own development (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Liljedahl, 2014;
Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). As previously stated, teachers learn more effectively when collaborating with colleagues sharing a similar commitment to student achievement; this construct includes improvement in traits of ethical character (Caskey & Carpenter, 2012; McGee, Wang, & Polly, 2013; Stewart, 2014). Teachers learn in the same way that students learn; by (a) doing and reflecting, (b) observing students as they respond to teaching strategies, and then (c) working together with other teachers to develop better teaching practices (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 2011; Hough, 2011; Stewart, 2014). Furthermore, teachers learn by observing models of new strategies and concepts, by practicing those strategies, and by receiving positive and supportive feedback from colleagues and school leaders (Hough, 2011; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011).

Researchers have identified several avenues of teacher learning that are essential to effective professional development beginning with teacher sharing of specific student needs followed by teacher direction of the collaborative nature of the program (McGee et al., 2013). The collaborative session will then peruse knowledge of character development and best teaching practices, while providing for active implementation and self-reflection as well as ongoing teacher support throughout the broader school culture (McGee et al., 2013). Stewart (2014) proposed a similar pattern, that the collaborative teaching community will (a) identify student-character needs, (b) identify related teacher learning needs, (c) work together to learn necessary knowledge and teaching strategies, (d) actively apply the new concepts to classroom teaching, and (e) use feedback and self-reflection to review student engagement and learning of related character traits. Researchers of the new models of professional development state that the engagement of teachers in personal professional development must be intense; the training is more effective if hands-on and teacher-enabling, and it must be sustained over time (Darling-
Hammond & Richardson, 2009).

**How Students Learn**

Social cognitive theory, the theoretical framework of this program evaluation, is an effective perspective for explaining the ways in which students learn and is also applicable to the development of character and social behaviors. Bandura (1986, 1997, 2006), who developed the theory, emphasized the effects of human agency and environmental influences as two significant contributors in the learning process (Erlich & Russ-Eft, 2013). Moreover, Bandura posited that human actions involve continual reciprocity among human agency, the social setting, and the structural environment.

Basic tenets of the theory additionally promote the concept that individuals identify and form their own intrinsic purposes, intentions, and goals; information perceived from the environment is then processed through the influences of interests, intrinsic purposes, intentions, and goals (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006). The theory additionally supports the belief that individuals are self-regulatory and capable of adjusting future actions as they reflect on the negative or positive effects of prior actions (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006). As noted through this overview, social cognitive theory can be applied to learning of any kind; central to this program evaluation, the theory also is applicable to the topics of character development and school behaviors.

**Program Evaluation Standards**

Standards exist to fulfill the need to maintain an acceptable level of certainty in program evaluations (Begininga et al., 2006; Gall et al., 2009). Members of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994), under the leadership of Stufflebeam (2003, 2010), published the initial list of 30 criteria pertaining to program evaluations (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2003, 2007). The initial committee was

Developed as standards, the initial criteria identified the salient attributes of effective program evaluations within the field of education. The original four categories of the standards were utility, feasibility, propriety, and accuracy (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994). The standards were designed to ensure quality in program evaluations, by preventing evaluations from becoming self-serving, and to improve the level of professionalism within evaluations of educational programs (Gall et al., 2009). Additionally, the standards were intended to increase the extent to which program stakeholders would find evaluation processes and products valuable in meeting specific organizational needs (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014).

For applicability within educational settings beyond high school, the standards were later revised to include five components (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014; Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2003, 2007). The revised version of the standards (Stufflebeam, 2010) includes the five categories of utility, feasibility, propriety, accuracy, and evaluation accountability. Stufflebeam (2010) reported that the utility standards were designed to establish expectations involving the usefulness of the results derived from program evaluations from the perspective of decision makers. The following is adapted from the work of members of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2014, utility standards section, para. 1):
1. Evaluator credibility standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should be conducted by qualified people who establish and maintain credibility in the evaluation context.”

2. Attention to stakeholders standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should devote attention to the full range of individuals and groups invested in the program and affected by its evaluation.”

3. Negotiated purposes standards establish the expectation that “evaluation purposes should be identified and continually negotiated based on the needs of stakeholders.”

4. Explicit values standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should clarify and specify the individual and cultural values underpinning purposes, processes, and judgments.”

5. Relevant information standards establish the expectation that “evaluation information should serve the identified and emergent needs of stakeholders.”

6. Meaningful processes and products standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should construct activities, descriptions, and judgments in ways that encourage participants to rediscover, reinterpret, or revise their understandings and behaviors.”

7. Timely and appropriate communicating and reporting standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should attend to the continuing information needs of their multiple audiences.”

8. Concern for consequences and influence standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should promote responsible and adaptive use while
guarding against unintended negative consequences and misuse.”

The feasibility standards were intended to increase evaluation effectiveness and efficiency. In addition, the standards are intended to ensure an evaluation will be realistic, prudent, diplomatic, and frugal (Stufflebeam, 2010). The following is adapted from the work of members of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2014, feasibility standards section, para. 1):

1. Project management standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should use effective project management strategies.”

2. Practical procedures standards establish the expectation that “evaluation procedures should be practical and responsive to the way the program operates.”

3. Contextual viability standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should recognize, monitor, and balance the cultural and political interests and needs of individuals and groups.”

4. Resource use standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should use resources effectively and efficiently.”

The propriety standards were intended to support what is proper, fair, legal, right, and just in evaluations (Stufflebeam, 2010). The following is adapted from the work of members of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2014, propriety standards section, para. 1):

1. Responsive and inclusive orientation standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should be responsive to stakeholders and their communities.”

2. Formal agreements standards establish the expectation that “evaluation agreements should be negotiated to make obligations explicit and take into account the needs, expectations, and cultural contexts of clients and other
3. Human rights and respect standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should be designed and conducted to protect human and legal rights and maintain the dignity of participants and other stakeholders.”

4. Clarity and fairness standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should be understandable and fair in addressing stakeholder needs and purposes.”

5. Transparency and disclosure standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should provide complete descriptions of findings, limitations, and conclusions to all stakeholders, unless doing so would violate legal and propriety obligations.”

6. Conflicts of interests standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should openly and honestly identify and address real or perceived conflicts of interests that may compromise the evaluation.”

7. Fiscal responsibility standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should account for all expended resources and comply with sound fiscal procedures and processes.”

The accuracy standards were intended to increase the dependability and truthfulness of evaluation representations, propositions, and findings, and specifically those supporting interpretations and judgments about quality (Stufflebeam, 2010). The following is adapted from the work of members of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2014, accuracy standards section, para. 1):

1. Justified conclusions and decisions standards establish the expectation that “evaluation conclusions and decisions should be explicitly justified in the cultures and contexts where they have consequences.”
2. Valid information standards establish the expectation that “evaluation information should serve the intended purposes and support valid interpretations.”

3. Reliable information standards establish the expectation that “evaluation procedures should yield sufficiently dependable and consistent information for the intended uses.”

4. Explicit program and context descriptions standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should document programs and their contexts with appropriate detail and scope for the evaluation purposes.”

5. Information management standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should employ systematic information collection, review, verification, and storage methods.”

6. Sound designs and analyses standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should employ technically adequate designs and analyses that are appropriate for the evaluation purposes.”

7. Explicit evaluation reasoning standards establish the expectation that “evaluation reasoning leading from information and analyses to findings, interpretations, conclusions, and judgments should be clearly and completely documented.”

8. Communication and reporting standards establish the expectation that “evaluation communications should have adequate scope and guard against misconceptions, biases, distortions, and errors.”

The evaluation accountability standards were intended to encourage adequate documentation of evaluations and a metaevaluative perspective focused on improvement and accountability for evaluation processes and products (Stufflebeam, 2010). The
following is adapted from the work of members of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2014, evaluation accountability standards section, para. 1):

1. Evaluation documentation standards establish the expectation that “evaluations should fully document their negotiated purposes and implemented designs, procedures, data, and outcomes.”

2. Internal metaevaluation standards establish the expectation that “evaluators should use these and other applicable standards to examine the accountability of the evaluation design, procedures employed, information collected, and outcomes.”

3. External metaevaluation standards establish the expectation that “program evaluation sponsors, clients, evaluators, and other stakeholders should encourage the conduct of external metaevaluations using these and other applicable standards.”

**Rationale for Conducting a Program Evaluation**

Agreement exists in the literature that the primary purpose for conducting an evaluation is to improve the worth or value of a program (Creswell, 2012; Gall et al., 2009; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2003, 2007). Representatives of the U.S. Government Accountability Office (2012), however, provided a more detailed explanation by stating that program administrators typically conduct evaluations because of an interest in acquiring, creating, evaluating, and disseminating knowledge believed to enhance programs. Moreover, organizational leaders often initiate program evaluations for either satisfying reporting purposes or for gathering information that may be useful in making related decisions (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2012). Stufflebeam (2010) delineated three essential steps for an effective evaluation: (a) determine criteria, or
standards, for use in evaluating the program; (b) collect the relevant information; and (c) apply the selected standards to determine the merit or value of the program.

Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2003, 2007) additionally underscored the importance of the recommendations that are derived from a program evaluation.

Researchers have contrasted the traditional basic and applied research methodologies to a program evaluation by identifying three primary differences: (a) basic research is primarily concerned with redefining a theory, (b) applied research involves efforts to solve practical problems within the research setting, and (c) program evaluation is a systematic process for collecting information to determine the value of a program (Mills, Airasian, & Gay, 2012). Research indicates agreement that effective program evaluations include three critical components, as the research (a) includes at least one objective process to add credibility to the findings, (b) replicable methodological procedures, and (c) often results in findings that are generalizeable to a wide range of audiences (Gall et al., 2009; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2003, 2007; Worthen, Sanders, & Fitzpatrick, 2010). Moreover, effective program evaluations utilize professional evaluation standards to ensure the usefulness of the results derived from program evaluations from the perspective of decision makers (Joint Committee on Professional Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014). These collective points underscore the approach used in this formative program evaluation.

Available Evaluation Models

Formative evaluations are a vital component of program success (Yarbrough et al., 2011). Although different methodologies are available for use in program evaluations, researchers generally conduct evaluations to examine identified components or procedures within the five areas of utility, feasibility, propriety, accuracy, and evaluation
accountability (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014; Yarbrough et al., 2011). Researchers have underscored the importance of clarifying three specific dimensions prior to selecting an evaluation model; by doing so, the validity of findings derived from evaluation studies is strengthened. These dimensions are the (a) purpose of the evaluation, (b) data collection methods, and (c) relationship between the researcher and organizational representatives (Fitzpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2010).

Collectively, researchers have identified 26 evaluation designs that are effective for use in conducting program evaluations (Creswell, 2012). Four of the 26, however, are directly aligned with the work that members of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (2014) completed. A brief description of these four designs is provided in the following text.

**Methods- or question-oriented designs.** Stufflebeam and Shinkfield (2007) reported that a specific methodology is embedded within methods-oriented designs. The model is useful in studies involving (a) the administration of standardized tests, (b) experiments, (c) program theories or models, (d) cost-analysis procedures, (e) case studies, or (f) management-information systems. For example, a methods-oriented design may utilize mixed methods or may triangulate the data (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Question-oriented designs are intended to answer specific questions regarding a target program; consequently, research questions may be derived from (a) accountability requirements, (b) an expert set of evaluative criteria, (c) program objectives, or (d) an interest in locating and defining unique and successful cases of interest (Creswell, 2012).

**Advocacy- and social-agenda designs.** Use of these two designs requires that the evaluator work closely with individuals within the target organization (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Because the designs are based on the concept that no single best
answer exists, the goal of these designs is to incorporate subjective information throughout the evaluation procedures (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Intuition is also symbolized throughout the designs with the ongoing exchange of information between the evaluator and members of the organization. Intuition is used as the basis for discovering, examining, and addressing program issues (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

**Eclectic designs.** When evaluators are unable to identify one specific methodological design, the use of eclectic designs is warranted (Creswell, 2012; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). To identify and develop eclectic designs, researchers merge selected components from a wide range of established designs (Creswell, 2012). Eclectic designs have universal applicability (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007) and reliable evaluation principles when implemented effectively (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 2014).

**Accountability- and decision-oriented designs.** Creswell (2012) reported that these designs are useful in answering questions for assessing the feasibility, merit, integrity, importance, equity, or safety of a target program. Researchers have identified three central goals for these designs, as they are effective when in (a) assisting consumers in making selections among different services or programs, (b) fostering accountability and improvement in a program through the assessment and identification of decisions related to the program, or (c) assisting representatives of accreditation associations in the processes of certifying educational institutions (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). Moreover, the designs integrate value judgment within program evaluations, as they (a) provide important data that policy decision makers can easily understand, (b) address questions necessary for assessing program value, (c) disseminate a report of the findings
from the program evaluation, and (d) provide accurate accounting records (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The CIPP evaluation model is classified within this category.

**Evaluation Framework**

Stufflebeam’s (2003, 2010) CIPP model provides a systematic and focused method for evaluating the performance and outcomes of a program to assist in either a formative or summative evaluation (Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). The CIPP model provides the opportunity for researchers to investigate programs within four key components: the (a) context component assesses needs and problems, (b) input component assesses the approach and feasibility, (c) process component gauges the implementation processes, and (d) product component examines program outcomes (Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). While evaluators must control the evaluation process to assure reliability of the integral processes, CIPP evaluations provide more than a passive role to program beneficiaries and other stakeholders (Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007). When evaluating a program using the CIPP model, evaluators are charged to keep stakeholders informed and provide ample opportunities for various stakeholder groups to contribute.

The CIPP model has been employed throughout the United States and in international settings as researchers conducted short- and long-term evaluations. According to Gall et al. (2009), the model has been applied in various disciplines and service areas including education, housing and community development, transportation safety, and military personnel review systems. In addition, Gall et al. found the CIPP model to be an effective model for researchers who have the opportunity to work closely with staff members who manage programs within the research setting. Similarly, and until recently, the present researcher worked as the assistant principal within the research
setting. As one employment practice, the researcher assisted in providing teachers with relevant information regarding the program. Since the inception of the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) 6 years ago, the program had not been evaluated.

**Summary**

The review of the literature began with a discussion of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006), which the researcher selected as the theoretical framework of this program evaluation. Bandura (1986, 1997, 2006) developed the theory to fully explain the various influences on the learning experience. Social cognitive theory includes the concept that individuals are active contributors to the circumstances of their lives and that behavior is rooted in personal intentions based upon identified goals. (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006). The various constructs of social cognitive theory can be applied to character development and school behaviors and is also useful as a fundamental structure on which an effective character development program can be implemented.

Several components of the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) were then described. Central to the program are 16 core habits that students are to practice; to ensure this occurs, the curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices must provide rich and provocative opportunities. The goals of the program are to assist students in behaving more intellectually by (a) becoming more flexible and open in thinking, (b) monitoring their own thoughts, (c) being curious, and (d) having a questioning attitude (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

Numerous facets involving character education in schools were then investigated. As representatives of the Character Education Partnership (2010) underscored, character
education is the deliberate effort to develop virtues that are good for both the individual and society. Other researchers have emphasized the belief that the provision of character education within public schools becomes more important over time (Beachum et al., 2013; Britzman, 2005; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). The view of several researchers is that shared values are absent from the youth of America (Britzman, 2005; Character Education Partnership, 2010). This possibility emphasizes the need for effective character development programs within U.S. public schools and adds credibility to the present program evaluation.

The literature involving the role of teachers in educational initiatives was then explored. Researchers have identified the difficulty with which teachers apply new instructional strategies immediately following professional development due to a variety of reasons (Theriot & Tice, 2009). The need for a high level of self-efficacy, brought through their experiences within the shared community of educators, was also discussed (Caskey & Carpenter, 2012; Stewart, 2014). The importance of making a new educational initiative part of a schoolwide policy was also noted in the literature (Caskey & Carpenter, 2012; Hough, 2011; Stewart, 2014).

The remainder of the chapter was dedicated to the subject of evaluation. Discussion included the program evaluation standards developed by members of the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (1994, 2014), the rationale for conducting a program evaluation, available evaluation models, and the evaluation framework of this investigation. Collectively, these related discussions provided the researcher with the methodological background necessary for conducting this program evaluation within the research setting.
Research Questions

For organizational purposes, and in reflection of the four components of the CIPP model (Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007), the research questions are delineated separately within each component.

Context Research Question 1. What are the identified students’ academic and disciplinary issues initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program? Two subquestions were helpful in gathering data to support the context. The first was as follows: What are the principal’s perceptions about student academic and discipline problems initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program? The second was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about student academic and discipline problems initially establishing a need for the Habits of Mind program?

Context Research Question 2. What procedures were involved in the initial implementation of the Habits of Mind program? Two subquestions provided data to support the context research question. The first was as follows: As perceived by the teachers, what procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program? The second was: As perceived by the principal, what procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program?

Input research question. Which programs were examined prior to selection of the Habits of Mind? The input research question had two supporting questions. The first was as follows: As perceived by the teachers, what programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind? The second was: As perceived by the principal, what programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind?

Process Research Question 1. Are the various components of the Habits of Mind
program implemented as designed? This process research question had three supporting questions:

1. What do archival data indicate regarding whether the components of the Habits of Mind program were implemented as designed?

2. What are the teachers’ perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the Habits of Mind?

3. What are the principal’s perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the habits of Mind?

**Process Research Question 2.** Did the school staff receive sufficient staff development and resources in order to implement the Habits of Mind program as designed? This process research question had three supporting questions:

1. What do archival data indicate regarding the professional-development activities and resources that were provided?

2. What are the teachers’ perceptions concerning the professional-development activities and resources provided?

3. What are the principal’s perceptions concerning the professional-development activities and resources provided?

**Product Research Question 1.** What is the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student academic achievement and discipline? This product research question had three supporting questions:

1. Based on empirical data, what impact does the Habits of Mind program have on student achievement and discipline?

2. What are the teachers’ perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement and discipline?
3. What are the principal’s perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement and discipline?

**Product Research Question 2.** What are any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? This product research question had two supporting questions. The first was as follows: What are the teachers’ perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? The second was: What are the principal’s perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program?

**Product Research Question 3.** Should the various components of the Habits of Mind program be sustained? This product research question had two supporting questions. The first was as follows: Based on the teachers’ perceptions, what components of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained? The second was: What are the principal’s perceptions of whether the various components of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained?

**Product Research Question 4.** What are any strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? This product research question had two supporting questions. The first was as follows: What are the teachers’ perceptions of the strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? The second was: What are the principal’s perceptions of the strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program?
Chapter 3: Methodology

The researcher presents a description of the Habits of Mind character development program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) and the participants in the first sections of this chapter. The CIPP evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003, 2010; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2003, 2007) is then reviewed, and the data collection instruments integral to the present program evaluation are discussed. Following these sections is a description of the research design and procedures involving the data collection and analysis.

Program

The Habits of Mind. Through model lessons, which serve as stimuli for discussion and development, teachers use the Habits of Mind character development program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) to provide students the opportunity to practice the 16 habits central to the program. To ensure students are able to sufficiently practice the habits, however, the curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices provide rich and provocative opportunities (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

Collectively, the 16 habits reveal the common language needed for the success of the program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). The first four habits are to (a) persist, or see a task through to completion; (b) think and communicate with clarity and precision, or strive for accurate communication; (c) manage impulsivity, or think before acting; and (d) gather data through all the senses, or use natural pathways to gather data. The fifth through eighth habits involve (a) listening with understanding and empathy; (b) creating, imagining, and innovating; (c) thinking flexibly; and (d) responding with awe, or being intrigued by the phenomena and beauty of the world. The ninth through 12th habits are to (a) think about thinking, or be aware of your thoughts, strategies, feelings,
and actions and know how they affect others; (b) take responsible risks; (c) strive for accuracy; and (d) find humor, including laughing at yourself when possible. The final four habits involve (a) questioning and posing problems, (b) thinking interdependently by learning and working with others, (c) applying past knowledge to new situations, and (d) remaining open to continuous learning (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

The Habits of Mind character development program was created in the early 2000s with the idea of promoting a vision and mission to transform schools into learning communities (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). As envisioned, these learning communities would promote thinking while creating institutions wherein related habits are taught, practiced, valued, and infused into the school culture. In doing so, the creators anticipated a more creative, thoughtful, cooperative, and compassionate generation of people who are skillful in resolving social, environmental, economic, and political world problems (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). The Habits of Mind character education program is synthesized from the works of leaders from within the fields of education, philosophy, psychology, and the arts (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). While authors from within each field may use different labels for describing the characteristics of thinking, their intentions were similar in describing how people behave intelligently by becoming more flexible and open in thinking, monitoring one’s own thoughts, being curious, and having a questioning attitude.

**Participants.** Although not participants, deidentified data regarding achievement and behavior were collected regarding the students in kindergarten through Grade 5 enrolled within the elementary school serving as the research site. During the 2013-2014 school year, 650 students were enrolled in the school. Each school year, approximately 98% of students are African Americans and qualify for participation in
the free or reduced-price meal program. The remaining students are of the following ethnicities: (a) 1.1% Caucasians, (b) 0.6% Asians, and (c) 0.3% Hispanics. Students range in age from 5 to 11 years, and genders are almost equally representative of females (50.7%) and males (49.3%).

The researcher applied one selection criterion for all participants when identifying individuals to contribute to this program evaluation. The selection criterion was that participating individuals had acquired a minimum of 1 year of personal experience with the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) within the school study site.

The first participant group consisted solely of the school principal. The principal, who had acquired 9 years of experience as a school administrator within the target school district, is a male African American between the ages of 50 and 60 and holds a doctoral degree in educational leadership.

The second participant group consisted of 21 of the 45 teachers employed within the target school. These individuals met the one selection criterion, as they all had acquired a minimum of 1 year of personal experience with the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) within the school study site. Seven (15.6%), however, were not employed at the target school when the program was implemented. These seven were not able to contribute to the research questions within the context and input components of the CIPP model. Regardless, the researcher believes that their participation was beneficial in answering the research questions within the process and product components of the model. Of the 45 teachers, 38 (84.4%) are African Americans and the remaining teachers are Caucasians. Teachers range in age from 23 to 60 years; 43 (95.6%) are females. Approximately 90% of teachers had earned advanced university
degrees, and 21 (46.7%) had acquired 10 or more years of teaching experience.

**Evaluation Model**

Stufflebeam’s (2003, 2010) CIPP evaluation model includes four major core components: context, input, process, and product. Context evaluations exist to identify populations and opportunities as well as to diagnose problems and investigate the ability for proposed objectives to address needs (Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2003, 2007). Input evaluations focus on resources for information, both human and material. Process evaluations serve the purpose of refinement, because they identify defects in the implementation of program designs. The last evaluation type is that of product evaluations, which work with outcomes by relating outcome descriptions to the context, input, and process information to acquire worthy interpretations. The data collected through product evaluations are expected to provide information about whether to discontinue, modify, or sustain the program.

**Instruments**

The data collection of the present program evaluation was triangulated and included (a) questionnaires, through which qualitative data were collected; (b) archival data reflecting professional-development activities and resources; (c) academic performance of students in Grades 3 through 5 on the Palmetto Assessment State Standards (PASS) annual state-mandated assessment, which provided quantitative data; and (d) discipline referrals, which provided quantitative data. Triangulation was incorporated within this program evaluation through the inclusion of multiple subjects and collection approaches encompassing a 6-year period of time. Each data source is described in the following text.

**Questionnaires.** Two questionnaires were administered as integral components of
this program evaluation. Both provided qualitative data for analysis, and responses were used to answer nine research questions within the four components of the CIPP evaluation model. The first questionnaire, which consisted of 12 open-ended questions, was designed for completion by the principal of the target elementary school (see Appendix A). The second questionnaire, which also consisted of 12 open-ended questions, was designed for completion by teachers of the target elementary school (see Appendix B). Although the questions on the two instruments were identical, two versions of the questionnaire were developed to ensure that the answers provided by the principal were analyzed separately from responses provided by teachers.

The questionnaires (see Appendices A and B) were self-developed for use in this program evaluation, creating the need to pilot the draft versions. This process occurred within a focus group setting with an ad hoc panel consisting of one principal and three teachers from a nearby elementary school. Panel members reflected similar demographics as those of the study participants in terms of gender, age, and administrative or teaching experience. To provide a quality piloting process, the researcher briefly described the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) and provided a copy of the purpose and research questions of this program evaluation. After discussing the program, the researcher distributed a draft version of each questionnaire and provided panel members time to read and discuss the two documents. Panel members unanimously agreed that the questionnaires were effectively designed for use in this program evaluation and suggested no revisions.

**Archival data.** The researcher reviewed archival data reflecting professional-development activities and resources pertaining to the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) for each of the 6 years of program implementation within
the target elementary school. Analysis of the data was used, in part, to answer one research question within the process component of the CIPP evaluation model.

**Academic performance.** Deidentified performance of students in Grades 3 through 5 on the PASS annual state-mandated assessment, in the core academic area of reading, provided quantitative data for analysis. All identifying information, such as student names, identification numbers, and demographic information, was removed before acquisition. Results of the analysis were used, in part, to answer one research question within the product component of the CIPP evaluation model. The test is administered in May of each school year, and performance is divided into three categories: (a) not meeting standards, (b) meeting standards, and (c) exemplary performance.

The PASS tests were collaboratively developed by representatives of the South Carolina Department of Education and McGraw-Hill (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011). The average reliability coefficients of the reading subtests for Grades 3 through 5, as measured by Cronbach’s alpha, reflect a range between 0.88 and 0.92 (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011). Content-related validity of the instruments was ensured by using a comprehensive curriculum review to determine the correspondence between the content domain and the test content (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011).

The PASS reading subtest is a paper-and-pencil assessment. All items are multiple choice and are machine scored (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011). The subtest for (a) Grade 3 consists of 39 items, (b) Grade 4 includes 47 items, and (c) Grade 5 incorporates 61 items. Students of all three grades are allowed 180 minutes to complete the reading subtest.
Since all students in Grades 3 through 5 have been tested annually using the PASS assessment beginning in 2009, and approximately 300 students are tested each year, the unit of analysis included 6 years of data (2009 through 2014), representing the reading performance of 1,853 students. In addition to the whole group of students in each grade level, data were differentiated within each grade level by the subgroups of students receiving free or reduced-price meals (low SES) and by gender.

**Discipline referrals.** Deidentified records provided quantitative data for analysis. All identifying information, such as student names, identification numbers, and demographic information, was removed before acquisition. Results of the analysis were used, in part, to answer one research question within the product component of the CIPP evaluation model. Discipline referrals are maintained electronically by the principal of the target school. For the intended purposes of this program evaluation, the data were limited to the number of instances in which teachers had referred students to the principal in response to misbehaviors. Requested data were categorized per year and by grade level, beginning with the 2008-2009 school year and continuing through the 2013-2014 school year.

**Procedures**

**Design.** This program evaluation, which was guided using the CIPP evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003, 2010), used a mixed methods approach to collect and analyze qualitative and quantitative data. By using a mixed methods design, researchers have the opportunity to develop a broad understanding of factors and relationships pertinent to the target problem under evaluation (Creswell, 2012; Gall et al., 2009). Procedures of the investigation occurred over 6 weeks of time.

**Data collection.** The procedures of this program evaluation included acquiring
data from four sources:

1. The two questionnaires (see Appendices A and B) were posted on SurveyMonkey (2014) for a period of 7 days to ensure candidates had ample opportunity to participate.

2. The researcher acquired archival data involving professional-development activities and resources from the principal of the target elementary school.

3. The researcher acquired deidentified PASS reading subtest results from the school principal. All identifying information, such as student names, identification numbers, and demographic information, was removed before acquisition.

4. The researcher acquired deidentified discipline referrals from the school principal. All identifying information, such as student names, identification numbers, and demographic information, was removed before acquisition.

**Data analysis.** The procedures of this program evaluation included analyzing data from four sources: (a) teacher and principal responses to the questionnaires (see Appendices A and B), (b) archival data involving professional-development activities and resources, (c) performance on the PASS reading subtest, and (d) deidentified discipline referrals. Each is described in the following text.

First, responses to the principal questionnaire (see Appendix A) were analyzed independently of the analysis conducted with teacher responses (see Appendix B). In this way, the data provided by the principal were memorialized separately from those provided by teachers. All responses to the questionnaires, however, were analyzed in the same manner. The initial step in analyzing the data was to group and document the data using Microsoft Word software. The personal involvement of the researcher is central to analyzing and interpreting qualitative data (Mills et al., 2012); therefore, data analysis
software was not utilized. Instead, the data were analyzed using interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA). The IPA approach is helpful in determining the meanings within the data and in understanding how to use the data in answering the research questions (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010; Moustakas, 1994).

The first preparatory step when using the IPA method, horizontalization, involves the researcher performing an initial examination and evaluation of the data (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010; Moustakas, 1994). To complete the data horizontalization, the researcher used line-by-line coding to annotate all of the data and become acquainted with the salient themes within the data. When using the IPA method, thematic clustering begins during data horizontalization and repeated themes are isolated within the narratives (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010; Moustakas, 1994). Through this approach, the researcher can use overarching themes for organizing and interpreting the data (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010; Moustakas, 1994).

After completing thematic clustering, the researcher began data synthesis, which is the final step of IPA (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010; Moustakas, 1994). During this stage, the researcher draws conceptual inferences between the research questions and the thematic clusters that answer the research questions (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010; Moustakas, 1994). In this program evaluation, results acquired from analyzing questionnaire responses provided by the school principal and teachers were used to answer research questions. At the conclusion of the data analysis and extended review of the literature, the researcher identified and interpreted findings for inclusion within this final dissertation manuscript.

The second source of data that were analyzed consisted of archival data involving professional-development activities and resources as well as schoolwide activities.
involving the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). These data were first organized by school year. Next, the researcher documented the activities, resources, and time periods comprising the various activities. The IPA method (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010; Moustakas, 1994) was then applied to synthesize the activities, resources, and time periods.

The third source of data consisted of performance on the PASS reading subtest. Results from the PASS are divided into three categories: (a) not meeting standards, (b) meeting standards, and (c) exemplary performance (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011). To analyze performance, the researcher calculated the percent of students meeting or exceeding standards for the (a) whole group within each grade level, (b) subgroup of low SES within each grade level, and (c) gender subgroups within each grade level. Next, the researcher determined whether any performance trends existed.

The fourth source of data consisted of deidentified discipline referrals. These data were categorized per year and by grade level, beginning with the 2008-2009 school year and continuing through the 2013-2014 school year. All identifying information, such as student names, identification numbers, and demographic information, was removed before acquisition. For each year, the researcher calculated the number of behavior referrals, by grade level, to determine whether any performance trends existed.

The following research questions and subquestions were answered using analyzed data acquired from various sources: (a) qualitative data from the questionnaires (see Appendices A and B) and archival data involving professional-development activities and resources using the IPA approach (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010; Moustakas, 1994) to identify topics, thematic clusters, and conceptual inferences; (b) data on the PASS reading subtest to determine performance of the whole group of students in each grade
level, the subgroup of low SES students in each grade level, and gender subgroups within each grade level in the three categories of not meeting standards, meeting standards, and exemplary performance; and (c) deidentified discipline referrals to determine the number of referrals, by grade level, and whether any performance trends existed:

1. Context Question 1 was as follows: What are the identified students’ academic and disciplinary issues initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program? Two subquestions helped the researcher gather data to support the research question. The first was: What are the principal’s perceptions about student academic and discipline problems initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s responses to Items 1 and 2 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The second was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about student academic and discipline problems initially establishing a need for the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Items 1 and 2 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B).

2. Context Question 2 was as follows: What procedures were involved in the initial implementation of the Habits of Mind program? Two subquestions provided data to support the research question. The first was: As perceived by the teachers, what procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 3 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The second was: As perceived by the principal, what procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 3 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A).
3. The input question was as follows: Which programs were examined prior to selection of the Habits of Mind? The research question had two supporting questions. The first was: As perceived by the teachers, what programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 4 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The second was: As perceived by the principal, what programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 4 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

4. Process Question 1 was as follows: Are the various components of the Habits of Mind program implemented as designed? This research question had three supporting questions. The first was: What do archival data indicate regarding whether the components of the Habits of Mind program were implemented as designed? This subquestion was answered by analyzing archival data reflecting professional-development activities and resources for each of the 6 years of program implementation within the target elementary school. The second supporting question was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the Habits of Mind? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 5 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The third supporting question was: What are the principal’s perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the habits of Mind? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 5 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

5. Process Question 2 was as follows: Did the school staff receive sufficient staff development and resources in order to implement the Habits of Mind program as designed? This research question had three supporting questions. The first question was:
What do archival data indicate regarding the professional-development activities and resources that were provided? This subquestion was answered by analyzing archival data reflecting professional-development activities and resources for each of the 6 years of program implementation and then comparing the activities and resources with program materials (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). The second supporting question was: What are the teachers’ perceptions concerning the professional-development activities and resources provided? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 6 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The third supporting question was: What are the principal’s perceptions concerning the professional-development activities and resources provided? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 6 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

6. Product Question 1 was as follows: What is the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student academic achievement and discipline? This research question had three supporting questions. The first was: Based on empirical data, what impact does the Habits of Mind program have on student achievement and discipline? This subquestion was answered by analyzing academic performance of students in Grades 3 through 5 on the PASS assessment from 2009 through 2014 and discipline referrals beginning with the 2008-2009 school year and continuing through the 2013-2014 school year. The second supporting question was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement and discipline? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Items 7 and 8 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The third supporting question was: What are the principal’s perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement and discipline? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s responses to Items 7 and 8
on the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

7. Product Question 2 was as follows: What are any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? This research question had two supporting questions. The first was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 9 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The second is: What are the principal’s perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 9 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

8. Product Question 3 was as follows: Should the various components of the Habits of Mind program be sustained? This research question had two supporting questions. The first is: Based on the teachers’ perceptions, what components of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 10 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The second was: What are the principal’s perceptions of whether the various components of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 10 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

9. Product Question 4 was as follows: What are any strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? This research question had two supporting questions. The first was: What are the teachers’ perceptions of the strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Items 11 and 12 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The second was: What are the principal’s perceptions of the strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s responses to Items 11 and 12.
on the questionnaire (see Appendix A).
Chapter 4: Results

This chapter presents the results derived from the analyses of the data.

Perceptions involving the Habits of Mind character development program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) were acquired from two groups of stakeholders. Group A consisted only of the school principal; Group B contained 21 of the 45 teachers (46.7%) employed within the target school. Seven (33.3%) of the 21 teachers, however, were not employed at the target school when the program was implemented. As a result, these individuals were not able to contribute to the research questions within the context and input components of the CIPP model. Regardless, their participation was beneficial in answering the research questions within the process and product components of the model.

By conducting the research, the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b), as implemented within one elementary school in the southeastern United States, was evaluated to determine if it was effective in promoting academic achievement and appropriate school behaviors. The evaluation was designed to (a) identify the key elements for judging the effectiveness of the program, (b) collect data from current stakeholders, and (c) apply the identified key elements to determine the overall effectiveness of the program. In the following text, results are organized by CIPP component (Stufflebeam, 2003, 2010; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2003, 2007) and research question.

Academic and Disciplinary Issues Establishing the Need for the Program

Context Question 1 was as follows: What are the identified students’ academic and disciplinary issues initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program? Two subquestions were designed to assist the researcher in gathering data to answer the
research question. The first was: What are the principal’s perceptions about student academic and discipline problems initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s responses to Items 1 and 2 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). In response to these questions, the principal replied,

Students needed assistance in developing critical-thinking skills and in ways to challenge their thinking process. Students needed help in order to develop skills to self-manage and reflect on their behavior choices. They needed to develop the capacity to think through their behavior and develop appropriate responses.

The second subquestion used to answer Context Question 1 was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about student academic and discipline problems initially establishing a need for the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Items 1 and 2 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). All of the 14 teachers who met the selection criterion responded to these two questions.

Teachers’ responses were varied regarding the academic needs of students. One declared, “Students don’t understand what it takes to be successful.” Another remarked, “Many of our students were behind academically and had little or no support at home.” One other teacher described several concerns by stating, “The students in the school were losing instructional time due to difficulties with behavior and a lack of motivation.” One similarly replied, “Many were not engaged in learning and showed a lack of respect for their teachers.” One of the 14 teachers identified reading as a challenging subject for students and added, “We believed the students needed a platform for self-guidance and goal setting.”

Another teacher expressed, “I wasn’t aware that academic problems were the reason for implementing Habits of Mind.” One other offered several ideas by stating,
“Before the Habits of Mind program was adopted, students were unorganized, unfocused, had a lack of confidence, and demonstrated minimal collaborative skills.” Another similarly reported, “Students were not focused on their learning. They did not have much intrinsic motivation when completing assignments and when working with others.” One teacher replied, “Students’ academic performance needed improvement.” Another offered the following thoughts: “Students had academic problems. We believed that the use of the Habits of Mind program would increase critical thinking and therefore positively influence academic growth.” One teacher offered a response that summarized many of the other responses: “The students were not taking ownership of their learning.” Another clearly described the extent of academic problems by remarking, “Students’ academic problems were grave. We were a below average school with struggling readers and deficient mathematics skills.” The final teacher declared, “The low-performing students had no strategies for improving their academic performance.”

Teachers shared some common beliefs about the students’ discipline issues. As one indicated, “The discipline policy we had in place was more reactive. Habits of Mind gave us a way to teach students how to think before they act negatively.” Another declared, “Kids didn’t stop to develop a plan. They didn’t think about cause and effect and didn’t know how to achieve their goals.” One teacher mentioned a lack of support from home by expressing, “Our school had numerous discipline problems, and there was not always support from home in dealing with these problems.” One other offered the following points: “Students had difficulty getting along.” As another recalled, “Students were disrespectful to adults and easily became aggressive.”

One teacher remarked, “Students had no knowledge of how to redirect negative behaviors to achieve their goals.” Another recanted the belief that, “Students had no
method for self-reflection regarding the cause and effects of their behaviors.” As one other teacher recalled, “Discipline referrals were very high. Students were not worried about the consequences of their actions.” One of the teachers maintained that, “Students had no skills for managing their behaviors.” Another similarly replied, “Students were without skills for managing their impulsivity.” A teacher additionally remarked, “Student discipline was at an all-time high with referrals and expulsions.” One other offered the following perception: “There was a lack of respect for authority and for classmates.” Another encapsulated the various concerns of teachers by stating, “The school climate was not a place where students could thrive.”

**Procedures Involved in the Initial Implementation of the Program**

Context Question 2 was as follows: What procedures were involved in the initial implementation of the Habits of Mind program? Two subquestions provided data to answer the research question. The first was: As perceived by the teachers, what procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 3 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B): What procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program? All of the 14 teachers who met the selection criterion responded to this question.

A lack of procedural steps was underscored by several teachers. As one stated, “There were no procedural steps provided for program implementation. We were just provided resources.” Another expressed the following belief: “The principal told us the district was adopting the program and that we would be implementing the program.” One teacher replied, “We began with a few high-performing students using Habits of Mind. Then they introduced it to the rest of the faculty.” Another cited a similar belief by
responding, “We spent time reading the book. It seemed to me as one more thing for
teachers to do. I think if the faculty had received better training instead of bits and pieces
for a select group, the program may have been more successful.”

Different perceptions were shared by other teachers. One stated, “We were
provided professional development on classroom management. We had a book study in
the morning meetings, and we had schoolwide behavioral initiatives.” One teacher
expressed that, “Teachers were provided training before, during, and after the school
year.” One teacher remarked that, “The principal first built awareness with staff and then
introduced the Habits of Mind to students using posters to illustrate each habit.” Yet one
other replied, “There was training given to all staff members prior to the implementation
of the program.” Another offered additional detailed information:

A half day training was provided during the school year to teach us how to
incorporate the habits into our school and how to teach the habits to the students.
A team was formed to help everyone with the habits. Some teachers visited other
schools that have been successful with implementing the habits of mind.

As one other teacher recalled,

The staff was given a book to read and asked to share ideas about Habits of Mind
over the summer break. We then reviewed the book during meetings. Select
members of the staff were sent to training conferences and then were required to
train the remaining staff. The staff then developed an outline to meet the needs of
our school. A variety of smaller groups were developed to implement certain parts
of the program. The faculty and staff were then expected to implement the
program. The support staff, however, did not receive any training and seemed to
not be included in the program implementation.

One teacher offered the following perceptions: “The faculty and staff attended
several professional-development sessions on the program. Teachers were given a book
to read as a faculty book study, and this was implemented during common planning
times.” One other teacher stated, “Teachers used books and class activities to introduce
the habits to students.” One teacher described that the habits “were established through
academics and as part of the behavior system.” Vivid details were shared by another teacher who expressed the following:

We had a professional book study on the program. We were given the opportunity to attend professional-development conferences and were required to attend on-site professional development. The implementation involved the use of (a) daily lesson plans, (b) posters, (c) schoolwide student recognition, (d) parent and family involvement, and (e) displays on the school marquee and in the school newsletter.

The second subquestion used to answer Context Question 2 was: As perceived by the principal, what procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 3 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). In response to this question, the principal succinctly replied, “Teachers were provided professional development. Parents were informed of the initiative, and the habits were introduced to the students.”

Alternative Programs Examined Prior to Selecting the Current Program

The one input question was as follows: Which programs were examined prior to selection of the Habits of Mind? The research question had two supporting questions. The first was: As perceived by the teachers, what programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 4 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). All of the 14 teachers who met the selection criterion responded to this question.

A dichotomy was noted in responses; of the 14 participants, seven (50%) stated the perception that no other programs were considered prior to implementing the Habits of Mind (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) character development program. Six participants, however, cited numerous programs or approaches they believed were considered: (a) positive behavioral intervention and supports, (b) the highly effective
teaching model (Center for Effective Learning, 2014), (c) applied behavioral analysis (Hess, Magnuson, & Beeler, 2011), (d) various lessons taught by the guidance teacher, (e) Botvin LifeSkills (National Health Promotion Associates, 2015), and (f) the various behavior plans and rules used in individual classrooms. A final participant additionally indicated the following: “Honestly, there have been so many different character building programs that I find myself lost in the waves of trend based educational character building programs.”

The second subquestion used to answer the input question was: As perceived by the principal, what programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 4 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A. The principal indicated that, “The Leader in Me (Covey, Covey, Summers, & Hatch, 2014) and the highly effective teaching model (Center for Effective Learning, 2014) were considered prior to developing the Habits of Mind program.”

**The Implementation of the Program**

Process Question 1 was as follows: Are the various components of the Habits of Mind program implemented as designed? This research question had three supporting questions. The first was: What do archival data indicate regarding whether the components of the Habits of Mind program were implemented as designed? This subquestion was answered by analyzing archival data reflecting professional-development activities and resources for each of the 6 years of program implementation within the target elementary school. In reflection of the IPA method of data analysis (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2010; Moustakas, 1994), program activities, resources, and time periods are summarized in Tables C1 through C6 in Appendix C.
Professional-development activities and resources. Year 1 of the implementation, which occurred in July of the 2008-2009 school year, began when the leadership team, consisting of the school principal, assistant principal, the guidance counselor, and one teacher within each grade level, attended a 6-hour training concerning the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). The editors of the program presented the training using oral presentations accompanied by PowerPoint slides. No handouts were provided. Attendees were provided a copy of the book entitled, *Learning and Leading With Habits of Mind: 16 Essential Characteristics for Success* (Costa & Kallick, 2009b).

In August 2008, members of the leadership team collaboratively provided the school’s teaching staff with a 2-hour professional development presenting the major concepts of the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) using *Learning and Leading With Habits of Mind: 16 Essential Characteristics for Success* (Costa & Kallick, 2009b), which was the book provided during the leadership training. Presenters used PowerPoint slides to briefly demonstrate the program as a method for students to learn to behave more intelligently. Teachers were assured that, in many instances, they were already promoting the 16 habits comprising the program in their classrooms yet needed a common language for framing these habits throughout the school community. The remainder of the presentation, which was the only professional development that occurred during the inaugural year, was devoted to describing the 16 habits central to the program:

1. Persisting: Stick to it! This habit emphasizes the importance of trying different strategies, finding different ways to reach one’s goals, and remaining focused on the goal (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).
2. Managing impulsivity: Take your time! This habit underscores the importance of thinking before acting, choosing a response before responding, and allowing thinking and waiting time prior to responding (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

3. Thinking flexibly: Look at it another way! This habit consists of five points: (a) looking at something one way and imagining it a different way; (b) being open to alternatives, differences, and change; (c) approaching problems from a different angle; (d) redefining the problem; and (e) be willing to listen to logical responses of others in reevaluating one’s decision (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

4. Listening with empathy and understanding: Understand others! This habit emphasizes the importance of understanding another person’s viewpoint and emotions. The habit additionally encourages individuals to consider summarizing the opinions of others prior to making a decision (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

5. Striving for accuracy: Check it again! This habit is comprised of five major points. The first is to strive to be one’s personal best. The second is to set high standards, and the third is to perform better each time. The fourth point is to review prior performance and look for ways to constantly improve. The final action involves determining whether a satisfactory performance is good enough or whether performance could have been better (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

6. Thinking about your thinking: Know your knowing! This habit underscores the importance of (a) being aware of one’s thoughts, strategies, feelings, and actions; (b) understanding what works and what doesn’t work when considering responses; and (c) using metacognitive awareness to reflect on the ways in which problems were solved in the past (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

7. Questioning and posing problems: How do you know? This habit consists of
four points: (a) having a questioning attitude, (b) remembering how situations appeared when one was 5 years of age, (c) knowing what information is needed to solve a problem, and (d) developing questioning strategies to identify the needed data (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

8. Applying past knowledge to new situations: Use what you learn! Two points comprise this habit. The first is the importance of accessing prior knowledge. The second is for one to take the knowledge beyond the original situation in which it was learned and apply what was learned to the present situation (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

9. Thinking and communicating with clarity and precision: Be clear! This habit emphasizes three behaviors: (a) avoiding generalizations and unclear language, (b) being accurate when talking and writing information, and (c) avoiding generalizations and distortions (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

10. Creating, imagining, and innovating: Try a different way! Two points comprise this habit. The first is to generate new ideas as often as possible. The second is to remember always to be original (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

11. Taking responsible risks: Venture out! This habit underscores four unique points: (a) setting high goals, (b) trying something new, (c) going outside one’s comfort zone to grow as a person, and (d) measuring the risks in advance (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

12. Gathering data through all senses: Use your natural pathways! This habit consists of three recommended behaviors: The first includes tasting, smelling, touching, moving, listening, and seeing. The second is gathering different kinds of data prior to making one’s decision. The third is learning by using all senses to gather information (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).
13. Thinking independently: Work together! This habit emphasizes the importance of teamwork. In order to be an effective team member, one must work with others collaboratively and learn from others while interacting (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

14. Finding humor: Laugh a little! Two points comprise this habit. The first is to be able to see the funny side of things while also developing the ability to laugh at oneself. The second is to avoid criticizing someone else (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

15. Responding with wonderment and awe: Have fun figuring it out! Through this habit, individuals are encouraged to be passionate, amazed, and intrigued. Enjoying what one does is also recommended (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

16. Remaining open to continuous learning: Having so much more to learn! This habit was described as the opposite of being arrogant. Rather than believing one knows everything, the habit encourages one to keep an open mind, learn more, and constantly improve oneself (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).

Throughout the school year, members of the leadership team led a book study using Learning and Leading With Habits of Mind: 16 Essential Characteristics for Success (Costa & Kallick, 2009b). The activities occurred in small groups, and each member of the leadership team led a group. The book study was conducted in 1-hour segments, at the conclusion of monthly faculty meetings, over the 9-month school year.

In addition to the 9 hours that teachers spent in small-group discussions during the school year, members of the leadership team selected one habit to emphasize throughout the school community during each 2-week period of time. For 32 weeks, one habit was the focus in school newsletters, morning announcements, and the marquee in the hallway.
The estimated time spent in morning announcements regarding the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was 3 minutes per day, for a total of 8 hours over the school year. At the conclusion of the school year, members of the leadership team met for 1 hour to plan the next steps in the implementation process. The total time dedicated to the initial implementation of the program was 26 hours.

**2009-2010 school year.** During the summer months preceding the school year, high school art students painted murals throughout the school facility to depict the 16 habits comprising the program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). In the beginning of the school year, which was the second year of program implementation, members of the leadership team presented the original PowerPoint to introduce the program to the four new faculty members. Although no book study was provided for these four teachers, the leadership team expanded the presentation to 4 hours to ensure the program was well communicated. For the second year of program implementation, members of the leadership team selected one habit to emphasize throughout the school community during each 2-week period of time. For 32 weeks, one habit was the focus in school newsletters, morning announcements, and the marquee in the hallway. The estimated time spent in morning announcements regarding the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was 3 minutes per day, for a total of 8 hours over the school year.

As a schoolwide art project, students created bricks, in reflection of the 16 habits, for placement in the school foyer. Students additionally created pictures of the 16 target habits for display throughout the school. At the conclusion of the school year, members of the leadership team met for 1 hour to plan the next steps in the implementation process for the upcoming school year. The total time dedicated to the program during the school year, not counting instructional time during art class, was 13 hours.
**2010-2011 school year.** At the beginning of the third year of program implementation, members of the leadership team presented the PowerPoint used in Year 1 to the four newest faculty members. Although no book study was provided for these four teachers, the leadership team expanded the presentation to 3 hours to ensure that program components were clearly communicated. Members of the leadership team additionally provided a 2-hour overview to returning teachers.

A new PowerPoint was used during the presentation. In addition to the 16 habits outlined in program resources, the leadership team identified *excellence* as the 17th habit. This habit was not part of the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b); instead, excellence was identified by the leadership team as a schoolwide emphasis that combined thinking, behavior, and academic performance (school principal, personal communication, November 18, 2014). The leadership team used the PowerPoint presentation to underscore the importance of the (a) 16 habits comprising the habits of mind program, (b) relationship between discipline and academics, (c) importance of using a common language when establishing behavioral and academic expectations, (d) role of humor as an essential characteristic of intelligence, and (e) application of the initial 16 habits among students as well as adults to create a schoolwide learning culture.

As in the previous 2 years, members of the leadership team selected one habit to emphasize throughout the school community during each 2-week period of time. For 32 weeks, one habit was the focus in school newsletters, morning announcements, and the marquee in the hallway. The estimated time spent in morning announcements regarding the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was 3 minutes per day, for a total of 8 hours over the school year.

As a schoolwide science project, students planted 16 trees in the school courtyard,
with each representing one of the 16 Habits of Mind (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). A plaque identifying one habit was placed next to each tree. As a schoolwide art project, students drew pictures explaining the 16 target habits and placed them near the school murals depicting the habits. At the conclusion of the school year, members of the leadership team attended a 6-hour refresher course in the program. The total time dedicated to the program during the school year, not counting science and art instructional time, was 19 hours.

**2011-2012 school year.** At the beginning of the fourth year of program implementation, members of the leadership team presented the PowerPoints used in Years 1 and 3 to the two newest faculty members. Although no book study was provided for these four teachers, the leadership team expanded the presentation to 3 hours to ensure that program components were well communicated. Again using the initial PowerPoint, members of the leadership team additionally provided a 2-hour overview to returning teachers.

As also occurred in the previous 3 years, members of the leadership team selected one habit to emphasize throughout the school community during each 2-week period of time. For 32 weeks, one habit was the focus in school newsletters, morning announcements, and the marquee in the hallway. The estimated time spent in morning announcements regarding the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was 3 minutes per day, for a total of 8 hours over the school year. As a schoolwide art project, students drew pictures reflecting the 16 habits for placement near the murals throughout the school. At the conclusion of the school year, members of the leadership team met for 2 hours to plan the next implementation steps for the upcoming school year. The total time dedicated to the program during the school year, excluding
time in art classes, was 15 hours.

**2012-2013 school year.** At the beginning of the fifth year of program implementation, members of the leadership team presented the PowerPoints used in Years 1 and 3 as a 1-hour overview to returning teachers. This brief presentation was possible because no new teachers had joined the faculty this year. Students again created pictures of the 16 target habits for display throughout the school.

As also occurred in the previous 4 years, members of the leadership team selected one habit to emphasize throughout the school community during each 2-week period of time. For 32 weeks, one habit was the focus in school newsletters, morning announcements, and the marquee in the hallway. The estimated time spent in morning announcements regarding the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was 3 minutes per day, for a total of 8 hours over the school year. At the conclusion of the school year, members of the leadership team met for 2 hours to plan the next implementation steps for the upcoming school year. The total time dedicated to the program during the school year was 11 hours.

**2013-2014 school year.** At the beginning of Year 6 of program implementation, members of the leadership team presented the PowerPoints used in Years 1 and 3 as a 1-hour overview to returning teachers. As in the prior year, this brief presentation was possible because no new teachers had joined the faculty for this year. Students again created pictures of the 16 target habits for display throughout the school.

As also occurred in the previous 5 years, members of the leadership team selected one habit to emphasize throughout the school community during each 2-week period of time. For 32 weeks, one habit was the focus in school newsletters, morning announcements, and the marquee in the hallway. The estimated time spent in morning
announcements regarding the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was 3 minutes per day, for a total of 8 hours over the school year. At the conclusion of the school year, members of the leadership team met for 2 hours to consider an alternative character development program for the upcoming school year and to identify the correlations between the two programs. The total time dedicated to the Habits of Mind program during the school year was 9 hours.

Teacher perceptions. The second supporting question for Process Question 1 was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the Habits of Mind? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 5 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). Of the 21 teachers who met the selection criterion, 18 responded to this question.

Teacher responses were useful in identifying numerous perceptions related to the program components. One teacher, for example, responded as follows: “I felt that it was a good way to implement and model character traits. We emphasized that the character traits were not only useful in the school setting but also as a part of everyday life.” Another cited the weekly spotlights in the school newsletter and explained, “These set the tone for not only students and teachers but also parents.” One teacher described different program components by expressing, “We incorporated the program into our daily lessons. Students recited the habits, posters were displayed, and bricks were placed in front of the school that displayed each habit.”

Other teachers limited their responses to stating only their perceptions of the program implementation. Several supported the implementation; as one stated, “My perception is that the rollout was successful and handled appropriately.” Another replied, “I perceive the implementation was successful.” One other expressed the following
perception: “The implementation should be effective when used properly and the whole school community is involved.” Another similarly reported, “When used correctly, the program is a great tool to aid students in becoming successful academically and behaviorally.” A teacher stated, “I found it to be manageable and effective with my students and grade-level team. We were consistent and true to the program.” One added the following thought: “I think the program became effective when teachers focused on infusing the components into the curriculum as opposed to teaching them in isolation. It was great because it was relevant for teachers as well as students.” Another remarked, “The program components were viable and highly effective.” One other replied, “The habits were integrated in such a way that they became a part of our culture.” One teacher expressed the belief that, “The program components were beneficial to students.” Another offered the following thoughts: “I think that having the entire school introducing the same habit at one time was effective at getting teachers to buy in to the program.” As a final contribution, a teacher remarked, “The components fit easily into what we teach.”

Other teachers, however, were less supportive of the program implementation. One of the teachers expressed the concern that, “The program was implemented at the same time as the Common Core Standards (Achieve, Inc., 2013) were. This seems like too much to introduce to the students so close together.” One simply stated, “Not sure.” One of the teachers remarked, “The implementation of the program was an easy process; however, it is challenging to ensure that students fully understand what each habit means.” Another cited the following challenges:

My perception was that the implementation was challenging because it required me to change the way I thought and talked. I had to let Habits of Mind begin within me. Once this change took place in me, then it overflowed to my students.

Principal perceptions. The third supporting question for Process Question 1 was:
What are the principal’s perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the habits of Mind? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 5 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). To this question, the principal replied, “My compliments to the leadership team! Program components were rolled out in an organized and intentional manner to enable everyone to manage small aspects of the program and then grow into full program implementation.”

The Sufficiency of Staff Development and Resources for Implementing the Program

Process Question 2 was as follows: Did the school staff receive sufficient staff development and resources in order to implement the Habits of Mind program as designed? This research question had three supporting questions. The first question was: What do archival data indicate regarding the professional-development activities and resources that were provided? This subquestion was answered by analyzing archival data reflecting professional-development activities and resources for each of the 6 years of program implementation and then comparing the activities and resources with program materials (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009a, 2009b).

Although members of the leadership team provided training to incoming faculty members and refresher training to existing teachers each year, the two PowerPoints were developed by members of the leadership team. The initial training provided through the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development to members of the leadership team involved a PowerPoint and an overview of one book entitled, Learning and Leading With Habits of Mind: 16 Essential Characteristics for Success (Costa & Kallick, 2009b). The leadership team then used the book to lead a book study during the school year when the program was initially implemented.

Two earlier books were published (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b), yet these
books were not used in any training efforts relative to the program. A subsequent publication (Costa & Kallick, 2009a) presented various related strategies for the use of teachers, but this book was not provided to faculty members through the school library or relative to any training sessions. No implementation manual for school leaders has been published; moreover, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development does not offer customized assistance in the initial program implementation (school principal, personal communication, December 4, 2014). Based upon a comparison of archival data indicating the professional-development activities and resources provided to teachers and the complete set of program activities and resources (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009a, 2009b), the data indicated that it was the efforts of the school leadership team that enabled teachers to incorporate the program within their classrooms and throughout the school.

The second supporting question for Process Question 2 was: What are the teachers’ perceptions concerning the professional-development activities and resources provided? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 6 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B). Of the 21 teachers who met the selection criterion, 17 responded to this question.

Many of the participants expressed the perceptions that they were provided sufficient training and ample resources. One participant stated, “I was given lots of professional development and resources for successfully implementing the program.” One other teacher offered that, “I was able to connect the professional development to classroom learning.” One described the resources by stating, “We were given books and posters. We had visual cues, like bricks and trees, as well. Also, the program was talked about in some faculty meetings.” Another responded, “The resources were very helpful.
The school also provided teachers with posters, professional development, and reading resources for assisting students in applying the habits to their everyday lives.” One teacher similarly stated, “Resources and professional development were sufficient—ample as well as effective.” Another pointed out that, “Most of the professional development was provided by faculty members; this proved to be effective for our school.” The final participant who was complimentary of the preparatory experiences offered the following: “Having the resources, such as the school newsletters, at our disposal was very helpful.”

Other participants, though, reported the belief that either the training or the resources were less effective than desired. One, for example, replied, “The professional development could’ve been better” yet provided no supporting text. One other similarly stated, “More professional development could have been provided.” Another expressed, “More related resources could have been provided to effectively implement the program.” As one teacher remarked, “I think we could have had more professional development throughout the year. We did more during the summer and not much during the year.” One other indicated, “There could have been more professional development involving the habits.”

Another contributed additional concerns: “It is my belief that training should have been revisited as we developed different levels of implementation. I also believe we were negligent in fully training new teachers.” One teacher additionally responded that, “The faculty and staff were not given the professional development they needed to make the program effective.” Another teacher reported similar concerns: “The professional development could have been improved with additional training and resources.” One teacher went into more detail: “Professional development was done over several weeks
but needed to continue throughout the school year. I’m not certain how many teachers actually taught the lessons.” Concerns over the facilitator were expressed by one teacher: “The professional development during the summer was okay, but our facilitator was not very engaging and at times was offensive.”

The third supporting question for Process Question 2 was: What are the principal’s perceptions concerning the professional-development activities and resources provided? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 6 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The principal responded as follows: “The professional development was thorough, informative, and presented in a way that engaged attendees and supplied reasonable answers to all questions. However, I’ve not found the program to be operating at a credible level. Yes, it makes good sense, but as a solid and respected application within schools, the supplemental material and program support just are not there.”

**Program Impact on Academic Achievement and Discipline**

Product Question 1 was as follows: What is the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student academic achievement and discipline? This research question had three supporting questions. The first was: Based on empirical data, what impact does the Habits of Mind program have on student achievement and discipline? This subquestion was answered by analyzing reading performance of students in Grades 3 through 5 on the PASS assessment from 2009 through 2014 and discipline referrals beginning with the 2008-2009 school year and continuing through the 2013-2014 school year.

Results from the PASS are divided into three categories: (a) not meeting standards, (b) meeting standards, and (c) exemplary performance (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011). To analyze student performance, the researcher
calculated the percent of students meeting or exceeding standards for the (a) whole group within each grade level, (b) subgroup of low SES within each grade level, and (c) gender subgroups within each grade level (see Tables C7 through C9 in Appendix C).

Overall, the reading performance of students in Grades 3 and 4 improved over the 6 years of program implementation. For fifth-grade students, performance did not follow the same trend. Although the percentage of low SES students meeting or exceeding reading standards increased by one point and the subgroup of males increased by four points, performance of the whole group of students and female subgroup regressed over the period (see Tables C7 through C9 in Appendix C). Performance trends within each grade level more specifically reflected the following:

1. At the third-grade level, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding reading standards increased over the 6-year period by (a) 16 points within the whole group of students, (b) 10 points for students of low SES, (c) 18 points among males, and (d) five points among females (see Table C7 in Appendix C).

2. At the fourth-grade level, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding reading standards increased over the 6-year period by (a) eight points within the whole group of students, (b) nine points for students of low SES, (c) 11 points among males, and (d) one point among females (see Table C8 in Appendix C).

3. Fifth-grade performance reflected that the percentage of students meeting or exceeding reading standards increased over the 6-year period for students of low SES, by one point, and by four points for the male subgroup. Conversely, performance of the whole group of students regressed over the period by two points. Performance of the female subgroup regressed by five points.

The fourth source of data consisted of deidentified discipline referrals. These data
were categorized per year and by grade level, beginning with the 2008-2009 school year and continuing through the 2013-2014 school year. All identifying information, such as student names, identification numbers, and demographic information, was removed before acquisition. For each year, the researcher calculated the number of discipline referrals, by grade level, to determine whether any performance trends existed (see Table C10 in Appendix C).

Analysis of the enrollment within all grade levels reflected that enrollment was relatively stable from year to year, thus increasing the confidence that fluctuations in the number of discipline referrals issued each year were meaningful data (see Table C10 in Appendix C). Overall, the number of referrals issued to students in kindergarten through the second grade was lower in the first years of program implementation. Conversely, the number of referrals issued to students in Grades 3 through 5 was higher in the first 2 years of program implementation. Although data for fourth-grade students do not demonstrate a specific trend, by Year 6 the number of referrals at this grade level also had decreased (see Table C10 in Appendix C). Performance trends within each grade level are as follows:

1. In Years 1 through 4 of program implementation, the number of discipline referrals for kindergarten students continually decreased. Year 5, however, reflected a noteworthy increase prior to decreasing again in Year 6 (see Table C10 in Appendix C).

2. Years 2 through 5 of program implementation reflected the lowest number of discipline referrals for first-grade students. A noteworthy increase, though, was reflected in Year 6 (see Table C10 in Appendix C).

3. As also noted in the data regarding first-grade students, Years 2 through 5 of program implementation reflected the lowest number of discipline referrals for second-
grade students. A noteworthy increase, however, was reflected in Year 6 (see Table C10 in Appendix C).

4. Third-grade students received more discipline referrals in Year 1 of program implementation than in any of the 6 years. The number of referrals issued in Year 6 represented a 55% reduction from those issued in Year 1 (see Table C10 in Appendix C).

5. No specific pattern was noted in the number of discipline referrals teachers issued for fourth-grade students over the 6 years of program implementation. The highest number of referrals was issued in Years 2 and 5 (see Table C10 in Appendix C).

6. Teachers issued the highest number of discipline referrals for fifth-grade students in Years 1 and 2 of program implementation. The number of referrals issued in Years 3 through 6 was relatively stable (see Table C10 in Appendix C).

The second supporting question for Product Question 1 was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement and discipline? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Items 7 and 8 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B).

Of the 21 teachers who met the selection criterion, 13 responded to Item 7. Eight (62%) of the 13 teachers expressed the belief that the program had a positive impact on academic achievement. As one stated, “Student achievement increased, because students understood how to use their character traits to enhance personal achievement.” Another added, “There was an increase in student achievement because students became more accountable.” One teacher remarked, “We saw an increase in standardized test scores in certain areas.” Another described the impact in this way: “I found it to be an asset to the growth and mindset of my students.” One other teacher remarked, “Our school data reflected an increase in academic achievement.” One teacher contributed the following
response: “Student scores increased because students began to take ownership of their learning.” The teacher with the most complimentary perceptions reported the following:

The impact of Habits of Mind on student achievement was amazing. Students were able and willing to think differently. They were no longer reproducing information but were acting on what they learned. They also became flexible in their thinking. The learning had come alive in them! Student achievement soared!

Another offered similar remarks:

I believe the impact was tremendous! It was remarkable to hear students of all ages using the language in a variety of ways. Habits of Mind leveled the playing field between high and low students, which boosted the confidence of lower-performing students.

Other teachers relayed the belief that the program had limited, if any, impact on academic achievement. Five (38%) of the 13 teachers expressed this perception. One, for example, stated, “The program provided no substantial impact on student achievement.” Another maintained, “I do now know if it helped but, if so, it was very little.” Another remarked, “I feel that the impact on student achievement was insufficient.” One other said, “Although the program may have had some success in terms of academics, it did not have the impact I expected.” Another brought up a challenge by expressing, “I am not certain there was an impact on student achievement. And how does a school determine that one program impacts student achievement when more than one program is implemented at the same time?”

Item 8 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B) was as follows: What are your perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student discipline? All of the 21 teachers who met the selection criterion responded to this question. Twelve (57%) expressed the belief that the program had a positive impact on student discipline. Three responded alike by expressing, “There was a decrease in discipline issues.” As the fourth teacher stated, “Habits of Mind made a positive impact on discipline because students
began reflecting about their behavior before acting.” Another similarly stated, “Habits of Mind gave students a process for how to think before they misbehaved.” One teacher remarked, “I think students learned skills to help control impulsivity.” Another described the perceived program impact in the following way: “I found it to be an asset to my students.” One other teacher remarked, “As I understand, the number of discipline problems decreased with program implementation.” One teacher contributed the following response: “With Habits of Mind, students responded to conflict by talking and thinking it through.” Again citing impulsivity, a teacher expressed the belief that, “Students are becoming accustomed to managing their impulsivity.” The teacher with the most positive perceptions reported the following:

With Habits of Mind, students understood themselves better. They are now able to control and handle situations that caused discipline issues in the past. They are able to manage their impulsivity, and this reduced the number of discipline referrals. Students were also able to communicate with clarity and precision, and this enabled them to talk about what was bothering them instead of reacting first.

Another offered similar remarks involving the impact of the program:

I think the Habits of Mind will have a positive impact on student discipline. The students take on leadership roles in their classrooms and throughout the school. Hopefully they will positively impact each other and strive to become better citizens in the school.

Two (9%) expressed uncertainty as to whether the program positively impacted student discipline. The first replied, “The program may have helped a little.” The second expressed the following similar belief: “Student discipline improved somewhat.”

Other teachers relayed the belief that the program had limited impact on student discipline; seven (33%) of the 21 teachers expressed this perception. One, for example, stated, “I don’t feel the program had an impact on discipline. It was not a part of their everyday conversations, so they did not take it seriously.” As another expressed, “The
program had no substantial impact on discipline.” One teacher further remarked, “I’m not sure that the program helped my students with behavior.” One other said, “If the program were routinely utilized, then it could have a positive impact on student discipline. That was not the case, however.” Another suggested the program implementation was less than successful by expressing, “If students truly understood the habits and the meaning of each, it would have a great impact on positive behavior.” One other teacher responded by offering the following thought: “There should be favorable effects, but all students did not participate in the positive aspects of the program.” The final teacher who expressed the belief that the program had limited impact on student discipline contributed several thoughts:

The Habits of Mind program can definitely assist in the student-discipline process, but it cannot be the only resource used. In order for the program to have an impact on student discipline, the students must be dedicated to the process to the point that they can identify with the habits. This, in my opinion, did not occur.

The third supporting question for Product Question 1 was: What are the principal’s perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement and discipline? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s responses to Items 7 and 8 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The principal replied as follows: “Based on student performance on assessments, I believe students were positively affected by the program and that their schoolwork was improved. I am not certain there is a direct correlation between the implementation of the program and student discipline.”

Unanticipated Effects of the Program

Product Question 2 was as follows: What are any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? This research question had two supporting questions. The first
was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 9 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B).

Of the 21 teachers who met the selection criterion, eight responded to this question. Two responses were in reference to effects of the program on the parents of students. One, for example, remarked, “I think that some parents tried to support the habits at home because of the home contacts that were sent by some teachers.” The second teacher referring to the impact of the program on parents expressed the following perception: “Unanticipated effects of the program involve the application of the program within students’ homes. Both students and parents began using the language.”

The remaining six responses collectively addressed negative perceptions involving the unanticipated effects of the program. As one teacher stated, “I think the implementation of the program added more to the teachers’ workload than the amount of positive results we’ve seen were worth.” Another faulted the overall implementation of the program by stating, “Implementing the program would have been better if there had been a clear and concise implementation plan.” Another similarly suggested that, “Not knowing the true meaning of each habit would result in confusion and misconceptions.”

One teacher cited concerns involving student behavior that may have been an unanticipated effect of the program. This individual stated, “There was more bullying from the low-level students to the middle- and upper-level students who became self-absorbed and reclusive trying to demonstrate that they were so smart.”

Reflecting a different perception, two teachers faulted the manner in which teachers implemented the program in their classrooms. As one suggested, “Teachers focused on just a few habits rather than all. They would begin using the habits as
discipline tactics instead of encouraging students to make the habits part of their lifestyle.” Sharing similar thoughts, another replied, “Managing impulsivity became a popular focus around the school. Teachers used it as a blanket term to mean students should stop whatever they were doing. The term soon lost its meaning.”

The second supporting question for Product Question 2 was: What are the principal’s perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 9 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). To this question, the principal responded as follows: “None noted!”

**Sustainability of Program Components**

Product Question 3 was as follows: Should the various components of the Habits of Mind program be sustained? This research question had two supporting questions. The first was: Based on the teachers’ perceptions, what components of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Item 10 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B).

Of the 21 teachers who met the selection criterion, 10 responded to this question. Four teachers provided short responses such as, “None,” “I don’t think so,” and “Not at this time.”

Six of the 10, however, referenced a change in administration and the subsequent departure from the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). As one teacher stated, “Our school is no longer focusing on the program. Instead, the leadership team is considering other programs the new administration favors.” Another teacher indicated that, “Many teachers continue to use the vocabulary even though the program is not promoted on a schoolwide basis any longer.” A third response was as
follows: “I thought the program was easily sustainable and cost-effective, but the new administration wants other programs to be considered in lieu of the Habits of Mind.” A similar response was provided by another teacher who stated, “I think the program needs to be continued, but the school emphasis just isn’t there.” One other teacher suggested that the implementation should be fully sustained even though another program may also be added. This teacher additionally cited concerns that, “The workload on teachers may become more than we can handle trying to manage two programs, yet I hate to give up Habits of Mind.” The final related response was as follows:

I think all components of habits of mind should be sustained. I think teachers and students should be held accountable for how they are infusing the habits into daily life at school. We immersed our students in these habits, and it was evident that the students knew and applied the terms. I just wish the new administration would consider these benefits before pulling their support from the program.

The second supporting question for Product Question 3 was: What are the principal’s perceptions of whether the various components of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s response to Item 10 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). To this question, the principal replied as follows:

I am uncertain. Some teachers believe that the program provides students opportunities to develop their cognitive skills and increases their capacity to self-manage, both of which are valuable within the educational process. Others, however, and particularly those on the leadership team, feel that it’s worthwhile to explore other programs to see if they may be more effective with our student population.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program**

Product Question 4 was as follows: What are any strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? This research question had two supporting questions. The first was: What are the teachers’ perceptions of the strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of
Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing teachers’ responses to Items 11 and 12 on the questionnaire (see Appendix B).

Item 11 of the questionnaire (see Appendix B) was: What are your perceptions of the strengths of the Habits of Mind program? Of the 21 teachers who met the selection criterion, all responded to this question, yet 17 provided brief answers. Six of the 17 cited the benefits of applying the habits. Five others noted that the program teaches students how to think before reacting. Three emphasized the common vocabulary, and three others stated that use of the program improved academic performance.

The remaining four teachers shared a variety of responses. As one stated, “The program has potential if teachers were allowed adequate time to implement it. Unfortunately, that would be at the expense of preparing for standardized tests.” Another teacher cited the concern that, “We did not maintain the program long enough to see full results.” A third teacher expressed the belief that, “Character begins at home. We can only do so much as educators.” The final teacher responding to this question stated, “I saw a great change in student confidence. They all seem to hold their heads a little higher when using terms related to the program.”

Item 12 of the questionnaire (see Appendix B) was: What are your perceptions of the weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? Of the 21 teachers who met the selection criterion, 14 responded to this question. Six of the responses highlighted concerns about the habits central to the program. As one teacher stated, “The habits can be overwhelming. I think there should be an elementary curriculum.” One other similarly maintained that, “There were teachers who didn’t fully implement the program because they didn’t feel like their students were capable of using the language.” Another similarly criticized the terminology of the program by stating that, “The language of the program is
not child friendly.” A fourth teacher expressed the belief that, “There were too many habits for elementary-aged students to comprehend.” A related response was that, “Some of the habits are too abstract and are not very relevant or applicable.” The final response involving the language was, “I think some of the habits are redundant. They could be merged for more effectiveness.”

Two teachers cited the time required to implement the program. As one briefly stated, “There’s not enough time to implement the program.” The second teacher expressed the belief that, “Teacher time to implement and teacher commitment just did not exist.”

A similar response involved the perception that, “The requirement to implement the Common Core Standards at the same time as implementing Habits of Mind was just too much. We can only absorb so many priorities!” Another teacher, also concerned about the implementation period, explained the following: “It’s difficult to fully assess the impact of the program since its use was used short term.” The lack of program resources was cited by one teacher who remarked, “There needs to be more resources available if we are to effectively implement the program.”

The remaining three responses involved faculty members of the school. As one stated, “The weakness of the program was the lack of teacher retention. Because of this, professional development must be ongoing.” A second teacher explained, “Several teachers never promoted the program as they should have.” A third offered the following:

The primary weakness of the program was in the attitude of the faculty. It became one more thing for teachers to do and less work for the administrative staff. Use of the program did not deter discipline problems. It seemed to lessen discipline referrals, though, because teachers were not sending students to the office. Their belief was that discipline referrals, or the schoolwide discipline plan itself, was not being enforced. Instead, administrators expected teachers to manage discipline problems within their classroom. As a result, teachers did not receive adequate
support to ensure appropriate discipline within their classrooms.

The second supporting question for Product Question 4 was: What are the principal’s perceptions of the strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? This subquestion was answered by analyzing the principal’s responses to Items 11 and 12 on the questionnaire (see Appendix A). In response, the principal remarked, “The program supports the school’s efforts to provide students the necessary skills for developing their characters and increasing learning.” In agreement with some of teacher responses, the principal cited the number of habits central to the program and stated, “This is the only area of the program that gives me cause for pause.”
Chapter 5: Discussion

This concluding chapter begins with an overview of the evaluation involving the Habits of Mind character education program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). An elaboration and interpretation of results derived from the program evaluation is then provided. Conclusions, which were drawn from the analysis of results, are presented next. After identifying the limitations of the study, the researcher presents recommendations for the consideration of school administrators. The final section provides additional recommendations for future research.

Overview of the Applied Dissertation

This investigation was a summative program evaluation designed to inform instructional and leadership practices involving the Habits of Mind character education program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) within a suburban elementary school located in the southeastern United States. The program was implemented in the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year and had just completed its 6th year of implementation at the time this evaluation was conducted. The research was guided by the following research questions, some of which incorporated subquestions, categorized within the context, input, process, and product components of the CIPP evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007).

Context Research Question 1. What are the identified students’ academic and disciplinary issues initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program? Two subquestions were helpful in gathering data to support the context. The first was as follows: What are the principal’s perceptions about student academic and discipline problems initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program? The second subquestion was: What are the teachers’ perceptions about student academic and
discipline problems initially establishing a need for the Habits of Mind program?

**Context Research Question 2.** What procedures were involved in the initial implementation of the Habits of Mind program? Two subquestions provided data to support the context research question. The first was as follows: As perceived by the teachers, what procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program? The second subquestion was: As perceived by the principal, what procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program?

**Input research question.** Which programs were examined prior to selection of the Habits of Mind? The input research question had two supporting questions. The first was as follows: As perceived by the teachers, what programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind? The second subquestion was: As perceived by the principal, what programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind?

**Process Research Question 1.** Are the various components of the Habits of Mind program implemented as designed? This process research question had three supporting questions:

1. What do archival data indicate regarding whether the components of the Habits of Mind program were implemented as designed?
2. What are the teachers’ perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the Habits of Mind?
3. What are the principal’s perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the habits of Mind?

**Process Research Question 2.** Did the school staff receive sufficient staff development and resources in order to implement the Habits of Mind program as
designed? This process research question had three supporting questions:

1. What do archival data indicate regarding the professional-development activities and resources that were provided?

2. What are the teachers’ perceptions concerning the professional-development activities and resources provided?

3. What are the principal’s perceptions concerning the professional-development activities and resources provided?

**Product Research Question 1.** What is the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student academic achievement and discipline? This product research question had three supporting questions:

1. Based on empirical data, what impact does the Habits of Mind program have on student achievement and discipline?

2. What are the teachers’ perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement and discipline?

3. What are the principal’s perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement and discipline?

**Product Research Question 2.** What are any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? This product research question had two supporting questions. The first was as follows: What are the teachers’ perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? The second was: What are the principal’s perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program?

**Product Research Question 3.** Should the various components of the Habits of Mind program be sustained? This product research question had two supporting questions. The first was as follows: Based on the teachers’ perceptions, what components
of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained? The second subquestion was: What are the principal’s perceptions of whether the various components of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained?

**Product Research Question 4.** What are any strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? This product research question had two supporting questions. The first was as follows: What are the teachers’ perceptions of the strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? The second subquestion was: What are the principal’s perceptions of the strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program?

**Elaboration and Interpretation of Results**

**Academic and disciplinary issues establishing the need for the program.** Context Question 1 was as follows: What are the identified students’ academic and disciplinary issues initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program? Subquestions were designed to identify the related perceptions of the school principal and the 14 teachers who were employed at the target school when the program was implemented. Analysis of the data supported the identification of five themes involving academic issues and collectively underscoring the belief that students needed to improve their (a) intrinsic motivation, (b) critical-thinking skills, (c) engagement in the learning process, (d) confidence, and (e) academic achievement. Prior to implementation, participants expected the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) would provide the platform for promoting related strategies.

Analysis of the data was also helpful in identifying five themes involving behavioral issues and underscoring the need for students to develop skills for (a) self-managing through self-reflection, (b) thinking before reacting, (c) understanding cause and effect, (d) achieving goals, and (e) managing impulsivity. Through their responses,
teachers additionally described the school setting as one wherein students lacked respect for authority, adults, and peers; consequently, the school climate was “not a place where students could thrive.” Teachers also reported that the schoolwide discipline plan was a reactive approach causing students not to be “not worried about the consequences of their actions.”

**Procedures involved in the initial implementation of the program.** Context Question 2 was as follows: What procedures were involved in the initial implementation of the Habits of Mind program? Subquestions were designed to identify the related perceptions of the school principal and the 14 teachers who were employed at the target school when the program was implemented. Analysis of the data reflected that the program was methodically implemented through (a) members of the leadership team attending training conferences, visiting other schools wherein the program was implemented, and subsequently training teachers at the school; (b) preimplementation occurring among selected, high-performing students prior to schoolwide implementation; (c) the use of a book club for training teachers throughout the school; and (d) an inclusive approach involving the use of the 16 habits within both the academic setting and the behavioral system.

Of particular interest to the researcher were the negative comments expressed by three teachers. Their perceptions were supported through responses involving the belief that the program had been adopted throughout the school district and thus teachers were required to implement related strategies without consideration. A second perception was that one teacher felt the program was, “one more thing for teachers to do.” Moreover, this teacher perceived that the professional development regarding program implementation had been provided for “a select group” and thus the program was less successful than it
otherwise may have been. A third perception was that the training was not provided to support staff, causing one teacher to believe that all staff members were not “included in the program implementation.”

**Alternative programs examined prior to selecting the current program.** The input question was as follows: Which programs were examined prior to selection of the Habits of Mind? Subquestions were designed to identify the related perceptions of the school principal and the 14 teachers who were employed at the target school when the program was implemented. Analysis of the data reflected two distinctively different perceptions. First, the principal and half of the teachers collectively cited several alternative character development programs or approaches that were considered prior to selecting Habits of Mind (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Six (43%) teachers, however, reported that no programs were considered other than Habits of Mind. This perception was further supported by a previous response of a teacher describing the belief that Habits of Mind was adopted throughout the school district and was, therefore, not optional for teachers within the school study site. A final teacher mentioned the feeling of being, “lost in the waves of [the] trend” involving the plentiful number of character development programs.

**The implementation of the program.** Process Question 1 was as follows: Are the various components of the Habits of Mind program implemented as designed? The first subquestion established the need to examine archival data regarding the implementation of program components. Analysis of these data indicated that numerous steps were taken to ensure the program was implemented as designed. In the initial year of implementation, members of the leadership team were trained and then provided similar training to the faculty. In addition to providing teachers a PowerPoint
presentation, the leadership team conducted a 9-month study of the most current program guide (Costa & Kallick, 2009b). To acquaint the broader school community with the program, the 16 habits were highlighted within school newsletters, morning announcements, and the school marquee. At the conclusion of the year, members of the leadership team met to collaboratively discuss the initial implementation and prepare for the following year.

During the subsequent 5 years, new faculty members were trained, program highlights and habits were continuously commemorated (a) within school publications, (b) outside the school facility, and (c) inside the building. The visual art and science curricula were also expanded to provide students opportunities for creatively depicting each of the 16 habits. Incoming teachers were trained each year in the program while members of the leadership team monitored program implementation and collaboratively discussed plans for continuing the program. At the conclusion of the sixth school year involving the exclusive use of Habits of Mind (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b), the leadership team held a planning meeting to consider an alternative character development program for use in the upcoming school year and to identify the correlations between Habits of Mind and the alternative program. In the absence of a training manual, as the researcher expected to identify, it appeared that the program was implemented as designed because the 16 habits were clearly communicated throughout the school community and every teacher received professional-development training to assist in program implementation.

The remaining two subquestions established the need to identify perceptions of the school principal and the 21 teachers employed at the target school when the program was implemented regarding the implementation of program components. Analysis of the
data again reflected a dichotomy of perceptions between two groups of teachers. As the school principal also reported, many of the teachers believed that the various program components were implemented in an organized manner. Teachers additionally indicated that the 16 habits integral to the program were useful in the school setting as well as in everyday life and were equally applicable for students and teachers. School communications, as one teacher reflected, “set the tone for students, teachers, and parents.” Teachers additionally maintained that they infused the program components into the curricula to the point that the 16 habits became part of the school culture.

With differing thoughts, however, some teachers expressed concern about the implementation of the program. Responses supported the existence of two forces within the faculty, with one in favor of the program and the other against. For example, one indicated dismay that the program was implemented along with the Common Core Standards (Achieve, Inc., 2013) and thus was too much to introduce to students simultaneously. Another expressed the belief that, although the implementation was a smooth process, teachers were challenged to ensure that students fully understood the meaning of each habit. Another indicated that the implementation was challenging because, as one teacher described, “I had to change the way I thought and talked. I had to let the Habits of Mind begin within me, and once this change took place it overflowed to my students.”

The sufficiency of staff development and resources for implementing the program. Process Question 2 was as follows: Did the school staff receive sufficient staff development and resources in order to implement the Habits of Mind program as designed? The first subquestion established the need to examine archival data regarding the professional-development activities and related resources. Analysis of these data
indicated that the two PowerPoints used by members of the leadership team for training faculty members were developed by the team rather than by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. The researcher also noted that the membership team used the most current book at that period of time to implement the program within the school study site (Costa & Kallick, 2009b). Another observation was that two earlier books (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b) existed, yet they were not used in any training efforts relative to the program. A year after the program was implemented within the school study site, a subsequent book was published (Costa & Kallick, 2009a) to provide strategies for the use of teachers, yet archived records did not mention this book as a component of the training nor its placement within the school library.

An additional concern is that no implementation manual for school leaders involving the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) has been published; furthermore, the publisher does not provide customized assistance with initial program implementation. The researcher compliments the leadership team for the diligence with which they trained teachers and promoted the 16 habits central to the program throughout the broader school community. These efforts required initiative and diligence on the part of the leadership team as they worked collaboratively with the school principal.

The remaining two subquestions established the need to identify perceptions of the school principal and the 21 teachers employed at the target school when the program was implemented regarding the professional-development activities and related resources. As noted in responses to prior research questions, analysis of the data reflected opposing perceptions between the two groups of teachers; while teachers within one group reported that the training and resources were sufficient, another described these
components as “less effective than desired.” An additional teacher further remarked that the facilitator was “not very engaging and at times was offensive.”

An interest in additional training and related resources also was expressed. One teacher indicated that the training should have been expanded as the school community moved through the different levels of program implementation. Another cited the belief that (a) negligence occurred involving the training of teachers new to the school faculty, (b) additional training and resources were needed throughout the school, and (c) training should have continued throughout the school year. An additional concern became apparent when one teacher stated, “I’m not certain how many teachers actually taught the lessons.” This theme supports questions as to the extent to which the program was implemented within classrooms, a topic that is further established through responses to the product questions of this program evaluation.

**Program impact on academic achievement.** Product Question 1 was as follows: What is the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student academic achievement and discipline? To answer this question, the researcher first analyzed reading performance of students in Grades 3 through 5 on the PASS assessment from 2009 through 2014. To analyze student performance, the researcher calculated the percent of students meeting or exceeding grade-level standards for the (a) whole group of students, (b) subgroup of low SES, and (c) gender subgroups within each grade level. The analysis reflected several trends. First, the overall reading performance of students in Grades 3 and 4 improved over the 6 years of program implementation. Second, analysis of the data pertaining to fifth-grade students reflected that, although the percentage of low SES students and males meeting or exceeding the standards increased over the 6-year period, the increase was relatively small and did not reflect a measurable improvement in reading skills.
At the third-grade level, the largest increase occurred among male students, at 18 percentage points, and within the whole group of students, at 16 percentage points. At the fourth-grade level, the largest increase was again among the male students, at 11 percentage points; for students of low SES, the increase over the 6-year period was nine points. Fifth-grade performance reflected a one-point increase among students of low SES and four points for males. The whole group of students and females, however, regressed over the 6-year period.

Additional subquestions were designed to identify the related perceptions of the school principal and participating teachers. Responses of the school principal reflected confidence that student performance had improved and that students were positively affected by the program. In agreement, one teacher stated, “Achievement increased because students understood how to use their character traits to enhance personal achievement.” Others stated that students had become more accountable and had taken “ownership of their learning.” As one proclaimed, “The learning had come alive in them!”

Analysis of responses again, however, supported the existence of differing perspectives among teachers. While eight of the 13 (62%) attested that the program had positively impacted student achievement, the remaining five expressed the belief that the program had resulted in little or no impact on achievement. One teacher further questioned how the influences of Habits of Mind (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) could be separated from the effects of another program implemented at the same time. Based on a prior comment, the researcher believes this teacher was referring to the Common Core Standards (Achieve, Inc., 2013), which were adopted throughout the state at the beginning of Year 6 of the Habits of Mind implementation.
**Program impact on student discipline.** An examination of discipline referrals beginning with the 2008-2009 school year and continuing through the 2013-2014 school year provided another source of data for answering Product Question 1. As noted with the reading performance, the data were categorized by year and grade level and were inclusive of the 2008-2009 and 2013-2014 school years. The data analysis reflected that the number of referrals issued to students in kindergarten through the second grade was lower in the first years of program implementation. In Grades 1 and 2, noteworthy increases were noted in Year 6, the year in which the Common Core Standards (Achieve, Inc., 2013) were adopted. Conversely, third-grade students received 55% fewer discipline referrals in Year 6 of program implementation when compared with Year 1. Upon examination of the performance data for fourth-grade students, no pattern could be identified. It was noted that the highest number of referrals occurred in Years 2 and 5 of program implementation. At the fifth-grade level, the largest number of discipline referrals was issued during Years 1 and 2 of program implementation. In Years 3 through 6, the number of discipline referrals decreased and remain relatively stable.

Related subquestions were designed to identify the perceptions of the school principal and teachers involving the impact of the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) on student discipline. Analysis of the data, for the first time, reflects reservations expressed by the principal: “I am not certain there is a direct correlation between the implementation of the program and student discipline.” As before, teachers exhibited opposing perceptions. Some believed there was a decrease in discipline issues and that students (a) began reflecting about their behavior before acting, (b) “responded to conflict by talking and thinking it through,” (c) became accustomed to managing impulsivity, and (d) assumed leadership roles in their classrooms and
throughout the school.

As one teacher attested, “Students understood themselves better. They are now able to control and handle situations that caused discipline issues in the past. They are able to manage their impulsivity.” Another credited the program for the belief that students were able to, “communicate with clarity and precision, and this enabled them to talk about what was bothering them instead of reacting first.”

Some teachers expressed uncertainty. For example, teachers stated the belief that the program had limited impact on student behaviors and improved discipline only somewhat. Of interest is that one teacher stated, “I don’t feel the program . . . was a part of their everyday conversations, so they did not take it seriously.” Another similarly stated, “If the program were routinely utilized, then it could have a positive impact on student discipline. That was not the case, however.” As another similarly suggested, “There should be favorable effects, but all students did not participate in the positive aspects of the program.” As a final comment, one teacher stated, “In order for the program to have an impact on student discipline, the students must be dedicated to the process to the point that they can identify with the habits. This, in my opinion, did not occur.”

**Unanticipated effects of the program.** Product Question 2 was as follows: What are any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program? Subquestions were designed to identify the related perceptions of the school principal and participating teachers. Analysis of the data again reflected distinctively different perceptions. While the school principal stated, “None noted,” one topic of interest to teachers involved the effects of the program on parents. One stated that some teachers sent communications to parents involving the program and, as a result, parents supported the program within the
home setting. Another expressed the similar belief that, “Both students and parents began using the language.”

Six of the eight teachers, however, shared negative perceptions involving the unanticipated effects of the program. One expressed concern that teachers are burdened by the program, because of the increased workload occurring from implementing related activities. Another faulted the initial implementation plan by remarking, “Implementing the program would’ve been better if there had been a clear and concise implementation plan.”

A unique and unexpected effect shared by one teacher was that, “Some low-level students acted as bullies to the middle and upper-level students because they were self-absorbed and reclusive, trying to model the habits and demonstrate that they were smart.” This comment supports the idea that higher-achieving students may have embraced the program to a higher degree than their low-achieving peers.

One other teacher faulted the manner in which teachers implemented the program within their classrooms. According to this participant, teachers ineffectively used components of the program to manage impulsivity among students; because of overuse in redirecting students, this individual expressed the belief that the term, “soon lost its meaning.” Another described confusion and misconceptions that had occurred within classrooms because the meaning of each habit was not clear to all students. These perceptions suggest that teachers may not have been committed to the full implementation of the program.

**Sustainability of program components.** Product Question 3 was as follows:

Should the various components of the Habits of Mind program be sustained?

Subquestions were designed to identify the related perceptions of the school principal and
participating teachers. A dichotomy in responses involving this question was not only communicated by teachers but also by the principal, who cited uncertainty and indicated that members of the leadership team felt it was, “worthwhile to explore other programs to see if they may be more effective with our student population.”

Four of the 10 teachers who responded to this question indicated no interest in sustaining any components of the program. The remaining six, however, collectively faulted the new administration for efforts to replace the program with a different model. Although the program is no longer promoted schoolwide, one teacher indicated that numerous others continue to use the vocabulary central to the program. Another stated an unwillingness to depart from the program; one emphasized the importance of maintaining the program by stating, “We immersed our students in these habits and it was evident that the students knew and applied the terms. I just wish the new administration would consider these benefits before pulling their support from the program.”

One teacher may have addressed a root problem affecting program outcomes. This individual stated, “I think teachers and students should be held accountable for how they are infusing the habits into daily life at school.” Similar responses were noted in the analysis of data regarding prior research questions, supporting the theme that the schoolwide implementation of the program may have been flawed.

**Strengths and weaknesses of the program.** Product Question 4 was as follows: What are any strengths or weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program? Subquestions were designed to identify the related perceptions of the school principal and participating teachers. In reference to the strengths of the program, the principal supported the program by stating that related components provide students with the skills for character development and learning. Seventeen teachers appear to have been in agreement with the
school principal, as they cited (a) benefits from applying the habits and common vocabulary, (b) the belief that students learn how to think before reacting, and (c) improvement in academic performance.

The remaining four teachers shared different responses. Citing the high-stakes testing environment common within public schools, one teacher declared that teachers do not have adequate time to implement the program; although potential benefits were possible, fully implementing the program would be, “at the expense of preparing for standardized tests.” Another teacher remarked that the program was not implemented a sufficient length of time to ascertain possible results. The third teacher stated that, “Character begins at home. We can only do so much as educators.” The fourth teacher contributed to the belief that the program is instrumental in increasing student confidence.

In regard to weaknesses of the habits of mind program, the school principal stated that the 16 habits central to the program were cause for concern; the researcher deducted that the principal felt that 16 habits were too many at the elementary level. This concern was shared by teachers; as one stated, “The habits can be overwhelming. I think there should be an elementary curriculum.” Along this line of thought, another teacher expressed the belief that teachers did not fully implement the program because, “They didn’t feel like their students were capable of using the language.” A third teacher supported related concerns by stating that the language used in the program is not child friendly. Another teacher additionally cited the number of habits and suggested that 16 may be too many for elementary students to comprehend. Teachers additionally stated that the habits may be too abstract, redundant, irrelevant, or nonapplicable.

Two teachers again underscored the belief that the program requires too much
time for implementation at the elementary school level. As one remarked, “There’s not enough time to implement the program.” The remaining teacher not only mentioned a lack of time but also suggested that, “Teacher commitment just did not exist.” The fact that the Common Core Standards (Achieve, Inc., 2013) were implemented concurrently with the Habits of Mind (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was also underscored. As the teacher added, “We can only absorb so many priorities!”

Although one teacher indicated that the weakness of the program was partially affected by a lack of teacher retention and thus recommended that professional development be ongoing, a second teacher stated different concerns. This teacher cited the belief that several teachers chose not to promote the program within their classroom. In agreement, another teacher identified the attitude of the faculty as the primary weakness of the program. As this teacher stated, “It became one more thing for teachers to do and less work for the administrative staff.” The dichotomy that surfaced within the majority of research questions may have been explained by the resentment reflected in the following response:

Use of the program did not deter discipline problems. [The program] seemed to lessen discipline referrals, though, because teachers were not sending students to the office. [Teachers’] belief was that discipline referrals, or the schoolwide discipline plan itself, was not being enforced. Instead, administrators expected teachers to manage discipline problems within their classroom. As a result, teachers did not receive adequate support to ensure appropriate discipline within their classrooms.

Conclusions

The problem addressed through this program evaluation was that the Habits of Mind program, which was implemented as the character education program at the study site at the beginning of the 2008-2009 academic year, had not been evaluated. The purpose of the investigation was to evaluate the program to determine its effectiveness in
promoting academic achievement and appropriate school behaviors. The evaluation was designed to (a) identify the key elements for judging the effectiveness of the program, (b) collect data from current stakeholders, and (c) apply the identified key elements to determine the overall effectiveness of the program. To accomplish this collective purpose, the study was guided by a total of nine research questions reflecting the four components of the CIPP model (Stufflebeam, 2003; Stufflebeam & Shinkfield, 2007): (a) two context questions, (b) one question within the input component, (c) two questions within the process component, and (d) four questions within the product component. The questions were answered using responses of the school principal and 21 teachers to questionnaires (see Appendices A and B) and through an examination of archived program documents, academic performance of students in Grades 3 through 5, and discipline referrals of students in kindergarten through Grade 5.

In the previous section of this chapter, the researcher elaborated and interpreted results relative to each research question. Through the process, several underlying themes were identified. This section is dedicated to concluding the evaluation, identifying the overarching themes derived from the study, and correlating the findings with the literature. Although the previous section was organized by research questions, the following discussion is structured using the overarching themes.

**Program implementation.** The Habits of Mind character development program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was implemented throughout the school district at the beginning of the 2008-2009 school year. Within the school study site, the principal promoted the program as a way of bringing unity and instilling a common language among all school stakeholders (personal communication, January 15, 2014). A review of the data indicated that members of the school leadership team first acquired training and
experience relative to the program and then led the professional-development training for faculty members of the school.

During the initial implementation period, a small number of high-performing students, as well as their teachers, were selected as members of a pilot group. For a brief time, training and information concerning the program were limited to these select individuals. Although this information was not apparent in the archival data, teachers referred to related practices as though they felt excluded during the initial implementation period. It is possible that the numerous dichotomies in perceptions stem from this brief period of time.

Over the next 5 years, members of the leadership team endeavored to immerse program components throughout the school community, although few resources were available from the publisher. Efforts included training faculty members, yet not staff members; promoting the 16 habits among parents through the school newsletter and teacher-parent correspondence; and embellishing the school facility and grounds with visual reminders of the habits. The habits central to the program were also integrated within the school curricula, such as the science and visual arts classes, to provide students opportunities to create and display reminders of each habit. Moreover, teachers were expected to use the program as the framework of instructional and disciplinary practices.

During the sixth year of program implementation, the archival data, as well as reported perceptions of the school principal and teachers, indicate that the leadership team did not aggressively promote the program as in prior years. At that time, based upon the perceptions of the school principal and several teachers, the leadership team began exploring an alternative program in response to stated interests of a new administrator. Although the data indicate that not all teachers were implementing the program with
fidelity, the majority of teachers had remained steadfast by continuing to embed the 16 habits within their classroom practices. When the incoming school administrator and members of the leadership team no longer promoted the program, the teachers who were immersed in the program expressed frustration that alternate programs were being considered. Thus, the school faculty was divided into two groups of teachers; one supported and integrated the program within classroom practices, and the other did not support program implementation. At the same time, several teachers within both groups were frustrated because the Common Core Standards (Achieve, Inc., 2013) had also become required components of instruction.

The overarching theme, and initial finding of this program evaluation, is the importance of ensuring the fidelity with which a schoolwide intervention is implemented. Through this present program evaluation, the professional-development training was carefully investigated and analyzed. This approach was critical to the validity of the evaluation and the degree to which findings could be generalized in other settings, as researchers have consistently emphasized the importance of implementing professional-development programs with fidelity (Symeou, Roussoundou, & Michaelides, 2012; Thompson, Marchant, Anderson, Prater, & Gibb, 2012; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). When training involves minimal time, low intensity, or ineffective sequencing, only minimal changes in instructional practices occur (Webster-Stratton et al., 2011). Researchers have also identified specific elements that notably improve outcomes of training experiences; these include objective administrative observations followed by honest, yet meaningful feedback (Hodgman, 2012; Webster-Stratton et al., 2011).

An additional approach identified in the literature to increase the fidelity of professional development was that of instructional coaching because related processes (a)
address the specific developmental needs of each teacher, (b) provide the opportunity for
teachers to learn within a collaborative environment, (c) ensure the provision of ongoing
support provided by a competent educator, and (d) improve the self-efficacy of teachers
(DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, & Many, 2010; Thompson et al., 2012). To increase the
effectiveness of instructional coaching, Thompson et al. (2012) suggested that coaches
include the use of (a) preconferences to identify the desired teaching skills; (b)
instructional protocols to guide classroom observations; (c) postconferences to enable
coaches and teachers to collaborate and analyze observed uses of target skills; (d)
personalized interventions, such as the instructional coach modeling the target skills; and
(e) goal setting, supported by subsequent observations and postconferences, to identify
progress over time.

Initially focusing on the learning objectives integral to any character development
program, the researcher selected social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006) as
the theoretical framework of this program evaluation. The theory is equally applicable to
the concept of adult learning, a topic that became central to this investigation during the
continual reciprocity among the constructs of human agency, the social setting, and the
environment. Social cognitive theory explains the way in which individuals perceive
information from the environment in that the information is processed through the
influences of the interests and intrinsic purposes of each person (Afflerbach et al., 2013).
Individuals are active contributors to the circumstances in their lives; moreover,
individual actions are rooted in personal intentions which are, in turn, based upon
identified goals (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006).

Bandura (1986, 1997, 2006) specifically emphasized the constructs of information
acquisition, self-efficacy, and mastery in the learning process. Bandura additionally promoted four influences on the development of self-efficacy: (a) personal success or failure; (b) observations involving the practices, successes, and failures of others; (c) the influences of others; and (d) emotions related to specific experiences. Mastery occurs as a process over time, is synonymous with personal achievement, and is a construct that directly influences self-efficacy (Erlich & Russ-Eft, 2013; Holzberger et al., 2013).

Directly applicable to this program evaluation is that self-efficacy, as well as personal experiences involving mastery, is directly affected by the modeling of target behaviors or actions (Bandura, 1986, 1997, 2006). Modeling, however, was not a component within the professional development training provided to assist teachers in implementing the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Members of the leadership team cannot be faulted for this oversight; as Beachum et al. (2013) reported, a lack of research involving teacher training in preparation for teaching character traits exists.

Fidelity of training was examined in an applied research study involving developmental support provided to students with behavioral disabilities (Oakes et al., 2012). The problem addressed through the study was the absence of an intervention within the general education environment to address the behavioral and academic needs of the students with disabilities. Oakes et al. (2012) compared a character development program to a Tier 1 intervention within the response-to-intervention framework; when used specifically for a group of students with behavioral disabilities, the intervention qualifies as a Tier 2 initiative. One of the research questions of this study was to determine whether the program was implemented with integrity, and this determination was largely based upon the fidelity with which teachers were trained.
Oakes et al.’s (2012) quasi-experimental study involved fourth-grade students with behavioral disabilities. The two teacher participants attended two days of training and also observed the intervention in use at another school. Central to the training process was that teachers practiced lessons together, a coach provided modeling and feedback, and collaboration and brainstorming among the coach and teachers occurred. Through the data collection, teachers reported a high level of fidelity involving the training as well as a noteworthy level of program integrity. Teacher expectations were exceeded; not only were behaviors improved, but academic achievement improved to the point that students scored just below the mastery level of 70%. Academic performance increased 14.5% after implementing the intervention for only 21 days, and teachers additionally reported an increase in student motivation (Oakes et al., 2012). This study is valuable for other researchers intending to implement professional development training, as the processes integrated training, observation, modeling, feedback, and encouragement. Although the study involved a relatively small number of students, procedures were sufficiently detailed for applying findings to a broader application.

Program effects: Student academics. Perceptions of the school principal and teachers were useful in identifying salient academic issues underscoring the need for an effective schoolwide character development approach. To improve academic achievement, the belief existed that students needed to develop critical-thinking skills and increase engagement in the learning process. Prior to implementation, participants expected that the Habits of Mind character development program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) would provide the platform for promoting related strategies.

A review of the data reflects that, in part, this expectation was achieved. At the third-grade level, notable improvement in reading achievement was documented among
the whole group of students as well as among males. At the fourth-grade level, measurable improvement in reading achievement was noted among the whole group of students, males, and students of low SES. Performance of fifth-grade students, however, reflected that reading achievement regressed over the 6-year period in which the program was implemented.

Primarily because the teacher questionnaire (see Appendix B) was not delineated by grade level, the fidelity with which the program was implemented within each grade level remains unknown. Furthermore, the dichotomies in teacher perceptions that surfaced during the data analysis were not defined by grade levels. These two phenomena, which are limitations of the study, prevented the researcher from gauging the degree to which fifth-grade students were immersed in program components. Consequently, the factors contributing to the lower academic achievement of fifth-grade students remain unknown.

The overarching theme, and second finding of this program evaluation, is that the academic performance of students in Grades 3 and 4 improved during the 6-year period in which the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was implemented. Similar findings were reported by Oakes et al. (2012). In their study, the average academic performance of students in Grade 4 increased 14.5% after implementing a character development intervention for only 21 days. Students who were previously failing scored just below the mastery level of 70%, and teachers additionally reported an increase in students’ motivation to learn (Oakes et al., 2012). Another study noted during the review of the literature refutes the findings of this present program evaluation as well as those of Oakes et al.

The study, which was conducted by Hanson, Dietsch, and Zheng (2012), provided
character development training to students in Grades 4 and 5 and then reported results through a mixed methods study. Acknowledging the lack of studies on the effectiveness of character education programs in terms of academic outcomes, Hanson et al. designed the study to determine the effectiveness of a related intervention on academic and behavioral outcomes of students. Based upon the research questions that guided the study, data included academic scores, an analysis of discipline referrals, and interview responses of teachers and students.

Fifty schools were included in the study, with half being assigned to the control group and the remaining schools being assigned to the treatment group. Hanson et al. conducted the study over a 2-year period of time, and the intervention depended primarily on the use of books and audio cassettes to teach character lessons within the English language arts classes. Principals were integrally involved with the implementation, as they governed the school displays, school-parent communication, and teacher activities. A coach was also available, both in person and via electronic mail, to ensure the program was implemented with fidelity. Findings of the study did not support significant improvements in the academic performance, social competence, or school behaviors of participating students.

**Program effects: Student discipline.** Perceptions of the school principal and teachers were useful in identifying salient behavioral issues underscoring the need for an effective schoolwide character development program. To improve student behaviors, the belief existed that students needed to develop within three areas: (a) intrinsic motivation, (b) critical thinking, and (c) confidence. Prior to implementation, participants expected that the Habits of Mind character development program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) would provide the platform for promoting related strategies. By the sixth year,
However, the school principal held reservations involving this expectation.

Although one group of teachers perceived that the program had improved student behaviors, the second group was not equally confident. Instead, teachers cited beliefs that the program was not fully integrated within classroom practices and that some students did not fully identify with the habits. Uncertainty also existed as to whether the higher-performing students embraced program components to a higher degree than their lower-performing peers. Another potential influence, as one teacher expressed, is the belief that teachers overused one of the 16 habits to redirect students who were off task rather than using this habit as intended by program developers. One other discrepancy is that a teacher perceived that some students may not have understood the meaning and application of each habit.

An additional concern, again underscoring the dichotomies of teacher beliefs, is the perception that school administrators expected classroom teachers to implement the program with such fidelity that all matters involving student discipline would be managed without administrative support. Questions, therefore, existed as to whether the program was effective in reducing the workload of teachers or only for administrators. The adoption of the Common Core Standards (Achieve, Inc., 2013) during Year 6 increased teacher concerns involving the expectation of school administrators.

Analysis of the data additionally reflects that the number of referrals issued to students in kindergarten through the second grade was lower during the first 5 years of program implementation. For second-grade students, the number of referrals increased during Year 6, the year in which the Common Core Standards (Achieve, Inc., 2013) were adopted. The number of discipline referrals for third-grade students, however, notably decreased during Year 6. No pattern was noted among discipline referrals for fourth-
grade students; students at the fifth-grade level received fewer discipline referrals during Years 3 through 6 than in Years 1 and 2, suggesting that program effects on student behaviors are unclear.

The overarching theme, and third finding of this program evaluation, is that the behavioral performance of students in kindergarten through Grade 3 improved while the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was implemented, yet the same pattern was not noted among students in Grades 4 and 5. Research on the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) is limited; a qualitative study conducted by Burgess (2012) is the one peer-reviewed article published within the last 5 years identified by the researcher within the electronic databases. As with the Oakes et al. (2012) investigation, the Burgess study involved efforts to improve the behavioral and academic performance of students with behavioral disabilities; however, students with learning disabilities were also included in the Burgess study. This inclusive population was also encompassed in the present program evaluation involving all students enrolled at the school study site. The 15 students in the Burgess study ranged in age from 7 to 12 years, and their parents were also participants in the research.

The purpose of the study was to identify the effects of the program on the thinking skills of students with disabilities (Burgess, 2012). The study included surveys of teachers and parents as well as semi-structured interviews of a random sample of teachers and parents. Although it was a small scale study, findings are applicable to the current program evaluation. As also mentioned by a teacher in the school study site relative to the present evaluation, the instructional leaders at the school believed that 16 habits were excessive for the student population and thus reduced the target habits to eight (Burgess, 2012). The selected habits involved (a) persisting, (b) managing
impulsivity, (c) listening with understanding and empathy, (d) thinking flexibly, (e) thinking and communicating with clarity and precision, (f) striving for accuracy, (g) applying past knowledge to new situations, and (h) taking responsible risks.

A major difference between the Burgess (2012) study and the present program evaluation is that parents attended the training sessions. In addition, parents were asked to contribute to the data collection. Combined responses of teachers and parents attested to an improvement in the thinking skills of participating students relative to all eight habits (Burgess, 2012). The greatest improvements were noted in persisting, applying past knowledge to new situations, and listening with understanding and empathy. Although the size of the study was limited and there were no objective test results in the data collection such as included within this present program evaluation, the findings support the concept that the Habits of Mind character development program is helpful with improving the behaviors of students in Grades 2 through 5. Consequently, the lack of evidence in the present evaluation involving improved behaviors among fourth- and fifth-grade students is not reflective of the findings of the Burgess study.

Similar findings, that students in Grades 4 and 5 are less responsive to character development programs, have been reported by other researchers (Cooper, 2014; Edwards-Groves & Hardy, 2013; Kindzierski, Leavitt-Noble, Dutt-Doner, Marable, & Wallace, 2013; Shapiro, 2012). One exception was a mixed methods study conducted by Roso (2013) within a religious elementary school. The purpose of the study was to describe how the concurrent curricula, which included the written curriculum, taught curriculum, and overall school culture, were effective at teaching positive character traits to students. The study was a holistic investigation of the school curricula and included an analysis of interview responses, observations of students, academic records, and artifacts.
Approximately 60 elementary-age children participated in the study, which focused on the teaching of Jewish religious beliefs and traditions within the curricula.

The importance of character development was included within the school mission statement, parent handbook, and discipline policies (Roso, 2013). Character education, therefore, permeated all aspects of the school and was also modeled by teachers. Class projects included outreach to community members who were economically disadvantaged. Teachers also provided hands-on projects, encouraged parent participation, and included field trips within the curricula (Roso, 2013).

The application of the Roso (2013) study within a public school is questionable because of the difference of emphasis on religion. In this regard, the school consisted of one culture, a factor not present within public schools. The class size and selective number of students also limited the transferability of results (Roso, 2013). The contribution of this study, and therefore its relevance to the present program evaluation, is that the character development intervention was woven throughout all aspects of school practices as well as among all stakeholders. Other researchers have promoted the importance of intricately including parents and support staff in schoolwide interventions (Marshall, Caldwell, & Foster, 2011; Snyder, Vuchinich, Acock, Washington, & Flay, 2012). Although in the present evaluation parents and members of the support staff were apprised of the 16 habits, they were not included in the training central to the study nor involved in the program evaluation.

Sustainability of the program. The data collection was instrumental in identifying perceptions of the school principal and classroom teachers involving program sustainability. By Year 6 of program implementation, the school principal felt it was worthwhile to explore other programs that may be more effective in improving the
academic and behavioral performance of students within the school. Teachers, as often noted in the analysis of the data, were divided on this subject. While one group preferred to continue using the program as a schoolwide intervention, the opposing group had no interest in sustaining the program either in its entirety or in part.

The group of teachers preferring to continue program implementation expressed the belief that the program was beneficial in many ways. One of these individuals held that many teachers will continue using the vocabulary central to the program even if the program is no longer promoted schoolwide. Another expressed resentment that the program was under consideration for termination. An additional potential underlying problem noted in the review of responses was that the schoolwide implementation of the program may have been flawed.

Because the teacher questionnaire (see Appendix B) was not delineated by grade level and was administered as an anonymous data collection, the perceptions of the teachers by grade level remains unknown. In addition, since classroom observations were not conducted, fidelity with which teachers of each grade level implemented the program also remains unknown. These phenomena prevent the researcher from gauging the degree to which teachers within each grade level were immersing program components within their instructional practices. Consequently, the fourth overarching theme and finding of this program evaluation is that the viability of sustaining any character development program and implementing the program with integrity will require the concerted effort of all staff throughout the school.

The lack of unity among teachers and between the principal and faculty is a challenge that many organizational leaders experience. An examination of the work performed by Bolman and Deal (2013) reflected four frameworks that embed different
views of reality and have the potential to affect organizational behaviors and accomplishments; these include (a) human resource, (b) political, (c) symbolic, and (d) structural. The political framework is applicable to the dynamics that are occurring among teachers involving the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Because teachers are already divided on this particular program, it is likely they also will remain divided on any subsequent program chosen by members of the leadership team. At the same time, teachers are further challenged by the concurrent implementation of the Common Core Standards (Achieve, Inc., 2013), an added challenge that members of the school leadership team may need to address.

The political framework identified by Bolman and Deal (2013) portrays a view of organizations as, “roiling arenas hosting ongoing contests of individual and group interests” (p. 194). Five assumptions comprise this framework, and four of them are relevant to the current organizational challenge. The first is that, “Organizations are coalitions of assorted individuals and interest groups” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 194). The second assumption is, “Coalition members have enduring differences in values, beliefs, information, interests, and perceptions of reality” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 194). The third assumption within the framework states that the most important decisions involve the allocation of scarce resources; based upon teachers responses to the questionnaire (see Appendix B), the resource teachers most value is their time. Consequently, the time involved in learning and implementing another character development program will be viewed as a scarce resource. The fourth applicable framework identified by Bolman and Deal is that the scarcity of resources and differences in perceptions create conflict and make power the most important asset an individual can acquire within the organization.
The subject of conflict is also addressed through the work of Bolman and Deal (2013). Although conflict can have costs, challenging the status quo is one benefit of conflict (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Conflict is additionally useful in stimulating interest, creativity, and social change. It is critical that organizational managers, such as school administrators and other members of the leadership team, manage the conflict identified through this present program evaluation in order to stimulate creativity and make the school more adaptive and effective.

The urgent need, therefore, is for members of the school leadership team to develop the skills for recognizing and managing the conflict presently occurring among teachers. Otherwise, this researcher is concerned that effective teachers may become frustrated and resentful, ultimately electing to transfer out of the school and into a new facility. Attrition of this nature, as also underscored by teachers, creates the need for ongoing training and would potentially risk the benefits of implementing a new character development program within the study site. In the opinion of this researcher, rather than to adopt another character development program, it is more important to first address the schism so clearly described in the qualitative data that teachers contributed.

Limitations

The first four limitations were apparent at the time this program evaluation was proposed. The remaining limitations were identified while conducting the investigation. In all, the external or internal validity of the evaluation may have been limited by the following factors:

1. As frequently noted in applied research studies (Creswell, 2012), questionnaire responses may have been limited by factors such as maturation, emotions, education, and experiences beyond the scope of this study.
2. The researcher developed the two questionnaires (see Appendices A and B) based on the research questions within the four components of the CIPP evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003, 2010). Although the instruments were pilot tested to determine their appropriateness for use in this evaluation, they were not professionally validated and therefore may have been biased or flawed in some other way (Creswell, 2012).

3. Seven of the teachers were not on staff at the time the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) was introduced within the school community. Consequently, these individuals were unable to respond to questionnaire items referencing the context and input components of the CIPP evaluation model (Stufflebeam, 2003, 2010) which limited the data collection.

4. Results acquired from action research studies, including program evaluations, are often not generalizeable to other settings (Creswell, 2012). Because the researcher presented thick and rich dialogue in the final report, however, other researchers may find results of this program evaluation useful in their research settings (Merriam, 1998).

5. Because the teacher questionnaire (see Appendix B) was not delineated by grade level and was administered as an anonymous data collection, the differences in perceptions of teachers by grade level remains unknown. Since classroom observations were not conducted, fidelity with which teachers within each grade level implemented the program also remains unknown. In addition, the factors contributing to the lower academic achievement of fifth-grade students and the behaviors of students in Grades 4 and 5 were not identified through the data collection process and were beyond the scope of this study.

6. Several teachers referenced a change in school administrators within their questionnaire responses. Not only was the school principal transferred during the fourth
year of program implementation, but the researcher was recently transferred to another school within the district. Moreover, responses indicated that the incoming administrator was instrumental in the consideration of an alternative character development program. The change in leadership and the perceptions regarding administrative support may have affected teacher bias in their responses.

**Recommendations for Educational Practice**

Based on findings of the study, the continuation of the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) is recommended for the present time. Although all teachers do not concur with every aspect of the program, and all also may not be implementing the program with integrity within their classrooms, members of the leadership team have provided training to all teachers. It is further recommended, as reflected in the work of Burgess (2012), Marshall et al. (2011), and Roso (2013), that members of the support staff and parents be included in a training event during the present school year in preparation to increase interest in the program for the 2015-2016 school year. Ongoing professional development and training, including the recognition of related practices noted through supervisory observations, is supported in the reviewed research (DuFour et al., 2010; Thompson et al., 2012). It is further recommended that the school principal identify a viable approach to leadership training for the purpose of assisting members of the school leadership team in the development of skills for recognizing and managing the conflict presently occurring among teachers. It is additionally recommended that members of the leadership team address the stated concerns of teachers in their questionnaire responses. Identifying an alternative character development program will not be effective until the issues reported by teachers have been addressed.
Recommendations for Future Research

Based on findings of the study, the researcher offers two recommendations. First, it is recommended that additional research on Habits of Mind (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b) be conducted at nearby elementary schools to determine the integral processes through which the program is implemented within other settings. The second recommendation is that the level of student understanding involving the 16 components of Habits of Mind be identified. The results of that research should guide future program development.
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Hello! Thank you for volunteering to respond to this questionnaire! You were selected as a participant in this program evaluation because you have acquired a minimum of 1 year of experience with the implementation of the Habits of Mind program at the school study site. Your perspectives of the program will be very helpful in the evaluation process. Please answer each question fully. The response box will expand as you type. This questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

1. What are your perceptions about student academic problems initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program?

2. What are your perceptions about student discipline problems initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program?

3. What procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program?

4. What programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind?

5. What are your perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the Habits of Mind?

6. What are your perceptions concerning the professional development and related resources that were provided?

7. What are your perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement?

8. What are your perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student discipline?

9. What are your perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program?

10. What are your perceptions of whether the various components of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained?

11. What are your perceptions of the strengths of the Habits of Mind program?

12. What are your perceptions of the weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program?
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Teacher Questionnaire

Hello! Thank you for volunteering to respond to this questionnaire! You were selected as a participant in this program evaluation because you have acquired a minimum of 1 year of experience with the implementation of the Habits of Mind program at the school study site. Your perspectives of the program will be very helpful in the evaluation process. Please answer each question fully. The response box will expand as you type. This questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

1. What are your perceptions about student academic problems initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program?

2. What are your perceptions about student discipline problems initially establishing the need for the Habits of Mind program?

3. What procedural steps were followed in the initial development and implementation of the Habits of Mind program?

4. What programs were examined prior to the development of the Habits of Mind?

5. What are your perceptions about the implementation of the various program components of the Habits of Mind?

6. What are your perceptions concerning the professional development and related resources that were provided?

7. What are your perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student achievement?

8. What are your perceptions about the impact of the Habits of Mind program on student discipline?

9. What are your perceptions about any unanticipated effects of the Habits of Mind program?

10. What are your perceptions of whether the various components of the Habits of Mind program should be sustained?

11. What are your perceptions of the strengths of the Habits of Mind program?

12. What are your perceptions of the weaknesses of the Habits of Mind program?
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Table C1

Synthesis of Training and Schoolwide Activities Involving Program Implementation: Year 1 (2008-2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Time allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership training</td>
<td>PowerPoint Learning and Leading With Habits of Mind: 16 Essential Characteristics for Success (Costa &amp; Kallick, 2009b)</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty training</td>
<td>PowerPoint Learning and Leading With Habits of Mind: 16 Essential Characteristics for Success (Costa &amp; Kallick, 2009b)</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book study with faculty</td>
<td>Learning and Leading With Habits of Mind: 16 Essential Characteristics for Success (Costa &amp; Kallick, 2009b)</td>
<td>9 hours/9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on habits throughout the school community</td>
<td>School newsletters, morning announcements, and marquee</td>
<td>8 hours/9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership planning meeting</td>
<td>Collaborative discussion</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Implementation centered upon the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Total time allocation: 26 hours.

Table C2

Synthesis of Training and Schoolwide Activities Involving Program Implementation: Year 2 (2009-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Time allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murals throughout the school</td>
<td>High school art students</td>
<td>Summer months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New faculty training</td>
<td>Initial PowerPoint</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the 16 habits throughout the school community</td>
<td>School newsletters, morning announcements, and marquee</td>
<td>8 hours/9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide art project emphasizing the 16 habits</td>
<td>Colorful bricks within the school foyer Pictures placed throughout the school</td>
<td>Instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership planning meeting</td>
<td>Collaborative discussion</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Implementation centered upon the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b).
Total time allocation: 13 hours.

Table C3

*Synthesis of Training and Schoolwide Activities Involving Program Implementation: Year 3 (2010-2011)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Time allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New faculty training</td>
<td>Initial PowerPoint</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty overview</td>
<td>New PowerPoint introducing excellence as the 17th habit</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the 16 habits throughout the school community</td>
<td>School newsletters, morning announcements, and marquee</td>
<td>8 hours/9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide science project emphasizing the 16 habits</td>
<td>Planting of 16 trees in school courtyard</td>
<td>Instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide art project emphasizing the 16 habits</td>
<td>Pictures placed throughout the school</td>
<td>Instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership refresher training</td>
<td>PowerPoint</td>
<td>6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group discussions and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Implementation centered upon the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Total time allocation: 19 hours.

Table C4

*Synthesis of Training and Schoolwide Activities Involving Program Implementation: Year 4 (2011-2012)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Time allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New faculty training</td>
<td>Two PowerPoints used previously</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty overview</td>
<td>PowerPoint emphasizing excellence as the 17th habit</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the 16 habits throughout the school community</td>
<td>School newsletters, morning announcements, and marquee</td>
<td>8 hours/9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide art project emphasizing the 16 habits</td>
<td>Pictures placed throughout the school</td>
<td>Instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership planning meeting</td>
<td>Collaborative discussion</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Implementation centered upon the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Total time allocation: 15 hours.
Table C5

*Synthesis of Training and Schoolwide Activities Involving Program Implementation: Year 5 (2012-2013)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Time allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty overview</td>
<td>Two PowerPoints used previously</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the 16 habits throughout the school community</td>
<td>School newsletters, morning announcements, and marquee</td>
<td>8 hours/9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide art project emphasizing the 16 habits</td>
<td>Pictures placed throughout the school</td>
<td>Instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership planning meeting</td>
<td>Collaborative discussion</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Implementation centered upon the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Total time allocation: 11 hours.

Table C6

*Synthesis of Training and Schoolwide Activities Involving Program Implementation: Year 6 (2013-2014)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Time allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty overview</td>
<td>Two PowerPoints used previously</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on the 16 habits throughout the school community</td>
<td>School newsletters, morning announcements, and marquee</td>
<td>8 hours/9 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolwide art project emphasizing the 16 habits</td>
<td>Pictures placed throughout the school</td>
<td>Instructional time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership planning meeting to consider an alternative character development program for the upcoming school year and to identify the correlations between the two programs</td>
<td>Collaborative discussion</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Implementation centered upon the Habits of Mind program (Costa & Kallick, 2000a, 2000b, 2009b). Total time allocation: 9 hours. An additional 2 hours was dedicated to the leadership planning team meeting at the conclusion of the school year.
Table C7

Reading Performance: Grade 3 (Years 2009-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Meeting or exceeding standards %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Data reflect performance on the PASS (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011). Rounded to the nearest whole. N = 646 students.*
Table C8

*Reading Performance: Grade 4 (Years 2009-2014)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Meeting or exceeding standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data reflect performance on the PASS (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011). Rounded to the nearest whole.

*N = 599 students.*
Table C9

*Reading Performance: Grade 5 (Years 2009-2014)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Meeting or exceeding standards %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data reflect performance on the PASS (South Carolina Department of Education, 2011). Rounded to the nearest whole. 

*N = 608 students.*
Table C10

**Discipline Referrals: School Years 2008-2009—2013-2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School year</th>
<th>Grade level</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Discipline referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Data reflect the number of discipline referrals teachers issued each year by grade level.

$N = 3,866$ students.