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This thesis investigates the form and implementation of the Colorado Shakespeare Festival’s Shakespeare & Violence Prevention Program by analyzing four program visits at four elementary schools in the Boulder Valley School District in the fall of 2016. The Colorado Shakespeare Festival (CSF) developed this program with the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado at Boulder in 2011. The program was developed in response to the increasing awareness and recent development of bullying prevention programming in the U.S. CSF simultaneously seeks to raise awareness regarding violence at school, introduce the intervention tool Safe2Tell, and hopes to nurture a love for theatre and Shakespeare through its creative program model. The four case studies lie at the center of this research, which include four performances of the touring production of CSF’s adaption of The Taming of the Shrew and the corresponding bullying prevention workshops. The model is analyzed within the framework of recognized Applied Theatre practices. The model is also compared to two other regional theatre-based bullying prevention programs – Choose Your Life by Arts Integrated Resources and “Your Voice Matters” by Mirror Image Arts – to gain insight into the CSF’s program placement within the regional context and distinguish the specific needs it serves within its target communities. The results of the study indicate that the program features a strong performance piece, but several elements of the applied theatre based workshop require further refining to become more inclusive, engage students actively and holistically, as well as meet the goal of disseminating pertinent bullying prevention material through the desired embodied practice. The thesis concludes with specific recommendations to strengthen the existing program and a need for further study to measure impact and efficacy of the program model.
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CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

Three hundred 3rd – 5th graders file into the gym at Whittier Elementary in Boulder in an orderly fashion. Their bright eyes take in their newly transformed gym: previously it had simply been an open space with a hard floor and mostly bare walls. Today, the far end of the space features a beautiful mountain vista printed on a portable room partition. Behind it, three actresses and a stage manager prepare for the show: The Colorado Shakespeare Festival adaptation of Taming of the Shrew. Students giggle and chatter animatedly as they wait. They sit on the floor in narrow rows, nearly sitting on top of each other. Their excitement is palpable as I watch them trying to crawl closer to the designated play space.

Teachers gently push them back to allow for enough room for the actresses to present the work. I overhear one student telling their friend, “I think Bianca will be beautiful. I want to play that role.” Another student clarifies a burning question with their teacher “Miss, we have to look out for where people are being mean to each other, right? Like we practiced with the video this morning?” Clearly, some teachers have prepared their classes for the content and the children are eager to apply their new knowledge. Then, the principal steps out and asks everyone to settle down and introduces the play. As soon as the performers step out from behind their backdrop, silence falls over the audience. Throughout the performance, students eagerly observe the actresses as they move across the stage and into the audience. Raucous laughter erupts in all the proper places and in the end, students sway and sing along to final musical number. Evidently, the show was a huge success with a majority of the students. Shakespeare’s work had come to life for them. As I watch the students leave the gym to return to their classrooms, their excitement and heightened energy reverberate through the school.
With great satisfaction and joy, I find myself once again reveling in the power of storytelling and how much enjoyment students got out of this experience in general. As the students exit the gym, chatting animatedly or singing the final tune once more, I have a chance to reflect on what I had just witnessed. I can step back and critically think through the material presented. With this thought, I turn to the investigation of how Shakespeare, violence prevention, and education come together in this touring model in Colorado.

Between 20% and 25% of U.S. students report being the target of bullying behavior or engaging in bullying behavior, according to the 2015 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Research also shows that victims of bullying are at higher risk for behavioral, psychological, and emotional disorders, which further increases risk of harm to others, self-harm, and suicide ideation (CDC 2016; Kingston et al.; 2016, O’Connell et al. 2009). According to stopbullying.gov, an online resource to prevent bullying, researchers currently do not have a consensus regarding the rate of bullying over the years. Patton, et al., authors of a 2017 research strategies review on school bullying, suggest this ambivalence in the research may stem from the fact that the research methods utilized do not fully capture the complex issue. In their review, they note that, “anti-bullying initiatives are on the rise, but bullying remains a persistent problem” (12). While bullying remains persistent overall, the rise of cyberbullying does indicate a potential for greater violence resulting in increased emotional and physical harm (Midlarsky & Klain, 38). In light of this urgent demand for stronger interventions and preventions, numerous studies, programs and practitioners point to the need for multidisciplinary and multitiered approaches (Denmark, 2005; Kingston, Mihalic & Sigel 2016; Meyer, 2008, Olweus, 1993; Villani & Ward, 2001, and others). The Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV)
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at the University of Colorado at Boulder (UCB) has developed several such cross-disciplinary programs and resources. For this study, the collaboration between the CSPV, Safe2Tell, and the Colorado Shakespeare Festival (CSF), will provide a site of investigation to further understand how such programming may look and be implemented.

The CSPV at UCB focuses on multidisciplinary research connecting the research community, practitioners, educators and policy makers. Their goal lies in finding effective and tangible programs for “preventing violence and antisocial behavior and promoting positive youth development” (“CSPV About”). Beverly Kingston, Ph.D., whose research, publications and personal interview will provide a foundation to this study, is the current CSPV director. CSPV has developed a multi-tiered programming approach called the Safe Community Safe Schools model (SCSS). The objective of this program is “to strengthen schools’ existing efforts to promote safety and enhance positive school climate. We will work in close alignment with what schools are already doing to streamline strategies that ensure schools are attuned and responsive to the needs of students and staff” (SCSS PDF). Both Safe2Tell and CSF’s are integrated in this model.

Safe2Tell is a wide-reaching, professionally run, and anonymous tool accessible to anyone in Colorado via a safe phone line, smartphone app, and interactive website. Their mission is “to ensure that every student, parent, teacher and community member in Colorado has a safe and anonymous way to report any concerns to their safety or the safety of others, with a focus on early intervention and prevention through awareness and education” (“Safe2Tell About Us”).

The Colorado Shakespeare Festival is a professional theatre company established in 1958 at the University of Colorado at Boulder. The festival’s overarching focus lies in investigating, exploring and preserving “the classics of the past and pursuing the classics of the future” (“CSF
about”) through artistry and scholarship. The CSF Shakespeare & Violence Prevention program (CSF program) stems from a collaboration with CSPV and Safe2Tell with support from CU Outreach and Engagement. CSF’s focus lies with bullying prevention specifically, while also seeking to address larger concepts of violence in schools. Since 2011, this particular program has reached over 72,000 Colorado students (grades 3 – 12). CSF describes the violence prevention program as: “Professional actors perform an abridged Shakespeare play at your school, followed by classroom workshops about violence prevention. Students in post-show workshops roleplay alternatives to violence and learn about Safe2Tell, an anonymous tipline” (CSF “Shakespeare & Violence Prevention”). Their program goals are mainly to nurture a love for theatre and Shakespeare, foster awareness regarding bullying in schools and upstander behavior, introduce Safe2Tell as an intervention tool, and to encourage continued discussion.

As noted, Safe2Tell and the CSF program are part of the overarching SCSS model, which aims to serve as a preventative measure to “positively impact school climate and culture; increase school safety; increase social-emotional competence and encourage prosocial behaviors; address mental health needs; reduce student behavior problems; support environments that promote academic achievement” (SCSS PDF). A key element of this prevention lies in pro-social behavior development and social-emotional competencies. Utilizing theatre practices to develop these skills and competencies is not a recent development, but has found a strong foothold due to rigorous social science and medical research.¹ CSF also recognized the link between theatre practice and social-emotional skill development and began a partnership with CSPV. CSF utilizes the affective power of theatre and seeks to include tangible tools for violence prevention.

suing critical analysis through storytelling and interactive educational methods. The program creators recognize the reality that bullying often occurs where no adult supervision is present and thus students are left to their own devices to manage bullying situations. In 2001, researchers Hawkins, et al. discovered that “when bystanders intervene, bullying stops within 10 seconds, 57% of the time” (519). CSF uses this data to shape their approach, as these bystanders mostly will be peers present during a bullying situation. The program focuses on positive behavior modeling, socio-emotional learning, and critical analysis to allow students to recognize bullying situations and evaluating ways to help. CSF has developed a two-step model: First, a large number of students (often the entire school) watch a 45-minute performance of an age-appropriate adaptation of a Shakespeare play, usually hosted in the school’s gym. Then three pre-selected classes (up to 30 students per facilitator) have the opportunity to engage in an applied theatre inspired workshop introducing bullying prevention tools such as Safe2Tell. For the students that cannot attend the workshop, teachers are encouraged to utilize complementary material in a classroom session. For the case study presented here, I will focus on the Fall 2016 production of *Taming of the Shrew* and workshop presented at four Boulder Valley School District elementary schools that are recurring partners with the CSF program.

In using the Colorado Shakespeare Festival’s Shakespeare & Violence Prevention in the Schools Program as a case study, specifically looking at the Fall 2016 season’s adaptation of *Taming of the Shrew*, I seek to discern what we can learn about using theatre as violence prevention programming in the Boulder Valley School District and neighboring region. What aspects of their model serve the community particularly well and where does it fall short? By placing this model into the larger applied theatre context and comparing it to two other regional models, where can CSF implement changes to serve the community with greater potential for
ethically, financially sound, and lasting impact? Lastly, it is important to note that this specific program has not been studied before. The hope is that this study will serve as the foundation for future study regarding its impact, efficacy, and scalability. As the program continues to receive funding to expand its reach, it is time to conduct an analysis and inspection of the model itself to strengthen the work moving forward.

In Colorado, CSF is not the only group that offers a theatre-based bullying prevention program. To place the CSF program in the larger applied theatre context in the state, I have selected two other well-supported groups: Mirror Image Arts (MIA) and Kaiser Permanente’s subgroup Arts Integrated Resources (AIR), Operating mostly in Denver, MIA, an applied theatre nonprofit, was formed in 2008. Since 2012, a new board of directors under the leadership of Andrea Rabold refocused the mission of the group: “Mirror Image Arts uses theatre as language to inspire dialogue, encourage awareness, and promote action in order to build a stronger, compassionate, and empowered community” (“Mirror Image Arts History”). More specifically, the central application of their programs – “Your Voice Matters” making up the single-day program – lies in bullying prevention through the use of theatre techniques to develop “empathy, skills for root cause analysis, problem solving, effective communication and conflict resolution” (Mirror Image Arts – Bullying Prevention). MIA relies mostly on methods developed by notable applied theatre practitioners Augusto Boal, Dorothy Heathcote, and Michael Rohd. Their work relies on original stories and dynamic characters based on children and teens’ experiences in today’s world.

The second group, Arts Integrated Resources (AIR), is a sub-organization of Kaiser Permanente Health Care Company (KP), which offered a comparable program as part of its community health initiatives. Choose Your Life explicitly focused on bully prevention through a one-hour interactive theatre performance. The production used exercises primarily from Boal and
Playback Theatre,\textsuperscript{2} and used an original script written and continuously edited by teaching artists employed by AIR. This particular program ended in December 2016; AIR had toured Choose your Life widely all across Colorado for over six years fueled by KP’s vast budget and administrative support. As of fall 2016, AIR has restructured its programming to offer new touring work using theatre methods. Instead of focusing on a program specifically geared towards bullying prevention, they have deepened their approach to address what they see as more foundational issues (issues involved in the social mechanisms that can lead to bullying): mental health questions, related stigma and socio-emotional learning overall. Comparing CSF to these two programs that provide a sense of friendly and productive competition in the shared market for such curricula, will allow me to investigate how CSF falls into this market and what niche aspects their program offers. The comparison will also illuminate what CSF can learn from other models in the organizations’ efforts to continually improve their existing format.

I come to this work as a researcher, scholar, practitioner and theatre artist, who began her practice of applied theatre in 2009 at Brandeis University. I have had the good fortune to have been raised in a multi-lingual, -ethnic, and -cultural setting, and have worked internationally on many projects with and for youth. My undergraduate studies focused on Peace, Conflict and Coexistence studies with a emphasis on the applied performance arts, which provides the foundation to my work. Returning to the U.S. for my master’s degree, I decided to discover how applied theatre methods could be utilized for violence prevention in U.S. schools while working within the often rigid and underfunded public school system. At UCB, the Colorado Shakespeare Festival is well-known for its efforts of this nature and through discussions with the program

\textsuperscript{2} Playback Theatre definition: “[Playback Theatre] is an original form of improvisational theatre in which audience or group members tell stories form their lives and watch them enacted on the spot” (“PlaybackTheatre”).
director Amanda Giguere, Ph.D., I recognized the need for a study of this long-established model. As an artist and scholar, I am completely unattached to William Shakespeare’s work, thus, I hope to provide clear and critical analysis for the reader. However, I will not promise unbiased interpretation of this data, as a human being can never interpret from a completely objective standpoint. In her dissertation, drama therapy and applied theatre scholar Nisha Sajnani notes the “necessity of situating oneself in relation to social stratifications of power in order to remain cognizant of the positive and negative biases that accompany an inter-subjective inquiry” (52). My analysis is colored by these stratifications of power and inherent lenses through which I interpret the world I perceive. In this case, my leanings underline the established practices of applied theatre.

On the other side of the data collection, simply standing in the room observing with a clipboard in hand, immediately alters the data observed as my presence may alter the subjects’ behavior. Moreover, it is significant to recognize, which data I did observe and what went unnoticed in my observation. Without doubt, a different researcher could have the opportunity to pick up other subtleties and perhaps discard those I offer to the reader. Therefore, bias, in the true sense, is unavoidable.

I personally did not interact with workshop participants due to BVSD regulations and limitations placed on my research. In not being allowed to interact with participants, I discovered a useful, albeit a more distanced, mode of observation. I do believe, this distance allowed me to observe minute details with greater accuracy than if I had been more directly involved. Furthermore, as I took no part in the development of the production and workshops, I could observe with fresh eyes and can critically analyze the work. Nonetheless, my previous professional and artistic experiences, my personal relative unfamiliarity with Shakespeare’s work and my cultural upbringing all undoubtedly influence how I present my research in this thesis.
LITERATURE REVIEW & DEFINITION OF TERMS

The multi-disciplinary and multi-layered nature of this research requires equally multi-layered analysis. First, I will outline key terms and ideas regarding current scholarship, research and practices in bullying/violence prevention in U.S. public schools. I will then look at the connection between theatre and violence prevention and the connection to the larger field of applied theatre (AT). I will then hone in on the placement of Shakespeare as a specific element in theatre and violence prevention work, and how CSF’s program fits into this larger narrative.

Scholarship on Bullying Prevention in the U.S. School System

This study does not seek to fully unfold all the diverse facets of bullying behavior and bullying interventions as its primary focus, however, a basic understanding of terminology, key facts and ideas remains significant to analyze the specific model CSF has to offer. Bullying behavior is complex and identifying contributing factors to such behavior have changed over the decades, thus the definitions of bullying vary greatly among scholars. CSF chose to shape their approach with CSPV and Safe2Tell utilizing Dan Olweus’ work as their foundation. Olweus is a research professor of psychology often celebrated as a pioneer in bullying research and thus quoted in numerous studies on the subject. In his seminal book *Bullying at School* (1993), Olweus defines bullying as: “A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students” (9). Olweus adds that the term should only be applied when a power imbalance exists between students and not be utilized merely during a fight or argument between two students of equal power (be this physical strength, popularity, etc.). Additionally, he notes the significance to recognizing *direct bullying* versus *indirect bullying* (10). Direct bullying consists of physical and verbal aggression, while indirect bullying includes gossiping, mocking, social exclusion, having
property taken or damaged, and more recently cyber bullying (“Olweus Bullying Prevention Program”). Olweus’ work does not directly address the link between bullying and issues of race, sex, gender, and class, however, these remain significant and contemporary research seeks to include these facets (Pepler and Craig 5; Stein 29; Meyer). With these newer insights, Pepler and Craig highlight an additional factor, which CSF has adopted: The major concern of bullying behavior lies in gaining power through aggressive means (5). Based on these criteria, the CDC and CSPV have determined that between 20% and 25% of students report being the target of bullying behavior or engaging in bullying behavior in the U.S (SCSS, 9; Hamburger et al., 1).

Bullying behavior is directly linked to several health concerns such as mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders, including substance abuse, self-harm and suicide ideation, further aggressive and violent behavior, etc. (O’Connell et al.106; Kingston et al. 133; Meyer, 35; Hamburger et al., 1).

CSPV, Safe2Tell and CSF frame bullying as a behavior, not a characteristic of a person. Bullying behavior can be situational and temporary. Moreover, it can be changed. Pedagogically and psychologically, it is significant to recognize this difference. If we view bullying as a stagnant characteristic, there is no possibility or hope for change and programming geared at intervention or prevention would be useless. Stopbullying.gov, a government funded digital resource for bullying prevention, operates on the same insight and has found that “using a label sends a message that the child’s behavior doesn’t change from one situation to the next. Actually, a child may play different roles, depending on the situation” and that “labels suggest that behavior is fixed and is unlikely to improve over time” (Stopbullying.gov). Thus, bullying should be viewed as a behavior that can be learned and unlearned. This is a core value CSF and CSPV base their programming on.
It is important to note that CSF works as a preventative method, not an intervention. CSPV and CSF utilize the definition the Office of the Surgeon General of the U.S. provides for their programming direction:

Prevention programs are designed to prevent or reduce violent behaviors by acting on risk and protective factors. Reducing risk is a less stringent standard than reducing violence, but reducing risk undoubtedly holds some promise of preventing violence. Thus, significant changes in risk factors for violence are acceptable indications of program effectiveness . . . In addition, because most violence begins in adolescence, childhood interventions are concerned primarily with risk reduction. (Office of the Surgeon General U.S.)

CSF’s aims are similarly long-term and seek to inspire further discussion and heighten awareness of the issues, thus supplementing the reduction of risk over time. While their one-time contact with students might feel simplistic, it does create a learning moment for those students it interacts with. CSF’s program serves just a single step towards cultivating holistic and healthy discussions regarding bullying and violence in school.

U.S. students are a culturally diverse group of people affected by bullying behavior. Surprisingly, in their book Violence and Non-Violence in the Schools: A Manual for Administration (2001) researchers Villani and Ward found that some U.S. schools operate on a misguided “belief that a child with good grades, no major discipline problems and good attendance is ultimately ‘fine’” (2). Similarly, it is incorrect to assume that only certain students (commonly assumed to be low-income, part of a minority group, and/or LGBTQIA) are at risk for bullying behavior or could become a target of bullying (Villani and Ward, 2; Meyer). In fact, any student is at risk of either exhibiting bullying behavior or becoming a target of bullying.
Good grades, participation in athletics and popularity are not guarantees for non-problem behavior. Any sort of social-emotional risk factors, such as exposure to trauma, mental health issues, race, gender, sexual orientation, and many more, may increase the likelihood of problem behaviors and can affect any student on either end of the issue (Kingston et al, 1). Furthermore, bullying and violent behavior is not limited to urban areas. Villani and Ward discovered that “the rise of violence is in suburban areas” adding that “no school is immune to violence, regardless of its location or wealth” (11). Specific elements, such as these, may impact the prevalence and gravity of bullying, but it remains difficult to distinguish them as individual factors. Rather they form a complex net that envelops students and clearly they are all deeply linked to political and social ideologies present in the culture of the U.S. overall, as well as internally in the microcosms of each school community.

As these issues overlap and form such dense complex intersections, who can best become involved to change the dynamics enabling bullying and violence? Researchers Pepler and Craig note that peers are present in 85% of bullying episodes (9). Based on this insight, Lynn Hawkin’s subsequent research with Pepler and Craig found that an intervention from a peer could stop bullying in 10 seconds (or less) 57% of the time (519). These findings have become foundational to bystander and upstander theories in bullying research and a significant part of many current bullying prevention programs. A bystander is usually understood as an audience member passively observing an incident. Once an observer actively steps in to intervene, even with a small gesture, they can be referred to as an upstander. This theory has served as a source of inspiration for numerous intervention programs, including research and tools developed at CSPV, Safe2Tellm and CSF. On a larger scale – numerous universities including the University of Colorado at Boulder – provide bystander trainings and workshops to educate community
members on how to intervene and deescalate situations. The development of these trainings suggest a common passivity of bystanders. Several studies imply that bystanders frequently feel anxious or uneasy during a bullying episode and opt not to intervene (Hazler, 14). The most common reasons found for a lack of intervention lies in 1) an insecurity of what to do; 2) they may fear retaliation and becoming a target of bullying themselves, and, 3) they may worry about creating bigger problems for all parties involved if they do not help in the right way (Hazler, 14; Unnever and Cornell, 7). Thus specific trainings addressing these notions as part of a standard curriculum can help ease these insecurities (Polanin et al, 61).

In addition to and as a part of bystander training, a greater focus on social-emotional learning and empathy training has emerged. Bystander interventions are considered prosocial behavior, as they largely rely on strong social-emotional skills and empathetic reactions (Polanin et al., 61; Gini et al., 619). Social and emotional learning (SEL) is a relatively new framework a growing number of schools and districts, including BVSD, are adopting. The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning is a leader in this research and they define SEL as the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. (“What is SEL?”)

These social-emotional skills assist students in managing their emotions for better mental and emotional health, self-regulation in highly emotional situations, and a greater capacity to intervene appropriately to deescalate conflict situations (O’Conner et al., 311). These skills can be learned and trained, forming pro-social behavior. Psychologist and researcher Nancy
Eisenberg and her colleagues have provided foundational terminology and research for this behavior. According to Eisenberg, Fabes, and Holmgren, “Prosocial behaviour is often defined as voluntary action intended to aid or benefit another” (169). Developing these skills for this voluntary behavior then can support the creation of a positive school climate. The former director of CSPV, Delbert Elliott, describes this ostensibly abstract and intangible notion in his 2009 article, “Lessons from Columbine,” as

A safe school climate is characterized by: a strong academic orientation; respect from teachers and peers; positive feelings and attitudes towards school on the part of the students; perceived reward for effort, is that students have then seen that if they work hard there are positive results; respect for authority, a clean and orderly campus; high teacher morale; and clear disciplinary policies that are fairly enforced. (55)

CSPV identifies SEL, prosocial behavior and the creating and maintaining of a positive and healthy school climate as key protective factors for the prevention of bullying and violence in schools (SCSS PDF).

However, Elliott notes that these elements remain difficult to implement in schools today. He observed a strong shift towards reactionary interventions to violence instead of strengthening prevention methods. Correspondingly, he noted the creation of “schools turned into mini-fortresses or jail-like settings in an effort to protect students” (54), which he and other researchers deem largely ineffective. Thus both grasping the various elements of prevention and the issue itself has proven to be complex. The corresponding research has been equally complex. Beginning with Olweus in the 1980’s, many researchers and program creators have found that a multi-tiered and systemic approach to anti-bullying training provides the greatest potential
impact. Olweus’ findings, Villani and Ward’s work, and the most recent research by Kingston et al. see the classroom and school as its own community with multiple tiers (students, teachers, staff and leadership) that intersect. Secondarily, the multi-tiered approach fanned outward to the larger community and families, as they further have a significant impact on the students’ daily lives. Moreover, the complexity of elements that arise with bullying, spanning from poor performance in school, health issues, absence from school, etc., further require a multi-tiered program in the interdisciplinary sense. The idea of having multi-tiered approaches has been adopted as a national recommendation (CDC; Kingston, 133; Denmark et al., X; Villani and Ward, 13, Garrity et al, 237). While the systemic and multi-tiered approaches have been key to modern interventions, only 5% of most high-risk students are receiving evidence-based programming and treatment (Kingston et al., 132). Kingston et al. also recognize that there exists a lack in consensus regarding the research with a clearly defined scientific standard, which has led to confusion regarding efficacy of programming (134). Patton et al. further note that there is “a gap . . . in linking empirically based bullying interventions to those actually delivered in schools” (12). Various researchers also note, pointing towards the complexity of the issue, that no “one-size fits all” research model to assess interventions exists. Their research makes it clear that further assessment tools, models, and a field-wide consensus are needed to evaluate intervention models (Kingston et al.; Patton et al.; Denmark).

Theatre-In-Education and as Anti-Bullying Prevention

Notable drama therapist and author of a *Handbook of Educational Drama and Theatre* (1982), Robert Landy, recognizes role-playing in school, specifically drama in the classroom setting, as “a method of educating” (15). He notes that schools have used drama to teach other subjects for some time, such as the language arts or history. Furthermore, he highlights “the
educational values inherent in the interdisciplinary nature of drama, a process that in many ways underlies all human learning” (56). However, here it is significant to return to a basic understanding of how Landy utilizes the terminology of drama versus theatre, the latter of which is of greater significance in this research. Landy sees drama as “not necessarily performed to an audience” (5) while theatre “implies the development of a product, a script that is rehearsed and performed . . .” (6). While the terms are often used interchangeably, Landy calls for a distinction between drama and theatre. Landy most productively discusses a method that attempts to bring these two concepts together, which this is where CSF’s programming fits in: Theatre-in-Education or TIE. TIE is a specific method that produces a “presentation of plays in schools or theatres by a trained team of actors-teachers who prepare ways to relate the experience of theatre to the regular classroom curriculum and to the lives of the students” (7). This final step leads to some room for interactive play with participants (63), akin to the workshops and brief post-performance question and answer session CSF conducts.

AT scholar Philip Taylor recognizes TIE in his book *Applied Theatre: Creating Transformative Encounters in the Community* (2003) as a movement and “just one example of how theatre has been applied in educational settings to address issues” (1). Interestingly, this newer term, *applied theatre* now serves as an umbrella term that includes TIE as a subgenre. AT scholar Helen Nicholson describes AT as “forms of dramatic activity that primarily exist outside conventional mainstream theatre institutions, and which are specifically intended to benefit individuals, communities and societies” (2). However, in *Theatre for Change* (2012), co-authors by Landy and David Montgomery, acknowledge that the term does spark controversy, which they find due to “its forays into political and social activism, and because of its challenge to the more established fields of Drama in Education and TIE” (129). Furthermore, some artist-practitioners
may feel negatively inclined towards this push for affective theatre and fear a loss of the purity and aesthetic quality of other forms of theatre. Landy and Montgomery thus feature Jan Cohen-Cruz’s answer to the issue in an interview:

The problem with Applied Theatre is that it is often understood as being too operational. You learn it and then you apply it to a situation. It’s treated as the second cousin of real knowledge. And the notion of application doesn’t communicate how reciprocal such relationships tend to be . . . Some of the people who understand Applied Theatre the least are people in theatre, but their goal in theatre is more product than process. (163)

This process lies at the heart of the work in AT. Augusto Boal is a founding figure of the AT field, fully embracing the philosophy of this process for change. In his seminal work *Theatre of the Oppressed* (1985), he unpacks his theory and praxis, which leans on Brecht’s work, Marxist theory and Paulo Freire’s pedagogy. Boal sought to activate the theatre audience and make them active participants in their own liberation, or change. The aim was to have the observer “free himself; he thinks and acts for himself” and Boal concludes that “perhaps theatre is not revolutionary in itself; but have no doubts it is a rehearsal of revolution!” (155). This activating of the audience is perhaps the most crucial ingredient to AT work in order to ignite change. Moreover, Boal locates the desire to become active not in simply providing the best solution for a problem, but in the debate and discussion itself, which he discusses in his later work *Games for Actors and Non-Actors* (1992). Thus creating an inclusive process that rehearses complex and variable approaches and solutions to a problem is a key goal for impactful AT work.

How does AT and/or TIE, manage to become an inclusive process of growth and not simply an “operational tool?” Cohen-Cruz, Boal, and other practitioner-scholars recognize the
need and desire for a dialectic relationship between aesthetic quality and affective process. In other words, the most powerful AT needs both the upholding of artistic integrity and inclusion of participants, regardless of where they are in their process. The individuals who create the script and program design are largely responsible for maintaining this balance. It lies in the hands of the facilitator-actor-teacher to reproduce this quality with each new group. The significance of facilitation is sometimes underestimated, but it is truly the facilitation that gives the work life to impact the target group as intended. Therefore, these facilitators require specific training, and are considered professionals in the field. Philip Taylor provides a practical overarching title for the role of facilitator-actor-teacher, which is commonly used today and becoming an increasingly recognized codified profession: the teaching artist. Taylor defines this key term eloquently:

[T]eaching artist refers to the actors who tour with applied theatre programs. In some ways, they are like a traditional theatre troupe . . . however; they are named teaching artists because they must bring both the skills of presenting theater work and the rare ability to act as educators who can help process the program’s teaching points with diverse groups. (emphasis original, 53)

These teaching artists must possess a distinct characteristic, which not only pertains to the quality of performance and ability to disseminate the content as noted above, but also connect with the participants on a personal level. The teaching artist thus needs the capacity to shift roles between artist, performer, facilitator and teacher all in one. The teaching artist must hold space for participants to interject their own voices and realities and allow for a process to unfold while still keeping program objectives in mind. Therein lies the skills of facilitation. Briefly, I will use the words teaching artist and facilitator interchangeably in this thesis. This is not a conflation of roles, but rather in line with what CSF’s model demands of the people it employs in these roles.
These performers must be equally trained as actors and facilitators. Both “jobs,” and all the additional layers of work these individuals must do in this model specifically, require training, and not one element should be deemed more important over the other in this specific program. The one role they do not need to be able to fill is the work of a therapist or counselor, which is a significant distinction to remember in this work.

At times, this work can also become triggering or feel like therapy. It is important to note that while AT is not therapy and facilitators do not need training and licensing in therapy or drama therapy to practice these methods. Landy and Montgomery recognize drama therapy as an “independent therapy profession” (171). AT practitioner Michael Rohd specifically highlights that AT work can be “therapeutic – it is Not Therapy!” (emphasis original, 71). Rohd goes on to state that practitioners who do not have training in therapeutic methods should not aim to practice therapy in AT sessions as it could lead to great harm done despite good intentions (72).

While AT is not therapy, some neuroscience and psychology researchers are attempting to uncover how this work can produce transformation. It appears the strongest areas of research lie in pro-social behavioral development, empathy, and SEL. Pro-social behavior, empathy, and SEL thus remain key elements as to how theatre becomes a sought-after method to discuss and prevent bullying. Not the only researcher focusing on this work but perhaps the most prolific at this moment is Blythe Corbett at Vanderbilt University, who studies how empathy and theatre are linked. She seeks to understand how empathy could be trained as a skill through interactive theatre for children on the autism spectrum (or other mental health diagnoses). Corbett’s body of research has provided evidence that the connection between theatre and empathy is vital and useful as a tool to develop empathetic behavior and interpersonal skills. Aleida Assmann and Ines Detmers further this idea:
Imaginative empathy plays a great role in the context of fictional works of art. . . .

Aesthetic empathy, projecting, and perspective-taking are closely connected as they all draw on the imagination. These variations of empathy can be trained, with the possibility of reaching higher stages of cultivation. Empathy generated in the purely hypothetical context of fiction differs from empathy activated in personal interaction. (4)

CSF utilizes this same idea in the development of its model, relying on the affective power of generating empathy through role-play. CSF is not alone in using this technique. In fact, many practitioners have studied this connection and often utilize this powerful tool to nurture pro-social skills in their workshops.\(^3\) However, the imaginative empathy relies on more than just the portrayal of empathetic characters or the lack thereof and facilitators highlighting this fact. What comes with this element of the practice is an idea sociologist and peacebuilder John Paul Lederach calls the *moral imagination*, which he outlines in his seminal work *The Moral Imagination* (2004). Lederach utilizes this notion specifically to transform and transcend cycles of violence. While his work focuses on larger global-scale issues, the same core ideas remain applicable to the question of bullying and violence prevention in this thesis.

Lederach determines that “transcending violence is forged by the capacity to generate, mobilize, and build the moral imagination” (5). He goes on to describe the four core disciplines and capacities that the moral imagination requires:

> The moral imagination requires the capacity to imagine ourselves in a web of relationships that includes our enemies; the ability to sustain a paradoxical

curiosity that embraces complexity without reliance on dualistic polarity; the fundamental belief in and pursuit of the creative act; and the acceptance of the inherent risk of stepping into the mystery of the unknown that lies beyond the far too familiar landscape of violence. (5)

At its best, AT programming allows for this moral imagination to develop in the play space through the stories themselves. It is then the teaching artists’ job to facilitate the necessary critical analysis, or distancing, to support the participants in connecting the dots between the ignited empathy, the moral imagination, and their lived experience.

In recognizing these foundational ingredients, numerous projects connecting AT work and/or TIE with bullying have emerged. The programs by CSF, MIA and AIR are such examples and all three draw from the plethora of techniques used and developed by innovators in the field. For example, Jo Salas, another pioneer in the AT field and co-founder of Playback Theatre, discusses how “acting out personal experiences with bullying fosters compassion and empowers all students – bullies, victims, and witnesses – to stand up for what’s right” (78) in her 2005 article “Using Theater to Address Bullying.” Furthermore, Salas found that “seeing their stories acted out helps many young students understand their own experiences in a new way.” Playback Theatre has become a celebrated form performed in and outside of schools internationally. Karen and Tina Gourd noted additional powerful qualities of utilizing AT methods to discuss bullying in their 2011 article “Enacting Democracy: Using Forum Theatre to Confront Bullying.”

We rejected a transmission approach to the topic of bullying, choosing instead to rely on the simultaneous use and development of students’ critical consciousness, creativity and humanness. We committed to acknowledging students as knowers – experts on their experiences with bullying – and as able to
analyze and understand the complexity of their personal and social interactions.

(404)

Tina Gourd herself is a school teacher, and found the idea of the student as the expert particularly impactful, which is something other teachers have recognized as well. Furthermore, Katja Joronen et al.’s article 2011 article “An Evaluation of a Drama Program to Enhance Social Relationships and Anti-Bullying at Elementary School: A Controlled Study” sought to assess this impact scientifically. It is one of the few comprehensive critical studies on the effect of TIE in school as a violence prevention method and their findings “suggest that a drama program may enhance social relationships between students and the students and the teacher” (11). Other notable projects that have influenced or perhaps even guided theatre based anti-bullying projects internationally require a brief mention as they shape my understanding of the work at least cursorily: John O’Toole and Bruce Burton’s The Brisbane DRACON project which served youth in the Brisbane area for several years and ENACT, a long-standing Educational Theatre company in New York, which was developed by drama therapist Diana Feldman. As I have met both O’Toole and Feldman and discussed their projects in detail, this information colors my observations and analysis. Colorado benefits from at least three significant TIE and AT programs comparable to the aforementioned programs (if not more that have gone unnoticed thus far). Evidently, using theatre based approaches for anti-bullying curricula is not novel, however, few use Shakespeare as a foundation. Based on my research, no other organizations have used this specific combination of components continually for so many years. Thus, the question remains, why specifically use Shakespeare to do this work?

---

4 Most recently Michael Balfour, et al. published similar findings in their 2016 book *Applied Theatre: Resettlement*, in which teachers and researchers noted a “growing sense of self-esteem” in their students (139).
Shakespeare in TIE as Anti-Bullying Programming

William Shakespeare’s work has been lifted to a pedestal in English speaking countries and his work is celebrated around the world. As a teacher and teaching artist, I often ask my students a) if they of know any playwrights and b) who they believe the most famous playwright is. If they said yes to a) the vast majority of students always answered William Shakespeare for b). Even as a teenager in Switzerland, I grew up with his work in my classes. In the U.S. in particular, Shakespeare’s work and the myth of a man has become part of nearly every English class syllabus. In fact, the Common Core mentions only Shakespeare by name as a required author and playwright. The core standards website states “[i]nclude Shakespeare as well as other authors . . . Include at least one play by Shakespeare and one play by an American dramatist” (“Common Core”). Evidently, Shakespeare has become the only writer (author and playwright) worth mentioning in the nationwide educational approach. Therefore, understanding and knowing Shakespeare’s work has become synonymous with academic success and generally a good education in the U.S. Entire festivals are dedicated solely to his work, or work inspired by his opus; the Colorado Shakespeare Festival is just one example. Thousands of websites are dedicated to the man, the mythical figure and his work. Michelle Boston writing for the USC News (University of Southern California) notes that Shakespeare has become a “profitable brand for hundreds of years” in her article “Six Reasons Shakespeare Remains Relevant 400 Years after his Death” (2016). This marketability certainly plays a role in the CSF program model as well.

Usually, Shakespeare is not introduced into the classroom until 9th grade as per Common Core standards, however, Shakespeare advocates, such as Canadian educator Lois Burdett, discusses the significance of introducing Shakespeare earlier in her chapter in the book
Reimagining Shakespeare for Children and Young Audiences (2003). In her work, she recognized that students understood far more than the basic plot of a play, but could also “begin to tap literary talents they never even suspected they had” and get to know “timeless themes and emotions” (48). She also found that an increasingly test-oriented educational system may deem drama a “frill.” Nevertheless, she recognized that many benefits to the students from their encounter with Shakespeare would not be measured by a test: as their concentration and attention develop, children started trying new things and she witnessed “children expressing a new confidence in their own abilities” (54). Similarly, former educator and Head of Education at the Folger Shakespeare Library, Janet Field-Pickering, discussed her surprising findings that even D.C.’s inner-city elementary school students fell in love with Shakespeare in her chapter “Shakespeare Steps Out: The Primacy of Language in the Inner-City Classrooms.” She wondered

Why did students like it so much? Are these inner-city children responding to Shakespeare’s position as a cultural icon? In a school district that includes elementary schools with a decided emphasis on multi-cultural or Afro-centric curricula, why the great interest in one of the original “dead white males?” (208)

Field-Pickering questions if Shakespeare is perceived as “alien or culturally oppressive in schools where the majority of the students are nonwhite?” (215). In her six years of work with this programming, she felt that students of any ethnic and cultural background had the capacity to understand and to greatly enjoy Shakespeare’s language and stories. She found that “[t]here is no fear of Shakespeare as alien, or culturally oppressive, or too difficult for any students or teachers to grasp” (216). Furthermore, researcher and English professor, Kristen Olson, Ph.D.,
discusses Shakespeare and language development in children in her chapter “Your Play Need No
Excuse.” She found that

Shakespeare is one of the most adept manipulators of linguistic pattern and
resonance, so it is natural to expect children to be responsive to the resonance of
pattern available in Shakespearean poetry. Though they certainly would not be
able to recognize the multiplicity of nuance inherent in a sonnet . . . children are
clearly sensitive to the play of pattern and symmetry available in Shakespearean
language, and their own linguistic development can be enhanced by exposure to
these experiences of pattern-rich language. (221)

In these educators’ writings, their findings reinforced their positive stance towards using
Shakespeare in the classroom. Indeed, many educators and scholars clearly still advocate for
Shakespeare in the classroom. For example, George Belliveau, Ph.D., Professor at the University
of British Columbia and his 2012 essay “Shakespeare and Literacy: A Case Study in a Primary
Classroom” illuminates how many literacy skills young student can gain through exposure to
Shakespeare at a young age. Similarly, Astrid Yi-Mei Cheng and Joe Winston’s 2011 article
“Shakespeare as a second language: playfulness, power and pedagogy in the ESL classroom”
serves as an example of how English language acquisition can be supported through the use of
Shakespeare in the classroom. Belliveau’s work demonstrates the capacity students have to
understand and embrace the dense and difficult Shakespearean language and stories. Cheng and
Winston’s essay argues the case that including Shakespeare as part of the curriculum for English
as a Second Language classes can provide valuable tools for students to gain “[a]ccess to cultural
capital, as well as formal linguistic competence” (542). They promote this notion as it also
positions “the personal, human interests of ESL learners as central” (543). However, fast
forwarding to more recent discoveries and arguments made against Shakespeare in the classroom, it becomes apparent not everyone supports the blanket use of Shakespeare in education.

Janet Field-Pickering already pointed at the issue of promoting the work of a “dead white male” in 2003. In recent years, educators, the media, and perhaps even the general public has become more acutely aware of this discussion. Sacramento teacher Dana Dusbiber penned the highly contested article “Teacher: Why I don’t want to assign Shakespeare anymore (even though he is in the Common Core)” featured in The Washington Post in 2015. Her article showcases many issues regarding literacy and teacher training, however, she pinpoints the crux of the matter most succinctly:

What I worry about is that as long as we continue to cling to ONE (white) MAN’S view of life as he lived it so long ago, we (perhaps unwittingly) promote the notion that other cultural perspectives are less important. In the 25 years that I have been a secondary teacher, I have heard countless times, from respected teachers (mostly white), that they will ALWAYS teach Shakespeare, because our students need Shakespeare and his teachings on the human condition. (emphasis original, Dusbiber)

Indeed, in contemporary discourse, the ideas for stronger representation of marginalized voices and stories has moved to the forefront. The destabilizing of the power that still remains with Euro-centric, white, Christian and male voices through the uplifting of marginalized voices has become a radical act to subvert the status quo. While I personally believe such small subversive acts are powerful components of allyship and important in today’s political climate, I also
recognize that the case for using Shakespeare remains strong and deeply researched. Indeed, Shakespeare in the classroom will not come to an end any time soon.

In 2015, African-American playwright, J. Holtham responded to Dusbiber’s article in his own writing in *American Theatre*. While he recognizes the fact that Shakespeare is indeed a white playwright and uplifting other narratives is equally significant, he strongly advocates for the use of Shakespeare in the classroom as

Shakespeare teaches us about love, honor, duty. About parents and children. About ambition and greed. These are things that all of us face, the things that make us human. There are other writers, of course, who write about these things, but most of them are in conversation with Shakespeare in one way or another. I don’t think Shakespeare should be alone in the classroom (or on our stages), but he should be there. (Holtham)

Holtham pinpoints the power of Shakespeare’s play as they have transcended time and space for centuries. Moreover, the stories are set in a time and place far away with customs vastly different from ours in the U.S. today. It is perhaps in that foreignness that great potential lies to connect and train audiences’ and students’ capacity for empathy. Shakespeare tells stories of people as they live their lives and audiences can connect to these characters with ease if mindfully performed. Similarly, Maurice Hunt, in his President’s Forum Keynote Address at Baylor University further connects the relatability to the recognition of empathy in the writing as “Shakespeare makes empathy personal” and may ignite a desire to do better than these fictional characters in the viewer (8). Thus, using Shakespeare in schools, in particular through specific programming such as CSF’s, operates two-fold: it can illustrate and utilize the power of
empathy, which students can draw on in their everyday life, and supports educational needs regarding cultural exposure, literacy, etc.

Aside from CSF’s program, there have been a few projects that have connected Shakespeare to theatre-based anti-bullying programming in schools: for example, the program by George Bellivieau, Ph.D. at the University of British Columbia;\(^5\) the Shakespeare Festival St. Louis Education Tour focused on anti-bullying; and lastly, “Speaking Daggers” by Shakespeare on the Sound in Connecticut.

Joe Winston and Miles Tandy, authors of the book *Beginning Shakespeare 4-11* (2009) further recognize that Shakespeare’s work has great depth and even practical jokes can make an audience member ask questions and recognize problematic content. Furthermore, audiences or participants can ask if a joke has perhaps turned into bullying as Shakespeare’s dramatic situations and dilemmas are doubtless more extreme than those that most children will have to face but they nonetheless resonate with what they know and understand about the world and their own place in it. . . Shakespeare is powerful, then, in a number of ways; his language can evoke and arouse powerful emotions, his stories can exercise a powerful grip on our imaginations; and his themes deal with all kinds of human problems that are still powerfully relevant to us today. (5)

**METHODOLOGY**

My immediate instinct lead to research regarding impact evaluation of the program, but I discovered I did not have the proper tools in place to complete such a multifaceted long-term

---

Thus, to set up a seedling understanding of the overall program, I determined the necessity of analyzing and unpacking the basic structure of the CSF program as a first step. To do so, I began by parsing out its multiple layers and the interdisciplinary nature of the program. Thus the study and methodology require an equally complex approach. As such, the study must be compartmentalized into several separate units beginning with the CSF script and performance, the Q&A segment, the workshop script and facilitation. The overarching model will be shaped around the observation of the CSF program at four schools, which serve as case studies. Judith Ackroyd published a useful collection of essays titled *Research Methodologies for Drama Education* (2006), which served as a starting point to devising the interdisciplinary methods used here. Philip Taylor’s chapter within this book aided me in recognizing that the researcher holds certain privileges and power and can never fully comprehend the diverse and complex perspectives of each participant in the study. In acknowledging this ambivalent and challenging positioning, the case study model emerged as a most viable methodology to capture as much of the underlying questions as possible while remaining with an intentionally narrow scope. This qualitative form allows for flexibility to investigate deeply within my scope and capture multiple facets through my observations. The case study as a form has become a much utilized tool for drama and theatre research. In his chapter “Researching Through Case Studies” in Ackroyd’s book, Joe Winston notes that “the real power of case study to generate new knowledge can be likened to the knowledge generated by the best forms of drama . . . it challenges and disrupts our common sense understandings . . . question what had hitherto remained unquestioned . . .” (44). Thus, the case study model serves as the foundation to the research at large.

The case study includes four specific schools participating in the CSF Fall 2016 school tour. I had the opportunity to observe four recurring partner BVSD elementary schools, all of
which had participated with the CSF program at least once before. The schools are located in vastly differing socio-economic areas within BVSD, including one school in a more rural setting, Douglass Elementary, compared to three relatively urban schools: Columbine Elementary, Crest View Elementary, and Whittier Elementary. This seemingly narrow scope provided rich and divers grounds to observe a vast variety of responses and interactions with the material presented.

CSF’s model falls under the wide net of AT and I will turn to Philip Taylor’s book Applied Theatre in order to set the lens and parameters for this analysis. In his first chapter “Applied Theatre as a Transformative Agent,” he extracts eight core elements to include in AT work. I have rephrased these elements as questions to decipher how CSF has approached these elements, if at all, and thus see how the program design fits with a larger AT narrative and approach overall:

1) How, if at all, does the research for the development of this program look at the target audience, goals and overall design to meet the needs of the community?
2) Does the design allow for open questions and the creation of more questions and solutions? Is it in a sense incomplete when the students first see it?
3) Does the programming allow for the demonstration of multiple possible narratives?
4) Is the work task-oriented, and if so, how?
5) Does the programming create an evolving narrative and dilemmas?
6) Does the facilitation provide positive feedback to allow for critical analysis of the interventions the participants may have offered? Are multiple future outcomes possible?
7) How does the program perform as an aesthetic medium?
8) How does the programming allow for the community to take space and have a voice?

Taylor sees these notions as essential to AT work. In his book, he does not specifically distinguish between AT’s open basic frameworks and fully scripted drama used as AT work (for example, through TIE). It appears to me that he uses these ideas regardless of the form itself but rather looks at these questions as the foundations and intentions for any “good” AT work. CSF’s program will potentially provide some challenges in this regard as it encompasses both scripted
and improvisational modes in its form. Moreover, I will not employ this line of questioning to evaluate impact or success of the work, but it allows me to simply state how CSF shapes its model within this established AT framework. Many AT practitioners, myself included, have embraced these ideas, along side others, as crucial to the development of our work with communities. Thus, I will utilize these questions as a foundation to my overarching analysis.

The CSF program will be analyzed as a suspended moment in time, a liminal time-space continuum during which students’ daily schedule was interrupted and they witnessed and participated in a performance and workshops that introduced a new world to them. In this liminal space, the performance and the workshops remain separate, however, both elements invoke Jon Paul Lederach’s notion of the moral imagination in different ways. I will analyze the program both as a whole and dig into details unique to each element of the program (the performance and the workshop). I will use Cynthia Cohen, Roberto Gutiérrez Varea, and Polly Walker’s concept to approach the space where the moral imagination comes to life. Thus I introduce their productive metaphor of a cell’s nucleus from their anthology *Acting Together: Performance and the Creative Transformation of Conflict* (2011):

> Within the membrane, elements that are free-flowing in the larger world (making them difficult to face, contextualize or fully comprehend) are condensed, given dimension, and framed so that they can be recognized and re-viewed . . . we propose that in peacebuilding performance this boundary consists of the aesthetic and ethical sensibilities of the creator/artist animated by the moral imagination – the capacity to be in touch with . . . sufferings of the real world, and simultaneously to imagine and work towards a more just and more life-enhancing imagined order. (162)
I will tie this theoretical lens to Aleida Assmann and Ines Detmers’ notion of imaginative empathy to shape the overarching foundational theoretical framework for the analysis of the case study. The separate elements are then further broken down as follows below.

Case Study Observations

To further understand the structural elements of the CSF program at large, I have developed a Boulder Valley School District (BVSD) observational tool modelled after standard class observational tools used by education researchers. By adjusting the tool to encompass both the CSF performance and following workshops, the tool allows me to track verbal and physical responses of participants, the number of students, staff and teachers in attendance, and make basic observations regarding perceived enjoyment, engagement, and understanding of content. I could further take note of simple codified behavior such as laughter, silence, smiles or frowns, raising of hands to answer questions, attentive posture leaning forward or sitting upright, fidgeting, disengagement by leaving the room, interrupting of actors, observing where students are looking (at the actors or somewhere else) and other general behavior of the audience/participants. The tool also allowed me to track any changes made by actors over time and how they adjusted elements within each classroom setting that I was able to observe. Naturally, seeing only four schools does not permit tracking changes from the beginning to end of the production, but rather my observations may serve as brief check-ins to see where the process is going as the facilitators gain experience. The tool also lets me take note of unusual occurrences and the correlating questions or issues those may bring up.

In a second step, I have also developed specific interview questions, which I will conduct with individuals I have identified as relevant to the study based on their involvement with the CSF program or comparable programming in the region. Each interview form is tailored to
address specificities of the various programs and individual roles of the interviewees. These interviewees are either part of the team of the CSF program, or developers of comparable regional programming. Unfortunately, I cannot conduct additional interviews aside from general conversation during visits, with teachers or staff at the schools I am visiting per agreement with BVSD. The questions in the interviews aim to collect additional information regarding the structure and history of the program, detailed insights of those working with the format, and insights as to how the program aligns with regional needs. The interviews with creators of comparable programs will serve as contrast to further identify unique aspects of the CSF program, gain ideas for recommendations for CSF, and put the program in a conversation with other programs.

Play & Performance

For the play and performance, I begin with the loose script analysis of the CSF adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Taming of the Shrew*. The main goal of the analysis lies in highlighting the key elements, themes, and ideas that CSF originally sought to highlight and also include the key themes that I observed. It is not so much about a structural play analysis in the traditional sense. In my writing, I will tease out the most significant aspects to aid the reader in understanding these specific components as they were presented on stage. As this performance may be the only version of the Shakespearian play the participants encounter at the time of observation, the focus will remain with the contemporary adaptation and not dive into dramaturgical work regarding the original play by Shakespeare. In this particular study, this play and the corresponding performance mostly remains the same from school to school with slight variations to accommodate differing spaces and age groups. In this thesis the elementary school version will be the object of analysis. David Ball’s *Backwards & Forwards* will serve as an overarching lens
as I dig into this investigation. It is worth noting that the CSF *Taming of the Shrew* fall 2016, was also a bilingual piece (English & Spanish), which adds an intriguing complexity to the piece. To my knowledge, a multilingual audience reception theory does not yet exist, so the findings here may serve as research ground to conceive of such a theory at a later date. In this particular study, I will not dive into such a theory, but begin such an exploration by seeing how the multilingual nature of the play fits into this model overall. However, I recommend future analysis of bilingual work as it will most likely remain an element for CSF’s work and others in the future.

**Workshops**

The workshops are formatted so that each of the three teaching artists becomes a facilitator to a single classroom with up to 30 students. Due to this limitation, not everyone who saw the Shakespeare performance can participate in the follow-up workshop (including teachers and staff), thus the workshops must be analyzed separately. As the workshops are interactive and hands-on, I will seek to connect the theoretical framing of the moral imagination in the nucleus and the correlating imaginative empathy to the practice on site. In a second step, I will re-introduce Taylor’s core questions to the applied practice of the workshops and highlight how these align or do not align in the design of the program. I will parse out the exercises and script CSF developed and uses in these workshops and compare them to exercises and models used by MIA and the AIR programming. Furthermore, I will also draw on established resources such as exercises and theory by Augusto Boal, Michael Rohd, and Cynthia Cohen, Ph.D. for this analysis.

Lastly, I am guided by the work of Cohen and her colleagues and their focus on a global perspective. This perspective is valuable because it highlights the greatly diverse needs of different populations and the requirement for facilitators and their programming to listen to those
needs with humility. I will apply the same critical perspective and cultural relativism to my inquiry. As these also form a basis for my own practice, I will also draw on my own training in AT to analyze the exercises and approach used by CSF.

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

As presented here, the subject of using theatre-based methods for in-school bullying prevention programming lives at the intersection of a deeply interdisciplinary quest including, but not limited to sociology, education, psychology, theatre and the subfields of AT. The CSF program itself is equally complex and multi-tiered. Thus the writing will be split into several subsections. The second chapter will focus on the history and development of the CSF program and the collaboration with CSPV and Safe2Tell. The third chapter will contain an analysis of most significant moments in the play and workshop scripts and form of the Fall 2016 Season of CSF’s Shakespeare & Violence Prevention’s play *Taming of the Shrew*. The case studies will be presented and discussed with a particularly critical eye towards the methodology for these observations. In the fourth chapter, I will put the workshops in the greater context of AT and TIE by contrasting the CSF model to MIA’s and AIR’s programming. This will serve as a foundation for potential recommendations for future practice and study, which will follow as recommendations in the fifth and concluding chapter. The thesis will conclude with suggestions and actions steps for future study ideas regarding the potential of multilingual audience interaction and a larger efficacy study of these kinds of programs.

SIGNIFICANCE

Colorado currently has at least three separate entities that offer theatre-based violence prevention programming in schools. Scholars have not yet analyzed the CSF programming and given that CSF’s program has already reached over 72,000 Colorado students and funding has
been granted to continue the touring program, this research is due. It appears that this model will continue to thrive and as more bullying intervention programming arise, understanding the potential benefits and forms provided is crucial to best serve the community of students in need. The research will allow for CSF’s program creators to understand more about the variety of programming it is competing with and see how its own program fits into the larger narrative.

Both within the boundaries of the Colorado education system and beyond on a national scale, this study will allow for practitioners to gain further insights into different programming ideas. It will allow other practitioners and program developers to learn from this specific model. I further hope to provide recommendations for the program and for future research regarding the efficacy of the program. Theatre has proven its power to tell stories and share ideas over the centuries. Robert Landy notes that children engage in “daily spontaneous play. There is available, then, a wealth of dramatic material for teachers to draw upon. Should teachers choose to ignore the natural dramatic play and rich inner lives of children, they are limiting their natural resources and potential to expand the educational experience” (1). A desire for robust theatre-based programming remains, however, stronger evaluation of such programming is necessary, as Kingston et al. (2016) and Patton et al. (2017) confirm.

This current study cannot speak to the full impact of the CSF program and thus limits itself as a starting point. However, a rigorous study of efficacy remains desirable. This subsequent study will require a multi-year and multi-level design. As the hope is to limit or even eradicate bullying behavior in schools and protect young students, we must aim to strengthen the programming offered for maximum reach and impact. This study shall serve as a first step in this direction for CSF specifically, but also other practitioners seeking inspiration.
CHAPTER TWO: Developing CSF’s 2016 Fall Tour – a History

CSF’s program is the product of a multi-year interdisciplinary collaboration with the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV) and its sub-organization Safe2Tell. CSPV’s task primarily lies with bullying and school violence research and prevention programming development. The Center has created several programs and published impactful research data on the matter for Colorado constituents. The Columbine High School shooting in Colorado in 1999 was covered heavily by the media and sparked nationwide debates on gun regulation, violence interventions, and school policies. The event also served as a catalyst for CSPV’s director at the time, Delbert Elliott, to dedicate their efforts to research, policy making, and the development of interventions to prevent such mass violence at schools in the future. Elliott’s 2009 article “Lessons from Columbine,” speaks to exactly how much still needs to be done regarding this problem. Elliott notes that most responses to the violence led to drastic changes made to schools’ infrastructures for maximum protection of students rendering school buildings into jail-like sites (54). However, these have not proven effective. Elliott proposes that schools and policy makers need to shift the focus from reactionary responses (fortification) to more preventative measures. Even though this information has been disseminated widely in the U.S., the implementation of preventative measures remains sparse. For many, the proposed preventative measures, which focus largely on long-term educational approaches such as SEL, conflict mediation, the development of positive school climates, etc. feel very intangible as such approaches are hard to measure and evaluate quantitatively. Elliott recognizes that it is perhaps this stringent desire for quantitative research that composes one of the main challenges in promoting prevention overall. Patton et al. further suggest similarly quantitative studies may not serve in this case and actually prohibit the development and implementation of programming.
They were surprised that quantitative studies made up the majority of in-school bullying research “since understanding this phenomenon requires a deeper insight into children’s perspective” (4). Based on their research, they found that qualitative research could do so best as its strengths lie in “its ability to empower participants by actively engaging the with research” and its capacity to “address subjectivity, or the personal experiences, emotions, motivations, and inner life of study participants.” Moreover, it can accentuate “local points of view, the value-laden nature of inquiry, the social construction of experience, and rich description of the social world” (4). This lack of depth provided in the vast majority of quantitative studies has lead to overall inconclusive research, delays or even blocks the implementation of programming.

Beverly Kingston, the current director of CSPV, further confirmed this notion and advised me to redirect towards qualitative research as well (personal interview). Since Elliott’s 2009 article, the CSPV’s team has further expanded its understanding of preventative measures through supplementary qualitative research and found that prevention is a multi-tiered and multi-modal endeavor. Violence prevention, the key word being prevention, has not been the center of attention even as countless more acts of violence have occurred since 1999. Elliott recognizes that prevention is particularly “hard to sell.” He notes the focus is typically on improving responses to violence rather than on stopping something that has not yet happened, even if there is a substantial risk that it will happen. State legislators and others would rather wait for it to happen and then respond – hence we invest in our prisons and various services to treat people who
have serious mental, emotional and behavioural problems rather than prevention programmes. Prevention could cut those costs dramatically.\(^6\) (60)

The research from CSPV shows just how much impact distant policymaking and politics have on the everyday lives of school children in the U.S. Thus Elliott notes that “lessons for responding to a violent incident have been successfully applied on a wide scale...but the lessons for prevention have clearly had limited application” (emphasis original, 61). Since Elliott’s article, CSPV has worked diligently to increase research and implementation of multi-tiered and community focused prevention methods regionally.

In this light, CSPV has developed the overarching initiative called Safe Communities Safe Schools (SCSS). It has become a platform for several sub-programs to emerge and become pillars of the umbrella programming in the region. The initiative serves as an additional intervention model with what schools are already doing and/or operating as the first mode of intervention. SCSS offers climate surveys, programming guides and fact sheets, regional trainings, technical assistance, and other services. Safe2Tell and the CSF intervention also live under the SCSS initiative.

Safe2Tell has branched out as a response service in multiple states reaching beyond just the schools working with CSVP, operating as a digital hub with professional staff available at all times. Safe2Tell can be reached by phone, website, or smartphone app and can act as a bridge to appropriate resources in all communities, not just operating on school grounds. This is indeed a

\(^6\) While it is not the focus of this thesis, note the direct correlation of school policing and the connection to the “school to prison pipeline.” Thus the school as fortress system has direct links to numerous other sociopolitical issues such as race and class. See Christine A. Christle, Kristine Jolivette, and C. Michael Nelson. “Breaking the School to Prison Pipeline: Identifying School Risk and Protective Factors for Youth Delinquency,” *Exceptionality* 13.2 (2005): 69–88. *Taylor and Francis*+NEJM. Web.
response-based model in some ways, but it is also part of a secondary measure Elliott highlights as part of beneficial violence prevention: the development of an effective intelligence-gathering system. Safe2Tell is one of three initiatives in Colorado CSPV helped start. Since 2009, the 24/7 service has become part of the larger prevention model of SCSS. According to the organization’s website, “Since 2004, Safe2Tell Colorado has received reports and aided in preventing hundreds of separate school attacks, helped prevent thousands of youth suicides, and intervened in countless threatening and dangerous situations” (“What We Do”). To further inform students, staff and teachers of the service on how Safe2Tell works, the CSF program has made the Safe2Tell information packet part of its workshop and training.

The CSF Shakespeare & Violence Prevention program arose out of a collaboration with CSPV and Safe2Tell. CSF began a touring program bringing Shakespeare to schools under “Living Shakespeare.” Despite the success of the established touring show, in 2011, Amanda Giguere, Ph.D. realized the tour had far more potential to serve communities in a greater scope. In a personal interview, Giguere explained how she and Tim Orr, CSF Producing Artistic Director, were developing the 2011 tour of *Twelfth Night*. At the time, the media was increasingly reporting on bullying and violence in schools. Thus they “were especially interested in the subplot of Malvolio’s gulling as an example of contemporary bullying.” From there on, with help from Jeanne McDonald of the Office for Outreach and Engagement at UCB, they got in touch with CSPV. Interestingly, CSF’s and CSPV’s buildings are practically neighbors and the match seemed perfect – CSPV wanted to partner with them immediately. Giguere remembers how

From CSPV's perspective, a live performance and interactions with live actors would be a far more engaging way to educate students about violence prevention.
And from our perspective, partnering with leading experts in violence trends was a way to bolster the project, and would lead to a more enriching, cross-disciplinary collaboration. (personal interview)

This desire for multi-tiered and cross-disciplinary programming aligned well with CSPV’s findings regarding multi-tiered research. CSPV director Beverly Kingston, Ph.D. saw particular value in utilizing the stories by Shakespeare as “theatre helps create empathy, a way to experience something that moves us without actually having to have that experience directly. Shakespeare is complex and goes to a lot of places, some dark places” (personal interview). As they were also working with Safe2Tell (a non-profit at the time, now state-funded), the Safe2Tell and CSF relationship was seen as mutually beneficial. Safe2Tell received an interactive and relatively inexpensive platform for dissemination and CSF could develop a strong curriculum with tangible methods first created by Safe2Tell. CSF’s format contains this information in its programming, which allows for an interactive mode of distribution.

CSF’s 60-year expertise in theatre, specifically producing Shakespeare’s work, has provided the foundation for their in-school engagement. Since 2011, the innovative partnership between CSVP and CSF means that CSF provides the theatrical and aesthetic expertise and CSVP provides trainings and pertinent data for actor-facilitators to use during workshops. Their model offers both a culturally and aesthetically stimulating performance as well as a practical training approach through the workshops. AT initiatives as a general umbrella have been working on bullying prevention for several years; however, the idea of using Shakespeare for this same goal has not found too much traction in the U.S. In Colorado specifically, Mirror Image Arts and Kaiser Permanente both offer bullying prevention using theatre conventions. However, neither of these programs use Shakespeare, are affiliated with a University nor have
worked with a research center for violence prevention on an ongoing basis. These appear to be two of the most significant elements that make the CSF program so successful. The growth of the program, the number of repeat schools and teacher partnerships indicate the model’s popularity in the state. The program is widely celebrated, with media pieces about the program on PBS, CPR, *The Denver Post*, and this year in the *Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education Magazine*.

Another reason the CSF program has remained successful lies in the fact that is CSF as an organization has gained a lasting foothold in the community. The celebrated summer festival draws Shakespeare and theatre fans nationwide, and has become a staple summer outing in the area. CSF also offers a children’s summer camp, another regional summer cornerstone for out-of-school activities. Lastly, CSF collaborates with BVSD elementary schools and hosts the program “Will Power.” With the help of CSF, teachers at several schools rehearse a Shakespeare play with their classes, which the children then perform in at UCB in the Spring semester. These aspects root CSF deeply in the community and has allowed them to develop strong relationships with teachers, school administration, and students in the region. This long-term investment in the community through the arts further deepens the connection to the people in the area.

Adding the violence prevention aspect to the school tour addresses a relevant and timely discussion occurring in schools. Doing this through a well-established program, a program vetted regionally for its artistic expertise and lauded for its work with children is attractive. Over the past five years, CSF also began to highlight tangential issues concerning bullying, such as including diverse characters on stage. In 2016, CSF’s adaptation features three female actresses playing both female and male roles and includes a Spanish-speaking leading character. In this way, CSF’s adaptation can speak to the Spanish-speaking population in BVSD directly,
providing an entirely innovative experience of Shakespeare for BVSD students. CSF hopes to provide a positive experience with Shakespeare at a young age, which may help students when they eventually encounter Shakespeare in their English classes. As the Common Core Standard in Literature lists Shakespeare as the required writer to be featured on syllabi (“Common Core State Standard”), students will eventually be required to read his work. Making his work relevant and allowing it to come to life for students is difficult as it is. Boulder County faces the additional challenge of an increasing English Language Learner population, particularly with a growing Hispanic population. In the 2015 census, the United States Census Bureau lists that 13.9% of Boulder County’s population is Hispanic, and numbers indicate that the Hispanic population is growing. The four schools I observed for this study serve Hispanic communities to a varying degree, depending on location. Most significantly, BVSD lists two values (as part of their mission and values statement on their website) that CSF taps into unmistakably: inclusion and respect for diversity and correlating societal inequalities and strengthening SEL programming in the district (“Vision, Mission, Goals”). The aim of CSF is not to solve and eradicate bullying, violence, issues regarding diversity or implement the perfect curriculum for SEL. Rather, they humbly seek to start a conversation about these issues. Beyond meeting Common Core requirements, here Shakespeare and theatre serve as the catalyst to spark these conversations and raise awareness.

2.1 THE FORM OF THE 2016 FALL TOUR

For the 2016 Fall tour, CSF brought in many new features to the established production format to keep the content fresh and relevant. Nonetheless, the overarching model of the program always contains the same three elements: a professional performance for the school, a Q&A and a workshop. The 45-50-minute live performance of a Shakespeare play adaptation by CSF
features three actresses and is performed in front of a large audience. All classes 3rd grade and older are invited to attend; the schools I observed each included an audience of about 250 - 300 students. The performance features a simple mobile set delineating a proscenium style play space, character-identifying props and several costume quick changes so that just three actors can play a myriad of characters. CSF designed these costume changes and representation of multiple characters with such a small cast very cleverly. In *Taming of the Shrew*, they utilized the actresses’ skills to adapt their voices, accents or an entire language for a character. Furthermore, the direction relied heavily on physical comedy and physical underscoring of the narrative to illustrate plot highlights. Ingenious costuming and easily recognizable props further assisted the actresses as they switched between characters. For example, each actress had simple costume pieces, such as a vest or hat that could be swapped in a quick change easily. To uphold the integrity of Shakespeare’s work, the original language by Shakespeare is maintained in its elevated form. For this production, CSF (with assistance from their professional dramaturge Gina Braswell), cuts are made very intentionally to highlight the most significant plot moments and character development, which further aids the accessibility of the play. The adaptation is clearly targeted at younger audiences, so much of the transitional writing, such as lengthy soliloquies and additional subplots, are cut.

The three actresses then turn facilitator and lead a short (five-minute) Q&A session. This Q&A is not an open session for students to ask questions, but rather the actresses facilitate a specific round of questions tying together the story, the adaption’s elements such as gender representation and the Spanish-speaking character, and bullying prevention. In this particular season, their questions were: 1) “Why was there a character that spoke only Spanish?” 2) “Where did you see bullying behavior and who could have done something about it?” 3) “What is the
significance of having an all female cast?” These questions lead the students to recognize the core elements CSF wished to highlight: gender representation, inclusion of different languages and ethnocultural background, and finally, the presence of violence or bullying in the play. The Q&A is a moment in which the audience can look at the content they just witnessed more critically with the assistance of the teaching artist.

The actors take a brief 10-minute break to break down the production materials with help of their professional CSF touring stage manager. Then each actor heads into a classroom and turns facilitator. Each facilitator works with one class, usually capped at 30 students, for 45-50 minutes. As of the 2016 touring season, the CSF contract also stipulates that classroom teachers must be present in the room during the workshop, which had been an issue previously. The ideal set-up for this facilitation relies on the cooperation of the classroom teacher to support the teaching artist with classroom management and curriculum content. CSF provides a packet of information teachers can opt to use in lessons leading up to the day of the show and workshop. These packets look at the play itself, help with literacy preparation and begin to introduce some of the bullying terminology the teaching artist uses during the facilitation. Ideally, teachers use these packets and prepare their students for the day. The teachers can continue the conversation on the materials presented once CSF departs the school.

The Fall 2016 workshop followed a script, which the teaching artists practice during the rehearsal process. In this case, the actresses received training through CSF and completed a special workshop with UCB’s bystander/upstander workshop training team. They then had several trial runs the week before the first official in-school showing. Through these trainings and rehearsals, the teaching artists could memorize their facilitation scripts and practice the exercises with little interference. The original script was altered after some experience in the
classrooms provided new insights that needed to be addressed. However, the main structure remained the same and was only altered in specific situations, for example, if a session ran out of time. The perfect format would entail the following elements:

- The classroom gets rearranged so there is a large circular space in which students can “play” in (for theatre games). Tables and chairs are set to the side.
- Students circle up and the teaching artists introduce themselves with their name, what they do and why they are there. They present themselves as CSF actors and working with CSPV. They state their purpose: “My goal is that you walk out of here with some strategies about how you, as an individual, might HELP when you witness mistreatment.” (original emphasis; workshop script, 1)
- They set up norms for the students: they ask for a brave space to try something new and a judgment free zone.
- 10-minute warms ups: students are asked to move around the space quietly and move with different qualities; for example, walking through jello or embodying emotions such as happy or sad.
- During the second circle-up they discuss terminology of a safe school environment and bullying.
- Students are asked to play a game embodying both good and bad environments. In a second step, the class is split into teams and they have to convince each other to switch to the different environments. This must be done silently.
- The group circles up once more and debriefs; once again, the teaching artists must also provide background information on bullying, this time discussing prevention specifically. They also discuss the role of bystanders/upstanders.
• Now the students are asked to volunteer for improvised scenes, which the teaching artist facilitates while simultaneously taking on the role of Petruchio from the show. His character serves as the antagonist. The students are asked to intervene and act as upstanders or provide alternative methods for Petruchio to achieve his goal (get Kate to like him).

• After two scenes, the students are asked to circle up one more time. In this final discussion, students are given information on Safe2Tell and the teaching artists hand the class teachers small Safe2Tell print-outs with more information to be given to students and their families.

• The very last activity provides feedback for CSF. The actors ask the students to close their eyes and raise their hands to agree with a question asked. This serves as a survey for CSF. The questions are:
  o Did you enjoy the performance?
  o After this workshop, are you more likely to be an upstander when you see that someone is being mistreated?
  o Would you like us to return to your school in the future?

Once these questions are answered, the teaching artists leave the classroom and reconvene. At this point they usually meet with a previously determined contact person, often a lead teacher or principal. In this meeting, the teaching artists provide feedback on how the sessions went and inform the liaison if any students behaved outside of the ordinary (for example, if a student told the facilitator about a bullying situation they had experienced, etc.). The liaison can also provide feedback if they saw or heard anything unusual that CSF should know about. With this final meeting, the one-time visit concludes.
The workshops highlight specific key terms and language used. CSF emphasizes these during the training period for the teaching artists. CSF phrases the core message as “You can make a difference in your community by becoming an upstander” (workshop script, 1). The actors are trained to say “acting as a bully,” not “is a bully” to align with the idea that this is not a permanent condition or character trait. They also use the word “target” instead of “victim” for a person being bullied. CSF gained this specific, and perhaps surprising, language from their research through CSPV, which implies that targets can “choose to move and change their situation” (workshop script, 2). CSF is also highly conscious of gendered language and employs a commonly used practice to avoid saying “you guys” to address the group and promotes using more gender inclusive language. Lastly, CSF’s workshop script highlights that “If a student brings up suicide – use the words ‘hurt themselves’ instead of repeating ‘suicide.’” Teaching artists were also instructed to operate from a specific vantage point depending on the age of the students. For elementary students, they were advised that “Elementary students operate on rewards/punishment system, so before workshop begins, ask teacher if there is a reward you can offer them” (workshop script, 3).

Overall, the script focuses on maintaining a “solution-oriented” outlook (“i.e., not spending too much time exploring how to harm, but spending most of the time on how to help”), steering away from personal narratives of students (focusing on roleplaying through what the children saw in the play and gently guiding away from personal stories being shared), and reinforcing that the teaching artist is an actor, not a counselor or therapist. Lastly, they aim for highly interactive and hands-on workshops and minimal discussion, focusing mainly on the lesson plan points. In general, this is the outline for all workshops. However, the vast age range demands some adjustments to meet the needs of a specific class. CSF performs the play for
students 3rd grade through 12th; he workshops are offered for 4th grade and up. I was able to observe four elementary schools with workshops for 4th and 5th grade students.

Here I must also discuss how this program is funded. The program is not entirely free to schools, despite CSF’s constant aim of producing the show at the lowest cost point possible. Amanda Giguere shared with me that the cost for a performance and three post-show workshops runs $600. This covers the wages of the professional actors and creative team, travel expenses, productions costs, and CSPV trainings. Giguere further explained

We [CSF] work very hard throughout the year to apply for grants to support this program, and most of those grants directly offset the fees paid by schools. This allows us to offer scholarships if a school cannot pay a fee. If we have an interested school with no available funding to pay for the program, we find a way to fund the visit from grants. We get about 50% of our funding from the CU Office for Outreach and Engagement and a few other smaller grants and corporate sponsorships, and about 50% from school fees. (personal interview)

These funding sources assist CSF greatly; however, the overall budget remains modest and CSF faces limitations regarding additional outreach, marketing, and assessment. Yet, CSF does benefit from having a deep connection with UCB, which also allows them to gain some assessment and training tools despite their low budget. For example, my own research as part of this thesis allowed for a preliminary and low-budget evaluation for the program creators to work from for future research and development. Compared to more robustly funded programs, such as AIR, CSF still operates modestly, unable to take on costly endeavors, such as a large impact assessment.
In this chapter, we have seen the evolution of this healthy touring program, which is already involved in its 2017 season featuring adaptations of *The Comedy of Errors* and *Julius Caesar*. The 2016 season premiered the Spanish-speaking component, which was received positively based on the CSF surveys. CSF has now hired a professional translator to polish the bilingual element and heighten the quality of the language used throughout the play for the 2017 season. In the following chapters, I will discuss the details of my observations and analysis. I will unpack the multifaceted factors of this model and compare it to other programs in Colorado. I will discern the strengths and weaknesses of the model and aim to provide useful feedback both for CSF to consider as they move ahead in expanding their programming and for schools looking to bring CSF’s to their students.
CHAPTER THREE: Case Study Observation & Examination

In the previous chapter, we looked at the ideal plan and script the facilitators ought to follow as provided by CSF. However, when working with students, the dynamics of each classroom and school often throw a wrench into such carefully planned scripts. For the 2016 Fall tour, CSF hired three full-time teaching artists (and one swing, whom I did not meet): the trio was comprised of Satya Chavez, a native Spanish speaking actress who had worked with CSF before and has had several years of experience as a teaching artist. She played Baptista and Lucentio in Taming of the Shrew. Mehry Iris Eslaminia, whose father is Iranian and mother is from El Salvador, is another Colorado local who worked on this particular show in the Spring semester as well. She played Kate and Grumio. Eva Balistrieri, new to Colorado and CSF, but an actress with years of experience working on Shakespeare, played Bianca and Petruchio. Each of these women served in the dual function of actress-teaching artist to meet the demands of CSF’s model.

I had the opportunity to observe four shows and four workshops at four different schools in BVSD: Columbine Elementary, Crest View Elementary, Douglass Elementary, and Whittier International Elementary School. Each school and performance brought out various strengths and weaknesses of the CSF program model. The various strengths and weaknesses either helped or hindered the facilitators’ ability to shift gears while still getting through the curriculum. Naturally, some of these inconsistencies stem from the diverse backgrounds and experiences the facilitators bring to their work. Those who had more experience with the material and who had worked with CSF before had an easier time adapting the model comfortably as they facilitated. In the following analysis I will therefore not only pin-point the strengths and shortcomings within the program model itself, but also its execution, allowing room for how each facilitator
handles the material. The experience, energy and identity each facilitator brings to a room has a significant impact on the outcome of a facilitation. Working from a scripted workshop model can thus hinder facilitators to work from their strength and remain pliable. However, as I only witnessed one facilitation each by Chavez and Eslaminia and two led by Balistrieri, I cannot speak to their skill level and development over the course of the tour. My observations included their very first open rehearsal and workshop test run, which was as much a test of my observational tool as it was a rehearsal and feedback session for CSF. I then completed three of my four official observations during their first two days of the tour. My fourth and final visit occurred during their fourth week of touring, so they had completed 17 performances by the time I rejoined the team. As BVSD was hesitant regarding the research component of the visits, I was restricted to observing four schools and was not permitted to use any data from the rehearsal visit at University Hill Elementary School and the corresponding workshop facilitated by Eslaminia that I observed. While the data from four schools is a small sample, the intentional focus on repeating participating schools of the same educational level (elementary school), did reveal rich information regarding the model and its repeatability overall.

Before I analyze the model itself, it serves the reader to understand the makeup of a school to begin to understand the communities CSF is serving. In order for me to conduct this research, I first had to gain permission from BVSD to enter the schools. The process culminated with the permission to visit, but included numerous limitations. For example, I was not allowed to speak to or in any way interview the students. Yet, I was allowed to take use all data I could observe and hear. Within the school setting, I also was not allowed to conduct interviews with teachers or staff; however, I was allowed to ask follow-up questions later on. With these restrictions in place, gaining supplemental information proved to be quite challenging as not all
schools are as forthcoming with information. In part, this is due to the incredible workload staff already has to manage. BVSD officials also informed me that some of the hesitation stems from the constant requests for research visits the district receives from the various local universities and their limited availability to grant such research requests. Thus my data on the school environment and cultural makeup come mostly from my independent research of publicly available statistics and information, which not every school has opened up for the public at this point. Overall, however, my analysis made it clear that the demographics, the schools’ visions and missions, and the physical space greatly contribute to the school culture. The school culture in general, the influences of staff and teachers and ultimately the time of day further impacted how CSF’s program went. The statistical data represented here was collected by the Colorado Department of Education in October 2016. I intentionally highlight specific data as it is relevant to the nature of the fall 2016 tour; commentary on vision and mission of each school stems from the schools’ websites.

Columbine Elementary:

- Residential Urban setting, located in central Boulder
- Demographics: 56.4% Hispanic or Latino students; 35.1% White
- 57.8% of students are English Language Learners
- 58.8% receive free or reduced lunches
- The school’s vision focuses mainly on bilingual education (English and Spanish) and on building a diverse and inclusive community. (“Columbine Elementary”)
- CSF performed on Thursday, 9/29/16 at 1 p.m. The play was put on in the school’s gym. CSF was introduced by the principal Guillermo Medina.
- ~250 students attended the play.
• I observed Balistrieri’s workshop.

Crest View Elementary:

• Residential Urban setting, located in North Boulder
• Demographics: 23.6% Hispanic or Latino; 64.35% White
• 27.2% receive free or reduced lunch
• No current statistics on English Language Learners available despite direct inquiry
  ○ The school website lists 15.8% as English Language Learners in 2014
• The school’s vision focuses largely on the development of compassionate students as active contributors to society, without special focus on any one academic area.
• Special Programming for students: “Conflict Resolution Training”
  ○ During the observation, students confirmed that many of them were trained “peer mediators.”
• During observations, an adult volunteer at the school commented on the fact that the school serves students living in a nearby trailer park, which has increased the Hispanic and English Language Learner population at the school. I have found no evidence of these numbers or the impact any such changes in demographics may have made. However, the volunteer suggested that there were tensions at the schools due to this influx (personal interview).
• CSF performed on Thursday, 9/29/16 at 10 a.m. The play was put on in the school’s multipurpose gym. CSF was introduced by a long-time partner teacher, Ms. Shae-Bower.
• ~300 students attended the play.
• Crest View is a participating school in CSF’s additional programming “Will Power”
• I observed Chavez’ workshop.
Douglass Elementary:

- Rural setting, located 6 miles east of central Boulder.
- Demographics: 5.4% Hispanic or Latino; 80.6% White
- 6.2% receive free or reduced lunches
- No current statistics on English Language Learners available despite direct inquiry
  - The school website lists 1.7% as English Language Learners in 2014
- The school focuses on a program titled “Leader in Me,” which focuses on Social and Emotional Learning alongside rigorous academics. Overall, the idea relies on cultivating leadership skills as part of personal growth and civic engagement.
- CSF performed on Friday 9/30 at 12:30 p.m.
- The school was partially under construction; thus the play was put on at the school’s library. CSF was introduced by a long-time partner teacher, Ms. Linda Taht.
- ~225 students attended the play.
- Douglass is a participating school in CSF’s additional programming “Will Power”
- I observed Eslamina’s workshop.

Whittier International Elementary School:

- Urban setting, located in downtown Boulder
- Demographics: 22.9% Hispanic or Latino; 59.7% White
- 40.6% receive reduced or free lunch
- Close to 1/3 of students receive English Language Development services (“Whittier Language Policy”)
• Since 2002 it is an International Baccalaureate World School. Whittier is primarily focused on academics, especially language learning (English, Spanish and specialty courses for other mother tongues).

• CSF performed on Friday, 10/21/16 at 10 a.m. The play was put on in the school’s gym. CSF was introduced by the principal Sarah Oswick.

• ~200 students attended the play.

• Whittier is a participating school in CSF’s additional programming “Will Power”

• I observed Balistrieri’s workshop.

3.1 DETAILED EXAMINATION THROUGH PHILIP TAYLOR’S QUESTIONS

In the examination of these case studies, I will look at the programming through the lens of the eight principals or questions based on Philip Taylor’s writing regarding AT as mapped out in my methodology. I will parse out commentary on the programming as a whole, then focus on details of the performance and the workshops separately. In a second step, I will focus on individual issues that arose but did not necessarily repeat themselves at other schools. Naturally, there are numerous such elements I could tease out; however, I will focus on the most pertinent issues that could have lasting impacts on students and/or could benefit CSF’s program team to consider further. Before I dig into the critical analysis, I also wish to note that CSF is operating with the best intentions with a tight budget and timeframe. I seek to assist CSF in strengthening its program for better positive impact and limit the potential for accidental harm done.

1) How, if at all, does the research for the development of this program look at the target audience, goals and overall design to meet the needs of the community?

CSF’s longstanding work is deeply rooted in the community through the variety of programming they offer. In looking at these four schools specifically, it must be noted that all four are repeat
schools receiving the CSF violence prevention program. Three out of four schools are also part of the “Will Power” training and several students at all four schools have either seen or participated in the summer festival and/or camp. One particularly useful and resilient element for the continued success of the program lies in the long-term relationships CSF’s team has developed with individual teachers, staff and principals at the schools. Despite busy schedules, two principals took time not only to introduce the play to the students, but also served as the contact person after the workshops for the teaching artists to meet with and provide feedback. This deep involvement of staff and teachers further aligns with the multi-modal and community oriented approach that CSPV nurtures and speaks to the strong ties CSF maintains. These ties also serve as strong resources for CSF to conduct research, receive feedback, and learn about specific needs in the community.
PERFORMANCE OBSERVATION

Based on these relationships and previous feedback received, CSF was inspired to expand its approach to address the needs for inclusion and bilingual education given the increasing diversity at schools, specifically a growing Hispanic and Latino population. In their play, CSF employed useful tactics to address the diverse needs of both Spanish speaking students as well as English speaking students. Not only did an emphasis on physical comedy and storytelling allow for students with diverse language capacities to understand the plot, but clever translation tricks ensured that students could understand what was happening. This is further underscored by musical interludes where song contributes to the narrative. To exemplify how this was done, I have pulled out the opening scene of the play. Most of the time throughout the play, an English speaking character (such as Bianca) would translate each sentence Baptista says in Spanish. In
the original, Shakespeare wrote Baptista’s lines as one cohesive monologue. CSF’s team cut the lines into shorter sections and split them between characters to provide greater clarity:

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**

(Gentlemen, importune me no farther,)

Señores, dejen de rogarme.

**BIANCA**

Gentlemen, importune me no farther,

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**

(For how I firmly am resolved you know)

Porque ya me decidí.

**BIANCA**

For how I firmly am resolved you know

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**

(That is, not bestow my youngest daughter Bianca [gesturing to BIANCA])

De no dejar a Bianca que se case.

**BIANCA**

That is, not bestow my youngest daughter Bianca [gesturing to herself and flirting with audience])

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**

(Before I have a husband for the elder: Katharina [gesturing to KATE])

Antes de que encuentre un esposo para Katharina, mi hija mayor.

**BIANCA**

Before I have a husband for the elder: Katharina [gesturing to KATE, realizing about
halfway through what rule her father is declaring and begins to throw fit because it is unfair to her."

*(Taming of the Shrew Adapted by Gina Braswell, Heidi Schmidt & Colorado Shakespeare Festival Education, 1)*

Bianca, Baptista’s daughter, translates every line word for word, while the physical acting underlines the narrative.

In my observations, I noticed that the majority of students maintained attentive postures and interest in the play, indicating that they understood exactly what was going on. I was further able to witness the level of understanding the students had through seeing them respond to rhetorical questions posed by the characters, laughing at intentionally funny moments, and overhearing excited whispers discussing what was happening on stage. At all four schools, I observed at least one student excitedly point out the Spanish speaking character. In one instances, a student at Crest View Elementary pointed at Baptista during this first scene, then he pointed at himself and told his neighbor “¡Puedo entender todo!” (“I can understand everything!,” my translation) followed by excited nods and eager smiles among other students sitting near this boy. During this same scene, at the same school but sitting a few rows away, one student looked rather confused and frequently asked a neighbor what was going on. After approximately 5 minutes, this student stated with exasperation “I can’t understand any of this.” This student continued to ask questions, frequently disturbing his friends sitting nearby as they were watching; they shushed him repeatedly. The student asked to leave the gym to use the restroom after 20 minutes and did not return until the end of the performance. At Douglass Elementary, several students (approximately 5%) continuously asked neighbors for clarification. These students were not alone in their confusion. CSF sends out anonymous e-surveys to
teachers and staff at participating schools. One anonymous individual replied to the survey with the following comment:

Loved it, but the Spanish speaking actor spoke ONLY Spanish and our English speaking students (and teachers) were lost. Our school does have 80% English language learners, but we do have monolingual English speakers. So, translating the Spanish portions would help! LOVE that there was Spanish - it is amazing and so helpful for our students! Thanks! (Emphasis original, 2016 Fall Tour CSF Survey)

This data raises some interesting questions, which I will address in my examination. However, first I must speak to another curious observation regarding Columbine, the school with the largest number of Hispanic and Latino students and a specific focus on bilingual education. While I assumed the bilingual play would be met with particular enthusiasm from students at this school, the opposite occurred. Columbine’s students were collectively the most disruptive and disinterested students I observed at all schools. By the end of the performance, my calculations show that nearly 50% of students were distracted, and 20% had left the space or were reprimanded to sit still by teachers and staff. These numbers of distracted/unengaged students at Columbine are distinctly higher compared to the numbers I calculated based on my observations at the other schools.⁷

EXAMINATION OF OBSERVATIONS

Based on data above, issues of understanding and clarity remain despite thought-through tactics of translation and communication. The fact that one adult survey responder (either staff or

---

⁷ At Crest View and Whittier, up to 30% of students showed signs of restlessness and disinterest after approximately 30-35 minutes of the play; at Douglass, up to 15% of students showed signs of restlessness and disinterest after 40 minutes of the play.
a teacher) missed that Baptista’s lines were actually translated is thought-provoking. From my observation, I cannot tell if the issue lies with the person’s knowledge of and capacity to understand the Shakespearean English or if the acting was unclear on that day or if other factors (such as poor sightlines or audibility) played into this lack of comprehension. Aside from these factors, it must be noted that not all students speak either English or Spanish, as most BVSD schools serve students that speak several other languages. These are not included in this play. Nonetheless, the majority of students did seem to comprehend the plot and remained attentive throughout the performance. Moreover, especially schools focused on multi-lingual education, such as Columbine and Whittier, can benefit from this model. Even schools with smaller numbers of Hispanic and Latino students benefit from the multi-lingual approach as it provides cultural exposure and displays cultural inclusivity on stage.

I return to the issue of lacking attentiveness and interest I observed at Columbine, which stood out as an anomaly during this research. Various factors may have played into this issue, such as the time of day (afternoon after lunch), the rather uncomfortable and aesthetically less pleasing space (compared to other schools), and/or the fact that the gym’s temperature was kept far too hot. Interestingly, the fact that the play was partially in Spanish did not hold these students’ attention. I had expected Columbine’s students to respond more positively based on my observations at previous schools. I witnessed three students separately note anything unique about the fact that there was a Spanish speaking character in this play. While these complex factors probably contributed to the general sense of disinterest, around half the student body present still demonstrated excitement over the visit. For example, as the workshops were scheduled for 4th grade classes only, the 5th graders had started a petition to receive the workshops as well. The 5th graders had behaved particularly poorly during CSF’s last visit and
the principal felt he could not allow them the privilege of the workshop visit. However, due to this activism, the principal and CSF decided to bring the workshops to the 5th graders at a later date. It remained apparent that the disruptive behavior persisted throughout the fall 2016 visit. Many factors play a role here, and I cannot answer the correlating questions in full. Still, it is significant to further understand and question if and how the bilingual element can serve these communities. Without a doubt, representation of diversity matters in schools and the theatre equally, and is worth further research. Yet, it appears that mere representation is not enough. Rather, additional considerations to increase student buy-in, such as temperature, time, and place adjustments, preparation, etc. may be required. How can CSF further work towards including all students and should they even aim to achieve such an ambitious goal? These questions remain unanswered, but are worth contemplating and investigating further.

WORKSHOP OBSERVATION

In my opinion, it is regrettable that just the play is in Spanish. The workshops are conducted in contemporary English entirely. One student at Crest View did ask a friend why the facilitator did not speak Spanish anymore. She looked disappointed. Regrettably, the student did not ask Chavez about this, so she was not able to respond. At none of the other workshops did I witness students questioning why the entire workshop was now in English or bring up the issue of language inclusion.

As students moved through various exercises and discussions, different questions of relatability and relevance arose. The specific role-play scenes the teaching artist facilitates and acts in as the antagonist did not appear to meet the students’ lived experiences. The scenes are partially improvised, but the teaching artist begins with a scripted set-up. The teaching artist begins as follows:
Remember when Petruchio shared his plan with the audience that he was going to starve Kate and not let her sleep? Let’s imagine a contemporary equivalent to Shakespeare’s scenario. Petruchio is a kid at your school, and he has concocted a plan to make Kate like him. I’ll play Petruchio in this scene, and I need three volunteers to be my friends. (PICK THREE.) Okay, being as realistic as possible, I’d like you three to find ways to be upstanders.

Set up scenario: Petruchio hacked into the school lunch system and deactivated Kate’s account, so she can’t eat anything at school. He also set an alarm on her phone to go off every ten minutes between midnight and 6 a.m., so she can’t get any sleep—and he changed the language settings to Mandarin, which she doesn’t speak. He shares this plan with his friends, and is seeking their approval on what he thinks is a hilarious plan. (emphasis original, workshop script, 5)

The students volunteering to improvise frequently huddled as a clump towards the back of the play space. During the Crest View workshop, the students eventually became more relaxed and were able to improvise an answer; however, at the three other schools, students remained shy and reluctant to play. The teaching artist often provided ideas or fed lines for students to try out, and even then, students usually did not leap into the improvisation with gusto. At this point, students observing the scene would shout ideas from the audience, which some teachers responded to by reprimanding them and asking them to be quiet, inadvertently inhibiting input.

One student at Douglass also mentioned that it seemed far-fetched that Petruchio would go to such measures such to try to get Kate to like him. The scene “did not feel real” to him so he “did not know what to say to Petruchio because he is just kind of dumb.” Interestingly, the phone hack seemed more plausible to students and they frequently had more responses to offer.
Although, one 4th grade student at Columbine did mention that most of them did not have phones with them at school, if they even had their own phone. Regardless, at all four schools, students were most concerned with the fact that Kate would just be too tired for school the next day and do poorly in her schoolwork thus receive poor grades. Not one student ever thought that these tactics would get Kate to notice and like Petruchio.

EXAMINATION OF OBSERVATIONS

The workshops only partially serve the community regarding language and representation given the all-English curriculum. As written, the content of the script of the workshop does not allow room for the culturally specific realities of Hispanic and Latino and/or low-income students, which do make up a significant part of the student population in Boulder and in my case study schools generally (except at Douglass). As representation and insight into culturally specific realities remain significant to the development of such note, I must briefly note who crafted this program for the sake of transparency. The script is developed by upper-middle class, adult, Caucasian artists working at and for a university/theatre company. I argue that an inherent distance exists between these artists and the cultural specificities of the target populations. This does not necessarily indicate a lack of awareness of this positionality or intrinsic negative impact, yet it is still worthy of consideration as I unpack my examination.

While Giguere shared that ideally they would be able to include multi-lingual aspects in the workshop, however, finding skilled bilingual facilitators who are also strong performers living and working in the Denver Metro area is an indisputable challenge. Yet, I wonder if there could not be a through-line to continue including Spanish speaking students in the workshops integrating their mother tongue. Naturally, even by including Spanish in the workshop, numerous students that speak other languages are not represented in the work. As the workshop is the
primary contact point between the CSF artists and the students, and is most directly linked to the curriculum concerning anti-bullying, the workshop presents a great opportunity to ensure that students feel included in this moment of community building.

Regarding the approachability of the scene work, several issues come to the forefront. First, CSF’s teaching artists have never worked with the majority of these students before and it is likely that most students have never improvised in a scene like this previously. Many students may never have experienced any theatre games or training prior to this workshop and the concept may feel foreign to them. Indeed, how can a teaching artist build the trust and skillset with a group of students to complete this task within a 45-minute workshop? Essentially, the teaching artist has 20 minutes to establish trust and a safe space in the very early moments of the workshop. From my personal experience observing other professional AT groups, I know that at least a temporary productive and safe environment can be created within this timeframe. It is important to recognize that doing too much in a single workshop does not lend itself to constructive impact. Instead, focusing on the quality of the material and correlating processes – and not the quantity of material – makes for a stronger workshop structure.

What is more, from the comments made by students in the workshop, I do not believe that the scenarios presented to the students for improvisation feel realistic to most of these students. Hacking the school lunch system for a 4\textsuperscript{th} or 5\textsuperscript{th} grader may be outside of the scope of what they could technically do. Also, a relatively large number of students receive reduced or free lunches (these determinations are based on recorded socioeconomic status of their families), data which schools must keep private and secure. The perpetrator of such a hack would most likely get into a vast amount of trouble. Students felt the tactic was unrealistic. While the more animated reaction of students indicated that they found the phone hack more believable, most
still dismissed the idea relatively quickly. My observations thus told me that an opportunity might have been missed by not providing more relatable scenarios.

FURTHER QUESTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

I am left with numerous questions: Regarding the bilingual element, how could the language further help students become more included in this liminal moment of the workshop, but also in the school community at large? Can this representation help elevate Spanish as a language that is deemed appropriate or even necessary for the classroom? Perhaps more research in this regard would determine more avenues of inclusion during this encounter. Thinking of the developed scenes, could the narratives have been more constructed to feel more realistic and relevant to the students? Would this have helped students jump into role and improvise responses more easily? Still, there remains potential for a more relevant and accessible narrative to include the students’ lived realities in a safe (non-triggering) manner. Additionally, CSF must continue to think of how to provide participants with tools to engage in the improvisation, especially as so many students have had little previous preparation or experience with theatre as a craft. Crest View’s class that I observed, which participates in “Will Power,” noticeably had more experienced students who could begin to improvise more freely. In classrooms with less experienced students, this could not happen. How can CSF ensure more access to this modality? Is this the strongest approach CSF can take to include interactive theatre techniques in the workshop? I assume there may be stronger methods to replace or lead up to this specific approach.

Lastly, I must address the issue of time. Taylor, Boal, and Rohd do not specify a minimum duration for any workshop, as needed time varies greatly to meet the differing needs of any one community. My personal experience informs me that 50 minutes is indeed extremely
short; however, this is most likely the most reasonable amount of time a school can offer for incoming groups to take up valuable classroom time. I do not believe that the workshop is therefore entirely useless or the time-limitations utterly absurd. Rather, a restructuring of the program where fewer tasks and components are included would serve the goals of the workshop far better. I shall include a more detailed discussion on this matter in the conclusion to this thesis. Either way, it does appear that CSF has tapped into a niche specialty for the area and greater BVSD community.

2) Does the design allow for open questions and the creation of more questions and solutions?

Is it in a sense incomplete when the students first see it?

Philip Taylor informs his reader that “the programs created do not pose simple solutions to life’s problems; here need to be opportunities for participants to negotiate the content and the direction of the work” (55). Michael Rohd, in parallel, focused on the idea that this work

\[ \text{…does not offer answers} \]

\[ \text{It does not declare right or wrong} \]

\[ \text{It does not seek single solutions} \]

\[ \text{It seeks discussion, trust, and} \]

\[ \text{a step forward in each person’s ability to take care of themselves and} \]

\[ \text{to look at their world with compassion. ( emphasis original, xviii)} \]

As Taylor and Rohd are celebrated scholars and practitioners of AT, many practitioners today rely on this wisdom in their program development and facilitations. CSF, mixing scripted and improvised elements of TIE for their AT praxis, approaches this somewhat differently.
PLAY OBSERVATION

The Shakespeare adaptation presented is fully scripted, a finished and polished piece. However, as live theatre responds to live interaction with audiences, some moments embrace flexibility within a scene. The CSF play is not, however, an interactive theatre piece. The actors occasionally walk into the audience, may ask rhetorical questions, or sing directly to a chosen audience member, but audience members are usually not asked to step into the play. The ending of the play provides concrete solutions to the quarrels the characters live through:

KATHARINA

(to Petruchio)

Fie, fie! unknit that threatening unkind brow,

(to LUCENTIO)

And dart not scornful glances from those eyes.

It blots thy beauty as frosts do bite the meads,

And in no sense is meet or amiable.

(to the audience)

I am ashamed that we are all so simple

To offer war where we should kneel for peace;

Or seek for rule, supremacy and sway,

When we are bound to love, serve, every day.

Come, come, you froward and unable worms!

My mind hath been as big as one of yours,

My heart as great, my reason haply more,

To bandy word for word and frown for frown;
But now I see our lances are but straws.

**LUCENTIO**

*(to Petruchio)*

Now, go thy ways; thou hast tamed a curst shrew.

**KATHARINA**

'Tis a wonder, by your leave, he will be tamed too.

*The three actors join together in final song- “I'm gonna love you like I'm gonna lose you” (CSF script *Taming of the Shrew*, 36-37)*

In stark contrast to Shakespeare’s original text, CSF’s shortened adaptation highlights gender equality. Instead of lamenting women as “simple,” Katharina stresses that “we” (everyone) remain simple. Here, Katharina has the final word, hinting at the idea that both men and women must be “tamed” equally, which contrasts Shakespeare’s original where Lucentio seeks to tame his own wife, Bianca. Katharina offers lessons and morals to follow, which should lead to a path for peace among the quarreling parties. Furthermore, CSF’s play ends with a romantic song sung by all three actresses in beautiful harmony. It is a peaceful and joyful ending where all harm seems forgiven and perhaps forgotten. The vast majority of students were enthralled during this last song, many swaying along in rhythm. The solutions offered are complete, at least philosophically, and romantically persuasive. Katharina suggests that one should adjust their perspective, be forgiving and humble, and finally sing a beautiful song together to move forward. Yet, I wonder as I extrapolate the message to reality— is this really all it takes? Is there not more specific awareness of personal narratives necessary to find this place of humility and forgiveness? Provided the psychology of individual people, the answer offered through this adaptation of *Taming of the Shrew* feels simplistic.
In the very final moments, after the applause, students get to insert their perspectives. This opportunity arises during the Q&A facilitated by the actresses. As a reminder, during the Q&A, the actresses ask the students the following questions:

- Where did you see bullying in the play? Who could have intervened?
- Why is there a Spanish speaking character and what does it mean?
- Why were all the characters played by women?

Depending on background and the level of preparation students had leading up to the performance, they answered with a variety of insights and opinions. In these four observation, it became clear that some answers were informed by diligent preparation, while others addressed the questions without academic or historic knowledge. This was also confirmed by some of the teachers as most were transparent if they had or had not prepared students with the materials CSF provided beforehand.\(^8\) In this instance, nearly no answer was dismissed as incorrect and it was an opportunity for students to insert their own and original insights. However, some answers were deemed “more” correct than others. I recognized this through the way the facilitation sought to rephrase and emphasize the most significant elements that CSF had previously determined the “proper” answers in their curriculum. Ideas that did not fit into this mold easily were not further discussed. The teaching artists always concluded the questioning segment with the specific answers CSF was looking to draw from the audience. They stressed that Baptista or Lucentio could have intervened in several scenes. They note that having a Spanish character promotes inclusivity and diversity. Lastly, they inform the students that during Shakespeare’s day, only men were allowed to act on stage so they felt it was important to show women in these roles.

---

\(^8\) The various substitute teachers present mostly also told me or the facilitator that they were unfamiliar with the content themselves. I surmise that the teacher’s preparation may have an influence as well.
instead to display gender equality. So while the questions appeared open-ended in the beginning and no answer was completely denied, CSF’s curriculum still brought up a bottom line and finality to the Q&A.

EXAMINATION OF OBSERVATIONS

Given the time constraint and the difficulties of facilitating a discussion of this nature with 300 participants, the finality to the Q&A may seem practical; however I wonder if it is effective. I have no insight as to how these discussions may have carried on after the play and if teachers reintroduced the material in their classrooms. Ideally, the Q&A could spark a continued examination of the material. Of course, the play is not the primary place for direct interaction and student engagement. The real crux of Taylor and Rohd’s question lies again with the workshop.

WORKSHOP OBSERVATION

CSF develops a full workshop script and trains teaching artists to remain faithful to the curriculum developed. Despite the improvisational theatre games and the playfulness of the activities, the structure of the facilitation is fairly rigid. In all four facilitations I witnessed, teaching artists heavily guide and rephrase possible answers and solutions offered by students to fit the curriculum narrative. In a few moments the classes were able to dive into a deeper discussion on material and students could give diverse answers or solutions. Given the discussion earlier, authentic responses and improvised authentic reactions became integrated in the activity.

EXAMINATION OF OBSERVATIONS

As mentioned, many AT practitioners base their workshop development on the ideas of Taylor and Rohd regarding a sense of open-endedness. Furthermore, many practitioners seek to activate their audiences to participate directly and get involved in the theatrical games and performances presented. Augusto Boal calls this the spect-actor: “the spectator no longer
delegates power to the characters either to thing or act in his place. The spectator frees himself; he thinks and acts for himself. Theatre is action!” (155). From my own praxis and in working with several other practitioners, this usually means having an outline and a list of exercises and possible goals for a workshop. This approach allows for ample planning while remaining flexible to respond spontaneously to questions and issues that might arise when working with diverse participant groups. Experienced facilitators also have an entire figurative toolkit to draw from should a problem arise in a workshop. Different exercises and approaches serve different needs and can help to hold a space most effectively and safely for participants to express their own viewpoints and possible solutions.

Some issue that can arise include distracted or disruptive behavior, more or less participants than expected, aggressive or fearful reactions to content, etc. We can never predict what may happen and must remain actively engaged with the community to recognize the shifting needs and pathways. Sometimes even the goals change during this process and a complete retooling is necessary. It remains dynamic and completely aligned with the aims of the community (a classroom or school in this case) – the facilitator’s assumptions frequently get tossed out the window. Practitioners Trent Norman, Rebecca Brown Adelman, and Ligia Batista Silverman put it simply: “You, as the facilitator, do not matter. . . Having your own agenda or holding on to a specific outcome is not facilitation, but teaching or activism” (4). CSF operates rather differently from an AT facilitation model in this traditional sense. While the model and exercises feel like an AT facilitation, the workshop is scripted with little flexibility. Furthermore, the minimum training might not allow the teaching artists to redirect if needed may hinder their best work.

FURTHER QUESTIONS & CONSIDERATIONS
While the model feels prescriptive and rigid, thus not allowing for questions and open
endings within the program itself, the aim of CSF is indeed simply to start a conversation with
students. This is an achievable goal despite the constrictions of the short timeframe the teaching
artist must operate within. So the answer is a bit of both: No, the model within its own
framework does not allow for open endings and deeper questioning while in session. However, it
does allow for continued discussion and questions later on that the teachers and staff at a school
could respond to. CSF can also return to the school to pick up the conversation through a new
theatrical performance. The open-endedness lives in the fact that the session is a rehearsal for
real life. What will students do once a real situation does occur? Will they know to use
Safe2Tell? Will they dissuade bullying and become upstanders outside of this session? It is up to
the students to internalize upstander behavior and respond with the tools practiced in the session.
It is also up to them and perhaps their teacher to continue the discussion. This one-time visit thus
is not the end-all of bullying, but merely a starting point for continued learning.
3) Does the programming allow for the demonstration of multiple possible narratives?

PLAY OBSERVATION & EXAMINATION

CSF’s play adaptation does not allow for much interaction or room for alternative
narratives. However, as the backstories and deeper psychology of the characters are not fully
disclosed during the play, students have the freedom to imagine what those narratives might be.
Students, however, are not guided to do so directly. More powerful, perhaps, is the Q&A
question that asks which character could have intervened in moments of bullying on stage.
Students can offer answers to this and further imagine how this may have looked and how it
could have changed the outcome of the play. Yet, students do not get to see these possible
alternatives acted out before them. There is no embodied practice for this step, which many AT practitioners might seek to do.

WORKSHOP OBSERVATION

In the workshop, CSF facilitators discourage students from letting personal narratives enter the scenarios in the games. This guideline stems from a fear of triggering emotional responses in students. CSF asks facilitators not to “open anything you can’t close” (workshop script, 1) and does not train these facilitators to handle more difficult situations with students should something come up. So avoidance of opening up narratives that might feel too raw or immediate for students remains key to their program. As the workshop script and training regulated exactly how and when students should arrive at certain exercises or even answers, the responses and reactions at different schools often felt like copies of each other. In part, because students acted with great hesitation during the improvised scenes, students often resorted to simply modeling each others’ behavior or mimicking the teaching artist. Original or “authentic” play did not arise easily in these situations despite the young age of the participants, where one might expect more playful responses. Particularly in the improvised scenes, students frequently did not have the tools to integrate their voices. Furthermore, the teaching artist, not having liberty and/or the training to draw on a variety of methods to encourage engagement, often faced a huddle of students. All three facilitators resorted to “feeding” the students ideas and lines to jump-start the improv. Again, working with the time constriction and a densely planned curriculum, teaching artists often had to rush through any emerging playfulness.

Naturally, the tight schedule was also impacted by students becoming overly excited or even disruptive. The teaching artists are advised to rely on the classroom teachers for assistance with classroom management. Perhaps fruitfully, even though possibly unhappily for the
facilitator, two of the visits I attended demonstrated just how difficult the reliance on the teachers really is, especially since these teaching artists have mostly never worked with any of these teachers before. Both instances occurred during Balistrieri’s workshops. I must note that she had the least experience of all three facilitators with this material and facilitation style. Yet, I see the majority of the issues lying in the CSF approach to the teaching artists’ training and workshop form rather than any individual teaching artists’ skill or previous training. She was not provided with tools to successfully or confidently lead her facilitation in the case of a teacher being unable or unwilling to assist directly.

At Columbine, the teacher present was a substitute teacher who was completely overwhelmed with classroom management and the content presented, not having had the time to study any of the material herself. Given that the regular classroom teacher was absent, the students were already extremely excitable and rowdy, which was increased during the workshop. The teaching artist was de facto on her own to handle the hyper class and evidently struggled with the situation. Getting through the curriculum and engaging students productively was nearly impossible in this setting.

At Whittier, the classroom teacher had the students dancing to a dance-video game during their break. Interestingly, the teacher was not watching or engaging with the students, but working on her computer, which resulted in several students not participating in the activity and instead milling around the room. According to the principal, bringing interactive games, movement and technology to the classroom is part of their pedagogy in the school. This is not an uncommon practice in classrooms today and quite appealing for many educators according to teachers at Whittier. I also know that teachers never have enough time to prep or simply take a breather for themselves, so these breaks must be much appreciated. However, I was struck by the
lack of engagement the teacher showed with her students in this moment. Disappointingly, the level of engagement did not increase once the workshop started. The teacher continued to work on her computer looking up occasionally and calling out orders to students when the energy got a bit rowdier in the room. As the CSF facilitators do rely on a teacher assisting with the classroom and being involved in the work, it was not surprising that some challenges arose during the session. When a student started becoming a bit rough and loud (albeit not unmanageably as Balistrieri confirmed), the teacher jumped in and pulled the student out of the workshop entirely, asking him to sit by her on the floor quietly before allowing him to join in again. She did not ask him why he was behaving in this way. Perhaps she knew why, but her actions overall felt dismissive of the student and effectively shut him out of the process. What was more, the situation overall appeared quite embarrassing for him as I witnessed other students watching him and whispering behind Balistrieri’s back. From what I could tell, they were talking about the student and laughing at him. I wondered if this could give rise to future bullying behavior?

EXAMINATION OF WORKSHOP OBSERVATIONS

The nature of the AT games and exercises does, at least partially, allow for personal narrative and insight to emerge, despite the rigid curriculum structure. It is in these moments of play that students can explore their own reactions and interpretations of the games’ rules. I perceive these reactions and this sort of play as authentic. In a handout for preschool teachers, the Elementary Teachers’ Federation of Ontario (ETFO), defines authentic play as “natural and instinctive” (“Authentic Play”). Educator and anthropologist Lisa Galarneau, Ph.D., links this authenticity to learning, titling this method “Authentic Learning Experiences.” She explains

Place the learner firmly at the centre of the learning experience, encourage him or her to take an active role, and make sure that the learning situation is not
abstracted from reality, but is placed directly in a real-world context, either physically or virtually. (3)

This is the sort of quality I sought in my observations as students moved through the exercises. It is in this play mode that students can navigate through a variety of embodied responses to prompts, for example, the concepts of a negative or positive school environment or they can insert their own voices to dissuade Petruchio from bullying Kate. Regrettably, more often than not, I saw students follow the preformed approach that the teaching artists or even teachers in the room whispered to them. While it is not inherently negative to model or provide a guiding hand for students as they learn how to play the games, there does appear a boundary at which point their original creativity and courage to try something different becomes stifled.

To complicate matters, the teaching artists in this moment had to play both the role of the antagonist and the facilitator. For these younger students, many of whom had not played many (or any) improvisational games before, distinguishing the different roles of the teaching artist became difficult to respond to. This can at times prevent a more natural reaction or insight to be inserted in the scene and ultimately eliminates the goal of having students “practice” or “rehearse” for real life. What they are practicing here is repeating information or a method that does not come from an inherent sense of action or motivation. This created a sense of oversimplification in the exercises and rushed facilitation, which does not allow space for students to insert their distinct perspectives, realities, and experiences, thus rendering the exercise inauthentic by default. Norman, et al. further highlight that a facilitator should “hold space” for students to express themselves. They seek “genuine ‘space holding’” which “requires that you have the ability to name, validate, and honor differing points of view” (4). The goal is to deepen the discussion and integrate differing realities into the conversation and practice. With
the rigidity of the workshop script, the frequent sense of lack of time, and fixed curriculum, CSF’s teaching artists cannot operate with dynamic responsiveness.

I return to the situation I observed in Balistrieri’s workshop at Whittier. Giguere, who was also present during the workshop, noted that the behavior and surprising reprimanding of the student was quite startling for her to observe. As per the agreement CSF makes with participating schools, teachers are asked to not only remain in the room (which they are legally required to as of this year) but also to engage in the work and assist the facilitator. The lack of engagement did present a challenge for Balistrieri and hindered the success of the workshop overall. Furthermore, we all left with a feeling that the notions disseminated during the workshop would most likely not be picked up and discussed further in this classroom, which felt unfulfilling at that moment. We discussed the issue with the principal, who informed us that the teachers should know more about the agreement with CSF and that she would follow up with the specific teacher. She did note that the teacher was new and inexperienced, but felt that the teacher had not met the expectations of the CSF agreement. This mishap or miscommunication indicates a need for stronger teacher buy-in, preparation for, and inclusion in the program. As challenges can arise when a facilitator is mostly relying on the classroom teacher to assist with classroom management, I recognize the need for stronger training of the facilitators, a more adaptable workshop structure lending itself to shift gears if needed, and better preparation for teachers to become part of the workshop.

This is not to say that teachers or the teaching artist should ignore disruptive behavior of students during the work. Naturally, not all disruptive behavior can be addressed and at times more decisive action must be taken, often through a teacher present. However, given the rigidity
of the workshop script, this ambiguous space could become a real pitfall for the implementation of the curriculum.

FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The CSF approach of the facilitation does not allow for much awareness or room for specific needs of students. In my observation, I did not see any preparation for accommodations to work with students with disabilities, different language backgrounds, or for alternative management for gifted and talented students. The model operates on a one-size-fits-all standard, which frequently falls short to include these diverse narratives. This is, of course, not easy to do, but should not be ignored. Socioeconomic issues could also become a hurdle for CSF. The tool presented in the facilitation, Safe2Tell, depends on access to a phone, smartphone and/or the internet, which not all students (especially not 4th and 5th graders) might have. The improvised scenes rely on very specific financial privilege, including phone access and the issue of lunches (again, note the large number of free or reduced cost lunches students receive at some of these schools). A mindless approach could inadvertently deny the reality of students who do not have these privileges and in turn could be triggering, despite CSF’s approach to avoid triggering content.

Not allowing for personal narratives to enter the conversation further denies or even erases their reality de facto, as awareness and light cannot be shed on it. This is just as harmful and triggering. Norman, et al. highlight the special facilitation ingredient “of noticing and naming, out loud” (10). Noticing and naming, allowing for ideas to come into the space, acknowledge their existence immediately. It takes experience and flexibility to know when and how to do this in a situation; these are tools which CSF’s training does not provide. Therefore,
deeply diverse and sometimes challenging narratives cannot enter the workshop, which in turn limits the possible narratives shared in the work.

Instead of allowing for alternative narratives, if a shared statement is deemed problematic or worth looking into by the teaching artists (based on CSF’s and CSPV’s recommendations), these are reported to the contact person (such as the principal) after the workshop. The students do not know this, and while it stems from a deep concern and wish to protect individuals as much as possible, the outcome could be tricky for those students. Could a deeper discussion and unpacking of the challenging statement have provided a moment of greater learning? I do not have a one-size answer, but my experience informs me that there is more to investigate on the matter. Alongside this matter, CSF could also explore how to recognize the privilege in their set-up scenarios and allow for greater cultural specificity in the workshops with a few key changes. I also wonder how the denying of personal narratives can essentially nurture effective learning when discussing a highly personal issue such as bullying. Bullying experiences are intensely personal and avoiding these personal elements through rigid structure could have adverse effects. Certainly, these are not the intentions of CSF’s team, but might result as unexpected harmful consequences nonetheless. Again, I end with an ambivalent answer to Taylor’s concern: Personal exploration and narrative can occur during play and games, but more profound personal expression and alternative narratives are discouraged. My insight from my observations weighs the scale slightly more towards the negation of personal narratives in this model.

4) Is the work task-oriented, and if so, how?

Taylor recommends “[c]oncrete tasks need to be offered so that participants can momentarily step into another’s perspective or confront the situation . . . from this experience of participating with the fictional event, participants can embrace firsthand the issues on which the
applied theatre focuses” (56). This question applies most to students that get to participate in the workshop. Those that saw the play without the workshop may gain tools or insights from their teachers, should the teachers choose to continue the discussion after the show. As I could not observe any of these classrooms, I cannot speak to the follow-up material possibly covered.

WORKSHOP OBSERVATION

For the students in the workshop, CSF provides very foundational practice for role play through the theatre games used as a warm-up. Regardless of their efficacy, these exercises are concrete tasks at large and aim to encourage students to embody different concepts in order to spark a discussion on bullying prevention and usptander behavior.

The most direct tangible tool that might remain with students and teachers long-term lies in the Safe2Tell discussion and reminder cards the facilitator hands out, which entails all relevant contact information for the tipline. However, in the workshop, the students never actually practice or witness the facilitator use the tipline. In one observation, the session was running behind and Eslaminia (facilitating) did not have sufficient time to discuss Safe2Tell in full. Thus she had to run through the basic ideas very rapidly and had the teacher hand out the cards without going over them with participants. There was no task or exercise assigned in the workshop for allowing students to engage actively with the tool.

Moreover, a lot of time in the workshop is spent with students sitting in a circle on the floor. The teaching artist asks them to sit quietly and listen while they ask more conceptual questions regarding bullying. The curriculum also dedicates a significant amount of time to top-down (teacher provided) disseminating of information on bullying, such as statistics on how many students live with bullying in their everyday life. Thus the task oriented qualities of the
workshop do still provide room for improvement to meet this core element Taylor indicates as significant.

EXAMINATION OF OBSERVATIONS

The workshops overall do employ task-oriented activities, but perhaps not most effectively. The exercises leading up to the improvised scenes are insufficient to prepare the students for the improvisation. Moreover, the activities of embodying different concepts do not always land well with students, so I surmise that the effort is misplaced. Furthermore, the sharing of statistics and definitions without any tasks attached feels like a missed opportunity to bring more interactive learning modes into the curriculum. The tasks that are provided also limit the creative engagement of students. Given that room for alternative and original narratives are not embedded within the outline of the workshop, few opportunities arise for students to discuss opposing viewpoints and other ideas.

Despite the very tangible tool, Safe2Tell, being presented, including with a visual aid in the form of an iPhone-shaped card, the placement and presentation style of the material jeopardizes that the tool is sufficiently introduced. In three of four observations, the introduction felt rushed and appeared as a tangential idea rather than a core component of the curriculum, which is CSF’s goal. Regrettably, there is no available data to know the percentage of student use of Safe2Tell discerning who has had adequate instruction and those who were merely given the card.

Interestingly, the strongest moments of encounter with complex and diverse characters actually occurs during the play, but as the role of a spect-actor is not encouraged in any way during this part of the visit, students cannot directly engage with these viewpoints. One of the characters then reappears during the workshop (Petruchio) and the scenario formed around this
encounter does not create a space for students to profoundly unpack the content. Thus the workshop does include tasks, but they are still primarily product/outcome instead of process oriented, which does not align with Taylor’s inquiry.

5) Does the programming create an evolving narrative and dilemmas?

   The play itself, the complex characters and insights Shakespeare wrote and CSF was able to draw from, does create a sense of development for the characters and the plot. By the end, the characters evolve to overcome their animosity and come together in unity. The problems that arise between the characters as the plot thickens, did attract the interest of students, as the majority of audience members did appear to remain engaged and enjoy the happenings on stage. Shakespeare (and in turn CSF) did develop scenarios that were not easily solved and students had the opportunity to witness characters evolve with vivid emotional depth. This experience created a setting where students could become engrossed in this other world of the story during the liminal time and space of the play. It is in this closed moment in time that students could imagine other narratives for characters, and backstories to understand the depth of their psychology through empathetic connections. However, without interviews, surveys or other modes of assessment and more direct facilitation of the content, it remains difficult to know how much students recognized the intricacy of this narrative and the problems the characters faced. Furthermore, I have no way to assess how much of the information was extrapolated and applied to the real world beyond the play.

   Students experiencing the workshop had a short moment to engage more directly with Petruchio and could imagine the impact his actions might have on Kate during the improvised scene. Given that the teaching artist has to both facilitate and act as the antagonist in the scene, the facilitation lacked a more nuanced discussion to tease out these realities and development of
the characters in all four workshops I observed. From my observations, I can see that the CSF play has great potential to serve as a foundation for a multifaceted and rich conversation to emerge. However, the current CSF workshop model remained inadequate regarding this question. Taylor’s insight that “teaching artists help participants tolerate ambiguity and the struggle with contradictions” (56) was not fulfilled during the workshops.

6) Does the facilitation provide positive feedback to allow for critical analysis of the interventions the participants may have offered? Are multiple future outcomes possible?

Taylor notes that “[a]pplied theatre is powered by interrogation of an issue, event and/or relationship. . . In applied theatre, participants are building a future either for a character they meet or a situation they create; there is a sense of destiny-building – a perpetual state of becoming” (56-57). CSF’s model provides small moments of feedback/interrogation, for example, during the Q&A after the performance. All students in the audience have an opportunity to think about specific aspects of the play in greater detail as guided by the actresses. They can opt do answer the questions as well and perhaps respond in a brief dialogue with others. The Q&A may also offer material for students to take with them to contemplate on their own or within the classroom later on. Ideally, a deeper investigation would happen with a teacher in the classroom. However, the story itself culminates with tangible finality. We do not witness the futures of the characters and students are not encouraged to consider what comes next as all characters end their story with a sense of satisfaction and peace.

WORKSHOP OBSERVATION

In the workshops, the curriculum also offers brief feedback and questioning. After each set of exercises, students circle up around the facilitator, who leads the discussion. During these discussions, students can debrief how an exercise made them feel or ask questions that have
come up for them. However, with time working against the facilitator, these discussions are often cut short and instead more information is shared by the teaching artist. Interestingly, the exercise on the school climate gained the most reactions during these short feedback round. In this exercise, the students’ task was to embody a positive or negative school climate (split into two groups) and begin to change or influence each others’ behavior and mood without talking or touching. Mostly, this meant that students in the positive environment smiled broadly and waved at each other or mimed giving out hugs and high fives. Students acting in the negative environment mimicked punching, fighting, started sitting on the floor, folding their arms around themselves and frowning, etc.

Not many students had responses ready regarding this exercise, but a few did share that they thought it was “fun” or “funny and weird” to try and change each others’ mood or behavior (from either negative or positive climate). Two students at different schools shared that acting as though they had to live in the negative school climate made them feel sad and negatively impacted. One student mentioned how she is “always happy, and like[s] being smiley and happy, so [she] did not like acting in the negative climate.” These insights are productive to deepen the discussion on these behaviors, which was done very briefly. Ms. Shea-Bower at Crest View stated that “I also like the work done by the workshop as it relates to teaching how feelings of joy or depression can be contagious in a group. I don’t recall the name of that activity but the kids really respond to it” (personal interview). Interestingly, this was the only workshop I observed in which I gained a sense that this particular exercise could actually draw out significant reactions and make sense to students participating. Notably, the facilitation in this classroom was done by Chavez, who has had the most experience with this model and AT facilitation outside of the CSF work. Without a doubt, her approach to the facilitation brought
out the most authentic responses and reactions in the work. In part, this positive response may stem from a combination of factors such as her personality, her ability to engage with students, her more profound experience with this approach and finally also the hands-on and well-prepared support from the classroom teacher, Ms. Shea-Bower. I did not see this level of engagement in the three other classrooms during this exercise.

Despite this evident success, the critical examination in all classrooms still fell short during the discussion regarding this exercise. Similarly, despite offering greater potential for productive content, the improvised scenes were not further unpacked and discussed. There was no discussion as to what worked well and what did not or what they could really glean from the exercise overall. I was expecting this sort of feedback as it is common-place in AT work, so I was surprised not to witness it here.

EXAMINATION OF OBSERVATIONS

In my experience, I know that profound learning lies hidden in these discussions. Really teasing out the highlights and impactful moments allows students to take away more distinct and concrete elements from a practice they are most likely less familiar with. However, as the discussion here is frequently cut short and does not unearth more insights, my observation is that the exercise (as currently employed) and follow-up discussion remain superficial. In fact, it felt as though these brief feedback sessions were a call to order and to calm the students after brief periods of play so that the teaching artist could share data and facts with the students. I remain cautiously skeptical of this specific element as I wish there had been more feedback and application of the content for real life behavior.

7) How does the program perform as an aesthetic medium?
Taylor discusses this particularly challenging concept from two angels. First and foremost, AT is an aesthetic medium – an issue some opponents of AT might bring up in discussion. For this analysis, what remains most significant is the idea that

[t]he applied theatre can entrap participants in a challenging situation that they have to work their way out of. The medium consists of an artful interplay of people, passion, and the platform as participants work toward a new, heightened, or revitalized understanding of some phenomenon. (57)

The artfulness of the play cannot be disputed. CSF has mastered how to invigorate Shakespeare’s play for young audiences, make it portable and accessible despite a minimal budget and a myriad of challenges they face when touring in BVSD. Students indubitably have the opportunity to engage with Shakespeare’s work in an inventive way and can contemplate bullying behavior and intervention through a fresh modality. Through my observation I realized that the play shows its strength in engaging students with theatre and Shakespeare’s material. Conversely, it remained unclear to me how much it allowed for students to see bullying behavior/interventions in a different way. For some students, the learning may feel rudimentary or obvious. Others may have missed the connection to the real world and their own experiences in life. CSF’s facilitation does not make this clear unless students have the opportunity to participate in the workshop.

The workshop features numerous elements that do allow for a new way of understanding the material presented. Traditionally, a lecture, worksheets or other such material may be utilized to introduce concepts on bullying, positive school climate and upstander behavior. CSF’s AT inspired approach does bring a very contemporary modality to the classroom. Currently, there is no data to tell us how much of this learning activity is brought into the classroom discussion and everyday life after CSF leaves, but the model does set the teachers and students up to continue to
unpack the material should they wish to do so. I remind the reader of Cohen et al.’s metaphor of the permeable membrane. Its creation requires a heightened aesthetic experience to invoke the moral imagination, which should then allow participants to analyze and discover challenging content and new understanding. The CSF curriculum does intend to do so, but the various challenges discussed in previous pages may hinder the success and efficacy of this goal.

8) How does the programming allow for the community to take space and have a voice?

I have previously discussed how the program does make a space for frequently marginalized voices of English Language Learners when it comes to TIE and specifically Shakespeare’s work in schools. The content itself sheds light on a very real issue. Bullying remains a significant part of many students’ experience in schools, thus the work is relevant and elevates the voices of those who may suffer from bullying situations in schools. During the play, the audience shares an invigorating experience as a community around this issue, thus inherently crafting a bond among all the students present. Taylor underlines that AT and the teaching artists “enable participants to understand how the theatre form permits us to dialogue, to interact, and to be different; and to show them how to live well in community” (57). I do believe that CSF’s intentions are in line with this notion. The desire to address this material and use theatre to do it fits this drive that Taylor illustrates throughout his writing. In some instances, the program as it stands may not meet these intentions with the most positive outcome.

First and foremost, the fact that not all students have the chance to join the workshop leaves out part of the school community in this important discussion. Secondly, the workshop training and script maintains that the teaching artist should avoid any personal narratives to enter the space during the facilitation. This distance to lived experiences in essence denies some of these voices and realities lived within the community to enter the work. My assumption, without
further efficacy assessment, is that the material introduced in the curriculum is not clearly and tangibly connected to real life experiences.

While shared laughter and play can in itself nurture a bond among the participants, none of the presented games push toward collaboration. As in any classroom, groups form between close friends, but frequently the bonds do not reach past those tight circles. AT provides a particularly fruitful method to encourage relationship and empathy development, and thus an understanding of those not as close to oneself through playful exploration. These elements are not realized in this curriculum. While the goal of the workshop lies in stressing that becoming an upstander is a positive way to be in community with others, the exercises do not necessarily underline this notion. While students act alongside and with each other, they can mostly operate within their own personal bubble of experience. The facilitation does not necessarily challenge problematic notions or biases students may have. The workshop does not discuss how race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc. impact bullying behavior and does not hold space for students with these diverse background to voice their experiences. Again, there may be a limitation given the timeframe to do so, but it is still significant to note that this nuance, and perhaps the corresponding marginalized voices, do not enter the workshop.

The workshop form does not allow for ensemble development or community specificities of each classroom to take space in the facilitation. The curriculum dictates how the facilitation must go. Without addressing these issues, I sense that the potential for positive impact remains limited. What is more, as the specific needs of each classroom are not addressed in this model, the community’s voice ultimately does not have space to enter the process.
3.2 OVERALL EXAMINATION

Taylor outlined these eight aspects as a sort of manual for AT practitioners. I have now discussed how CSF does and does not meet these goals. Indubitably, there is no clean yes or no answer as to if and how exactly CSF’s model fits into each of these elements. It remains productive that the model frequently falls into ambiguous spaces in this regard as the reader, other practitioners and CSF itself can learn from this discussion. I must also address once again the issue of time in the classroom as CSF continues to develop this material. A 45-minute workshop is very short; some practitioners may argue too short to be of value. From my observation, I do think the short workshop has potential to make a lasting impact but some further considerations are required. The goals of CSF, as a reminder, remain multifold: they seek to raise awareness regarding bullying, introduce upstander behavior and the Safe2Tell tool, and hope to nurture love or appreciation for theatre and Shakespeare. These goals are ambitious, but can be achieved more consistently through some recalibration of the model.

Aside from the workshop, the play itself offers fruitful grounds and ingenious components that can undoubtedly create a positive experience and exposure to theatre for the students. As CSF’s additional goals alongside the interest in bullying prevention include aims to inspire enjoyment of and love for the theatre at large and Shakespeare specifically. CSF’s Amanda Giguere sees the great potential in Shakespeare for this work because Shakespeare offers so many examples of mistreatment and complicated ways in which humans treat and mistreat one another with rich language, complicated stories and the situations students are seeing are not overly simplified, even in the abridged adaptation [created by CSF] . . . and we can connect it to a time beyond our own, and we can see that patterns of violence go beyond our time and space.
In a larger framework, we can understand patterns of violence and maybe do better. (personal interview)

While I do not hold this same passion for Shakespeare, I do recognize the value of the work overall. My observations clearly indicate that students generally understood the plot of the play; they commonly responded positively to rhetorical questions and moments of more direct interaction, they could answer follow-up questions in the Q&A, etc. Furthermore, the physical reactions throughout the play were equally telling: the majority of students laughed when funny moments happened on stage (even at some of the subtle jokes) or displayed sad frowns or disgust in their facial expressions when appropriate for the plot. While some students may have lost track of some narrative details, gotten distracted or even left the play, the number of disengaged students remained relatively low. Even by the end, when many students started to fidget more and sometimes become more disruptive (keep in mind that they have been asked to sit on the floor for over 45 minutes), the energy generally stayed positive and alert. From my distanced perspective, I surmise that the students generally enjoyed this visit and I hope that some did find the spark for their own passion for the theatre. The play certainly formed a healthy permeable membrane for students to engage with a new world and perhaps sense a glimmer of their moral imagination. The workshops most likely sought to do the same, but given the in-depth analysis above, some shortcomings became apparent as well. These shortcomings meant that the membrane became less permeable and thus lived experience and fictionalized world of the workshop no longer stood in dynamic dialogue. The setting, then, was no longer as nurturing as it could be to enable impactful exchange and learning.

I witnessed three main issues that most likely contributed to these shortcomings. CSF appears to look for actors before facilitators during their casting and hiring process. Ideally, the
selected teaching artists are equally skilled in both facets. CSF works and rehearses with the teaching artists for approximately three to four weeks. From the rehearsal schedule, I surmise that the performance receives more attention than the workshop and facilitation training. The schedule outline actually indicates that facilitation itself receives the least amount of time. Preferably, the teaching artists come in with some training as facilitators. It can take a long time to become a skilled and confident facilitator. However, with a strong program model, short term training can lead to success if done properly. In this case, this certainly means including the assistance and training through experienced AT practitioners at the very least. The importance of good facilitation should never be underestimated, but especially when working with very young participants on such personal subject matter.

A second issue has to do with the short time allotted to the workshops and Q&A. These segments could be the most constructive components of the program that directly address and raise awareness regarding bullying and bullying prevention. A 5-minute Q&A does not allow for much room to bring in more critical analysis and I sense that a strong learning opportunity within this segment has been lost. The 45-50-minute workshop felt equally rushed in three of the four observations. While the timeframe is extremely narrow, I suspect that more meaningful moments can be achieved if fewer things are sought to be done during the workshop. It is generally helpful to over-plan, but allowing facilitators to navigate their path through the curriculum with some freedom to know which things they can drop when needed might strengthen the work. Again, this does require that the teaching artists are trained to know how to read the room to do this appropriately and that their familiarity with the curriculum is such that they can navigate through it freely.
Lastly, I infer from this examination that a core issue is CSF’s handling of the different program components. I have observed that CSF dedicates the most energy and time to the script adaptation of the play and the rehearsing of the performance. While CSF does conduct solid research to develop the workshop curriculum, the research still lacks some depth. Furthermore, the implementation of the training with the teaching artists regarding the workshop also receives less attention. This reality suggests that CSF is more product oriented than process oriented – a key issue Cohen-Cruz discussed when looking at AT practices. CSF suffers from the same issue. However, AT work thrives in the process; this is where the deep learning can happen. This imbalance should be illuminated and addressed further to redistribute the strengths of and efforts put into the program development. CSF can improve the program through this shift and the following insights they might glean from it.

To gain even more from this investigation, I shall turn to a brief comparison of CSF to two other local models in the following chapter. This analysis will illuminate how CSF sets itself apart from other programs. Simultaneously, I hope that the comparison can illustrate the strengths of other programs and inspire new program model ideas for CSF to strengthen their approach. I also aim to provide an overview of the three programs in order for schools to recognize various factors as they consider bringing one of them in for a program day.
CHAPTER FOUR: The Greater Applied Theatre Context – Zooming Out Regionally

From my in-depth analysis of the form and implementation of the CSF violence prevention program based on Philip Taylor’s outline, I gather that the intention and general notions behind the program do align with AT praxis overall. CSF does seek to ignite a positive transformation of the participants involved, which Taylor promotes as a central idea of AT. In line with Helen Nicholson’s description, CSF does bring theatrical activity out of the traditional play space and into the classroom to benefit a larger community. Lastly, their model invokes the moral imagination by presenting a different, but relatable, world for students to engage with. However, the analysis also displayed several shortcomings and ambiguous outcomes that require further investigation and consideration.

Currently, schools must make economical and well-informed decisions on which programs they can bring into schools in addition to everyday programming. The political, social and ultimately funding landscape in our country and in this state fluctuate constantly. The arts, education and school programming often become a political football hurtled about in political debates. As such programming is tremendously vulnerable to political influences and funding changes, it is in everyone’s best interest (including the recipients of the programming) to continually strengthen and, at times, recalibrate existing programming to meet the shifting needs of a community. In Colorado, CSF must compete with other theatre-based violence prevention programming, including two other organizations that have made an impact and become well-known in the state over the past decade or so. I set out not to claim that any one program is superior to the other, as each program is unique in their approach. Interestingly, despite these distinct differences, all three main representatives of each organization (Katie Wall at AIR, Andrea Rabold at MIA and Amanda Giguere at CSF), with whom I spoke, somewhat jokingly
referred to the other program models as “friendly competition.” They all also indicated that they have potential to learn from each other to impact their program development positively. Every one of them mentioned the desire of wanting to observe each other’s work and discuss methodology. So, I shall offer a preliminary sharing through my writing.

As each program promotes different modalities and models, I will analyze and compare specific components of the three groups. I will include a look at finances and logistical support, the origins of the program development, the team behind the program creation, the theoretical framework they each operate from and the specific AT methods and theatrical modes they include in their curricula. While finances and organizational support may appear superficial, the varying funding models actually shed light onto how some of the models were developed and changed over time. This will allow the reader to gain a more nuanced picture regarding how these models actually function on the ground to meet the changing needs of the diverse communities they serve.

4.1 COMPARING ARTS INTEGRATED RESOURCES: CHOOSE YOUR LIFE

First, I turn to the program that enjoys the greatest logistical and financial support. This program is provided through Kaiser Permanente’s Arts Integrated Resources (AIR). As a reminder, their comparable programming, Choose Your Life, ran for six years before it came to an end during the fall semester 2016. During that time, Choose Your Life was seen by over 152,759 students and 6,952 adults, based on statistics from a few years ago (exact date unknown). AIR gave me access to original print materials, including the script. The comparing of scripts, AIR to CSF’s, offered fruitful grounds for this investigation. To complement my reading of the printed material, I also conducted an interview with Katie Rose Wall, a long-term staff member and former teaching artist with Choose Your Life. While my research with AIR
does not reach as deeply as my observations for CSF do, I was still able to discern valuable information through my more distanced or even secondary research method. *Choose Your Life* contains elements that parallel CSF’s model while also featuring distinctive components.

To begin with, a few elements are strikingly similar: *Choose Your Life* is a one-time visit program to schools, which includes interactive theatre and other AT modalities, such as Playback Theatre and TIE methods. Each year new facilitators and actors were carefully vetted, auditioned, and once selected, trained to serve as part of the AIR team. Like CSF, AIR toured the *Choose Your Life* program to schools for several years and received overwhelmingly positive feedback according to Wall. Both programs draw on the Olweus bullying research and prevention methods, meaning the definitions of bullying and the community multi-tier approach are maintained in both programs. Lastly, both programs work with and rely on the logistical, academic, and (partial) financial support from larger well-established institutions.

*Choose Your Life* did exemplify several differences from CSF’s program. *Choose Your Life* began via the work of full-time professional staff at AIR. These professionals specifically work in arts-based community outreach and engagement, and developed the script drawing from a variety of AT methods, including Playback Theatre and Boal’s Theatre of the Oppressed. They adjusted these modalities liberally to fit the style of their script, but the origins remain evident throughout. Over the years, the script mostly stayed the same, with a few edits made to ensure contemporary relatability for the audience and fit for the teaching artists. Most notably, *Choose Your Life* does not include a workshop but the structure of the performance itself includes numerous interactive components, which could stimulate discussion and unpacking of content with students. The play thus serves as both a theatrical and educational experience, while also providing some opportunities for volunteer students to practice their “courageous bystander” (the
terminology for upstander AIR used) behavior directly. It does not function as a hands-on training. Briefly, it is also worth mentioning that the interactive theatre methods used in the play are drawn from a wide scope of AT techniques, most of which were informed by AT practitioners working out of Chicago. AIR staffers, including Wall, researched methods with professional AT companies in Chicago, including Adventure Stage and Albany Park Theatre Project. They were able to travel and conduct research due to AIR’s strong financial and logistical support from KP. This in turn allowed AIR to offer the program at no charge to all schools and supported in-depth assessment to be completed for the program, including a survey, which indicated the need for a change in overall programming.

This funding through KP allowed for the program to travel around the state constantly. Wall noted in an interview “Kaiser is a non-profit organization, so 3% of all income Kaiser makes on the medical side goes back into the community. So everything that we do is a free service for the community.” As the program was free to all schools, they could book visits at schools without financial restraints. As the travel costs were also covered, they could travel to schools further away more easily than the comparable programs in the state. Wall noted that this did mean they brought the program to schools at an accelerated rate. Furthermore, the financial and logistical support through Kaiser ensured long-term research opportunities for the program developers, such as conducting surveys with participants and schools, and fieldwork done in Chicago. These findings, in particular the collaboration with celebrated professional AT programs, inform their approaches and how they can move forward. In the particular case of Choose Your Life, their findings also showed that this model required a change. As the core
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9 Albany Park Theatre Project recently received the MacArthur Award for Creative & Effective Institutions; Adventure Stages draws from an internationally award-winning pool of teaching artists for their work.
narrative in the script itself did not change, a large number of students saw the exact same production in the six years it toured. While interactive scenes allow for some improvised and conceivably “new” moments of action, the overall structure of the play and the development of the characters remained the same. As the show also concluded without a workshop and only sometimes featured a short Q&A, no further development or new findings could become part of the model in this way. What is more, their surveys and research mainly showed that schools were no longer interested in the program in 2016. While I did not have access to these survey outcomes, Wall shared that some of the feedback had to do with the fact that a vast majority of students at their more frequent partner schools had already seen the show and wanted something different.

Contrastingly, CSF creates a new play adaptation every year so students, so even participants at repeating schools, always get to see a new show. CSF’s efforts to include new modalities, such as specific exercises during the workshops, further brings new material to the students. Through my observations, I recognize CSF’s particular forte in adapting Shakespeare’s work for young audiences, which ensures high-quality artistic and aesthetic standards for the play presentation itself. CSF produces a high quality touring show at a relatively low cost point. The short e-survey CSF sends out to receive feedback, which is not mandatory for participating schools to fill out and thus sometimes gets forgotten, usually shows overwhelmingly positive responses. To clarify, these e-surveys are filled out by staff and teachers exclusively, not the students. Out of CSF’s brief post workshop survey and the e-survey sent out to staff and schools as a follow-up the next day, CSF has gathered that 97% of participants enjoyed the show (personal interview).
I cannot speak to the aesthetic quality of the *Choose your Life* live show; however, in reading the script, I would categorize the game-show setting as an eccentric stylistic choice. This style may either serve to distance the audience in a Brechtian sense or may simply function as light entertainment. The quality of the writing overall indicated the latter in my personal opinion. The script also contains several AT techniques. Throughout the script, I recognize easily how AIR very fluidly wove the role of a facilitator and various distinctly AT exercises into a cohesive play. They set the action in a game show, which allows characters to step in and out of roles easily, create room to tap into the students’ imagination and suspend their disbelief through the fast pace of the game show format. Within the structure, the Game Show Host serves as the facilitator in many ways, leading the main characters and the audience through their experiences. The play tells the story of Chris Tungsten, the quarterback who bullies Tony Bravado by shoving him during lunch. Tony is friends with Maria Miller, who does well in school but recently experienced trouble with her friends and family. Bianca Styles, formerly Maria’s friend, loves gossip and fashion and has taken to cyberbullying. Through different short scenes that play out in the daily life of these high school students, we see their relationships develop. The game show interrupts these scenes with different game options that highlight the various tactics students could employ to deal with a bullying situation.

The game show atmosphere in general lends itself to a light and fun energy that progresses the story rapidly, even when potentially triggering content is presented keeping the encounter with the material “safe” in an evident desire to avoid unintentional harm. In several scenes, audience members are asked to participate either through offering suggestions to the actors (drawn from a Playback Theatre format). In some moments, students have the opportunity to join actors on stage and take bystander roles themselves. The actors guide them through the
action carefully, as indicated in the script, thus the students do not need any particular skills to improvise and perform their roles. Based on AIR’s research, they included six “choices” or tools students could use in bullying situations. The *Choose Your Life* script features these following six options:

1. **Use Humor:** When you are being targeted a bully may use words as their weapon. You can use humor to laugh it off.
2. **Take a Stand and Walk Away!** You can try to approach the person targeting you and if needed (if the situation is too dangerous) walk away from the situation.
3. **Find some Friends:** The goal here is to get as many of us as possible to become courageous bystanders and stand up to bullying together peacefully as a group.
4. **Get Involved:** Studies show that kids who are involved in activities at school are less likely to be targeted by bullies.
5. **Tell an Adult:** turn to a trusted adult, or several contact people, to assist you.
6. **Ask a Friend:** You can always ask a friend for advice.

From my research in bullying prevention, I do note that some of these options are problematic; they do not ensure safety and frequently rely on people in a student’s immediate surrounding, which may not be a useful or realistic option for them in the real world.

Furthermore, as this is not an in-depth training, some of the tools may be used in ways that could make a situation worse. Especially the issue of using humor against a bully might require quick wit, a strong sense of self-esteem, and could be inflammatory to the already tense situation.\(^\text{10}\)

Lastly, the game format presented here does not lend itself to open ended narratives, diverse

\(^{10}\) AIR has since implemented the idea of “Safe humor” in its current programming. It is further explained in their video *Confronting Conflict Strategies: Safe Humor*. Kaiser Permantente’s Arts Integrated Resources. 2016.
solutions, etc. The script still brings AIR’s idea of “best solution” to the forefront, regardless if audiences agree with them or not. Besides, some solutions, especially the issue of “getting involved with student activities,” lends themselves to great potential for further ridicule or bullying. For example, at certain schools some club activities might be more popular than others. These options do not take school-specific cultural indicators into account. Furthermore, not all students can participate in specific clubs and would be further alienated from these activities and people involved. Overall, the presentation and some of the solutions offered appear simplistic and superficial. While they did include the option of turning to allies (students and adults), they did not introduce Safe2Tell, which might have served well in this collection of solutions. Considering these issues, it is evident that a recalibration of content became necessary.

Nevertheless, the fact that all students in the audience could witness characters apply very clearly circumscribed methods, either when they themselves are being targeted or if they are in a bystander role, is impactful. Furthermore, the audience could observe those characters react to the wide array of suggestions audience participants may make in real time and sometimes, I would imagine, see how those options might fail. This could resemble outcomes in real life. The fact that all students had the opportunity to watch this performance in community, as one cohesive audience, allows for a shared vocabulary around these issues to arise and resonate among the students. Choose Your Life provided additional written material, including material in Spanish, which students could discuss in classes after the performance should teachers decide to continue the conversation. Ideally, this model could then further nurture productive dialogues and insights on the matter that could find a lasting hold in these school communities. Considering this goal, I believe the fact that all students present have the opportunity to witness
and participate\textsuperscript{11} in this experience communally is the best part of this work. The smaller workshop methods may make a greater impact on a few – albeit I do not have data on this matter – but the majority of students get left out of that continued work. Thus, I perceive the broader reach of this model as a point of improvement for CSF’s work.

From my research on bullying prevention, CSF’s tools are rooted in robust research provided by CSPV; the CSF program directly draws from CSPV’s framework to build a safe and impactful curriculum. The application of Safe2Tell as a core feature stands out in this regard. However, CSF has not found a way for all students watching the show to share this knowledge, specifically Safe2Tell, as only the students participating in the workshops have the opportunity to interact with these tools. As AIR created an original play, they could ensure maximum access for a larger student body to participate in an interactive model without needing to develop a small scale workshop to accompany the play. For CSF, the organization’s core mission to produce Shakespeare becomes an inherent challenge in this light, as they do not have the freedom of creating a contemporary interactive piece. This dedication to Shakespeare before their direct bullying prevention work then requires the smaller workshop as a separate part of the overall model, which automatically reaches fewer students in one visit than AIR can. AIR’s in-depth work with AT practitioners very clearly influenced exactly how to implement this goal effectively and creatively. CSF has not yet connected these points despite having a multitude of experienced and celebrated practitioners within their affiliated university department at UCB.

\textsuperscript{11} Arguably, not all students will be able to participate directly in the AIR model. However, I use Boal’s sense of the word of active participation. In \textit{The Rainbow of Desire}, Boal notes that you can actively engage in an intervention, or choose not to act, but this decision is still considered participation (72). CSF’s model, the small workshop segment especially, essentially requires active participation and does not necessarily provide space for student to opt not to engage directly without being perceived as disruptive (and will therefore be reprimanded by classroom teachers and facilitators as I observed).
Significantly, despite having had ample opportunity to collaborate with established AT practitioners in the area (Mirror Image Arts, Affinity Arts, Erin Kaplan, myself, etc.), CSF has not taken advantage of such an occasion, as confirmed by the aforementioned practitioners. As CSF does not work with AT professionals in their program development or during the training of their teaching artists, their model lacks expertise in that field. While Giguere utilized some theoretical knowledge in the development of the work based on Augusto Boal’s writings and improvisational theatre games, and techniques she encountered during her education, the limited practical knowledge of AT of the team does remain a concern in my observation. As I discussed the facilitator training with Giguere, it became apparent that AT professionals had never been consulted. Thus, I turn to MIA, an organization firmly grounded in AT, an example of expertise in this area.

4.2 COMPARING MIRROR IMAGE ARTS: “YOUR VOICE MATTERS”

MIA has served the metropolitan Denver area since 2008; they went through a major recalibration in 2012, when Andrea Rabold, a long-time actress, practitioner, and facilitator with the group, was asked to step in as the Executive Director. While theatre, AT in particular, always formed the core of the organization, the issues addressed by MIA changed over time. During their redevelopment phase, MIA undertook in-depth need-based research to discover how they could best serve the community. With the overhaul of the programming, bullying prevention became a central focus to their work.

Before I continue on to a deeper analysis and comparison, let’s take a brief overview of how MIA’s one-day workshop program “Your Voice Matters” aligns with CSF’s programming. “Your Voice Matters” is a one-day, 90-minute, touring visit to schools. In their current unpublished material, they state their program vision as working to support efforts so “young
people positively impacting community. The 90-minute curriculum is designed to help participants find their unique voice and compel them to take positive action in their own lives and in their communities” (1). MIA draws from established violence and bullying prevention research, and methodology and includes the upstander vocabulary and theory based on the same data that CSF and CSPV use. Both organizations include these facts and general vocabulary during the workshop to ensure a shared understanding on the subject matter with participants. MIA also operates with a rotating group of contracted teaching artists and a core professional team that supervise the programming. They further parallel CSF in seeking high artistic and aesthetic quality in their application of theatrical methods, while also crafting a safe and inclusive space for participants in which to explore and learn. MIA’s curriculum further includes exercises for the “rehearsal of reality” to apply the learned skills and knowledge to life-like situations within the safe framing of the workshop.

MIA’s program also differs from CSF considerably: primarily, their main concern lies in building empathy and skills for root cause analysis and problem solving, while still maintaining an excellent theatrical experience for participants – CSF does not include this emphasis on root cause analysis and problem solving. “Your Voice Matters” essentially takes up the same amount of time as CSF per school day but it is not broken up into two separate components that moves students from one space to another. Furthermore, the team stays together for the entire program rather than breaking up to work alone in a classroom. MIA works closely with classroom teachers to assist with classroom management and organization within the school, but their larger visiting team does not rely on the teachers in the same way as CSF does. As “Your Voice Matters” does not include a separate play for the whole school to attend, a smaller group of students participates at once (never more than 50 students per visit). This means the relationship
between the visiting team and the students can become more individualized. While MIA does include a play in this workshop, it is directly linked to the content participants discussed throughout the session and can build on these learnings as it happens towards the end of the workshop.

To discuss this all in greater detail, I shall begin with the approach first. As “Your Voice Matters” focuses on the complex goal of building empathy and prosocial skills for root cause analysis and problem solving, MIA has also developed more intensive multi-week programming model (6 or 8-9 weeks at schools, brought in by the schools) alongside their one-time visit. They approach this multifaceted content through well-researched AT methodology combining the workshop with a short theatrical play (no more than 20 minutes long) directly instead of splitting the experiences into separate segments. Given this AT form, they maintain the role of a lead facilitator throughout the work in both the multi-week and one-day visit models. This more intimate workshop approach does mean that only up to 25 students can participate in the multi-week programming and 50 students at a time can participate in the 90-minute experience. Lastly, and most obviously, MIA has developed an original contemporary piece for the workshop. In my reading of the most current script, I classify the piece as naturalistic, easily accessible and relatable for diverse youth today. It does not rely on the heightened entertainment factor of either a game show, such as AIR produced, or the heightened language the Shakespeare play used. Instead, MIA creates dramatic tension and the potential for engagement through realistic characters, relationships, and relevant life-like high and low stakes in each situation.

My insight into “Your Voice Matters” stems primarily from video analysis, discussing the work with MIA facilitators, reading through much of their written materials, the workshop outline and play script, and personal meetings with Rabold. I have been able to distill the most
pertinent elements that are relevant to discuss in this comparison through a distanced research method parallel to my approach for my analysis of AIR’s program. In a more usual AT method, the 90-minute workshop brings in a facilitator (Joker\textsuperscript{12}) and four teaching artists, who act as specific characters and co-facilitators. They work with only one group collectively, which caps at 50 students at a time. They begin with theatre warm ups, building community, creating a “safe” space, and slowly introducing elements of play and exposing students to theatre – many of whom have never experienced this before. Rabold described it as “giving them an easy way in while also getting them into their bodies and out of their brains” (personal interview). From there, they introduce some bullying awareness terminology, identifying exactly what bullying is and is not, especially as Rabold recognizes how the term has become easily overused and misused to encompass a wide variety of situations. MIA locates the work and play around bullying specifically as it related to power dynamics and recurrence over time (much in the same way as CSF sets out to do).

The correlating play for “Your Voice Matters” highlights the different nuances of bullying for this school-age population. The story here revolves around four high school students, Frankie, Taylor, TJ, and Alex (note their genders are not disclosed). Alex is Taylor’s step-sibling and presented as the main character demonstrating bullying behavior, however, all characters eventually fall into different entrapments of bullying behavior, sometimes becoming a target and sometimes behaving as an aggressor. Despite the brevity of the script (9 pages), short but poignant moments allow for audiences to gain insights into the psychological state of each character, instantly complicating the various relationships and behavior seen on stage. Rabold states “we create the play as close to their real life example as possible; that’s what I love about

\textsuperscript{12} Augusto Boal calls the facilitator the “Joker” in his work \textit{Theatre of the Oppressed}, 1995.
using new work . . . because it is really important to us to create accessible and relevant scenarios through the play” (personal interview). They then bring in hands-on activities: they split the participants into four groups and assign each group to a character in the play. Each actor, representing one of the characters, leads the groups through a problem-solving activity, which centers around root-cause analysis. With the actors’ facilitation, the groups unpack what the problem is that each character is left with at the end of the play. From there, they work backwards to understand what created that situation in the first place. Once this is understood, they can discern the options they could have tried instead, the choices they could have made and in essence practice a simplified form of conflict resolution. “It’s just 90 minutes, so it’s not about teaching conflict resolution, it is about exploring empathy for others and about being able to reflect back and understand where and why a different choice could have been made. Then [we ask] ‘can you identify what that different choice could be?’” [emphasis original] Rabold discussed in our interview. As a final section, the actors take suggestions and try them on stage, improvising the scenes as directed by the Joker in an exercise inspired by Boal’s Forum Theatre methodology. The Joker asks further reflective questions for the actors and the participants, plays with different relationship dynamics and power dynamics to discover how different techniques might work differently in specific constellations. This form gives participants a lot of agency to discover their own truths in the work and try different options directly. This practice can be done in several variations, but as the workshop lasts only 90 minutes, the main goals stay with preliminary prevention and raising awareness on the issue.

While MIA does not have institutional support (namely, at the university or commercial business level) and, therefore, less financial support than AIR or CSF – they have created strong collaborations with local non-profit organizations, fundraisers, and various grant-based programs
to assist their administrative costs and program assessment. MIA does charge a fee for the workshops, however recent additional financial support has positively changed the cost schools have to cover for MIA to provide their program. Given the recent changes, Rabold was unable to give definitive insight into these costs; therefore, I cannot compare them directly to CSF’s program fees. Regardless of the financial capacity MIA demonstrates, their theoretical framing and resources to significant leaders in the field is impressive. Most significantly, the roots of this program connect to Augusto Boal, Dorothy Heathcote, and Michael Rohd both in theory and practice. Despite their narrower reach and smaller organization overall, MIA has become well connected nationally and now includes Michael Rohd himself as a consultant and advisor for their new programming in 2016-17.

Considering this evidence, MIA clearly operates very differently from CSF overall. Where CSF spends a majority of its time as a company on the preparation for their summer festival and AIR functions as a supplementary group to Kaiser Permanente’s overarching community work, MIA focuses on bullying prevention and youth outreach through theatre fulltime and year-round. Their team demonstrates years of experience in AT work. Aside from Rabold’s long-standing work with the organization, their newest hire in the role of Program and Partnerships Director, Meghann Henry, brings a plethora of experience with her as well; Henry also holds an MFA in Theatre for Young Audiences. The organization’s Board includes a diverse group of people, many bringing decades of knowledge on the regional education system, community outreach, and artistic expertise. Their advisory board members show vast proficiency in business management and arts administration, curriculum development and education, psychology and mental health, theatre, assessment, etc. They also include teenage students as advisors. MIA celebrates the youth as experts of their lived experience, thus deeply valuing their
input on program development. This diverse range of experience and personal backgrounds allows for a holistic approach to the programming and organizational development.

This strong team and vast range of experience drives the organization to constantly grow and improve its programming, reassess needs, and dynamically advance alongside the needs of the communities they serve. Given CSF’s primary concern with the Shakespeare productions and children’s camp in the summer, their team and research regarding the development of the workshops specifically cannot match this depth. Contrastingly, MIA’s fulltime commitment to this work and connection to Michael Rohd, which is remarkable, sets MIA apart. They have made the principles of AT their guidelines in theory and praxis. Given their link to civic practice and social change, they have made theoretical frameworks of contemporary social change movements an intrinsic part of their work. For example, their constant awareness and checking of privilege of facilitators and teaching artists, and their drive to seek new modalities to involve and embrace the growing number of Spanish-speaking students, low-income participants, and Somali refugees with whom they work. As Rabold discussed in our interview, they aim not to overpromise impact with prescribed solutions, but to produce authentic work that stems from the real experiences of the students they serve and offer reasonable tools to begin the deep-rooted uncovering and gradual changing of the issue at hand. Likewise, it is obviously deeply aligned with Boal, Rohd and other practitioners’ outlook regarding the idea that an outsider’s approach could offer any viable solutions and that AT practitioners should avoid solution oriented programming.

Rabold strongly implies that this is a prevention, not an intervention model. Through in-depth need-based assessments in 2012 and a trial workshop, they recognized the necessity of this distinction. They could not truly focus on forming an effective intervention, but could instead
hone in on skill building that could “prevent someone from wanting to do it in the first place.”

She also remained frank about the issue of presenting solutions and how MIA resists the temptation to offer solution, especially as people who do not live the same day-to-day experience as many of these students do. She stated that

one of the things that we balance is, we want to empower people who are in systems of oppression, for sure, but we cannot be so unfair as to believe that unless these systems of oppression change they are nothing but victims. So we try to find that balance of empowering people to make choices in their life and feel like they can, but also recognizing and owning that we live in certain systems that some people, some classes of people, will have a hard time being empowered inside of. And for us what we didn’t want to do was empower a bunch of kids that deserve to be empowered only to disenfranchise them because they didn’t get to do what we said they could. So that is also what created this model for us that we are not coming in to tell people what to do. Quite frankly, we do not know what a person’s life truly looks like. We can understand and listen and hear their stories, but ultimately the only people who can create the solution for themselves are the people who are experiencing the things for themselves. And what we appreciated from the model of the *Theatre of the Oppressed*, the Forum Model specifically, is that it gives agency to people to practice something that can be as high stakes as a life or death situation in a very controlled environment. (personal interview)

While the students do have the opportunity to see different solutions play out in the temporary space of the performance and imagine various outcomes, MIA refrains from pushing one solution over another and claiming any one technique as the end-all method to use in any
situation. Instead, their work opens up various possibilities that could follow, invoking the moral imagination as well. MIA’s aim remains modest as they seek to build “common vocabulary, shared experience, that both teachers, admin and kids have” (personal interview). Rabold shared with me how she witnessed students, particularly younger kids, understand the material “cerebrally,” but could not readily apply it to their own life and daily experiences. So once they got out to play on the playground in recess after a workshop, children would engage in bullying behavior and forget the analysis they had just completed in the facilitation. It then comes back to the teachers or staff on duty to utilize the language they had all just shared in and remind students of the actions in the play. In this moment, students may recognize how their life parallels the lives of the characters in the play. They can then begin to connect the dots between the happenings in the play, the solutions they had tried, and what they were doing in their real life at that moment.

Like many arts organizations, MIA operates on a small and often unstable budget, relying on donations, regional partnerships, and grants, for which they are constantly applying. While they can offer free, or near free, programming for some schools, especially schools the Denver Public Schools (DPS), some schools do pay the full price for their visits. This means their reach is smaller than the other two programs (1200 students since 2013). They have grown sufficiently to create more in-depth programming to expand far beyond the one-time visit, including a three-part expansion of their multi-week programming, which is currently being developed. They have been able to grow their program due to the growing demand for their model. Their ties in the communities they serve remain strong, which has provided traction to move their work forward. They serve numerous repeat schools and continue their work with Denver Parks and Recreation. Currently they are getting ready to launch more new programming and continue to strengthen
their existing partnerships. New initiatives include support from partnering with the Boys and Girls Club, and they are recipients of the Denver-based government funded grant 2A BOOST.

MIA has come into its own and is growing steadily as an organization. Considering this, it surprised me to find that they had no contact with CSF. Rabold also told me that she had in fact reached out to CSF to meet and discuss best practices, but had received no response. In my discussion with Giguere, she mentioned knowing of MIA, but did not pursue contact with them. I see this as a missed opportunity to share theoretical and practical knowledge.

4.3 OVERARCHING COMPARISON

Now that I have discussed the forms overall, what can we learn from this comparison? 1) I will discuss the recognition of the value of self-assessment and revitalization of programming; 2) I will address the quality of the workshop/performance model; 3) I will discuss the plays directly; 4) I will illuminate the question regarding language and bilingual inclusion, and 5) I shall highlight the parallels of the evident theoretical foundation of each program.

It is through the conclusion of AIR’s Choose Your Life that I recognize the value of ongoing self-assessment for such programs to ensure their relevance and potential impact. Furthermore, I appreciate how CSF and MIA continually revamp and evolve programming to ensure longevity. In part, CSF and MIA’s need to continually apply to grants and external funding forces them to consider their work anew with each application. This helps to ensure that both models stay fresh and relevant.

Despite the end of Choose Your Life, I do believe there is more to be learned from the form itself. Their contemporary script, which is playful and interactive, displays how smoothly interactive methods can be applied within performance – they do not necessarily need a separate workshop in their model. Perhaps this short form glosses over some of the depth a more detailed
workshop, such as MIA‘s “Your Voice Matters” or CSF provide, yet the fact that a larger audience can share in this engaging experience maintains its own value. Considering this, I find it interesting that CSF’s model is the only one that intentionally separates the play from the workshop. This difference is not inherently a poor decision, but I do wonder if a stronger connection between the two components could make the model feel more cohesive and inclusive overall. In my opinion, the CSF workshop requires more development as discussed earlier. I turn to MIA’s model to gain inspiration for such a program reformatting.

CSF has evidently mastered adapting Shakespeare for young audiences as a touring production. This is perhaps where MIA and AIR could learn from CSF in how they can create strong work that meets the specific needs within the school system on an academic level. This might ensure that schools could justify the inclusion of their programming more easily as it meets several needs simultaneously. The play also exemplifies the mindful effort CSF has put into shaping a bilingual theatre experience for students. The level of inclusion and effort put into utilizing Spanish as an equal language in the Shakespearean play is significant and I have not seen either of the other organizations include the bilingual aspect to this degree. Again, I do recognize the challenges of implementing multilingual work in improvisational workshops and the obvious expectations this puts on the teaching artists, yet I do believe it is possible to do.

Regarding theoretical contexts, AIR and MIA come at the work through different lenses and supporting organizations, but all three organizations ultimately share the same theoretical framework based in Dan Olweus’ work and contemporary bystander/upstander theories. CSF certainly offers in-depth knowledge of prevention development through their ties to CSPV, while AIR and MIA have gained their information through other modes of research. Each organization has brought a different focus and toolset to the programming, which they in turn offer to the
participants. Considering this, CSF’s collaboration with Safe2Tell does promise a strong option as a tool to share with students. Safe2Tell in itself is not a solution, but it seeks to operate as a prevention tool, thus still meeting the need for non-solution oriented work. I believe combining this specific tool with the development of other socio-emotional skills – the capacity to engage in root-cause analysis and unfolding the complex layers that come into play in a bullying situation – could be the most fruitful approach and true to the theoretical framework all three organizations embrace.

In conclusion, all three program models offer distinct approaches, goals, and reach. Each of these differences promotes the unique aspects each organization has to offer to Colorado schools. The parallels, particularly regarding foundational research, indicate the validity of each program, while also demonstrating that a demand exists for such multimodal programming in the state. From the comparison, I emphasized the most significant components that each program offers, which I hope can provide the reader and the organizations’ leadership stimulating content in considering future programming.
CHAPTER FIVE: Conclusion

As I write this conclusion, I think of my own childhood. I lived in a rough neighborhood in the 90s and school fights and gang violence were not unheard of. I remember being bullied for the first time; I remember a friend standing up for me; I remember bullying someone in retaliation and I remember becoming a defender and upstander for another friend. We were in elementary school. I also think of my path towards a lifestyle of mindfulness and non-violence and taking such work to war-torn areas in the world, for example, Israel & Palestine. I think of how much the arts specifically allowed me to enter a different reality, a world of peace and magic, which invoked my sense of morality. At a very young age, my awakened moral imagination shaped me into an empathetic ally and upstander. I wonder, would I have become this person had I not had access to the arts? I do not think so. The arts kept me out of trouble in many ways and provided an escape. Thinking of my own path, I feel a great sense of joy when I witness how (some) young students today have the opportunity to engage with the arts and useful tools to train their empathetic socio-emotional skills. I find it thrilling to know that these opportunities exist and artist-educators are investing so much time, energy, and passion into developing programming. And yet, I remain acutely aware that the work is never stagnant, the target communities’ needs change constantly, and how we must remain constructively critical of programs that have been in place for years. How can we improve the work? How can it become more inclusive and ethical? How can we fortify the programs to withstand conservative politics and budgets constant scrutiny? With these thoughts, I am excited to share what I have learned from this research.

This case study of CSF’s Shakespeare & Violence Prevention in school program highlights significant learnings on the micro and macro level when considering the use of
theatre, Shakespeare specifically, as a prevention method. The analysis has illuminated what we can learn from the model within the immediate context of the target community (Boulder schools primarily), how the form compares to other regional models, and underlined the larger educational significance, which could be transferable to other regions. The most immediate insights lie with the recognition that the needs and relationships within the community matter most. CSF demonstrates five specific components most successfully:

1) How to include regionally available tools, such as safe2Tell, to increase reach and potential safety through multimodal and creative methods of dissemination.

2) How to use their strengths and link them to the academic needs of BVSD (and beyond) by aligning material with the Common Core standards.

3) How to incorporate rigorous social and behavioral research in artistic programming through their partnership with CSPV.

4) How to represent the changing cultural makeup of the region, in this case by including Spanish in their play.

5) CSF promotes access and nurtures the love for theatre and the arts, Shakespeare specifically, as they foster the decades-old community ties to the summer festival. This model overall, despite several deficiencies, does provide positive exposure to the arts and has potential to raise the moral imagination.

In this way, CSF cultivates the permeable membrane, invoking the moral imagination both within the liminal space of the creative experience, and has sought ways to connect the same learnings to real life experience outside of the membrane. These five points highlight the significance of strong relationships and responsiveness to the target community’s culture, while remaining responsive to larger structural requirements, such as the Common Core demands.
These are the strongest points that make the CSF program, as it stands currently, appealing to school staff and teachers deciding which programs to contract. However, my analysis also pinpointed areas of weakness in the program, moments where the tension to maintain the permeable membrane falters.

While CSF’s intentions are well placed, the implementation demonstrates that the program does not yet meet its maximum capacity to serve the complex needs of the target community. At the same time, I realize that meeting all the needs a community presents is a near impossibility. Yet, I believe that distilling those nuances and considering possible ways to address those may aid CSF in their future decisions. Naturally, financial constraints, correlating staffing and time limitations, and bureaucratic challenges working with the public school system, pose certain hurdles for CSF’s programming. It is through my trained critical eye as an AT practitioner of 10 years and the findings I discerned through Philip Taylor’s eight questions that I address these issues. Based on my observations, I consider the play itself of high quality, while the interactive elements regarding bullying prevention, the Q&A and the workshop, lack depth and finesse.

Ms. Shae-Bower, a teacher and main contact person at Crest View, shed light on the matter in a similar fashion. For her, the inclusion of contemporary content – such as a discussion on gender-swapping and the use of cell phones illustrating cyberbullying – while maintaining Shakespearean English throughout the play – were true highpoints. However, she felt the connection between these elements in the play and a further conversation in the workshops was missing, especially regarding a larger discussion on gender roles and the possible impacts on bullying behavior (personal interview). Giguere also commented on this disconnect; she felt the
significance of the gender swap, the power or significance of women playing men’s parts, had not been made apparent enough in the Q&A or in the workshop.

I locate the problem of this disconnect in the fact that CSF is mainly product oriented while neglecting the process students could experience and learn from, especially during the workshop. I remind the reader of Jan Cohen-Cruz’s insight, which I included in the introduction regarding the significance of process oriented work to nurture the embodied learning of AT methodologies. The performance is a polished and strong product; I could sense the passion CSF put into creating this adaptation and their desire to stay faithful to Shakespeare’s text and story throughout was evident. However, observing the workshop, noting that a smaller number of students have the opportunity to participate in the hands-on work, and recognizing the rather short training period the teaching artists received, it feels as though the workshop comes second. This could pose not only an issue with the quality of the workshop and the overarching narrative of the program offering, but also become a weakness in CSF’s marketing. As the material CSF markets to schools has a strong focus on bullying prevention and this is mainly achieved within the workshop session, the workshop itself should be their primary, or at least fully equal, focus.

Yet, the workshop demonstrates several weak spots as I described in Chapter Three. Again, some of the weak spots tie directly back to the very real limitations CSF has to manage financially and logistically. However, I sense that some of these issues may stem from a lack of understanding or appreciation for the intrinsically process-oriented nature of AT work. Given that CSF presented their model to be under the AT label, I thus also draw my considerations from this approach, even if some aspects of the model may suggest a different methodology altogether. Thus, I believe these weak areas in the workshop and more process-oriented features provide productive moments to contemplate possible improvements.
I must begin with a discussion regarding the workshop curriculum. The CSF workshop curriculum is so tightly woven that the narrative allows only for the predetermined content and exercises to be part of the encounter. Thus, each action point within the script must be met, even if the process itself is being rushed – hence the process gets abandoned almost entirely and the time that it takes for students to begin to embody their learning is cut short. It is particularly useful to contemplate the fact that this curriculum may frequently feel rushed for several reasons: first and foremost, the curriculum is densely packed with exercises and content, which provides little room to attend to the different needs of participants, such as disruptive behavior, disinterest, or overly excited students showing their enthusiasm by asking numerous questions – all of these situations take up time, yet cannot be ignored. Moreover, there may also be a fairly steep learning curve for facilitators to know both the physical and intellectual content and feel comfortable with disseminating the material quickly. As I witnessed just a small selection of visits, I cannot say if the time management aspect and generally rushed feeling I observed subsided over time, however, my professional insight leads me to believe that the set-up itself may present an issue that cannot be overcome just through practice. That being said, I recognize the risk of tapping into the unpredictability of process-oriented work. The openness to process rather than the reliance on a final and exactly duplicable product, opens the door to unpredictable outcomes and occurrences.

Undeniably, having a scalable and reproducible curriculum is more marketable and perhaps a (financially) safer choice for schools to consider in their decision on which program to contract. Thus having a dense program and training facilitators to adhere to it strictly, may feel like the most controlled way to deliver such a product. Yet, it would be dangerous to believe that embracing the process means eliminating the product – the reproducible elements of a program –
and thus falling into a scheme that feels ill-prepared or unprofessional. Indeed, both approaches to development of the model can serve fruitfully and provide useful information to cultivate a rigorous scalable model. I look at what I deduced from the comparison and analysis of *Choose Your Life* and “Your Voice Matters” to support this idea. While AIR provided a finished product, the product – an interactive play - itself allowed for numerous improvised and unpredictable moments through the directly integrated interactive theatre elements. MIA takes this a step further, while including a finished product in form of a short scripted play, they distinctly elevate the process-oriented elements of their approach. Both examples show different options to include both process and product more holistically, while maintaining a scalable and reproducible forms. CSF’s focus on their play and the faithfulness to script of the workshop eliminate most of the beneficial qualities often found in process-oriented work in AT programs. As AT practitioners, many of us value the process as a foundation to embodied learning. This embodied practice has also been lauded by many teachers CSF has worked with, for example, again Ms. Shea-Bower, who find the methodology an exceptionally powerful pedagogical approach. What is more, it is this productive and dynamically fluid process that allows for relevant personal narrative, cultural specificity, and lived experience to enter the space. It is in this responsiveness that the process allows the students to recognize the explorations and what they learned in the workshop, and begin to apply it to their lives outside of the controlled environment of the workshop. Naturally, the CSF model, which includes two, or arguably three, distinct components with little overlap, must be considered slightly differently from a more “traditional” AT model, for example, MIA’s program. Yet, deepening this process work can strengthen the potent qualities despite the variance in form.
Before I launch into my recommendations to attend to the issues my observations raised, I must mention that CSF has itself already started addressing a few of the problems I had uncovered. Most immediately, they noticed that their current program components feel too separated from each other and have taken steps to improve the building of connections between the various elements. For example, CSF has already hired a professional translator to elevate the quality of the Spanish translation in the play for the 2017 season. However, there is still room to improve this bilingual component and cultural representation in the workshop, which Giguere has mentioned has not yet been completed. Similarly, the issue of cyberbullying and gender-based bullying behavior require CSF’s attention beyond the presentation in the play. To address the latter issue, Ms. Shea-Bower offered the idea of role reversal in the play and bringing up the discussion in the Q&A portion more profoundly. CSF has clearly tapped into rich and pertinent material, but fell short on the implementation of a deeper discussion of these matters as time and financial constraints presumably limited which goals they could include. Despite such constraints, several avenues could allow CSF to reimagine its program as they continue to develop the material to remain relevant and better serve the target communities.

5.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

My comparison in Chapter Four accentuates that schools often only have a narrow window of time they can give up for additional programming to be brought into the classrooms. From my understanding, 60 to 90 minutes is the standard class session for visiting programs. While it is a tight timeframe, 90 minutes can still produce ample material for students to ponder and embody. The constant push for time and financial resources, and the desire to serve the students with the most helpful programming are the foundation to this section of recommendations. Moreover, programs compete to gain slots at schools; each program team
must consider ways in which to remain relevant, think forward with and beyond the current needs of the participants to the best of their ability. Furthermore, they must continually provide new content for students to consider. Despite generally positive observation data noted in earlier chapters, CSF’s model does have areas that can benefit from some improvements, which then may also meet the demands of the continual pressure such organizations face when seeking to work in public schools. My analysis via Taylor and more significantly, my own expertise as an AT practitioner, sheds light on areas where CSF can consider changes. Even though CSF’s model does not only map directly onto the structures of more “traditional” AT programming, this specific lens can offer potent avenues for CSF to tap into the power of the process-oriented work more deeply. From my experience as a pedagogue and teaching artist, these may allow CSF to engage its program’s maximum potential.

Specifically, I will discuss considerations regarding their touring team structure, the training for the team (especially the facilitators), and options for a restructuring of the program model itself. Based on my analysis in Chapters Three and Four, I deduce that CSF could consider a large-scale overhaul of the form and/or make a few small adjustments over time.

Most immediately and considering the financial challenges restructuring might incur, I suggest CSF focus primarily on enhancing the training of the hired teaching artists. From what I have seen during this season, I sensed that priority was given to the rehearsals of the play and the training and skillset of the hired cast as actors primarily. I recommend refocusing on hiring individuals with greater facilitation capacity rather than actors with limited facilitation experience. In addition, the training phase for these teaching artists should be lengthened and deepened so they can become more familiar with the workshop material and perhaps gain greater confidence with the tools they are given. Furthermore, I suggest bolstering this training with
support from local AT practitioners, of which there are numerous, who can provide training tools, tips, and valuable insights for the CSF teaching artists to consider. These regional professionals could also serve as consultants prior to even staffing and beginning the rehearsal process, which may also produce excellent access points for the training itself. Naturally, some of the learning must still be done in the classroom on site, but some more time could be taken during the preparatory phase. Perhaps connecting with the UCB theatre students and faculty could offer a way to host practice sessions to benefit both the students and the hired teaching artists at no additional cost to CSF or the department. These sessions should also occur early enough in the process so that feedback can be incorporated into the program before the team visits the first school. This may provide the most financially viable and immediately realizable change to the programming.

Perhaps the most valuable change I recommend, lies in looking at new ways of staffing the touring production. If the form itself remains the same, I recommend that CSF put a greater emphasis on seeking well-trained and practiced facilitators. In my experience, many more traditionally theatre focused organizations underestimate facilitation skills. CSF, in particular, requires strong actors for their program and with the exceptional caveat that they must be able to act Shakespeare, which creates an additional challenge for teaching artists. Finding such individuals may be a difficult task. While such skilled people do exist, the local pool may somewhat small to pull from. Therefore, I suggest that CSF consider splitting up the roles and reorganize how it staffs the touring program.

CSF could consider hiring two separate teams: actors and facilitators. My suggestion here allows for the program model to remain the same while hiring more staff, which naturally increases the financial demand on the organization. To maintain the number of students per
school visit that receive the workshop, I suggest hiring three facilitators. The company of six individuals could then work in tandem during the Q&A and the workshop. The actors become teaching artist assistants and aid the lead facilitator with improvisational scene work or stay in role for exercises such as a hot seat question round. Naturally, employing such a robust team of six people requires more funding. MIA, perhaps financially the more comparable organization, has found resources to have five to six people at all their visits, thus I enthusiastically believe that it could be done by CSF as well. Some ideas for additional funding may lie in finding additional grant resources, hosting fundraising events, and/or connecting with the Theatre and Dance department at UCB, which could lead to funding support either through a system where hired facilitator-students could receive credit for their work. I also suggest considering possibly lucrative connections through the department with the creation of the new “Applied Shakespeare” program and some new ideas regarding AT training currently being made (these program directions have not yet been solidified and could offer creative options in the future). I find it extremely worthwhile considering additional fundraising ideas to support a robust team of this nature. It might be the most attractive and tangible option for a recalibration of the program.

More drastically, a reconfiguring of the model could bring forth some exciting ideas to nurture the process-oriented and embodied learning aspects of the work. Through analyzing MIA and AIR’s programs, I recognize that the split format of CSF’s program may not be the most beneficial for participants. The current format highlights the Shakespeare play as the most important part of the visit as the largest amount of people get to see it in one visit. However, there remains an issue with the fact that a fraction of students who saw the play get to continue their learning through the workshop. It feels significant that CSF currently does not have a way to engage the entire audience in developing a common language and awareness on bullying and
bullying intervention. One idea CSF might want to entertain is a hybrid form of what AIR and MIA offer. By shortening the play and placing it into a larger interactive framework, the entire audience could engage with the activities during this one session. I draw this idea from AIR’s format, while wanting to infuse the model with the depth and greater interactive approach that MIA provides.

As it would be very challenging to ask younger students to sit and watch a performance for 90 minutes, I suggest intersecting active exercises with the more passive spectatorship during the play performance may offer an interesting approach. Some examples of these large-group interactive options include a mass warm-up, interactive teaching of vocabulary regarding bullying prevention, a culminating hot-seat activity with the characters, small forum theatre inspired activities to involves individual students on stage, etc. Having a larger team to facilitate these exercises with assistance from school staff could allow even a large group of participants to engage directly with the material. Another part to consider with this overhaul is the fact that CSF does not offer workshops for 3rd grade (CSF’s team feels the material and workshop format would not be age appropriate for younger grades). Thus, looking specifically at the elementary school level production that I observed, it might mean that only 4th and 5th graders could attend the performance. However, this is not necessarily a negative aspect, as it makes the audience in attendance smaller, while still engaging more students per visit in the bullying prevention program than the current model does. Ideally, the 3rd graders would still gain from this experience both in the “real world” outside of this visit as they interact with older students and then, of course, the following year as they may get to participate themselves. Naturally, this idea requires far more fleshing out to meet the various complications that undoubtedly would arise with such a recalibration.
Perhaps the more pragmatic idea, at least to begin with, is a smaller scale reimagining of just the Q&A and workshop. I suggest expanding the Q&A to include more questions that focus on deeper analysis. Furthermore, a short exercise or activity could be added to fortify the conversation on bystander behavior and connect the dots to real life experiences. Currently, the single question on this issue asks where one of the characters could have intervened in a bullying situation. The analysis ends there. How could the teaching artists continue the conversation to connect these characters’ behavior to what you can do in the real world? Hot seating, a modified forum theatre drawn from a scene out of the play, Image Theatre (embodied tableaus) or exercises drawn from Playback Theatre methods might serve here. To see which exercise might offer the strongest approach, I recommend a test run with an audience, for example, inviting undergraduate and graduate students at UCB to try the form. Making the Q&A longer may also mean shortening the play slightly, which I think is possible without eliminating any essential aspects of the theatrical and aesthetic experience. Especially given that my observations indicate that students were increasingly more distracted and disengaged after 30-35 minutes of the play, shortening the performance and switching to an interactive mode might help students retain more of the information. I do not believe that much would be lost by way of quality of the play if it were shortened by 10 minutes, but it would certainly require clever reconfiguring of the adaptation to maintain the high aesthetic quality CSF seeks to deliver. I do believe CSF could meet this challenge with great care and expertise.

The reconfiguring of the workshops is perhaps my most significant recommendation. From my research, I deduce that the highlights or key components CSF currently has in place are: 1) building a “safe” or “brave” space for students to engage in the work; 2) the teaching of basic understanding of the definitions of bullying behavior and bystander/upstander behavior; 3)
introducing the positive school climate concept in general; 4) applying this abstract knowledge to “real” scenarios through the play and recognizing the behavior through the characters; 4) practicing upstander behavior; and 5) disseminating information regarding Safe2Tell. These goals are complex and too much for a short 45 minute workshop. To scale back, I recommend focusing on warm ups that also include group or ensemble building exercises (for example, working together unraveling the “Human Knot” or creating a human “Machine”). Furthermore, I would then eliminate the many moments of what I call “circle lecture time.” In these moments, students are asked to sit in a circle, answer a few basic questions, and then the teaching artists lecture to them about the definition of bullying and offer a few statistics. Instead, shorten the amount of material that is shared (for example, fewer statistics) and teach the material through interactive and multimodal methods, for example, using visual aids on a blackboard. One idea might be to create large letter size laminated “playing cards” that entail information about bullying written in an engaging way (a poem or story). Students then have to string together the narrative by connecting the cards, making the teaching of definitions and terminology fun and simultaneously embodied, visual, and linguistic practice.

From there, I suggest cutting the school climate embodied practice entirely. Three out of the four sessions I watched demonstrated a lack of involvement and understanding when this exercise was done, which indicates that it is not the most effective exercise. Giguere later noted that she also was no longer convinced of this particular technique and was open to different ideas. Thus, I recommend making the school climate part of the definitions section mentioned. As the bystander/upstander terminology has been presented, introducing Safe2Tell should be the next step. Once the students know how to use this tool, they could each use the printed handouts from Safe2Tell, which are shaped like an iPhone with faux buttons, to actually play with the tool.
The facilitator could present a scene in which the antagonistic character wants to bully their counterpart and the students, instead of simply improvising, can use this tool for others, which have been introduced previously (for example, telling a teacher) to practice being an upstander. It is then a rehearsal for real life, which responds directly to Boal’s vision of his methodology and Taylor’s notion bringing in task-oriented approaches. This scene would undoubtedly be stronger if more than one trained person were present to act it out, but I still believe there is a way to do this successfully with just one teaching artist. The first requirement for this to work is that the scene becomes more relatable. Since each season brings a new show, I strongly suggest rooting the selected scene and relationship to lived experiences that are accessible for students. In the past season it felt as though the focus remained more with staying true to the Shakespearean characters’ lives than those of the students. I suggest asking current students of the target age group during the development phase to recommend encounters they have witnessed or encountered – they are the experts in this moment (these could be personal acquaintances if they are willing to help). With a stronger scene, students could test out a variety of options to become upstanders and analyze what worked well and which options did not land with the help of a facilitator.

Naturally, all of this can only be done with the teachers in the classroom being engaged and using the informational packets and preparatory curriculum CSF sends them before the visit. In the classrooms that used the preparatory material, students already knew some of the basic content and could interact with the material more freely. Those who had no preparation struggled through understanding the most elementary concept the teaching artists brought in. This inconsistency regarding preparation and the unpredictability in engagement from teachers during the workshop, suggest that the teacher buy-in is not strong enough. I do not have a specific
recommendation as to how CSF can gain better teacher buy-in, so a survey asking about this element expressly might shed light on where the hesitation lies or what teachers need to feel better prepared and more engaged. If this is not possible to conduct, then I suggest inviting the teachers who have a more intricate relationship with CSF overall, such as the “Will Power” teachers, or those who are personal friends of the CSF staff, to a gathering where CSF can gain their insights on creating stronger teacher and staff buy-in. I believe a creative solution could be found to discover what is missing and what needs strengthening in this regard. Once teachers are more invested and feel more confident with the content, I believe the workshops can also gain more traction with the students and proceed more smoothly. Regrettably, I was not granted permission by the district to conduct this level of research, thus I do caution CSF in this regard and hope they can prepare a more compelling case to the district to complete such surveys with teachers.

To recap, I recommend that CSF focus more on training the teaching artists as strong facilitators (or hiring additional facilitation leaders) and simplifying the workshop. Emphasizing fewer ideas through a more engaged practice would provide space for more playful examination and deeper exploration despite the very short timeframe of the workshop. Better training of the teaching artists will strengthen the curriculum and ensure that the main points can be duplicated in any setting, while still allowing for personal narratives and exploration to enter the discussion without getting stuck in the rabbit hole of “personal story time” and oversharing. With a strong team in place, any doubts regarding reproducibility, reliability, and marketability of the curriculum, should dissolve. MIA’s model proves that this can be done with a tight budget and tight timeframe. Moreover, these steps may also set the teaching artists up for a greater sense of
success and confidence as they head into the classrooms. Their sense of confidence and concomitant comfort with the material in this work can surely benefit the participants.

Considering the rich regional expertise of AT practitioners and fellow bullying prevention specialists, I still suggest a coming together and consulting with local practitioners. As I noted in Chapter Four, there is great worth in continually researching and reinventing the models currently employed to ensure longevity and relevance. A sharing of approaches and ideas can spark the necessary imagination and collective problem-solving for such development. The meeting may also assist the groups in clarifying what distinct qualities each of their programs offer to better market their specific approaches. This conversation could support a thriving market of friendly competition. Such exchanges form a mode of assessment for each organization as well. In addition, self-assessment and multilevel research further provide insight regarding future innovation for each program. CSF already includes some of this ongoing self-assessment and recalibration, but they can dig deeper and make more drastic changes when the opportunity arises. Furthermore, to ensure a more objective evaluation of how their model is actually landing, external assessment through meeting with counterparts or hiring of researchers conducting observations, such as I completed here, remains invaluable. This may require additional funding and logistical support. Of course, all of this should always be done with the interests of the community and the students at the center.

It is worth a reminder that my research does not speak to the impact of the CSF programming. While I originally aimed to measure and assess impact, my foundational research presented here demonstrates the vast complexity of this work. A larger study would require longitudinal measurements, a team of researchers that can observe and include the various factors of the programming and the target schools, etc. A conversation specifically regarding
assessment with Beverly Kingston, Ph.D., at CSPV further highlighted the overwhelming cost a multi-tiered assessment would entail. Indeed, quantitative assessment may be nearly impossible to complete given the vast nuance of the work and frankly, may not serve most beneficially to capture the pertinent data. Instead, if funding, logistical and personnel support could be provided, I suggest a mixed-method, primarily qualitative, study to assess impact.

On this note, Kingston also warns me that the idea of assessing impact of a program such as this would actually not be the best use of resources. Narrowing down what is meant by impact or success is vital. She suggests measuring how the program lands by looking at what students gain through the process, what resources are leveraged to take action and raise awareness (such as continued conversations in the classroom, supplemental trainings, etc.). What are the takeaways from this program and what remains with the students over time? So checking back in with a follow-up a few weeks or even months later could shed light on this. Much of this relies on the collaboration of the teachers and staff, so it could be extremely challenging to undertake. MIA happens to have been recently accepted to a nation-wide research project with 16 various organizations that will measure such outcomes and efficacy of this program and I would suggest discussing with them what they may have learned during this process. Furthermore, a discussion with AIR’s program evaluators may also lend insight that could serve CSF to develop a further measurement tool for their program. I still recommend finding a way to measure the efficacy and what the program can actually achieve in the near future, as it will further help CSF strengthen and improve its programming.

5.2 FINAL THOUGHTS

While it may be ideal to find more expansive support to conduct a more complete study to measure some outcomes of the CSF program, this notion may well be too grand to reach in the
short-term. I had to navigate several limitations, such as the small sample of data I could gather, the time restraints, and the BVSD boundaries. These limitations and origins of the data observed should caution the reader to look at the data provided with a critical eye. Aside from my own qualitative (and intrinsically subjective) observations, most data I gained came directly from CSF. While data from the survey appears unbiased, it is naturally mediated through CSF before I receive the numbers and anecdotes – a factor which must be considered when looking at the mostly positive feedback the group appears to receive. Furthermore, the small survey conducted with students at the end of the workshop does not provide neutral insight regarding impact or enjoyment of the work. When analyzing the survey results, we must consider the emotional state of the students, the time crunch, and the idea that students may want to raise their hands simply to please the facilitators in the room, especially as the survey focuses on leading questions. I feel that the numbers could not provide a fully unbiased image of the student engagement and quality of the work; indeed, one anonymous adult spectator mentioned that they felt the survey was “coercive.” As I am acutely aware of these factors, I also rely on my personal experience and insights in making the recommendations I compiled above.

I must also note that the analysis of the work through Philip Taylor’s eight questions produced numerous challenges. Taylor’s model applies mostly to unscripted or loosely scripted work rather than this hybrid form that CSF created. I used Taylor’s questions as a guideline because, so far, few other AT researchers have developed a transferrable measuring tool with such a wide scope. However, I have found that his questions do not fit this particular model perfectly. In Chapter Three, my findings are often tainted by the fact that I am attempting to retrofit either his scale or the CSF model to work together. In mapping one onto the other, it is
not surprising that the results often sway negatively if I uphold Taylor’s elements as the golden standard.

Indeed, it may be useful to ask if the CSF model should even be considered through an AT lens as it is more of a TIE or even traditional theatre-AT hybrid form. Perhaps measurement tools used for Shakespeare in Prison workshops could serve better, or the development of an entirely new evaluation could provide stronger insight into the quality and reach of the work. Ideally, a different scale could critically analyze the hybrid model holistically. I do believe that Taylor’s guidelines help distill certain key points regarding the workshop specifically, but it is not necessarily useful concerning the Shakespeare performance, thus leaving out half of the programming automatically. While I do not find this lens entirely inapplicable, it may in some ways have become a failed experiment – a useful failure nonetheless.

It is worth noting that some AT practitioners might denounce the use of Shakespeare entirely (as I have discovered in numerous conversations at conferences and AT trainings around the country). However, I implore them to pause for a moment. The current question in our educational system is not if we should teach or use Shakespeare in schools, but rather how we approach the material. If we carefully consider the framing of the stories and the person, we can avoid falling into the trap of promoting primarily white men’s oeuvres within the Common Core Standards. Not only can we supplement Shakespeare’s work with other authors of diverse backgrounds in the classroom and in our AT programming, but we can actually scaffold his own work to illuminate issues of diversity and inclusion. CSF does this already through the use of Spanish, which inherently subverts the established English-centric power dynamics.

To illustrate this point further, I wish to share the approach utilized by Erin Kaplan, established AT teaching artist, Shakespeare admirer, and Ph.D. candidate. Kaplan has found a
way to connect Shakespeare with the lived experiences of diverse students living in New York City. She has succeeded\(^{13}\) in framing Shakespeare in a manner that makes his work relevant to students who have experienced marginalization in and through their educational path. This includes students of color, students of multilingual upbringing, students at community college coming from underserved communities, and students who have previously struggled with the content for a multitude of reasons. In a personal email exchange and follow-up conversation, she discussed how she uses *Othello* in her lectures to prove two core ideas: 1) she shows students that they too have the capacity to understand this so-called "elite" language, and 2) she provides insights that Shakespeare was already discussing, concepts such as internalized racism, racist stereotypes, gender-based stereotypes, etc. Kaplan’s work proves that Shakespeare’s work can become relevant to a contemporary and diverse audience’s lived experiences. Thus, I also recommend that CSF bring in consultants to help address some of these issues. Undoubtedly, Shakespeare will remain part of the educational setting, and we have treasured resources in this community to bring Shakespeare to life and make his work relevant to students who will eventually have to study his writing. In many ways, CSF is uniquely placed to give local students an early and highly engaging glimpse into the world of Shakespeare that so many students and teachers often feel negatively towards in their later schooling.

For my final thought, I wish to turn to the students that I observed. In this complex and ever-changing political and cultural climate, I recognize the deep value of bringing the arts to young children and allowing them to engage with well-crafted work. The arts provide a space for

\(^{13}\) She shares anecdotes as evidence of this success illustrating how students who previously struggled with the content could productively analyze the material in exams and essays by the end of the course. Furthermore, she tells the stories of individual students who suddenly recognize where and how Shakespeare becomes relevant to their own lives, despite their earlier resistance to the material.
creative self-expression, multimodal and embodied learning, and a kinesthetic approach to explore and develop socio-emotional skills. In the U.S. today, the arts face the largest budget cuts within an already tight educational budget, despite the well-documented positive impact the arts have on students. Therefore, I do not wish to undermine CSF’s approach, but rather encourage the organization towards improvement; I have sought to illuminate tangible steps to grow the program in beneficial ways. I hope the reader can gain valuable insights from the many aspects uncovered through this analysis, which speaks to the intricacy and complexity of the issues at hand. Despite these challenges, the CSF model overall has great value must continue to be explored.

Finally, I want to share the image of particularly engaged students watching the Shakespeare play and participating in the workshop. I do not know how much exposure to this material they would have without CSF’s visit. What I was able to observe, surely, was the great sense of enjoyment these children experienced. The wide eyes, jubilant laughter and giggling, the carefree mobility in the space as they are not confined to their desks during this encounter. All of these joyous images underline how valuable such programming is. Even if just for a half-day, these students had the opportunity to engage with crucial material in a playful and multimodal manner and were allowed to move freely with their bodies. This was perhaps the first and only time students encountered Shakespeare as a play and not through the written word in a classroom. Hopefully this encounter can inspire a deeper love for theatre and ease anxiety over tackling Shakespeare in the academic setting when they enter their later school years. This I particularly important when their encounter with Shakespeare juxtaposes their encounter with personal experiences and narratives. What is more, some students who normally would not hear their own language presented on stage – especially not in a Shakespeare play – had the
opportunity to witness Spanish-speaking leading characters on stage. The excited twinkle of recognition in many students’ eyes will stay with me for years to come. Those moments remain precious and few, therefore we must seek to strengthen and promote the creative and innovative work of all arts-based initiatives at the most basic level.

I shall leave you with this image: a small boy, maybe 9 years old, is sitting alone at the back of the gym. He seems detached and uninterested. Another student asks him, in Spanish, why he is sitting in the back alone. The boy shakes his head and answers that he is uninterested in being here. The boy continues to sulk at the back of the room until Baptista steps out and speaks his first few lines in Spanish. The boy appears to want to resist the temptation to look up and get engaged in the play, but after a few more minutes he can’t seem to help himself. He stares at Baptista; he seems entranced. I turn away to observe other students but within 15 minutes I see movement out of the corner of my eye – the boy has inched closer to the rest of the audience and closer to the performance space. There is now a faint smile on his face. During this visit I continue to observe the entire audience as best I can, but frequently find myself watching this boy. Where his friends start becoming restless and disengaged around the half hour mark, he continues to stare at the performers with sincere fixation. He starts to shush people around him. At the end of the play, it takes him a moment to snap back to the real world. He enthusiastically starts clapping as the performers take their bows. During the Q&A, he is the first person to raise his hand and answer a question.

This is the power of theatre at work happening directly in front of me. A student’s energy and engagement has entirely transformed within 45 minutes. I hope he can maintain this enthusiasm and enjoyment for theatre; who knows, he may be the next great theatre maker of the future. This valuable power is what we cannot neglect and lose. We must continue to nurture
these powerful and impactful encounters in the classroom and beyond, to uplift and inspire our youth. They are our future.
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APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW ONE: Katie R. Wall

Interviewee: Katie R. Wall  
Actor/Facilitator and Program Developer  
Arts Integrated Resources – Kaiser Permanente  
1/3/2017  
11 – 11:30 a.m.  
Mode: Phone Call

Goldfarb: Hi, this is Alia Goldfarb calling. How are you?

Wall: Hi, it’s good to hear from you. I am well. I’m so glad we could finally connect. How are you?

Goldfarb: I am doing well and really very excited about this interview. Thank you so much for taking the time to do this. I hope your vacation was enjoyable and relaxing.

Wall: (laughing) Indeed, it was. Happy New Year to you!

Goldfarb: Thank you, to you as well. So, as I do have a few questions for you and do not wish to steal too much of your time, are you ready for the interview?

Wall: Yes, excellent, go ahead! I am happy to answer to the best of my abilities, what I can tell you is that Choose Your Life was developed before I even joined the team. I will answer as much as possible and I will see what I can figure out for your outside of the interview if there are things I do not know.

Goldfarb: Sure I certainly understand that. If you have any other documentation, print and digital material, those sorts of things, I would love to see those if you can share them. That might help fill in a few gaps as well, if there are any.

Wall: Yeah, definitely. Yes, I can do that for you, I’ll make a note of it.

Goldfarb: I was just looking through the website and those materials, so some of my questions come from my research there. I would love to start off with your role. Bud had told me your role might have switched a bit over the years?

Wall: Yes, I did. I used to be part of the touring actor as part of our educational program, as an actor. Now I primarily facilitate workshops, teaching artistry and workshop facilitation for adults and kids as well. So, basically people of all ages.

Goldfarb: (laughing) Wow, sounds like an excellent job there.

Wall: (laughing) Yes, it really is wonderful!
Goldfarb: If I am understanding correctly, I am not sure if your specific facilitation is geared this way as well, but overall, I saw there was an approach for AIR is conflict mediation. Is that right?

Wall: Yeah, so, currently, one of the workshops is about conflict resolution. It is part of our middle school workshops for 7th and 8th grade students.

Goldfarb: Is that part of a bullying intervention/prevention?

Wall: It is actually not about bullying prevention at all. Choose Your Life, the program you reached out about, was primarily about bullying prevention. A lot of the research was from the Olweus prevention method. The Conflict Resolution workshop called “Preventing Conflict” is basically... the goal is basically about upstream behavior, where we get students to work on conflict before it even becomes bullying. To learn how to talk to each other, how to communicate better, or what to do during a moment of bullying to stop it from getting worse. So It’s not specifically focused on bullying prevention.

Goldfarb: So does it stand a little bit on upstander behavior modelling?

Wall: That was really more Choose Your Life. And I will send you the info we have about Choose Your Life and what messages we taught the kids. We used bystander not upstander terminology, specifically courageous bystander. We had a handout that we would give to students so I can send you all of that information. But the Conflict resolution does not talk about upstanders at all.

Goldfarb: Is Choose Your Life then still running at the moment? Or is that now done?

Wall: At the moment it is not. We actually work with CSU [Colorado State University] and they toured Choose Your Life with college students through CSU. We would basically give them a grant to go out and tour Choose Your Life local fort Collins schools. So they took that off the road at the end of Fall 2016. Currently, Choose Your Life is not in Colorado

Goldfarb: Really, the conflict resolution one has now taken over for different demographics then?

Kate: Actually not necessarily, the conflict resolution program is geared towards middle school. Our touring team still goes out with brand new shows. One of them is an actual internship with Metro State University and they tour a program that is all about social-emotional health and skills. Then there is one directly through our department about the stigma of mental health issues. They don’t directly focus on bullying intervention, but they sort of replaced Choose Your Life in the touring world at AIR.

Goldfarb: Ok, yes...

Wall: And the conflict resolution program is a workshop, not a show. But If you look on their website, you can see there is People Like This. That is a show. They do a show and then they use
Goldfarb: That is really interesting, thank you for clarifying this. Do you know why the show was ended? Was that just funding, or was it deemed irrelevant now...or...

Wall: I do know. It was not because it wasn’t appropriate or relevant, it probably will be appropriate forever, or as long as bullying exists. I think it was partially because we had toured that show for about 5+ years and I think a lot of schools had seen it already. We were looking for new programming specifically for us. We had done the Healthy Kids Colorado Survey and a couple other surveys, which told us to focus more on mental health and social-emotional health. It is not about it not being relevant, but some things needed some updating, such as upstander as you mentioned. But the messaging I think was pretty relevant, we just needed a different direction. The team that toured it in the fall got great responses. I can send you the script to so you can see how it worked. It is interactive, they go into the audience, they ask for feedback. We still get comments, positives ones, about that.

Goldfarb: If you could tell me more about that and if you have the script that would be great. I was also wondering in terms of form, how the show works. Is it a pre-written script fully, is it based on applied theatre methods? If yes, if you know which ones, if you can pin point them? Are they professional actors like yourself facilitating? And so forth... I would love to know more about the form generally.

Katie: Initially, when the script was first written it was first written in house by employees here in the office. They researched the Olweus method of bully prevention, and I actually don’t know how the development of the script worked, but I think they just started writing. And then they toured the show for a year or so and came back and rewrote stuff. Practically every season that we toured the show, it got rewritten. What happened was they brought a director in and she brought in a team of people and we were constantly revising it and making sure that the lines landed, etc. And as actors we had a chance to say how the lines worked and if things didn’t feel right. We were constantly rewriting and reworking it. The script now is maybe the 4th rewrite or 5th draft of it. And yes, they were professional actors. All the actors that toured the first tours were all professional actors hired by KP. But then it did go beyond us, and recently at CSU, they are student actors, but the first four or five years were all professional.

Goldfarb: Was there, in the beginning, a workshop with it or did that come later or was there not one?

Wall: There was no workshop. Sometimes a school would ask for a talkback so we would have a quick talkback, but there was no workshop attached to it. There was ancillary material we provided, which I can send you. But there was no workshop with the show. It was just the theatrical piece.

Goldfarb: Ok, yes. I assume the script was very contemporary geared and kind of speaking more to the community right then and there. Since I am comparing this to Colorado Shakespeare Festival, and they use Shakespeare, I am curious to look at how the show landed and where the stories came from. Also what sort of feedback you were getting. I would be really curious about...
all this.

Wall: We used to have a tracking system with comments from teachers and hope to find some of the good ones for you. By and large what works for this show was to kind of two-fold. It was a game show. So because of that it allows kids to get involved and participate in a more authentic, breaking-the-fourth-wall kind of way. I think that was successful I think the participants, I mean the actors, I mean the characters, they are in high school. So those are closer in age for the audience. They are not elementary or middle schoolers, but certainly close enough in age that they can relate. The show was also successful because it showed two different types of bullying. They had the sort of typical girl bullying about social status and friendship and cattiness. And then there was the typical sort of male bullying, more physical force and such, as well. So students could find themselves in those characters. I think that was the goal.

Goldfarb: Ah yes, thanks for explaining that. So without the workshop you sometimes had a Q&A or talkback.

Wall: It wasn’t part of what we sold, but some schools did ask for it. But by the nature of the show, actors could get into the audience and interact. The game show host especially could get live feedback and reactions. The actors on stage then took the information and interpreted it on stage in a few different moments of the show.

Goldfarb: If you are familiar with Play Back Theatre, was it a bit like that?

Wall: Yep exactly like that in fact. It was using their words, their ideas. The actors would literally rewind and do the scene over with the words form the students in the audience.

Goldfarb: Ok, that gives me a great idea of what that looked like, thank you.

Wall: We also did like a stand-up-sit-down portion of it, or a step in of sorts. That allows the audience to participate in a larger group and use their authentic reaction.

Goldfarb: Cool, yes, I can visualize that. I come from an applied theatre background, so I’m really trying to locate CSF’s program in that world and also locating what else is available in the state.

Wall: Yeah, we used a lot of AT for the middle school program, the conflict resolution program. We do a lot of role playing and various games and techniques there.

Goldfarb: Excellent, really a multi-pronged approach from KP with multiple programs at once. That is interesting to see. I guess, I just have a couple more questions if you have a few more minutes. So if you have numbers on how many schools or students you’ve reached, can you send those along?

Wall: I will have to dig but I can find those somewhere. So you are looking the numbers of the participants of Choose Your Life, year by year, or the whole program?
Goldfarb: The total number in the end would be excellent if you have those. That would help my comparison.

Wall: yes, sure I can do that.

Goldfarb: I was wondering about the cost to schools and how that worked. I know CSU received a grant to run the tour. But I assume schools had to come up with some support?

Wall: Actually all the programs at KP are free to the schools. Because Kaiser is a non-profit organization, there is a return as well. So 3% of all income Kaiser makes on the medical side goes back into the community. So everything that we do is a free service for the community. So it is zero cost for anyone. CSU, for them to bring the program out, that was a different entity since it didn’t include our actors. We otherwise pay for everything. With CSU, they would bring student actors and pay them a stipend for rehearsal and acting time and the professor got paid her professorial fee for the semester. We covered props, set, sound, and all of that stuff and the only cost to them really was the van. Actually I think we paid that too. So really zero cost to them.

Goldfarb: That is a really interesting funding approach then, certainly different from what I am otherwise looking at. So yes that was happening mostly in Fort Collins through CSU. Do you know if they ever did go out to other high schools or was it just local?

Wall: CSU wasn’t high schools – sorry I was a bit confusing on that. All of the touring programming we have currently, and Choose Your Life, are geared towards Elementary schools. Then the middle school workshop is an in-class workshops, so we do a bit more with them. As students get older and they comprehend more information, we do more specific workshops.

Goldfarb: Certainly. On that note, I did see the video online about the middle school program and something called “safe humor.” Is that a method that is used or taught in that specific program?

Wall: “Safe humor” is a strategy we teach to students. In the research, we found that this is a strategy that middle schoolers tend to use in moments of conflict. We often deflect to it an it becomes unsafe quickly, such as roasting. Humor as bullying and laughing off things that are very rude and intense. So we have a whole conversation about safe humor and what it means to be safe and what it looks like to be safe. And often that is not the only strategy. With safe humor you have to come in and deflect whatever is coming at you and then know a different strategy so you can actually talk.

Goldfarb: Aha, that certainly clarifies things. Interesting.

Wall: Humor is one of the things that hey use the most. Roasting is super common in middle school. They don’t understand the difference between between the “your momma joke” or laughing at someone’s clothes or making fun of someone and just saying or deflecting something through humor.

Goldfarb: yes, I can see that. That is interesting to consider, for sure. I would also be interested in
some of your research on the programming itself. Do you have studies on efficacy for the programming? Or studies or material on the background of the programming and also what the source material was?

Wall: Which program do you mean for this specifically, the middle school one?

Goldfarb: Really either one you have, Choose Your Life primarily, but also the conflict resolution program is interesting to me.

Wall: We do lit reviews in terms of developing the program. We pulled from various different sources. It’s a lot of Sternberg, etc. there are just so many different kinds. We don’t pull from one specific program, but we did research or fieldwork really. A colleague and myself, we met with leading people in devised and applied theater in Chicago. It’s a culmination of different ideas.

Goldfarb: Who did you meet with in Chicago?

Wall: Oh yes, of course. One is a good friend of mine, Sarah Rose Greenberg, who works at Adventure Stage. We followed her and discussed our program with her. And then we went to Albany Park Theatre Project. And then others, such as a middle school teacher who works with devised theatre in school in Evanston, Illinois.

Goldfarb: Oh, that is excellent, really drawing from some established practitioners then. That is certainly also interesting for my personal research in the field, thank you for sharing that.

Wall: Of course! [laughing] They really have done cool stuff and are winning awards.

Goldfarb: Yes, I have heard of the two companies, that is really a great opportunity! [laughing] So then my last question is about how the training for facilitators and actors works. Is there a special training you work on? I know this is a professional appointment as well, and probably involves some preparation?

Wall: It is both professional and some contracted work. We have a team of seven teaching artists that we work with, 3 of us are full time employees at AIR, the rest are contracted. So we went through an extensive audition process to find teaching artists. Once they were hired, we went through an intensive two-week specific training for the specific program and teaching artist training overall. There is always new stuff to learn and it is not a clear cut thing. So things are always shifting. We are constantly meeting and discussing best practices. All of us do facilitation her eat AIR, so the full-time people and we have kind of an idea of what we like to do. As an organization, Arts Integrated Resources, we focus on positive youth development. And one of my colleagues is also one of the founders. We work with him a lot and try to find how to treat youth voices like they really do matter. We don’t want to talk to or at them; we want to work and talk with them. We do a lot of work on that. We are constantly developing our process. But we do have an outline within which we work, which I can send you. It’s a little rough because we are re-developing parts of it, but it gives you a sense of the concept, It’s essentially a three-part workshop for the teaching artists. So once they are hired, we have them start by reading through
the outline and the supplementary material. We work through the information, try it over and over in simulated experiences and then we throw them into the classroom especially with the people working on the middle school program. I think that is where you do most of your learning. There you see what works and what doesn’t work – it’s hands-on learning. The workshop is designed to honor these voices and allow for dialogue instead of speaking to. You really need a specific kind of person to not just be a teacher in the room but to inspire dialogue and ideas.

Goldfarb: Absolutely, people really underestimate that often.

Wall: Yeah and it was hard, we saw 30 or something people. We had to find that right person who is willing to learn and work as a group and team and who works well with young students. They go in as a group, by the way, so they really have to work together extremely well and not flaunt their egos and respond in the moment. They have to learn in the moment quite often. For the touring program we really need actors of course too and they don’t have to do as much facilitating. That works a bit differently.

Goldfarb: Of course this is opening up a few more questions for me. Do you have just a few more minutes to spare?

Wall: Yes, of course, I can imagine it is a lot of information. Ask away!

Goldfarb: Excellent, thank you. So my last question then is about this teamwork. As they go in as teams, I wonder, how many students are usually involved in the classroom setting then?

Wall: It’s about 30-35. It is classroom based. Often times, the teaching artist will see the entire grade in one day. It’s an hour long workshop. So they do 4-6 workshops in one day. Then they come back again another day and do second part. Then they return for a third day for the third part of the workshop.

Goldfarb: Well that is certainly an intensive day for the facilitators.

Wall: Yes, indeed. Oh and just so you know, the outline I’m sending you is still missing a component. This year we are redeveloping our evaluation of that program. So we evaluated the whole last year with a written evals and this year our hope is to change it to a more interactive evaluation. We are using clickers for the students to be a part of the process in that way. We haven’t really written that yes, so just so you know ahead of time.

Goldfarb: That is actually really interesting. I originally had set out with the goal of doing evaluations with some sort of digital interactive media or clickers at well but it is incredibly expensive to do and I just didn’t have the resources for that. I’m really fascinated to see that you are doing that.

Wall: Yes, it really is very expensive and we got a lot of support to set that up.

Goldfarb: Yeah!
Wall: You know, it really came out of the nature of the work. To be so interactive and experiential and then ask “hey, fill out this paper” doesn’t speak to the work we do. We are trying to change that. Our goal is to be able to communicate with every single person in the classroom and with students with different learning styles. Also thinking of students who don’t talk and don’t want to talk, we have writing or we have participatory eval, so they get be a part of the activity without actually speaking.

Goldfarb: definitely, I surely understand that. I’d love to see anything you have on this material just for my personal research and looking for new ideas and models.

Wall: Of course, of course! Honestly, we are also happy to have you come and watch the workshop in the later Spring. We already have a lot booked but it won’t be for a few more weeks at least. We would be happy to have you.

Goldfarb: Oh thank you so much! That is really generous. If you could send me a schedule that would be excellent and I can see where it fits in. I assume it might not start early enough for me to include that in my writing at that point.

Wall: Definitely, I will do that. And yeah, I think it might be a bit too late for you but we would still love to have you come.

Goldfarb: Excellent. Do you happen to know if you are scheduled for anything in Boulder?

Wall: You know, right now I don’t think we are, but I’ll send you the whole list so you can see. And I’ll send updates as it comes in. We may have a few that will be closer.

Goldfarb: Yeah, that would work. I live in Fort Collins so I can just pick one and go from there.

Wall: Wow, you travel from Fort Collins to Boulder for school? That is quite a lot of driving then. I will try to highlight ones that are a bit closer to you then.

Goldfarb: Yes, a lot of time on the bus for sure getting work done.

Wall: That is really great that you have a bus to use, I’m sure that helps. I’m impressed.

Goldfarb: Oh yeah, the nature of the beast I guess.

Wall: I will make sure to send that and just let me know what works.

Goldfarb: Well overall, I think that pretty much does it for this interview. That is a lot of information for me to look into.

Wall: Yeah, it really is [laughing].
Goldfarb: That is just what I was hoping for, thank you so much. It really helps to have the direct input and insight from someone who has so much experience with the programming.

Wall: Of course! I will make sure to send you all the material for Choose Your Life. Let me know if anything else comes up I would be more than happy to answer more questions or whatever else.

Goldfarb: Thank you! I do very much appreciate your taking the time. It will really be great to include in my thesis.

Wall: Of course! Good luck with all of that then and do just let me know if you need anything else.

Goldfarb: Thank you and I hope you have a great rest of the day. And again, Happy New Year!

Wall: To you too, thanks! Onward we go! Bye then.

Goldfarb: Good bye!
Interviewee: Andrea Rabold
Executive Director, Mirror Image Arts
01/05/2017
1:20 – 2:30 p.m.
Mode: Google Hangout Interview

Rabold: Hello!

Goldfarb: Hello!

Rabold: How are You today?

Goldfarb: I am warm and not in the snow - so sorry that I could not get through the snow today.

Rabold: I am so glad that you are home and safe. It would have been awful if you had to come all the way down here even if the buses were working today.

Goldfarb: Yes in some ways, but I am disappointed I couldn’t make it to actually meet with you in person. We have been trying to plan this for so long! I think this is the third time we have gotten snowed out of our meeting.

Rabold: Yes, indeed. The third time, wow, that is crazy. Well the weather is just not a fan of us during the winter.

Goldfarb: It seems not! Well, thank you so much for understanding and being so flexible with all of this. I really appreciate you taking the time.

Rabold: Well, I am so glad we are actually finally talking and could make this work.

Goldfarb: Well, how are you doing.

Rabold: Well I have some great news about funding and we just have to work on a grant application right now, so I am just incredibly busy with everything. If we could just be done by 2:30, I would really appreciate that.

Goldfarb: Oh yes, of course! I really want to take as little of your time as possible.

Rabold: Of course and don’t worry, I am here for you! I am really happy to be doing this. I just do have to address that today, it is pretty important for u.

Goldfarb: Of course, I fully understand and well, thank you! I really just have these burning questions for you about MIA and what you do and where things are heading right now. I really
want to include it all in my thesis and my research looking forward as well. I think it is important work.

Rabold: Yeah, well thanks for even thinking about Mirror Image Arts!

Goldfarb: Yes, of course. Well, as you know the focus of my research really is CSF’s program and MIA fits in as a comparison for the region.

Rabold: Yes, exactly. So we are flattered to be included.

Goldfarb: Well, I find it an honor too and I think a really productive comparison to understand who is serving communities here.

Rabold: Well, you know it’s really interesting. I always feel I can learn more from other people and even our “competitors” or maybe especially from them. I mean we do serve the same communities in some ways. There is overlap. So I had also reached out to CSF to share how we all do the work and maybe just know who the other people are working here. It isn’t even about sharing best practices or anything. We just wanted to get to know them and that has been really hard to do. We couldn’t really get any ground around that and so we kind of just stopped asking. And then the second piece is, we also want to check our programs through a certain lens. I also wanted to ask, what have you heard about Mirror Image that makes you interested in the program and our approach and our work, especially as you have not yet seen the whole thing. What about us makes you want to consider us?

Goldfarb: Totally fair questions, and yes, I haven’t seen all of it and will of course be learning more coming up. On apart is that I have just heard such strong recommendations from Ligia [Baptista Silverman], who is a co-facilitator with me and I have really intimate insight into her approach and ideas. Given that I completely trust her opinion on your work and she is the one who got us connected anyway. Also of course talking to Maya Osterman has really given me a great insight into your approach and everything she said was just incredibly interesting to me and sounded like ideas that align with my own notions. So that is really why I felt this was a good place to start. And of course, I know from your digital materials that your source material for your practice is exactly in line with my own training so I really just wanted to highlight those ideas in my writing. I think it could serve both CSF and hopefully you as well in the long run.

Rabold: Well thank you, it’s so great to hear that from your perspective. So I guess go ahead and let me know what your questions are!

Goldfarb: Excellent, thank you. I guess, I would love to start with just the program overall and your approach. I’m really curious to see how you are implementing your work regionally, what your reach is, yeah, all of those things. I would love to know more, tangibly, what your program looks like on the ground. I think I have a good general idea from your other materials, but if you could flesh that out that would be great.

Rabold: Yeah, ok, oh, [laughing] big question. I’m going to go back and give you some history for us first. These are the discoveries and lessons we learned along the way that made us who we
are today. When we originally started, we were an organization that was really using theatre as a tool to bring education and awareness, which is also amazing, specifically to eating disorders and mental health. I firmly believe that education and awareness are really important. At the end of the day, we knew that this work could do so much more. So what would happen if we started testing that and started to create change and action that comes out of education and awareness? When the founder left the organization and handed it over to me… by the way I started as an actor in the program - and just was also, at the same time, given some incredible business experience through the international organization I was working with at the time - and I just kept coming back and sharing stories about leadership and management, and people and organizational development with the founder and she was really beginning to depend on me for that.

So I became a cast manager soon after and then became an artistic director for an artistic director for a hot second because I had no idea what I was doing nor is that really where my experience was. I would have loved to say: “In an other lifetime that is where I would love to have been” but ultimately my background and experience, while totally theatre based, because I did get my BFA in acting, I had done some directing and have designed shows, I had done all of that. I just really had more professional experience around the organizational parts and the executive director role. Managing people and leadership, the work on the horizon, those pieces are much more comfortable for me versus things like reading a bunch of scripts and deciding what our season would look like - not to say that we even have that traditional model, but the point is the artistic director role kind of scared me a little bit, but I was like “Ok, sure.” So ultimately when she handed that over to me, I really was like “what…Erin, I love you, I think it’s amazing that you are asking me to do this, but I need to take a moment to think about it because I know my life was going to change forever if I accepted it.” And two weeks later, I accepted it and yes, my life was changed forever.

I tell you all of this, because in 2012 when the organization was handed over to me, it was dysfunctional.

Goldfarb: Oh, yes, ok. [laughing]

Rabold: [laughing] yup. There were a lot of hurdles during the process of rebirthing it. She wasn’t exactly a great administrator, so there were a lot of issues structurally, the mission, and a whole lot of other perspectives. The first thing we did, if this should have any longevity, this really has to be about the work that we are doing. That is when we got the new mission statement that you see. That gave us the ability to work on more social impact issues and it allows us to stay relevant. So from there, we then totally rebranded. Created all the new marketing material and then did that in relationship to our new program. And when we started doing work around our new program, we did a needs assessment. We asked ourselves: “If this can be anything, what should it be? Because it can’t be all the things.” I just manage my life that way - if everything is a priority then nothing is. So when we did the needs-based assessment, we discovered that the work that we were doing was originally was great, and still applicable, but was more symptomatic of the real problem. The real problem was, Kids - the things that they have to go through in their life, some of the trauma that they experience, and then their day to day relationship issues within themselves and with their peers - we called it bullying because it was
becoming an incredibly popular word in the media and society and in the schools, so we wanted to make sure it was marketable…so we call it bullying prevention, but the part I want you to know is that it is actually around skill.

We call it prevention, not intervention, because what we are building is the social skills, the social-emotional skills, that would prevent somebody from wanting to do it in the first place. So when we crafted our program, we didn’t know that yet. We were hovering between bullying prevention and intervention, and feeling like it wasn’t right. I will just give you a quick qualitative story. When we were first piloting our 90-minute program, which is just a one-touch with as many kids as we can, which we capped at 50, because any more than that, with a program called “Your Voice Matters” wouldn’t actually ring true [laughing] as your voice really doesn’t matter with more. So we created this 90-minute program and took it into the school and the school had set us up with kids who were only from their group of kids who have been bullied and the group of kids that have engaged in bullying behavior. We realized very early on that we are NOT an intervention tool and on top of that, the majority of the statistic that we are trying to adjust is related to the bystander intervention statistic. the moment that a bystander intervenes in a bullying situation, the bullying stops within…I can’t quite remember the number, it’s a pretty low number but higher than anything else that you see.

Goldfarb: Exactly, yes, I’m familiar with that. I am also using that one in my research as CSF uses it too.

Rabold: That is the one that we picked because we do come from a Theatre of the Oppressed background, one of the things that we balance is, we want to empower people who are in systems of oppression. For sure…but we cannot be so unfair as to believe that unless these systems of oppression change they are nothing but victims. So we try to find that balance of empowering people to make choices in their life and feel like they can, but also recognizing and owning that we live in certain systems that some people, some classes of people, will have a hard time being empowered inside of. And for us what we didn’t want to do was empower a bunch of kids that deserve to be empowered only to disenfranchise them because they didn’t get to do what we said they could. So that is also what created this model for us that we are not coming in to tell people what to do. Quite frankly, we do not know what a person’s life truly looks like. We can understand and listen and hear their stories, but ultimately the only people who can create the solution for themselves are the people who are experiencing the things for themselves. And what we appreciated from the model of the Theatre of the Oppressed, the Forum Model specifically, is that it gives agency to people to practice something that can be as high stakes as a life or death situation in a very controlled environment.

So that is all of what we learned inside of the process. We are not truly Theatre of the Oppressed, we do pull from Michael Rohd and - I just have to put in a side note, we are currently working with him. He is consulting our “Speak Up and Speak Out” project.


Rabold: Yup. I even just received a personal email from him this morning. It never gets old [laughing enthusiastically].
Goldfarb: Yes, that is incredible. Pretty cool. I am very envious.

Rabold: Yeah, I just wanted to share. It has been really great.

Goldfarb: Nice!

Rabold: Yes! So anyway, the other point we learned very quickly, if we were to truly try to affect change, we cannot do it in one touch. So we have the 90-minute program and then we started building out our 6-week program. What we are finding is that we actually are, right now anyway, are crafting a bully prevention 3-part program. To allow us to potentially be in residency at a school.

Goldfarb: Wow, ambitious.

Rabold: Yes. I will just give you the high level overview: the 90 minute actually sort of gives you the framework which we then expand in the multi-week program. So the 90-minute one-touch program works with 50 kids at a time. We go in, we utilize theatre warm ups to create that ‘safe’ space to create community. So to allow people to experience theatre, some of them have not experienced ever, so giving them just a really easy way in, while also getting them into their bodies and out of their brains. Because they spend so much time linearly thinking inside of their brain inside of the school. So it just gives us a good platform to get started from. From there, we will actually talk a little bit, we bring in a little bit of bullying awareness, because it’s better to talk about what it is and what it is not because I would also say that bullying is becoming a word that is overused. So it’s not conflict, it’s not a mean moment, it could be a mean moment, it could be a series of mean moments that contribute to bullying, it’s not just teasing…but these are all definitions of bullying. They are and that is in some ways correct, but for a child to understand that incredible nuance can be challenging. It is important for us to identify what it is. And what we “play” it is, is the power imbalance.

Goldfarb: yes.

Rabold: Also over time, it is not one time. It’s a power imbalance over time. It is, in fact, oppression. So we talk about that and then from there we perform a play. The play gives as many different examples where bullying, bullying and conflict, can occur, so that we can start to differentiate what the two are and how one leads to another if something isn’t done. Like, conflict resolution, isn’t done or maybe can’t be done because of the power imbalance. So we use the play as a real-life example, or we try to form it as close to their real life example as possible. That’s what I love about utilizing new work and not, say, Shakespeare, because it is really important to us to create accessible and relevant scenarios through the play. So it’s not just scenarios, it is a play. From there we break up into small groups and we do a problem solving activity. And it’s really around just root cause analysis and understanding what created it, what created the issues to begin with. But each group is associated with each character. So we have four characters in the play and we split up into four groups and each one of the teaching artists that play those characters actually facilitates those small groups. And they are diagnosing: “What is the problem that the character has at the end of the play?” Then we go backwards in time and
see what created that in the first place. Once we understand that, now we have the options of where we could have actually created a conflict resolution approach or had a different choice. It’s not even about teaching conflict resolution, because it is just 90 minutes, so it’s not about teaching conflict resolution, it is about exploring empathy for others and about being able to reflect back and understand where and why a different choice could have been made. Then [we ask] ‘can you identify what that different choice could be?’ So then, let’s practice is. Let’s try it. Then actors get up and improvise the new choice that the students suggested. That is the true forum model. So the joker is actually interjecting and asking those reflective questions that tie either back to their real life or ask the question “was this authentic? Would you see this in your life? If not, what else could be done here? Let us try that.” So we push the kids past their first blush answer, which is, quite frankly, perhaps what we as adults have fed to them, and they can’t help but use it because that is just what they know, right? They go back to what they have seen. So this is an opportunity for the large group to go: “NO! That doesn’t work!” Then the facilitator can dig deeper and ask for other options. Then they try those. The other thing that we love is that it is “choose your own adventure” - our jokers are incredible so they can also say :‘ok, well, this didn’t work with this characters, but what would happen if we put it in a different characters. What based on that relationship changed the way that they responded?’” So there are a lot of different ways you can play with it but at the end of the day, it is only 90 minutes. so ideally our objectives for the 90-minute is that we are creating a common vocabulary or common and shared experience that both the teachers or administration and kids have. What we are finding is that kids get it, I think cerebrally, but they don’t necessarily know how to apply it to their own life after 90 minutes. So they are seeing what happened to lets say the characters TJ and Alex, Alex doing most of the overt bullying to TJ, and yet, they then go out to the playground and do almost the exact same thing and don’t recognize it for what it is. So the teachers are actually saying: “Do you remember what you saw in the play with Alex and TJ and do you remember what happened between then?” So then they have a much richer dialogue because the kids suddenly go “Oh, right.” So there is a sort of accomplishment in that.

Goldfarb: Well I love that recognition there, that is so good.

Rabold: Thank you. That has also made us keenly aware, if we wanted to do more, we needed more than a 90-minute program. We needed a 6 or more week program and elongated the 90-minute program. So the way the 6-week program works is each one of the characters is associated with a skill-build. So for example, TJ, who is the one who has the most self-confidence issues and because of that mostly can’t express themselves the way they want to, that character brings self-expression activities. The kids are also able to express themselves on the TJ-day. So for an example, they all create an “I Am” poem, which is an activity use on that day that allows them to express themselves creatively. Then also they start the day with discovering more about TJ and I want to make sure I tell you, the first day is all about and only about community building and trust building. It’s all 90 minutes, each session is 90 minutes. Then the next week we bring in TJ and self-worth through the character in the eyes of TJ. Then they also spend some time at the beginning of the day going through TJ’s backpack. So they are becoming subject matter experts about TJ and they get to ask him questions in relationship to the backpack but they are also making assumptions.

Then we start to draw out what assumptions can do to people and how, in some ways, they can
keep us safe, and how in other ways they keep us from knowing each other. We use the backpack as an example of how to extrapolate that. That backpack comes through every week, so it also something the kids start to look for and they gain agency through that. Kids get invested to know what might happen next. Which keeps them feeling more comfortable and willing to take risks and each one of our programs also start elevating the activities that make them feel slightly uncomfortable, and bring that into the comfort level, slightly uncomfortable to comfortable. It continues to push on them, gentle, and they start to expand their beliefs in themselves and helps them feel safe because they know what is going to happen next. And then we also, in the six week program, build in a little bit of theatre education activities. So it is also really important for us to let the kids understand that theatre, well it’s not that important it just happens as part of the process, because we need for them to know the craft enough to do activities that, quite frankly, it would not be fair for them to do if they don’t know enough about the craft. So theatre education is a byproduct here, but we are also super clear about why we are doing things like warmups, etc. You know, for an actor it is important to be stretched and warm before they go on stage, etc. Just to continue quickly. The third day then is with Alex and Alex brings with him empathy. So here is the character who does the majority of overt bullying, the easiest one one for us to hate, but the kids get to know them the same way they got to know TJ. So guess what, this week they meet Alex and see them only through the lens of TJ. On a side note, all of our characters oscillate between male and female and we unpack the dynamics and power dynamics of the characters being male or female and what could come up in this gender conversation about power and such. It can be really interesting and fun ultimately [laughing]. But that aside.

The empathy component, they come in that they are going to hate Alex. But through the work they realize that this person is also a person who has quite a long history of abuse from his stepdad and abandonment from his biological father and wanting to protect his sibling, which is why he does some of the things he does. It’s really about understanding what motivates people and what their given circumstances are. They leave the day loving Alex and wanting the best for them and then we bring in Frankie, who does some of the …um…their biggest relationship started out with Taylor and it is in conflict and they weren’t talking, but because retaliation happened they bring a lot of the subtler natures of bullying. There is the teasing, the spreading rumors, all of those pieces. And then, we do “Machines” with them. Do you know “Machines?”

Goldfarb: Yeah, love it. I use it all the time.

Rabold: Great, yup great one. That is really about exploring emotions and the complexity of emotions and how those make up relationships and finally we bring in the character Taylor and Taylor is really about how to become an up stander or how to take ownership over your own life. And the choices that you make. Then, again we do backpack throughout all of this, so by the end, each of the kids…not only do they relate better to a certain character, but no matter what, every kid really gets to care about the characters. and when they see the play, they become little detectives throughout the whole thing and putting it all together but only through their own lens right, and then they see the play. IT has actually heightened the activity around wanting to solve what happened to the characters. Oh and I forgot about “hot seating”, I should have told you, we do do “hot seating” before we do Forum. In the 90 minute too.

So anyway, in the hot seating we give them an opportunity to ask more questions and then finally
we go into small group activity, just like in the 90 minute, then we do Forum, but this time, because the kids have actually been learning the craft of theatre along the way and they have also built trust, they are the ones that actually do the Forum in the traditional sense. So they stop the action and actually step in for the characters and make the different choice.

Goldfarb: Oh wow, that is really cool. And you do this in the school setting? So this is 6 weeks you come back, all the time, is that how that works? Wow.

Rabold: Yes [laughs] and we generally come back once a week for 90 minutes for those 6 weeks and we have also created 8-9 week, which we built out more depending on the populations we serve. It just takes longer to build trust and also there is more work to do on the background, or in the back end, to applying it to their real life, so some schools have actually asked for us to come out. We have also adapted the program for high school and we are launching that in the winter [2017]. And then finally, we are starting to develop our second part of it, we just got grant funding for that. So that was 1.0. The 2.0 is gonna be more around crafting your own personal narrative. So actually there is going to be, the performance aspect is actually going to be in writing. So this is where they get to develop how this looks in their own personal life. And then the third one is very community oriented. So now that we can understand the “other,” in the 1.0 now let us understand ourselves and what we have to do inside of this and then finally how do we actually create an entire community out of people who are taking action and standing up.

There will be a performative aspect in that as well. Every program that we have, everything we do, we run it through a certain artistic lens and one of those lenses is that we will have a performative aspect to everything we do. A lot of applied theatre can be just workshops or never really get to performance itself and we believe in product almost as much as we believe in process. That is also something to know about us. The more that we grow the more we are looking to expand our programming for sure. But it is really important for us to not only pull in the narrative from the communities we are serving, but to do it in a way that is artistically valuable. Because it is our responsibility as artist.

Goldfarb: Yes, beautiful.

Rabold: That is something we really believe in. That is what we are bringing into “Speak Up, Speak Out” and why we asked Michael Rohd to work with us. Not only were we going to do civic practice, which is his approach, but also, we really wanted to do something that was of artistic intrinsic value. And knowing that that is also what they have been able to do was really important to us.

Goldfarb: Yeah, that is incredible. I am so glad and proud that you also got funding for all this because I know how hard that can be.

Rabold: Totally, Thank you!

Goldfarb: And having his knowledge at your fingertips is also such a gift. That is Amazing. I haven’t heard of too many people that have been able to snag him, although, I have a feeling he has shifted his work a little bit now that he is at Northwestern.
Rabold: Yeah, what I would say, is one of the reasons he went to ASU is because they wanted to further and expand his work around civic practice and then also he has really become a consultant so that is why he is working all over the country and I think he is also perhaps working internationally. We had also talked to him about that. He is definitely expanding the efforts into more communities, which is exciting.

Goldfarb: That is really exciting. That makes me really happy to hear. I’m very excited for you all as well. I can see how much research and development is going into your work, which is something I really appreciate.

Rabold: Thank you for saying that. It is a real fucking slow role. I must admit. Ultimately, we are also about continuous improvement the tis something we value. So we have mechanism inside of our program that take so much effort and work but it is so important for us to make sure that we are constantly evaluating the impact that our program is having on every single school and community. For example, in a six-week program, we will actually be in contact with the psychological counselor three times. Once before we come in because we have to make sure we are adjusting specifically to the community we are serving, then we meet with them half way through and then we provide final thoughts and they provide their final thoughts at the end and discuss how things could be better. Generally, we get to come back and work with them again. So every single time they are informing our work as much as we are informing sort of their culture as well. This is a partnership that we need. We could not do this work without recognizing and understanding the problems that they face because we are wanting to support them with the help they are doing and not somehow either stomp on the work that they are doing or work around it. It is a true partnership.

But it takes a lot of staff activity. Not only that but we have a lot more too. We have a ton of work that is going around evaluation. Including that we just got accepted to the Pace Project. The Pace Project is piloting, in associating with Mont Claire University and they got the funding to work with 16 different organizations nationally around youth development and around character building. There are a ton of awesome evaluation models out there that work to evaluate the actual development that is happening, specifically with youth. So we are one of the 16 national organizations working with them. And they are working specifically on “Speak Up, Speak Out” but we know it has far reaching impact across our other bullying prevention as well, but that is just our next focus. So…we are also doing that and we also work with an evaluator from Boulder. He is a semi-retired professor around data analysis and he has been helping us really shore up the bullying prevention, he is really the one who recognized that we cannot do all the things we originally set out to do, and actually evaluate that we are doing those. So having someone like him telling us that it is ok to focus on one thing and you are going to be able to really do that because you have these metrics in place has been really exciting.

But it is a really slow role. You know, we can’t, we are crazy building programming right now but we really needed to recognize that we need to practice and that we can’t be perfect. We are not even looking for perfect, but strive towards the best. We really needed to understand our approach more and see how it could work and make adjustments before growing and expanding and going larger scale in our program development. So we do, like I said, we are adapting the
high school version of this program and we are creating the 2.0, which will also be 6 weeks. That will be done in I think April. In August or September of next year we are working not he 3.0 version and finally we are crafting a first through third grade program that is totally separate, not an adaptation, but a totally separate bullying prevention programing that we will launch in January. This is the first time we have had such massive programming work and ultimately also we built our staff. So for me I was doing it all last year. And then we hired a program and partnerships director this year.

Goldfarb: Yeah, I saw that, that must be so helpful!

Rabold: Yes, oh my gosh, absolutely. And she got her MFA in theatre for young audiences, so her expertise is excellent there. It is so valuable to have her. she also operated as our chair before she took the position so it is someone who intrinsically understands what we do. She deeply understands the organization.

Goldfarb: That is incredible, I am so happy that is working out well. I know you have to run, so I don’t want to steal any more of your time but I almost feel like 10 more questions of course. So [laughing]...

Rabold: [laughing] of course, that was so much information!

Goldfarb: I just wanted to let you know I can come down to Denver to see you whenever the snow is not doing this and the buses start running again [laughing].

Rabold: [Laughing] yes, we would love that. So I guess you re still interested in this. Obviously there is so much to share and provide information for you to write about and include.

Goldfarb: Yes, of course there is so much more and I look forward to chatting more and learning. I am trying to synthesize everything you just told me as best I can. But, if you have a few more minutes, I was wondering about one more thing. #00:52:54.69#

Rabold: Yes, go for it.

Goldfarb: My top questions would be 1) how are you getting in touch with eh schools and how are they affording to have you come in? I assume they have to come up with some funds for that. and then 2) How are you approaching the diversity within those schools? I know Denver in particular has a very diverse population and how are you touching base on that? I know that a lot of our programs in the area are very…white. Upper middle class potentially. So how are you addressing some of that and also the Spanish speaking populations that are larger in Denver anyway.

Rabold: Yep. Ok. good questions. So funding first. Our funding model is as cheap as we can make it. It is basically covering cost; it barely covers any administrative cost. It covers the cost of our teaching artists and we have a very robust amount of pop that come in. I don’t believe in 20-30 kids per facilitator and actually feel like you can create some real change that way. Not to say anything about CSF’s model because it certainly depends on what they are trying to achieve.
But the things we are trying to do is really difficult to do so we actually have the four actors and then we have, in the six-week program, the lead facilitator, and a support facilitator as well, so six people. In the 90 minute it is five people.

Goldfarb: Wow.

Rabold: That costs money….for what we determine is pretty high quality programming. And, we are not charging nearly enough of course. So it is about finding the balance. So that is where our additional fundraising happens to meet the needs of this specific program. And that works to help offset the costs and then we also apply for grants and we have gotten a really large grant from the government that is called 2ABoost. wE are also about to start working with boys and girls club and we are continuing our work inside of DPS and we are also working with the Bridge Project. 2ABoost is really helping with a lot of these costs for these projects. We are still working on our program funding model overall, but it moderately takes care of some of the administrative fees associated with it. Part of it also, what we are working on, is how to have one more staff member who will do the majority of the lead facilitating, which will also take the pressure off how much it is costing externally for us. Because all our teachers are contract workers. So that…did I answer that questions?

Goldfarb: yes, thank you for that.

Rabold: Also Denver Parks and Rec is a really large partnership that we work with and they are able to afford the normal, or what I call normal, pricing of the program. So some organizations can just pay. wE work with some schools in Adams County and Aurora and they also pay full price.

And then in terms of how we deal with or work with the populations that we serve. So it is really important for our actors to show the demographics and the stories of the narratives of the youth that we are serving. So we actually have two immigrants to this country working with us, one is from Mexico and one is from Japan. And then we also are …we have two Spanish speakers in the group. And we have a gap for African American representation, and that is really significant, so we are definitely looking for stronger representation there. Our demographics that we serve average about 35% African American and then about 70% Hispanic. And actually that is really high. It is probably more like 20% African American students. And then we have about 15% of students who have a refugee background. So it is quite high. And we don’t have a lot of places that we work in that have a lot of white people. So what we are working on right now in terms of diversity is actually diversifying our leadership team. Not necessarily the staff specifically because they we have just two white people working on staff right now and we just can’t change the work in that way at this point. But it is so important for us to recognize the subject position and we need to own and share that. So we talk a lot about privilege and what it means and how we have been privileged and can you actually just say that out loud? Because a lot of times, we can bring people to a place where these demographics can move inside of the space, if we can recognize the privileges we have been given. But we are interested in the Board of Directors actually looking, not just looking, but actually coming from the communities that we serve. So that is what we are seeking to do right now. We have already worked on our program advisors, so our advisory board…we have one youth advisor. A teen. Then also we have an advisor that
comes from their …their position is the Community and Engagement position for DPS and she comes from the communities that we serve and she works inside of the communities as well. So having her insight is invaluable. Because she primarily works with refugee populations, she is not refugee but an African American woman from the community that she now serves. so having those people as part of our development process has been awesome.

And we have more work to do.

Goldfarb: Certainly always. That is really great. I think that answers my most pressing questions right now. Thank you so much for taking the time. It has been a real pleasure and incredibly insightful.

Rabold: Absolutely because we are just so grateful that you even thought of us. And I am sad that I barely got to know anything more about you. I would love to have us meet again and have an opportunity some time in the next few weeks. I would love to meet up and invite you to see more.

Goldfarb: Yes, thank you so much. I will definitely send you might availability but also let me know what comes up for you all. Of course I will also send you what I ultimately write so that you can review it and let me know if things are in there that you feel need changing. Obviously, with maybe some limitations [laughing] but I do want to do it justice.

Rabold: [laughing] Thank you. I do appreciate that. Yes, send it along and I will send you our additional material and get you in touch with our other staff member as well.

Goldfarb: Thank you so much for all of that. I guess for now, keep warm and out of the snow!

Rabold: Yes, thank you and you too. Bye [waving on screen].

Goldfarb: Bye [waving on screen].
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Goldfarb: Hi Amanda, thank you for taking the time today. We are now officially on record.

Giguere: Hello there, great. Let’s do this.

Goldfarb: Awesome! So my first question. I have a few follow-up things to go over first that we discussed in passing at some point, but I just wanted to clarify it all and have it written down. So, where did you get the statistic from that 160,000 kids miss school every day?

Giguere: We got that from CSPV, who I think got it from the 2002 Secret Service Study. We also have our other statistics from there.

Goldfarb: Ok, good to have that source. I can’t seem to find that study anywhere so I hope Beverly at CSPV can provide me with that information. I don’t know what that isn’t more available at this point.

Giguere: That is interesting, you should definitely ask her. Let me know what you figure out.

Goldfarb: I will! Ok, rapidly moving on. What is the definition you at CSF use for upstander versus bystander?

Giguere: Ok, let me pull that up from our text. Ok, there. We say: Upstander – a person who steps in to help. Also called an ally or helper. Then the person who might witnesses mistreatment but does not step in is a bystander. If that person chooses to help, we call them an upstander.

Goldfarb: Excellent, ok just wanted to have your exact words down for that. Ready for the next one?

Giguere: Yes, go ahead.

Goldfarb: In your opinion, why Shakespeare? Why Shakespeare for this work?

Giguere: Obviously I, and we at CSF, love his work. But it really just stands out to us how much Shakespeare has to offer. Shakespeare offers so many examples of mistreatment and complicated ways in which humans treat and mistreat one another. All of it with rich language, complex stories and so we can offer situations for the students to see that are not oversimplified, even in the abridged adaptation. We get to inhabit characters’ minds and see the varying perspectives.
And we can connect it to a time beyond our own, and we can see that patterns of violence go beyond our time and space. It is a larger framework. We can understand patterns of violence and maybe do better.

Goldfarb: Well that was beautifully stated, thank you.

Giguere: Oh, I try. [laughing]

Goldfarb: Well done! Alright, the next one. How are you moving forward with the bilingual elements of this production? What are your future plans?

Giguere: Oh great one. So we have gotten great feedback, as you know. We will definitely continue this. It has been a breakthrough for this program. So many more kids feel included with the bilingual element. We can really work against the myth that Shakespeare is only for the white and privileged elite. The teaching artists now are countering that and opening up new possibilities – a woman can play a role written for a man, or a Spanish speaking character can be a part of the story. Integrate diversity and inclusion throughout the plays and years down the road the myth might dissipate. We can open up new possibilities for young people in the audience to recognize themselves in these plays. Both new shows have bilingual elements and have a translator with heightened language, who will do this professionally! We want to keep representing underrepresented bodies and voices now that we have an idea how to do it.

Goldfarb: Certainly an honorable thing to set out to do. I am glad to see it was generally well received. I really think it is a new strongpoint for CSF. Are you ready to move forward?

Giguere: Yup, shoot.

Goldfarb: Ok. So next, a bit of a longer one. In *Taming of the Shrew*, with your adaptation what are the key moments and/or key themes you wanted to really highlight in the production that were then picked up in the workshop? From your perspective? What are the “universal” themes and did you have to do any "translating" of the domestic violence issues in the original versus the elements of bullying seen in the adaptation? Ok, that was more than one question. I can repeat if needed.

Giguere: Oh yes, it’s important. I’ll try to get all that. The focus on this production is the role of the bystander. So many people witness the mistreatment between Kate and Petruchio, between Petruchio and Grumio, and yet they don’t intervene. The dad doesn’t speak up. Bianca doesn’t step in to defend her sister. Grumio doesn’t take action to help Kate. I don’t ever think about Shakespeare as universal—it’s not. These are specific situations rooted in specific times and places. The theme I wanted kids to walk away with was the idea of an upstander and how they can use upstander behavior in many situations—there were so many possibilities for upstander behavior, and so many missed opportunities to prevent the violence. With such a short time to work with students after the show, I find that we succeed when we keep the workshops solution-focused, and broadly directed at the idea of upstanders, or helpers. So it’s not a workshop about bullying, or domestic violence, or misogyny, or gang violence—it’s more broad than that. It’s
about the idea of helping; when I witness mistreatment of any kind, what are some ways I can take action?

Goldfarb: Yes, definitely interesting. So on that note, what do you think really worked particularly well this season and where did things fall short or just not work?

Giguere: Hmmmm, yes. We did have to do some rethinking here. What worked well with this show in particular, is the wide range of examples. There are so many examples of people mistreating one another and being disrespectful and people standing by. *Taming of the Shrew* is an exaggerated version of that mistreatment. It draws this out in really blatant ways. The all female cast was incredibly successful to think about gender etc. But, we could have done more there. We could have done a better play to call attention to the misogyny in the play and in the workshop. The structure of the program, it’s such a short visit, makes that challenging. I think with that brevity, the role of the workshop is to inspire kids to like theatre, enjoy a play, and have this critical lens. But we really should have spent more time teasing out gender dynamics in the play. It didn’t become as much of a central focus as I had thought.

Goldfarb: Thinking about gender here in particular, did you get any feedback regarding the issue of domestic violence or the rather controversial marriage represented in the play?

Giguere: Funny enough, we really didn’t get any responses on that. There was very little negative feedback, especially not considering this issue. So from here, we are now having a mixed cast for this next season and really highlighting the gender dynamics and gender swapping. We will see how that lands.

Goldfarb: Oh interesting. I am glad to see you are expanding that further.

Giguere: Yeah, we needed to flesh that out a bit more.

Goldfarb: I understand. Learn something every time, for sure. So I think it is time to zoom out a bit and look at CSF on a larger scale for a moment. These might be larger questions coming up.

Giguere: [nods]

Goldfarb: Looking back at how all of this started. How did the collaboration between CSF, CSPV and Safe2Tell really start?

Giguere: Ok this is a longer one. In the spring of 2011, I was planning a fall tour of local schools for CSF. My colleague, Tim Orr, and I started talking about staging *Twelfth Night* in schools in our area. We were especially interested in the subplot of Malvolio’s gulling as an example of contemporary bullying. Was there a way for us to connect this play to some real issues facing schools? At that time, we were reading in the news about bullying, bullycide, and other violent incidents in schools. We thought: can we tour a Shakespeare play, and lead follow-up workshops that connect the play to some of the real issues kids are facing? I sat down with Jeanne McDonald of the Office for Outreach and Engagement at CU Boulder, and floated the idea by her. She connected me with the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, a center at CU
Boulder, which turned out to be just a few doors down from my office at CSF. I met with a few CSPV folks to tell them about what we were planning, initially expecting them to recommend a book or two for us to read about bullying. Instead, they wanted to partner with us.

From CSPV’s perspective, a live performance and interactions with live actors would be a far more engaging way to educate students about violence prevention. And from our perspective, partnering with leading experts in violence trends was a way to bolster the project, and would lead to a more enriching, cross-disciplinary collaboration. We are in a unique situation here at CSF, because we’re a professional theatre company in association with a research institution. With all of these experts at our fingertips, we have the opportunity to deepen the kind of work we can do. It’s not solely about producing Shakespeare; it’s about recognizing the overlaps between Shakespeare and other disciplines.

When the project launched in 2011, CSPV was also partnering with Safe2Tell, the anonymous tipline in Colorado. It was a natural fit to tie in S2T as a resource in the work we were doing in schools. Since that time, S2T has grown, and had become state-funded (when we started, S2T was a non-profit, relying on grants each year).

What began as an anti-bullying program has become about violence—yes, we deal with bullying, but that’s only one kind of mistreatment occurring in schools.

As I look back on the birth of this program, it really grew out of a few passionate people who were curious. What could happen if we combine a Shakespeare program with a violence prevention program? Can it be something that’s theatrically interesting and also effective? Are there things that we already do in the theatre that might help a violence prevention center share its research? I still see it as a curious experiment; each year, we make adjustments, learn more, and change things (as we do with any theatre production).

Goldfarb: It really still remains that experiment every time as you dig into new material each year.

Giguere: Definitely.

Goldfarb: So thinking about all of this, what do you personally think is the greatest value CSF provides, especially when comparing it to other programming schools can take advantage of?

Giguere: As a theatre program, this project is unique because of its violence prevention angle. As a violence prevention program, it is unique because it is using live theatre as a vehicle. As a theatre/violence prevention program, it’s unique because we use Shakespeare’s plays—some of the richest plays ever written. This program is a true testament to the way collaboration can work at a higher education institution—we bring together some of the best actors in our community, leading researchers in violence, teacher training experts from the CU School of Education, graduate students, theatre professors. It’s truly a unique program that draws together so many disciplines, all with a single mission: to bring about a healthier, safer, kinder world.
Goldfarb: Of course, that is the main goal here. But really, how do you do it all? My last question, then, is about financing. I know you probably can’t share it all and might not have it off the top of your head, so let me know if you want to send me more info by email later on. But I still have to ask. Could you walk me through the funding process for the CSF program in schools? Also, how does that work for the schools? Do they pay anything or is it all supported?

Giguere: Sadly, no, we can’t quite do that. Schools are charged a fee to bring the program in. Currently it’s $600 for a performance and three post-show workshops. These fees cover the wages of our professional actors and creative team, travel expenses, production costs, and CSPV trainings. We work very hard throughout the year to apply for grants to support this program, and most of those grants directly offset the fees paid by schools. This allows us to offer scholarships if a school cannot pay a fee. If we have an interested school with no available funding to pay for the program, we find a way to fund the visit from grants. We get about 50% of our funding from the CU Office for Outreach and Engagement and a few other smaller grants and corporate sponsorships, and about 50% from school fees.

Goldfarb: Excellent, thank you for all that information. Thank you so much for taking the time. I certainly don’t want to bother you with more at this point.

Giguere: Of course, no problem. It is always a pleasure.

Goldfarb: Well, thank you and all the best!
Goldfarb: Thank you so much for meeting with me. I know our schedules were nearly impossible to align.

Kingston: Yes, finally. My apologies as well for those issues. It has been months.

Goldfarb: Well, we made it at last! Thank you for taking the time.

Kingston: Of course. It is a pleasure.

Goldfarb: Well, not to take too much time, I know you are busy, shall we get started?

Kingston: Yes, let’s.

Goldfarb: Alright, well I would like to begin with just some clarifying questions. First, I know CSF uses several of the statistics that you use and provide for them here at CSPV. One question I had regarding the statistic that over 160,000 students don’t go to school per day due to bullying that they face in the school. Do you know where you got that data from?

Kingston: I think that one came from a study by the Secret Service, but I am not sure. I would have to look it up. But really, it is data we don’t typically use. We would look more at the CDC’s numbers of students at risk given their absences within a 30-day period. I will have to look into it more. That really isn’t the best statistic to use.

Goldfarb: Oh alright. Yes, CSF uses that number and I have had an excruciatingly difficult time finding the actual source that first cited that. It is a number that is used frequently in the media as well, but a piece in the Atlantic actually suggested it might not have a strong foundational basis.

Kingston: Interesting. I think that is one to scratch then. I will have to look into how we use that number. I have, of course, heard it, but I am not looking at that source material at this point. I will have to investigate a bit further.

Goldfarb: Well, thank you for that insight as well. I will have to steer away from that number too then. So, again with numbers, my apologies, it is not the most interesting fact element to discuss, but I was still curious what your take on it is. I’ve been reading a lot in the media that people feel there might be a rise or spike in bullying behavior in schools. However, more scientific research
Goldfarb: and educators feel that this is not true but rather think the rise of awareness lies elsewhere. What is your take on that and also from CSPV’s standpoint?

Kingston: Yes, it is true the numbers of that nature are not my main focus at this point. The research does suggest that simply answering that question is even difficult. The different disciplines and policies and definitions are very broad, even the question is broad in itself, so that can’t be responded to in a clear way. Bullying has different definition within different schools or sectors so the fact that there is no clear singular definition or approach is telling. But yes, it doesn’t necessarily indicate that there is a rise in bullying behavior, but I think the media presence, the social media coverage and the general attention the topic is getting makes it seem like there is more. We can’t really answer that specifically though. One thing to consider too is that there might be a difference in numbers because of new ways of reporting or even over reporting because the definitions are unclear.

Goldfarb: Yes, thank you for that nuanced insight indeed. I can see where that lines up. I will move forward with some more interesting questions then. From your viewpoint, do you know how the collaboration between CSF and CSPV and Safe2Tell occurred and then continued?

Kingston: Well, sort of. I actually came to the center a year after CSF was already working with CSPV. From my perspective, it is a way to bridge the gap between research and practice, begin a conversation about root causes of violence and problem behavior. We can come together around a common purpose. Also, theatre helps create empathy by letting us experience something moving without actually having to have that experience. So that is a good place to work from. Shakespeare is complex and goes to a lot of places, some dark places. It is very valuable. For me it is thrilling to be part of it, and I think it is a great collaboration. We are always investigating how to use it further as a jumping off place, and always refining. There is always more to unpack.

Goldfarb: Great. Thank you. On that note of continuous refining, what are the future plans or goals for this collaboration from your end?

Kingston: I would like to see it go as part of a comprehensive approach to school safety, a part of something bigger, systematic. For example, linking the Shakespeare program to the paper I wrote.

Goldfarb: Oh yes, I cite it in my research with some gusto! It is helpful.

Kingston: Oh great, I am glad that was helpful for you. So yes, how can it become par of the infrastructure system in school – blend Shakespeare into more comprehensive middle school approach and play with that. We are currently creating a school action plan, it is now our first year, and we suggest Shakespeare as way to integrate it all over the course of a year or two. Then they can build out more systematic programming, monitoring school climate, and expand the full model. Add theatre to that and see how that helps build capacity with the school, also partially as buy-in with the students, collaboration with the parents...it could really work well. It is enticing overall.
Continuing to learn of what is needed is another aspect. Even a little more programming would be good. It begins to be too big without further resources and can get lost or less meaningful. So we have to remember that.

Goldfarb: Interesting insight and certainly the program seems to fit in well with the multi-tiered approach you recommend in your paper. I am also curious to know more about the bilingual element of the current season and what looks like will be continuing on. How does that fit in?

Kingston: Yes. The bilingual element is a brilliant idea. It is really very exciting. It will help connect with diverse experiences to Shakespeare and connect with the diverse student body. That is of course part of the multi-tiered element as well, we have to recognize that. So this is excellent and I really look forward to see how it will develop from here. It is a niche position, certainly.

Goldfarb: Lovely to see your excitement. I was also curious, in terms of linking to the diverse groups, if you have ever considered other programs. Here I am thinking especially ones using original narratives and not Shakespeare? Would you think there is merit in that and a different approachability with the content?

Kingston: Well, I think they could be complementary approaches. I certainly wouldn’t be opposed to it. But since we have CSF’s programming to work with, I think it is important that they stay very intentional and true to Shakespeare as their approach. But yes, I could imagine a complementary program, or an additional part to the existing program, to help with the accessibility and such. But I do love how they use Shakespeare. It can be quite powerful.

Goldfarb: Thank you for that insight. There are of course other groups, but that is perhaps a discussion for another time. As our time is coming to an end, I really have one last larger question and something we already discussed briefly last semester. I am curious to know what your take on evaluation of such a program is. Specifically for CSF. You certainly know how massive an evaluation can be and I had to adjust my approach as I am just one lone graduate student without funding to do more. So I have focused fully on the qualitative approach and observations for the form itself rather than measuring impact or efficacy. So, do you have a recommendation regarding future studies, evaluation, etc.?

Kingston: Yes, these sorts of assessments can be massive. First, the question is: What are you evaluating? I would be hesitant to invest in a major quantitative randomized trial looking at how this might reduce bullying behavior itself. IT would be an incredible cost and demand vast resources. I would suggest looking more at how great the impact is regarding awareness in general. Does it help the school become more motivated to do something else? How does it change the school’s call to action? As a stand alone prevention, that is certainly not it. So it would be more productive to ask: How is it a call to action, what resources were leveraged? Does it become a call to evidence-based action? What spins off, essentially. So you look at monitoring the quality of the program, the number of kids attending is certainly strong. Then looking at pre and post program and ask: What did you gain? So it is more about process and evaluating that. So this first step sets up for that sort of evaluation. Yes, certainly there are a lot of factors to include there. It is complex.
Goldfarb: Yes, I found that too. Down to the timing of the workshop and teacher involvement, etc. It is really complex.

Kingston: Indeed. I would imagine it would take quite some investment and need a team of people to conduct the research. It is a challenge I imagine and would need some real narrowing down and specificity. Given your earlier question, it would also be interesting to look at how Shakespeare specifically impacts this versus other stories. I am not sure how that would be done, but it could be considered.

Goldfarb: Definitely. Thank you so much for that. It is really helpful to gain your experiences to this through process as CSF may move forward with a future study. I cannot do it on my own.

Kingston: Certainly. Yes, it would take more consideration. Unfortunately, I do have to attend a meeting in a few minutes. Did you have more questions?

Goldfarb: I think that will cover my most pressing questions. Would you be available to answer any follow-up questions by email as I write this all?

Kingston: Certainly, let me know what comes up. How is the writing going?

Goldfarb: Well, it has been a challenge. Getting all the data from my observations and finding times for all these interviews has been a challenge, especially as I keep getting snowed in. So I have written my beginning chapters and such, but not much more yet. I am still waiting for information.

Kingston: Yes, I understand that. It can be really daunting too before you start anything. I always have that problem. It took me a long time to write that other paper you just read. I’m writing a next paper and it has been challenging. I keep getting distracted with other things I need to address.

Goldfarb: Absolutely, I really do understand that. I have had a lot of the same going on as well with distractions and other things I have to do, such as teach!

Kingston: Yes, that can be really hard. Well, I recommend this book, it really helped me. It is called “The Now Habit” by Neal Fiore. IT helped me a lot and I have been practicing that. Even just writing for 30 minutes a day can help get you started.

Goldfarb: Oh, thank you. Yes, I have heard of it but never read it. I should look into that. It might be really helpful. Thank you for that!

Kingston: Of course! Best of luck with it all. I am sure it will turn out well.

Goldfarb: Thank you. And again, thank you for taking the time. It has been a pleasure and truly very helpful.
Kingston: My pleasure, I am glad it finally worked out. Let me know if you have any other questions.

Goldfarb: Thank you. Have a great day.
APPENDIX E

*The Taming of the Shrew*
(From [http://shakespeare.mit.edu/taming_shrew/full.html](http://shakespeare.mit.edu/taming_shrew/full.html))
Adapted by Gina Braswell, Heidi Schmidt & Colorado Shakespeare Festival Education

Characters:

**Actor 1: Eva**
Petruchio/Bianca

**Actor 2: Mehry**
Katharina/Grumio

**Actor 3: Satya**
Lucentio/Baptista (Bilingual/Musician)
INTRODUCTION

ACTOR 2 (Mehry)
Hi everybody! We’re actors from the Colorado Shakespeare Festival, and we’re here to perform *The Taming of the Shrew*.

ACTOR 3 (Lucentio)
This comedy tells the story of two sisters and their father. The younger sister, Bianca, wants to get married, but her father won’t let her until her older sister, Kate, has found a husband.

ACTOR 1 (Eva)
The catch is... Kate has scared off everyone who has tried to marry her. But there is one man up for the challenge of winning her heart: Petruchio.

ACTOR 2 (Mehry)
Now, Kate may not be the easiest person to get along with, but neither is Petruchio. This play is about the “taming” of two strong personalities.

ACTOR 3 (Satya)
Mehry will play the older sister Kate, the “shrew.”

ACTOR 2 into KATE
Mehry also plays Grumio, the poor servant who is just trying to follow his boss’s orders.

ACTOR 2 to GRUMIO
Grumio’s boss, Petruchio, played by Eva, is the man who is out to win Kate’s heart.

ACTOR 1 to PETRUCHIO
Eva also plays Bianca, Kate’s younger sister who gets all the attention.

ACTOR 1 into BIANCA
Bianca and Kate’s father is played by Satya. His name is Baptista.

ACTOR 2
Satya also plays Lucentio, who is head over heels in love with Bianca.

ACTOR 2 into LUCENTIO who strums his guitar/ukulele and sings dramatically, “Bianca”

This project is a collaboration between the Colorado Shakespeare Festival and the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. We see some pretty bad behavior in this play and theatre is a great way to learn about how people interact and treat one another. As you watch the play, think...
about what you would do differently if you were in these characters’ shoes.

**ACTOR 3**
After the show, we’ll ask you some questions the play, so look out for moments where you witness mistreatment and how it was handled. Who is unkind? Who has power? And who, in this play, is brave enough to stand up and be a peacemaker?

**ACTOR 1**
We know you already know what not to during a performance, like use your phones or talk. But, here’s what you can do: you can laugh at things that are funny, clap if you like something, and feel free to interact with us if we interact with you. But for now, let’s get on with the show!
Scene 1.
Enter BAPTISTA [played by ACTOR 3], KATE, and BIANCA. Throughout this scene, Baptista addresses the audience, as if they are ALL competing for Bianca’s hand, and this is his public decision about the suitors. Bianca enthusiastically translates for her father after each line (as if she is used to often doing this for him) – KATE stands shrewishly in the background.

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
Gentlemen, importune me no farther,
Señores, dejen de rogarme.

**BIANCA**
Gentlemen, importune me no farther,

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
For how I firmly am resolved you know
Porque ya me decidí.

**BIANCA**
For how I firmly am resolved you know

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
That is, not bestow my youngest daughter Bianca *(gesturing to BIANCA)*
De no dejar a Bianca que se case.

**BIANCA**
That is, not bestow my youngest daughter Bianca *(gesturing to herself and flirting with audience)*

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
Before I have a husband for the elder: Katharina *(gesturing to KATE)*
Antes de que encuentre un esposo para Katharina, mi hija mayor.

**BIANCA**
Before I have a husband for the elder: Katharina *(gesturing to KATE, realizing about halfway through what rule her father is declaring and begins to throw fit because it is unfair to her.)*

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
If any of you all love Katharina
Leave shall you have to court her at your pleasure.
Si alguien ama a Katharina, claro que se pueden casar con ella.

**BIANCA** *(less enthusiastic)*
If any of you all love Katharina
Leave shall you have to court her at your pleasure.
[Defiantly to Baptista] To cart her rather: (To audience) she's too rough for you.

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
Gentlemen, that I may soon make good  
What I have said, Bianca, get you in:  
And let it not displease thee, good Bianca,  
For I will love thee ne’er the less, my girl.  
Señores, quedo firme en lo que dije. Metete Bianca, tu sabes que te amo, mi amor.

**BIANCA**  
(Sarcastically) Sir, to your pleasure humbly I subscribe.

*Bianca sits on the stage defiantly (instead of going in) possibly letting out a cry of teenage annoyance, and becomes absorbed in her phone, texting friends about how unfair her father’s new rule is.*

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
And for I know she taketh most delight  
In music, instruments and poetry,  
Schoolmasters will I keep within my house,  
Fit to instruct their youth.  
¡Hay! La hice enojar. ¿Ahora que haré? La niña necesita una distracción fuera de los muchachos. Hmm...Yo sé que le gusta la música... ¡Ya lo pensé! ¡Le encontraré un nuevo profesor de música! ¡Eso le va alegrar!

**BAPTISTA exits (quick change to LUCENTIO)**

*Bianca is upset about having to wait for Kate to get married before she can date. KATE and BIANCA are left onstage together. A moment of sisterly hatred.*

**KATE**  
Go in, Bianca.

*BIANCA scoffs at KATE. KATE walks towards her, threateningly. LUCENTIO enters playing ukulele/guitar absentmindedly but quickly notices the girls fighting and hushes his instrument to witness this. BIANCA gives one last wave to the audience, and perhaps blows a kiss to LUCENTIO, then goes in, followed by KATE.*

**LUCENTIO**
But see, while idly I stood looking on,  
I found the effect of love in idleness:  
And now in plainness do confess to thee,  
*(plays and sings this line)*I burn, I pine, I perish.  
Counsel me, for I know thou canst;  
Assist me, for I know thou wilt.  
*Text message dings, and he checks phone to read BAPTISTA'S proclamation.*
But hark! I look'd so longly on the maid,
Perhaps I mark'd not what's the pith of all.
Her eldest sister is so curt and shrewd
That till the father rid his hands of her,
Masters, my love must live a maid at home;
But art thou not advised, he took some care
To get her a profesor de musica to instruct her?
I will be the music teacher!
That's my device to achieve that maid
Whose sudden sight hath thrall'd my wounded eye.

Starts to leave, lovestruck and playing absentmindedly. Then stops. Struck by another idea.

But to get a husband for her sister? Though her father be very rich, is any man so very a fool to be married to hell? There be good fellows in the world would take her with all faults, and money enough.

Exits.

PETRUCHIO, followed by GRUMIO enters, lugging on scenery for LUCENTIO's door

PETRUCHIO
Verona, for awhile I take my leave
To see my friends in Padua, but of all
My best beloved and approved friend,
Lucentio! And I think this is his house.
Here, sirrah Grumio; knock, I say.

GRUMIO
Knock, sir! whom should I knock? is there man has rebused your worship?

PETRUCHIO
Villain, I say, knock me here soundly.

GRUMIO
Knock you here, sir! why, sir, what am I, sir, that I should knock you here, sir?

PETRUCHIO
Villain, I say, knock me at this gate.

GRUMIO
My master is grown quarrelsome.

PETRUCHIO

---

14 So much opportunity for playing with physical violence here.
Will it not be?
Faith, sirrah, an you'll not knock, I'll ring it;
I'll try how you can sol, fa, and sing it.

He wrings him by the ears

GRUMIO
Help, masters, help! My master is mad.

PETRUCHIO
Now, knock when I bid you, sirrah villain!

Enter LUCENTIO (possibly through audience) who sees Grumio being beaten and shares a short moment of shock with the audience at the bullying behavior. *Lucentio could even say to a few audience members- “Do you see that? I feel like I should do something” before saying the next line.

LUCENTIO
How now! what's the matter? My good friend Petruchio!
How do you?

PETRUCHIO
Signior Lucentio, come you to part the fray?

LUCENTIO
Rise, Grumio, rise: we will compound this quarrel.

GRUMIO
If this be not a lawful case for me to leave his service, look you, sir, he bid me knock him and rap him soundly, sir: well, was it fit for a servant to use his master so?

PETRUCHIO
I bade the rascal knock upon the gate
And could not get him for my heart to do it.

GRUMIO
Knock at the gate! O heavens! Spake you not these words plain, 'SIRRah, knock me here, knock me well, and knock me soundly'? And come you now with, 'knocking at the gate'?

PETRUCHIO
SIRRah, be gone, or talk not, I advise you.

LUCENTIO
Petruchio, patience. 15

---

15 We’re already seeing signs of Petruchio’s temper here, and his friends seem to know this about him.
Grumio and Lucentio share a subtle fist bump or thank you kind of acknowledgement that Lucentio stepped in to help him. Lucentio then pulls PETRUCHIO aside, as GRUMIO licks his wounds.

And tell me now, sweet friend, what happy gale
Blows you to Padua here from old Verona?

PETRUCHIO
Haply to wive and thrive as best I may.

LUCENTIO
Petruchio, shall I then come roundly to thee
And wish thee to a shrewd ill-favour'd wife?

The two men share a hearty chuckle, then...

And yet I'll promise thee she shall be rich,

Petruchio is listening...

And very rich…

Now he’s interested.

Her only fault, good friend
Is that she is intolerable curst
And shrewd and froward, so beyond all measure
That, were my state far worser than it is,
I would not wed her for a mine of gold.

PETRUCHIO
Lucentio, peace! thou know'st not gold's effect.

LUCENTIO
showing Petruchio the text
Her name is Katharina Minola,
Renown'd in Padua for her scolding tongue.

PETRUCHIO
I will not sleep, Lucentio, till I see her.

LUCENTIO
Tarry, Petruchio, I must go with thee,
For in Baptista's keep my treasure is:
His youngest daughter, beautiful (Sings) Bianca

16 It would be hilarious if every time Lucentio says Bianca’s name, he sings it like “Maria” in West Side Story.
Supposing it a thing impossible,
That ever Katharina will be woo'd;
Therefore this order hath Baptista ta'en,
That none shall have access unto Bianca
Till Katharina the curst have got a husband.  

_LUCENTIO_ ushers _PETRUCHIO_ and _GRUMIO_ offstage. Quick change to _KATE/BIANCA_. If time is needed to cover this quick change, this would be a great place for love-struck Lucentio to play a chorus of a love song. This could work before or after this next monologue.

Now shall my friend Petruchio do me grace,
And offer me disguised in sober robes
To old Baptista as a _profesor_ named (strums dramatically) Cambio
Well seen in music, to instruct (_Sings_ Bianca;
That so I may, by this device, at least
Have leave and leisure to court her by herself.

_EXIT LUCENTIO playing merrily. Fruita Fresca is the song._

---

17 Clarity is so important here. Second time they’ve mentioned the arrangement, so it’s important the students hear it.
18 Is Lucentio putting on this disguise now, to establish the storyline clearly? Does he perhaps take a costume piece from Grumio or Petruchio? Or some other clever bit? Maybe pulling something out of Petruchio’s satchel?
Scene 2.  

Enter KATE and BIANCA, engaged in sisterly combat.

BIANCA  
Unbind my hands!  
They separate.

KATHARINA  
Of all thy suitors, here I charge thee, tell  
Whom thou lovest best: see thou dissemble not.

BIANCA  
Believe me, sister, of all the men alive  
I never yet beheld that special face  
Which I could fancy more than any other.

KATHARINA  
Minion, thou liest.

BIANCA  
(laughing)  
Is it for them you do envy me so?

Enter BAPTISTA. BIANCA begins weeping, playing on dad’s pity.

BIANCA  
I prithee, sister Kate, untie my hands.

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)  
(To audience) Why, how now, dame! Whence grows this insolence?  
Bianca, stand aside. Poor girl! she weeps.  
¡Dios mio! ¿Que está pasando aquí? ¡Pobre Bianca! ¡La hiciste llorar!

KATHARINA  
Her silence flouts me, and I'll be revenged.

Flies after BIANCA. BAPTISTA speaks directly to the audience then gets between the girls.

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)  
What, in my sight? Bianca, get thee in.  
¡Ugh! Estoy muy viejo para esto. Vamos, vamos, Bianca, pásasle.

Exit BIANCA

KATHARINA  
What, will you not suffer me? Nay, now I see
She is your treasure, she must have a husband; 
Talk not to me: I will go sit and weep 
Till I can find occasion of revenge. 
Exit.

BAPTISTA (in Spanish) 
Shrugs 
Was ever gentleman thus grieved as I? 
¡Hijas! ¿Qué van hacer?

Enter Petruchio

BAPTISTA (in Spanish) 
God save you, gentleman. 
Buenos días señor.

PETRUCHIO 
(Trying to speak Spanish with a bad accent) 
Y tu señor! Tienes una hija llamada Katherina...

BAPTISTA 
...I understand English...

PETRUCHIO 
Pray, have you not a daughter 
Call'd Katharina, fair and virtuous?

BAPTISTA (in Spanish) 
(Trying to figure out how this description could possibly be Kate) I have a daughter, sir, called Katherina. 
Sí.... tengo una hija llamada Kate... señor. ¿Qué quiere usted con ella?

PETRUCHIO 
(Still miming important words) 
I am a gentleman of Verona, sir, 
That, hearing of her beauty and her wit, 
Her wondrous qualities and mild behavior, 
Am bold to show myself a forward guest 
Within your house. 
And, for an entrance to my entertainment,

19 This is an important moment to ensure the students can see the emotional effect favoritism can cause. 
20 Especially in this initial scene, but throughout interactions with Petruchio and Baptista, we would like to play with words being lost in translation and incorporate comedic miming to try to break the language barrier between these two characters. Petruchio could also play with attempting to find the right Spanish words in his limited vocabulary to describe Kate.
I do present you with a man of mine,
*Gesturing offstage (or showing him a photo on his phone)*
To instruct your daughters.

**BAPTISTA (In Spanish)**
Muy guapo!

**PETRUCHIO**
Sí! He is well-schooled in music, Español too.
Cambio is his name.

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
Cambio shall go see his pupils presently.
But for my daughter Katherina, this I know,
She is not for your turn, the more my grief.
Cambio puede ir a ver a sus alunmas ahora. Respecto a Kate, estoy seguro que usted no le va a gustar a ella. Eso es muy triste para mí.

**PETRUCHIO**
I see you do not mean to part with her,
Or else you like not of my company.

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
Mistake me not; I speak but as I find.
Whence are you, sir? What may I call your name?
Solo le digo la realidad. ¿Además quién es usted?

**PETRUCHIO**
Petruchio is my name.

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
You are welcome.
Bienvenidos

**PETRUCHIO**
Signior Baptista, if I get your daughter's love,
What dowry shall I have with her to wife?\(^{21}\)

**BAPTISTA**
After my death the one half of my lands,
And in possession twenty thousand crowns.
¡Le daré la mitad de mis tierras y veinte-mil dolores!

\(^{21}\) This is another moment where the miming could add some comedy as well as help our non-spanish speaking audience members understand what is being said- Petruchio miming out money (tossing bills/making it rain/ rubbing fingers together) to get the point across.
PETRUCHIO
(Trying to figure out the amount of money offered, possibly counting on his fingers, figuring it out in a “lightbulb” moment before jumping at the opportunity)
20,000 dollars? Let specialties be therefore drawn between us.

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)
Ay, when the special thing is well obtain’d,
That is, her love; for that is all in all.
Solo si la convence que lo ame, y no hasta entonces.

PETRUCHIO
Why, that is nothing: for I tell you, father,
I am as peremptory as she proud-minded;
And where two raging fires meet together
They do consume the thing that feeds their fury:
So I to her and so she yields to me;
For I am rough and woo not like a babe.\(^{22}\)

BAPTISTA (in Spanish) (while exiting for quick change)
Well mayst thou woo, and happy be thy speed!
But be thou arm’d for some unhappy words.
Bueno, pues adelante, y suerte.

PETRUCHIO (rehearsing his greeting)
Good morrow, Kate. (Tries another way) Good morrow, Kate. (in spanish) Good morrow, Kate.

*We hear playing backstage, then off key plucking before hearing a smash. Re-enter LUCENTIO, with a broken lute and head injury.*

PETRUCHIO
How now, my friend!
What, will Katharina prove a good musician?

LUCENTIO
I think she'll sooner prove a soldier.

PETRUCHIO
Why, then thou canst not break her to the lute?

LUCENTIO
Why, no; for she hath broke the lute to me.
I did but tell her she mistook her frets,
And bow'd her hand to teach her fingering;
When, with a most impatient devilish spirit,

\(^{22}\) This is another moment that would be hilarious if mimed out to help the translation.
'Frets, call you these?' quoth she; And, with that word, she struck me on the head, And through the instrument my pate made way; And there I stood amazed for a while, While she did call me rascal, fiddler, And twangling Jack; with twenty such vile terms, As had she studied to misuse me so.

**PETRUCHIO**  
Now, by the world, it is a lusty wench;  
I love her ten times more than e'er I did!  
Proceed in practise with the younger daughter;  

**LUCENTIO**  
Petruchio, shall I send his daughter Kate to you?  

**PETRUCHIO**  
I pray you do.  
*Exit LUCENTIO, leaving PETRUCHIO alone*  
I will attend her here,  
And woo her with some spirit when she comes.  
Say that she rail; why then I'll tell her plain  
She sings as sweetly as a nightingale:  
Say that she frown, I'll say she looks as clear  
As morning roses newly wash'd with dew:  
If she do bid me pack, I'll give her thanks,  
As though she bid me stay by her a week:  
But here she comes; and now, Petruchio, speak.  
*Enter KATHARINA*  
Good morrow, Kate; for that's your name, I hear.

**KATHARINA**  
Well have you heard, but something hard of hearing:  
They call me Katharine that do talk of me.

**PETRUCHIO**  
You lie, in faith; for you are call'd plain Kate,  
And bonny Kate and sometimes Kate the curst;  
But Kate, the prettiest Kate in Christendom,  
Myself am moved to woo thee for my wife.

**KATHARINA**  
Moved! in good time: let him that moved you hither  
Remove you hence.

**PETRUCHIO**
Come, come, you wasp; i' faith, you are too angry.

**KATHARINA**
If I be waspish, best beware my sting.

**PETRUCHIO**
My remedy is then, to pluck it out.

**KATHARINA**
Ay, if the fool could find it where it lies,

**PETRUCHIO**
Good Kate; I am a gentleman.

**KATHARINA**
That I'll try.
*Shares a look with the audience before she attempts to strike him*

**PETRUCHIO**
I swear I'll cuff you, if you strike again.

**KATHARINA**
If you strike me, you are no gentleman.

**PETRUCHIO**
Nay, come, Kate, come; you must not look so sour.

**KATHARINA**
It is my fashion, when I see a crab.

**PETRUCHIO**
Why, here's no crab; and therefore look not sour.

**KATHARINA**
There is, there is.

**PETRUCHIO**
Then show it me.

**KATHARINA**
Had I a glass, I would.

**PETRUCHIO**
What, you mean my face?

**KATHARINA**
Well aim'd of such a young one.

**PETRUCHIO**

Now, by Saint George, I am too young for you.

**KATHARINA**

Yet you are wither'd.

**PETRUCHIO**

'Tis with cares.

**KATHARINA**

I care not.

**PETRUCHIO**

Nay, hear you, Kate: in sooth you scape not so.

**KATHARINA**

I chafe you, if I tarry: let me go.

**PETRUCHIO**

No, not a whit: I find you passing gentle.
'Twastoldme you were rough and coy and sullen,
And now I find report a very liar;
For thou art pleasant, gamesome, passing courteous.
Thus in plain terms: your father hath consented
That you shall be my wife; your dowry 'greed on;
And, will you, nill you, I will marry you.
For I am he am born to tame you Kate,
And bring you from a wild Kate to a Kate
Conformable as other household Kates.
Here comes your father: never make denial;
I must and will have Katharina to my wife.

*Re-enter BAPTISTA*

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**

Now, Signior Petruchio, how speed you with my daughter?
Hola señor Petruchio. ¿Cómo va todo con mi hija?

**PETRUCHIO**

How but well, sir? how but well?
It were impossible I should speed amiss.

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**

Why, how now, daughter Katherina! in your dumps?
¿Que te pasa hija? ¿Porqué tan triste?

KATHARINA
You have show'd a tender fatherly regard,
To wish me wed to one half lunatic;
A mad-cap ruffian and a swearing Jack.

PETRUCHIO
Father, 'tis thus: yourself and all the world,
That talk'd of her, have talk'd amiss of her:
If she be curst, it is for policy,
For she's not froward, but modest as the dove;
And to conclude, we have 'greed so well together,
That upon Sunday is the wedding-day.

KATHARINA storms off.
BAPTISTA turns to PETRUCHIO, as if to say, “it went that well, huh?”

PETRUCHIO
'Tis bargain'd 'twixt us twain, being alone,
That she shall still be curst in company.
I tell you, 'tis incredible to believe
How much she loves me.
Runs off after KATE. (Quick change to BIANCA)

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)
God send you joy, Petruchio! 'tis a match.
Que Dios le mande alegría, Petruchio. Hacen buena pareja.

Exit. Quick change to LUCENTIO.
Scene 3
Enter BIANCA, trying to avoid her studies. LUCENTIO sneaks up behind her and surprises her. Lucentio could enter singing a love ballad and Bianca can shush him to establish the fear of being caught.

BIANCA
Where left we last?

Lucentio will attempt to teach Bianca a Spanish love ballad. He will strum and instruct one lyric at a time interjecting his secret news between lines. The song is Suave Mente. However, though Bianca understands Spanish, she is not the best singer...

LUCENTIO
(Sings) Suavemente, besame
que quiero sentir tus labios
besandome otra vez
Here, madam:
(Sings) Suave, Besame , besame
as I told you before,
(Sings) Suave, Besame otra vez
I am Lucentio,
(Sings) Suave, Que quiero sentir tus labios
son unto Vincentio of Pisa,
(Sings) Suave, Besandome otra vez
disguised thus to get your love.

Bianca will attempt to sing it back to Lucentio as he strums, however she does not properly pronounce the words and is not necessarily the best singer. The more off key the better.

BIANCA
Now let me see if I can construe it:
(Sings) Suave, Besame , besame
I know you not,
(Sings) Suave, Besame otra vez
I trust you not;
(Sings) Suave, Que quiero sentir tus labios
presume not,
(Sings) Suave, Besandome otra vez
despair not.

Lucentio is thrilled. He dramatically bursts into the love ballad, singing lovingly to Bianca, who enjoys being doted on. When Bianca’s phone receives a text with her father’s request, she will quickly cut him off.

LUCENTIO
Suavemente, besame
que quiero sentir tus labios
besandome otra vez

BIANCA
Lucentio, my father prays I
help to dress my sister's chamber up:
You know to-morrow is the wedding-day.
Farewell, sweet Lucentio.
*LUCENTIO will continue to try to woo her with his song but she will shoo him away.*
Farewell Lucentio…
*LUCENTIO exits. Quick change to BAPTISTA*

Bianca turns to the audience, and gives a knowing grin.

I must be gone.

*Exit*
Scene 4

Enter BAPTISTA, KATHARINA

BAPTISTA (in Spanish) (to audience)
This is the ‘pointed day
That Katherina and Petruchio should be married,
And yet we hear not of your son-in-law,
What will be said? What mockery will it be?
What say you all to this shame of ours.

Hoy es el día en que Kate y Petruchio serán casados. ¿Pero donde estará el novio? ¿Hay, mi hija, qué dirá la gente? ¡Nuestra familia quedará en vergüenza!

KATHARINA

No shame but mine: I must, forsooth, be forced
To give my hand opposed against my heart
I told you, I, he was a frantic fool.
He'll woo a thousand, 'point the day of marriage,
Yet never means to wed where he hath woo'd.
Now must the world point at poor Katharina,
And say, 'Lo, there is mad Petruchio's wife,
If it would please him come and marry her!'

Exit furious

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)
Go, girl; I cannot blame thee now to weep;
For such an injury would vex a very saint.

Goza, niña, no es justo que llores ahora;
Porque tal herida al mentira a un santo.

Enter PETRUCHIO, dressed wildly inappropriately for a wedding.

PETRUCHIO

How does my father?

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)
Why, sir, you know this is your wedding-day:
First were we sad, fearing you would not come;
Now sadder, that you came so unprovided.
Petruchio! ¡Por fin! ¿Cómo se atreve usted señor? ¡Usted sabe bién que es el día de su matrimonio! ¡Ha llegado tarde y mal vestido!

PETRUCHIO

Sufficeth I am come to keep my word,
But where is Kate? 'tis time we were at church.

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)
See not your bride in these unreverent robes: Go to the chamber; Put on the clothes of mine.
¡No deje a mi hija que lo vea vestido de esa manera! ¡Vaya pongase alguna de mi ropa!

PETRUCHIO
Not I, believe me: thus I'll visit her.

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)
But thus, I trust, you will not marry her.
¡Vestido de esa manera, mi hija nunca se va a casar con usted!

PETRUCHIO
To me she's married, not unto my clothes.

Exit PETRUCHIO

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)
I'll after him, and see the event of this.
Dios mio, Dios mio. Tengo que seguirle. Esto se va a poner bién.

Exit BAPTISTA (On his exit he will play the wedding march on his harmonica and then noise and chaos/hubbub from offstage.)
Re-enter BIANCA

BIANCA
(to audience)
Why he's a devil, a devil, a very fiend.
Tut, she's a lamb, a dove, a fool to him!
I'll tell you, sirs: when the priest
Should ask, if Katharina should be his wife,
'Ay, by gogs-wouns,' quoth he; and swore so loud,
That, all-amazed, the priest let fall the book;
And, as he stoop'd again to take it up,
The mad-brain'd bridegroom took him such a cuff
That down fell priest and book and book and priest:
This done, he took the bride about the neck
And kiss'd her lips with such a clamorous smack
That at the parting all the church did echo:
And I seeing this came thence for very shame;
And after me, I know, the rout is coming.
Such a mad marriage never was before.

Re-enter KATHARINA, BAPTISTA [played by ACTOR 3]. BAPTISTA comforting KATHARINA who is ad-libbing in Spanish. Followed by PETRUCHIO (after quick change)

PETRUCHIO
Gentlemen and friends, I thank you for your pains:
I know you think to dine with me to-day,
But so it is, my haste doth call me hence,
And therefore here I mean to take my leave.

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
Is’t possible you will away to-night?
¿Esta noche?

**PETRUCHIO**
I must away to-day, before night come.

**BAPTISTA (in Spanish)**
Let us entreat you stay after dinner.
Vamos, yerno mío, quedese, por lo menos, hasta después de la cena.

**PETRUCHIO**
It may not be.

**KATHARINA**
Let me entreat you.

**PETRUCHIO**
I am content.

**KATHARINA**
Are you content to stay?

**PETRUCHIO**
I am content you shall entreat me stay;
But yet not stay, entreat me how you can.

**KATHARINA**
Now, if you love me, stay.

**PETRUCHIO (calling offstage)**
Grumio, my horse.

**KATHARINA**
*Sin verguenza!* (shameless)
Nay, then,
Do what thou canst, I will not go to-day;
No, nor to-morrow, not till I please myself.
The door is open, sir; there lies your way.

**PETRUCHIO**
O Kate, content thee; prithee, be not angry.
KATHARINA
I will be angry: what hast thou to do?
*BAPTISTA tries to interrupt*
Father, be quiet; he shall stay my leisure.

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)
Now it begins to work.
Ah...empieza a funcionar.

KATHARINA (gesturing to the audience, as if the wedding guests)
Gentlemen, forward to the bridal dinner:
I see a woman may be made a fool,
If she had not a spirit to resist.

PETRUCHIO
They shall go forward, Kate, at thy command.
Obey the bride, you that attend on her;
But for my bonny Kate, she must with me.
Nay, look not big, nor stamp, nor stare, nor fret;
I will be master of what is mine own:

Draws a spur from his boot to threaten audience as he guides Kate off.

And here she stands, touch her whoever dare;
I'll bring mine action on the proudest he
That stops my way in Padua.
Fear not, sweet wench, they shall not touch thee, Kate.

*Exeunt PETRUCHIO and KATHARINA*

BAPTISTA (in Spanish)
Of all mad matches never was the like.
Now being mad herself, she's madly mated,
I warrant him, Petruchio is Kated.
De todas las parejas locas, nunca he visto el igual.
Now, being mad herself, she’s madly mated.
I warrant him, Petruchio is Kated.

Exit

Scene 5
*Enter GRUMIO*
GRUMIO
Fie, fie on all tired jades, on all mad masters, and all foul ways! Was ever man so beaten? Was ever man so weary?

First, know, my horse is tired; my master and mistress fallen out. Out of their saddles into the dirt; and thereby hangs a tale.

We came down a foul hill, my master riding behind my mistress,—Her horse fell and she under her horse; thou shouldst have heard in how miry a place, how she was bemoiled, how he left her with the horse upon her, how he beat me because her horse stumbled, how she waded through the dirt to pluck him off me, how he swore, how she prayed, that never prayed before, how I cried, how the horses ran away, how her bridle was burst, how I lost my crupper.

By this reckoning he is more shrew than she.23

Silence! I hear my master.

Exit GRUMIO

23 This invites the question of who is the real “shrew?” Who mistreats who?
Scene 6
Enter PETRUCHIO, carrying on scenery for his house.

PETRUCHIO
Where be these knaves? What, no man at door
To hold my stirrup nor to take my horse!
What, no attendance? no regard? no duty?

Realizes he is alone, and confesses to the audience:

Thus have I politicly begun my reign,
And 'tis my hope to end successfully.
And till she stoop we must not be full-gorged,
We ate no meat to-day, nor none shall eat;
Last night we slept not, nor to-night we shall not;
As with the meat, some undeserved fault
I'll find about the making of the bed;
And here I'll fling the pillow, there the bolster,
This way the coverlet, another way the sheets:
Ay, and amid this hurly I intend
That all is done in reverend care of her;
And in conclusion she shall watch all night:
And if she chance to nod I'll rail and brawl
And with the clamour keep her still awake.
This is a way to kill a wife with kindness;
And thus I'll curb her mad and headstrong humour.
He that knows better how to tame a shrew,
Now let him speak: 'tis charity to show.
Exit
Scene 7
Enter KATHARINA

KATHARINA
(to audience)
What, did he marry me to famish me?
Beggars, that come unto my father's door,
Upon entreaty have a present alms;
But I, who never knew how to entreat,
Nor never needed that I should entreat,
Am starved for meat, giddy for lack of sleep,
With oaths kept waking and with brawling fed:
And that which spites me more than all these wants,
He does it under name of perfect love;
I prithee go and get me some repast;
I care not what, so it be wholesome food.
Go, get thee gone, thou false deluding slaves,
Sorrow on you and all the pack of you,
That triumph thus upon my misery!

Enter PETRUCHIO with meat

PETRUCHIO
How fares my Kate?

KATHARINA
Faith, as cold as can be.

PETRUCHIO
Here love; thou see'st how diligent I am
To dress thy meat myself and bring it thee;
I am sure, sweet Kate, this kindness merits thanks.
What, not a word?
I'll take away this dish.

KATHARINA
I pray you, let it stand.

PETRUCHIO
The poorest service is repaid with thanks;
And so shall mine, before you touch the meat.

KATHARINA
I thank you, sir.
PETRUCHIO
Kate, eat apace: and now, my honey love,
Will we return unto thy father's house
With silken coats and caps and golden rings,
With ruffs and cuffs and fardingales and things;

*He removes her plate before she can eat anything*

What, hast thou dined?

*Presents her with a brand new cap*

Here is the cap my Katharine did bespeak.

*He takes a better look at it.*

Fie, fie! 'tis lewd and filthy:

*Calling offstage*

Away with it! come, let me have a bigger.

KATHARINA
I'll have no bigger: this doth fit the time,
And gentlewomen wear such caps as these

PETRUCHIO
When you are gentle, you shall have one too,
And not till then.

KATHARINA
Why, sir, I trust I may have leave to speak;
And speak I will; I am no child, no babe:
Your betters have endured me say my mind,
And if you cannot, best you stop your ears.
My tongue will tell the anger of my heart,
Or else my heart concealing it will break.

PETRUCHIO
I love thee well, in that thou likest it not.

KATHARINA
Love me or love me not, I like the cap;

---

24 This must be the heart of the piece. When Kate finds a way to speak her mind, to match Petruchio with words, and to become vulnerable. Important that this moment is a POWER moment, and doesn’t look like capitulation.
And it I will have, or I will have none.

*Petruchio tosses the cap offstage with a grin. They are getting somewhere in this relationship, and he's a bit speechless.*

**PETRUCHIO**
Well, come, my Kate; we will unto your father's
Even in these honest mean habiliments:
Our purses shall be proud, our garments poor;
If thou account'st it shame, lay it on me.
Let's see; I think 'tis now some seven o'clock.

**KATHARINA**
I dare assure you, sir, 'tis almost two.

**PETRUCHIO**
It shall be seven ere I go to horse:
Look, what I speak, or do, or think to do,
You are still crossing it.
It shall be what o'clock I say it is.

*They begin their journey.*

Good Lord, how bright and goodly shines the moon!

**KATHARINA**
The moon! the sun: it is not moonlight now.

**PETRUCHIO**
I say it is the moon that shines so bright.

**KATHARINA**
I know it is the sun that shines so bright.

**PETRUCHIO**
Now, by my mother's son, and that's myself,
It shall be moon, or star, or what I list,
Or ere I journey to your father's house.
Evermore cross'd and cross'd; nothing but cross'd!

**KATHARINA**
Forward, I pray, since we have come so far,
And be it moon, or sun, or what you please:
Henceforth I vow it shall be so for me.

**PETRUCHIO**
I say it is the moon.

**KATHARINA**
I know it is the moon.

**PETRUCHIO**
Nay, then you lie: it is the blessed sun.

**KATHARINA**
Then, God be bless'd, it is the blessed sun:  
And the moon changes even as your mind.  
What you will have it named, even that it is;  
And so it shall be so for Katharina.

**PETRUCHIO**
Well, forward, forward!  
Is not this well? Come, my sweet Kate.

*Exeunt*

**KATHARINA**
Better once than never, for never too late.

*Exeunt*
Scene 8
Enter LUCENTIO, singing ("I'm gonna love you like I'm gonna lose you"
Then enter BIANCA (wearing a wedding veil) They sing together, Kate walks in and recognizes the marriage, gives approving hug. Bianca goes offstage to quick-change to Petruchio while Lucentio finishes the song, smiles at Kate and says the next line to her alone on stage, incorporating a hug if needed to cover quick change.

LUCENTIO
Sister Katharina,
Feast with the best, and welcome to my house.
(PETRUCHIO Enters)
Padua affords this kindness, brother Petruchio.

PETRUCHIO
Padua affords nothing but what is kind.

LUCENTIO (a joke at Kate’s expense)
For both our sakes I would that word were true.

PETRUCHIO
Now, for my life, Lucentio fears his bride!

LUCENTIO
He that is giddy thinks the world turns round.

KATHARINA
'He that is giddy thinks the world turns round:'
I pray you, tell me what you meant by that.

LUCENTIO
Your husband, being troubled with a shrew,
Measures my sorrow by his woe:
And now you know my meaning.

KATHARINA
(Directed to audience) A very mean meaning.

PETRUCHIO
To him, Kate!

KATHARINA doesn’t rise to the bait, choosing instead to not pick a fight. She exits.

LUCENTIO
I think thou hast the veriest shrew of all.

PETRUCHIO
Well, I say no: and therefore for assurance
Let's each one send unto his wife;
And he whose wife
Do come at first when he doth send for her,
Shall win the wager which we will propose.

LUCENTIO
A hundred dollars?

PETRUCHIO
A match! 'tis done.
Who shall begin?

LUCENTIO
That will I.
Hey, Siri, text Bianca and tell her to come here.

(pauses for text tone)

LUCENTIO
My mistress says
That she is busy and she cannot come.

PETRUCHIO
How! she is busy and she cannot come!
Is that an answer?

LUCENTIO
I know Kate’s answer.

PETRUCHIO
(Calling offstage) Katharina!!

KATHARINA
What is your will, sir, that you send for me?

PETRUCHIO
Where is your sister?

KATHARINA
She sits by the parlor fire.

LUCENTIO
Here is a wonder, if you talk of a wonder.
I wonder what it bodes.
PETRUCHIO
Marry, peace it bodes, and love and quiet life,
And, to be short, what not, that's sweet and happy?

LUCENTIO
Now, fair befal thee, good Petruchio!
The wager thou hast won.

LUCENTIO tosses PETRUCHIO some money.

PETRUCHIO
Nay, I will win my wager better yet
Katharina, I charge thee, tell these headstrong people
What duty they do owe their friends and loved ones.

LUCENTIO
Come, come, you're mocking: we will have no telling.

PETRUCHIO
I say we shall: and first begin with me.

KATHARINA
(to Petruchio)
Fie, fie! unknit that threatening unkind brow,
(to LUCENTIO)
And dart not scornful glances from those eyes.
It blots thy beauty as frosts do bite the meads,
And in no sense is meet or amiable.
(to the audience)
I am ashamed that we are all so simple
To offer war where we should kneel for peace;
Or seek for rule, supremacy and sway,
When we are bound to love, serve, every day.
Come, come, you froward and unable worms!
My mind hath been as big as one of yours,
My heart as great, my reason haply more,
To bandy word for word and frown for frown;
But now I see our lances are but straws. 25

LUCENTIO
(to Petruchio)
Now, go thy ways; thou hast tamed a curst shrew.

KATHARINA

25 It is important that this speech reiterates that the relationship ultimately works because of compromise and teamwork.
'Tis a wonder, by your leave, he will be tamed too.

_The three actors join together in final song- “I’m gonna love you like I’m gonna lose you”_
APPENDIX F

TAMING OF THE SHREW Workshops—Spring 2016
Created the Colorado Shakespeare Festival and the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence

Some thoughts from CSF Education:

- This workshop has been developed in collaboration with representatives from the Colorado Shakespeare Festival and the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. Please consider this your “script.” You have about 50 minutes (though workshops frequently get cut short). We have crafted this language to set you up for the best possible workshop, so please memorize everything in italics.

- The primary message of this workshop is “You can make a difference in your community by becoming an upstander.”

- We want these workshops to be solution-oriented (i.e., not spending too much time exploring how to harm, but spending most of the time on how to help).

- The workshops should be active, hands-on, and interactive. These are not discussion groups, but hands-on theatre workshops. Make sure students are spending plenty of time on their feet, trying out the activities for themselves. Keep discussion to a minimum (and focused on the lesson plan).

- All examples of theatre activities and roleplaying should come from the play, not from student’s personal lives.

- Don’t open anything you can’t close. (i.e. asking “has anyone been bullied before?”)

- Acknowledge your role as an actor, not a therapist/counselor.

Language to be mindful of:

- Someone is “acting as a bully”, not IS a “Bully” – it’s not a permanent condition or character trait.

- You are a “target” if someone is bullying you, not a “victim”. Targets can choose to move and change their situation.

- If a student brings up suicide – use the words “hurt themselves” instead of repeating “suicide”

- Avoid saying “you guys” when addressing the group. Instead, use “you all” or “all of you.”

Classroom management:

- Involve your classroom teacher as a co-facilitator. Check in with them before workshop begins, and inform them you will provide content, but you’ll look to them to keep kids participating, and keep discipline in check.
• **Elementary audiences:** Elementary students operate on rewards/punishment system, so before workshop begins, ask teacher if there is a reward you can offer them. (“Your teacher has told me that if everyone listens well and participates with open minds, you will get 5 minutes of free time/extra recess…etc”)

• Ignoring disruption tacitly accepts it. When a student is disruptive, address it (or encourage teacher to).

• Eye Contact and Proximity: if a student is disruptive, look at them, then move close to them. Then do a brief check-in, if it continues: “what’s going on?” Give students benefit of the doubt, then move closer to understand it.

• In case of disruptive student, it’s okay to say “I see you aren’t contributing. Why don’t you step aside and talk with your teacher?”

• Use the “teacher eye”—“I see you, I know what you’re doing, and it’s not okay.”

• **High School:** students in high school are trying to be adults, and they check out when you treat them like children. They are ready for more responsibility. With high school, use **challenge by choice.** (I will throw opportunities out there, and you get to decide the level of challenge. If it’s a challenge for you to do X, you decide how much you get out of this experience.)

• With your body language/voice, assert that you take this seriously. Don’t try to be cool (especially with high school students). You are the adult; you are the authority. Embody someone worthy of respect.

• Teachers have been asked to clear the desks in preparation for the workshop. If you arrive in the workshop and the desks aren’t cleared to the side, ask the students to quickly move desks and chairs so you have space to move.

• Ask teacher if they have a specific attention-getter and use it. Or…
  - Elem -- “One, two, three…eyes on me.”, “if you can hear me…”, etc.
  - MS – Freeze, flick lights, call and response, clap and respond, etc.
  - HS – clap and respond, stop talking and wait for them to focus, etc.

• A question is much more engaging than a statement. A question to which they have to answer “no” and correct you with the right answer is even more engaging.

• Take a focusing moment if needed – i.e. plant feet, breath, eyes on me, voices off, etc

**DEALING WITH GENDER IN THE CLASSROOM**

• Don’t reduce ideas down to binaries, stereotypes, and reductionist ideas (“all boys are X, all girls are Y”)

• Affirm everyone’s identities and experiences.

• Use qualifying language (“some boys do x”, “it might be true that…”)

• Don’t assume heterosexuality. Don’t assume gender identity.

• Speak in gender-free language. THEY instead of he/she. Don’t use language that assumes anything.

• Don’t erase trans kids.

• In offering up examples, don’t only give hetero ones.

• Discuss gender in nuanced terms
Middle and High School: Taming of the Shrew Workshop

Introduction: 2-3 minutes

Hi, my name is ___. I am an actor with the Colorado Shakespeare Festival and I also work for the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence.

We all just watched this play, The Taming of the Shrew, where we saw people really hurting one another. Today, we are going to do some theatre activities related to the play, and find ways to connect what you saw onstage to what you see in your community. My goal is that you walk out of here with some strategies about how you, as an individual, might HELP when you witness mistreatment.

I ask that we all agree to be brave and respectful today; this is a judgment free zone for the next 50 minutes. Agreed? Okay. On your feet!

Warm up (10 minutes)

Teaching Objective: Wake up our bodies and physicalize some of the questions we’ll explore. Lay groundwork for thinking about school climate, upstanders, and gender.

I’ll make a statement, and you’ll move to a spot in the room, depending on your answer. This side of the room is “agree.” This side is “disagree.” The middle is “neutral.” Place yourself in a spot that best describes your answer. You don’t need to be in a single-file line; blobs are okay. Also, this is a silent exercise and please keep your hands to yourself.

“I love Brussel sprouts”

“I watch Keeping up with the Kardashians.”

“I like to play Pokemon Go”

“I feel that My school is a safe place”

“I see bullying at my school”

“When I see someone being mistreated, I always try to help them.”

“I treat everyone the same, regardless of gender.”

Wrap-Up: This activity helps you see where you position yourself in terms of some key questions, and how your peers position themselves. This helps us see what our SCHOOL CLIMATE looks like.

• What do I mean by school climate? (air you breathe, environment surrounding you)

• What words would you use to describe a healthy school climate YOU would like to be a part of?

---

26 This workshop script is a slight variation on the workshop model I saw during the Fall 2016 season. Most content remained the same but some exercises were done in a different order. However, it is the script CSF provided for my research.
• “Bullying” is a term that is thrown around a lot, but let’s be clear about what it is. There are three criteria for behavior to be bullying. Can you guess?
  • There is an intention to harm (i.e., you mean to cause harm)
  • It’s repeated over time—and often escalates
  • Power imbalance (and the person with power misuses it)

• 160,000 students in this country miss school each day because of bullying. Let’s think about that number in perspective: Mile High Stadium holds 76,125 people. That’s more than two Broncos stadiums full of students missing school each day.

• Bullying is not the only kind of mistreatment in a school—it’s a particular kind of mistreatment (and it’s helpful to know the definition, so you can differentiate bullying from other kinds of conflict). You all probably witness bullying in your world, but you also witness other kinds of violence and mistreatment, too. Today, we’re going to think about all of the various ways that you can make a difference by paying attention, speaking up, and caring about the people around you.

• What do we call someone who witnesses mistreatment?
  • (A bystander). And when that person decides to help, we might call them an upstander. Do you have specific terms in your school you use for a person who steps in to help? (Ally, upstander, helper, etc)

  • In the play, there was a moment where Kate begged the audience for help. Raise your hand if you WANTED to help her? (praise for how many raised hands you see, how we have a lot of potential helpers in the classroom.)

  • What might prevent a bystander from speaking up to help (thus becoming an upstander?) Think about the reasons you did not step in to help Kate.
    • Let kids identify their own reasons:
      • doesn’t want to be a tattle
      • doesn’t want to become target of bullying
      • doesn’t care enough
      • doesn’t want to stand out

• Even though we all know we want to live in a safe, happy, healthy space, we don’t always speak up when we see mistreatment. But yet, we usually WANT to help.

• We hear about a lot of violent incidents in the news, more than ever, it seems. When a planned attack occurs at a school, do you think someone (other than the perpetrator) knows what is going to happen? (Take responses) In fact, 81% of the time, someone else knows a violent incident is going to happen. This means that there is a lot of
opportunity for people to speak up, and violence is usually preventable, because of BYSTANDERS.

Activity One:

In the theatre, we often say “we are what we repeatedly do.” So we get to use theatre today to help us rehearse the kind of interactions we’d like to have. Theatre is a great way to try out different realities and to rehearse strategies. So for the next 20 minutes or so, we’re going to practice being upstanders. Because it takes practice!

Scenario 1 (Level 1):

Remember when Petruchio shared his plan with the audience that he was going to starve Kate and not let her sleep? Let’s imagine a contemporary equivalent to Shakespeare’s scenario. Petruchio is a kid at your school, and he has concocted a plan to make Kate like him. I’ll play Petruchio in this scene, and I need three volunteers to be my friends. (PICK THREE.) Okay, being as realistic as possible, I’d like you three to find ways to be upstanders.

ACTOR PREP TO USE IN IMPROVISING SCENE WITH STUDENTS: Petruchio hacked into the school lunch system and deactivated Kate’s account, so she can’t eat anything at school. He also set an alarm on her phone to go off every ten minutes between midnight and 6 a.m., so she can’t get any sleep---and he changed the language settings to Mandarin, which she doesn’t speak. He shares this plan with two of his friends, and is seeking their approval on what he thinks is a hilarious plan.

Try the scene out once, with teaching artist as Petruchio. Ask students, “What strategies worked here?” Then get a few more students up to try a second time (still with teaching artist as Petruchio). The students are always roleplaying as the bystander, not the perpetrator.

Wrap-Up: 5 minutes

- You came up with lots of creative ideas, and this shows us how many ways there are to accomplish the same goal—to HELP. I am so pleased to see that so many of you naturally want to help. As good citizens, it’s so important to help others.

- When you help, be sure you are safe. Don’t put yourself in harm’s way.

- However, the solution is often not as hard as we think. What if, the next time you saw someone being bullied, you said “that’s not cool” to the person acting as the bully?

- Do you think that’s an effective strategy? In fact, 57% of the time, bullying ends in 10 seconds or less when a bystander becomes an upstander. That means that by choosing to step in (in any way) more than half of the bullying at your school could be stopped...and fast.

- Safe2Tell: Sometimes we don’t feel safe helping, we don’t trust the adults, or we are scared of people knowing that we told. In those cases, Safe2Tell is a great resource. Or if you know of an immediate threat to someone else’s safety or your own, you can call Safe2Tell or report it online and they will take swift action.
• **The great thing about Safe2Tell is that it’s not up to you to decide how to fix the situation. You report it, and the professionals determine how best to handle it. Safe2Tell has saved lives, prevented suicides, and stopped planned attacks. But it only works if we care enough to report dangerous behavior when we see it.**

• **Safe2Tell has a new mobile app, which you can download on your smartphones. (Show students what the app looks like on your phone.)**

• **I’m going to hand out Safe2Tell cards after the workshop, which your teacher will pass out, and if you have questions about how it works, your counselor can help answer those.**

• **When you get home after school today, I’d like you to share this information with your family. Safe2Tell is not just for students; it’s for everybody. Show them this card, educate them about what Safe2Tell is, and then talk with them about downloading the mobile app on your devices. I’m sharing this information with you because I know it can help prevent violence. If you tell even one person about Safe2Tell, you are helping to prevent violence, too.**

• **THANK YOU for your hard work today, for being open to these activities, and for being brave. I hope you’ll continue to be brave, to do the hard thing of speaking up when you see someone being mistreated.**

• **I have some questions for you, to help me better understand today’s workshop.**

• **First of all, what was new for you today? (if students need more prompting) What ideas came up that you hadn’t considered before? (take 3-4 examples, if they arise)**

*Now close your eyes, and I’ll ask some questions. If your answer is yes, please raise your hand.*

1. Did you enjoy the performance?

2. After this workshop, are you more likely to be an upstander when you see that someone is being mistreated?

3. Would you like us to return to your school in the future?

**HIGH SCHOOL WORKSHOP STANDARDS**

**Common Core Speaking and Listening Standards:**
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.SL.9-12.1: Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grades 9-12 topics, texts, and issues, building on others’ ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.

**Common Core Reading Literature Standards:**
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.9-10.3: Analyze how complex characters (e.g., those with multiple or conflicting motivations) develop over the course of a text, interact with other characters, and advance the plot or develop the theme.

**MIDDLE SCHOOL WORKSHOP STANDARDS**

**Common Core Speaking and Listening Standards:**
CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.SL.6-8.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions
(one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 6-8 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly.

**Common Core Reading Literature Standards:**

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.5: Analyze how a particular sentence, chapter, scene, or stanza fits into the overall structure of a text and contributes to the development of the theme, setting, or plot.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.7.6: Analyze how an author develops and contrasts the points of view of different characters or narrators in a text.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.8.3: Analyze how particular lines of dialogue or incidents in a story or drama propel the action, reveal aspects of a character, or provoke a decision.