

The Role of Arts in Health Program Evaluation

Mukamana Sandra Gisele

School of Applied Health Sciences Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Arts-based interventions are gaining recognition for their potential to enhance health outcomes, reduce stigma, and improve the well-being of individuals and communities. As such programs proliferate across healthcare settings, from hospitals to senior centers, the need for rigorous evaluation frameworks becomes essential to assess their effectiveness. This paper examines the intersection of arts and health programs, examining their contribution to physical, emotional, and mental well-being. It emphasizes the importance of evaluation in validating these interventions, outlines key components of arts program evaluation, and highlights methods for assessing impact, including mixed-method approaches. The aim is to provide a comprehensive guide for evaluating arts in health programs, ensuring their sustained integration into healthcare practices.

Keywords: Arts in health, Health program evaluation, Mental health, Community well-being, Mixed-methods evaluation, Arts-based interventions.

INTRODUCTION

Recent years have shown a growing interest in understanding how the arts—broadly defined—can be integrated into broader health initiatives to improve individual, community, and system well-being. The arts can play a powerful role in helping the public break through fear and stigma to see the value in people living with mental health problems. Integrating the arts into health programming has the capability of producing two important kinds of outcomes: First, bringing people together, building a sense of "normalcy" and social support, and giving people a valued role to play. Second, participation in the arts can also lead to individual health outcomes, e.g., reducing isolation and depression. When well-designed, artistic and cultural productions and experiences can do the same. Research has repeatedly demonstrated the ability of the arts to produce relaxation and decrease the subjective experience of pain, as well as the stress and strain of health care, and to enhance people's satisfaction with their care [1, 2]. Arts-based approaches are beginning to find their way into healthcare practice settings. Music and art therapies have emerged as professional disciplines and academic areas of study, and are offered at some time in the course of treatment for both physical and psychiatric disabilities. Some arts programs are not clinical taking place in hospitals, nursing homes, and senior centers. These programs bring in artists to perform or to lead a group of co-participants in a hands-on activity or lesson in a particular art. The growth in arts programming has created a greater need for valid evaluation frameworks to be able to determine the extent to which these interventions are effective for people who participate in them. This short paper addresses this gap and provides a point of departure for people interested in assessing how the arts themselves might contribute to the experience of health recovery [3, 4].

The Intersection of Arts and Health Programs

Arts and health programs are characterized by the integration of artistic practices—such as theatre, visual art, and music—with wellness and prevention services. These programs exist at the intersection of two important factors that impact the quality of human life: the benefits of arts and the worlds of health and illness. Research has demonstrated that people who engage with the arts experience improved physical, emotional, and mental health outcomes. Music, drama, recreation, humor, arts and crafts, and visual art are some of the most common forms through which people express and experience the rich

complexity of their emotional and intellectual lives. Support for using arts as part of health promotion and prevention strategies comes from some profound case studies that have led to transformative experiences for those center stage in the healing and rehabilitation process [5, 1]. The primary targets of arts and health programs are the recipients or participants who may include patients, caregivers, and community members. These participants may engage in the program to improve their health, learn new coping strategies, or simply to experience pleasure. Another primary target is arts and health practitioners, artists, and wellness providers who work together to improve the quality of the programs through interdisciplinary collaboration. Nurses, visual artists, music therapy researchers, recreational therapists, drama therapists, psychologists, complementary and alternative therapists, arts administrators, and project developers may design, implement, and/or evaluate arts and health programs. A third target audience is evaluators and researchers working at the intersection of arts and health. Understanding how the arts impact individual and community wellness is important work. Ultimately, it may initiate the selection of arts programs to include as part of a wellness program or surface interesting new ways that wellness programs might be evaluated. Overall, the perspective on arts and health program evaluation offered in this guide is open, exploratory, and grounded in project development. At the same time, its framework is consistent with principles for usefulness and evaluation that matter. Just as in the development of a multi-faceted, multi-stakeholder arts health program, these principles place collaboration and context at the forefront [6, 7].

Importance of Evaluation in Arts and Health Programs

It is important to evaluate arts in health programs because evaluating our work is a way to understand whether our programs are effective, whether our efforts produce the desired changes in health and healthcare, other outcomes of interest, and the area we want to be changed. An evaluation provides insights for program improvement, evidence of effectiveness, documentation of outcomes, and a means for reporting to funders and other stakeholders. In part, the stakeholders, for example, funders, policymakers, arts and cultural organizations, and community members who support efforts if they think the evaluation results offer valid evidence for choosing among programs or implementing new, effective solutions [8, 9]. The evaluation also helps validate the use of the arts as part of interventions that contribute to better health and understanding of health and adds to the evidence-based research that can increase the resources available to grow these programs around the country. Evaluation is important to understand outcomes and to document effectiveness. Arts in health outcomes involve measuring what has been accomplished or affected after an intervention, experience, or arts event is completed. Outcome measurement can be quantitative, qualitative, or both. Most arts in health programs evaluate effects qualitatively in addition to measurements of quantity and effectiveness. This kind of evaluation is critical to understanding the experience of the participants and the benefits of this kind of work. Program and impact evaluation of arts in health needs to be more rigorous and quantitative to be a reliable and policy-shifting body of evidence on which to base our work. Yet, many questions remain about the use of the arts in improving patient health, care, and provider well-being. Program and impact studies need to be done. Further, we need to use baseline data to show how the arts resulted in change or better outcomes. All of our work will make arts in health programs more enduring and integrate more deeply into care and communities [10, 11].

Key Components of Arts in Health Program Evaluation

Ensuring that the evaluation of arts in health programs is meaningful and provides useful information for multiple stakeholders requires a combination of components. This section outlines four key concepts that must be carefully considered in creating evaluation frameworks, adapting them to unique programs, and using a mixed-methods evaluation strategy [12, 13]. Although the fundamentals of evaluating any project should always include an understanding of the project's goals and objectives, this is often overlooked. Evaluation of the arts in health often struggles to define the project's intended outcomes and unpack any assumptions around the project's impact. Engaging with stakeholders is crucial to designing an evaluation framework that is both manageable and meaningful. These stakeholders may then request different aspects of the program be evaluated, which could also require different data collection methods. Broadly speaking, however, any evaluation should be based on: [14, 15].

1. Clear and well-defined goals and objectives, so that programs can be adequately benchmarked for success.
2. Well-articulated goals and objectives as a means of allowing stakeholders to help shape the outcomes measurement, thus helping to craft a relevant evaluation framework before the program begins.

3. A meaningful and collaborative approach, in as much as evaluation will generally be based on definable measures and on subjective accounts of what is achieved at an individual level. These will strongly place less reliance on one approach than on a mixture of both quantitative and qualitative research. Given the broad, confounding factors around the arts and health debate, a mixed-methods approach is essential [16, 17].

Methods and Tools for Evaluation

Generally, formative evaluations have employed qualitative techniques to collect stakeholder perceptions, such as interviews and focus groups, with resulting data then subject to systematic analysis. Formative evaluations often help programs identify systemic barriers to efficiency and outcomes, for example but are not usually well-suited to directly measuring outcomes. Qualitative data can also be important inputs when designing other evaluation strategies, such as various kinds of participant satisfaction surveys often used in summative evaluations. When articulating outputs, success indicators, and impact measurements, however, programs should utilize best practices used in the evaluation of high-impact arts programs. This includes using pre-post assessments and satisfaction surveys with robust quantitative data collection instruments to evaluate change in six domains for audiences, including cognition, behavior, affect, physiology, skills, and the social domain. When selecting a single method for a study, evaluators should employ the process of fitting the intervention to the evaluation. The methods used should be based on a program's theory of change and goals, the availability of resources and commitment to the methods, and the appropriateness of the method to the context. Existing evaluation frameworks are important resources when adapting a method for an arts-based intervention program. In addition to an experimental or quasi-experimental design, the Schedule for Meaningful Assessment has been used for digitally gathering a range of feedback on participant experience and instructor methodology. Finally, although policymakers have favored the use of quantitative data over qualitative data, an approach that utilizes both kinds of data deliberately and in an integrated manner is necessary for a comprehensive understanding of art in health intervention [18, 19].

Case Studies and Best Practices

To better understand how comprehensive arts in health programs operate, this resource includes a variety of case studies and examples of safe, ethical, and effective arts programs for each of the eight approaches to arts programs. Project Description: The Art for Recovery program is part of the Health Fund. This resource is one of the most recent that has been dedicated to the health of patients, their families, and the Medical Center. A. Categorizing Arts in Health. Page 12. San Francisco. Sources came from numerous sources, including a wide range of evidence and materials, interviews with local and national health healing programs and artists about how their programs worked, arts in health training, and health healing programs [20, 21]. The artwork includes eight primary arts in health programs, as well as more than 200 hospital and clinic communities across five categories. Best practice strategies for all affinity categories are included in the chapters of five of these approaches described in this guide. These include the use of artists, staff, and volunteers; providing a budget for arts and health programs; program quality assurance through consideration of patients and staff; and a comprehensive resource for providing environmental arts, endowment, and evaluation. Data included more rigorous evaluations of some of the support provided through the health healing programs and independent research on a variety of arts in health programs. Finally, Chapter One shares dozens of good practice strategies for integrating artwork into three paradigmatic types of health-enhancing environments. pp. 007-010. With the stories, scientific relations were made between artists, designers, architects, and others. The roster page includes individual roster entries with all the qualifications and supporting evidence of the artist, as well as how to contact us about the project [22, 23].

CONCLUSION

The integration of arts into health programs presents a unique opportunity to address health disparities, improve patient outcomes, and foster community well-being. Evaluating these programs is important not only for validating their impact but also for ensuring their longevity and expansion. A comprehensive evaluation framework, grounded in clear objectives and mixed methods, allows stakeholders to measure both qualitative and quantitative outcomes. As the field grows, rigorous and adaptable evaluation models will be vital to demonstrating the arts' role in enhancing health and well-being. In turn, such evidence will drive the continued integration of arts into healthcare systems, ultimately benefiting patients, caregivers, and communities alike.

REFERENCES

1. Clift S, Phillips K, Pritchard S. The need for robust critique of research on social and health impacts of the arts. *Cultural Trends*. 2021 Oct 20;30(5):442-59.
2. Musikanski L, Rakova B, Bradbury J, Phillips R, Manson M. Artificial intelligence and community well-being: A proposal for an emerging area of research. *International Journal of Community Well-Being*. 2020 Mar;3(1):39-55. [isqols.org](https://www.isqols.org)
3. Lenette C. Mental health and critical multicultural practice: An arts-based approach. In *Critical Multicultural Practice in Social Work* 2020 Jul 16 (pp. 101-115). Routledge.
4. Bunn C, Kalinga C, Mtema O, Abdulla S, Dillip A, Lwanda J, Mtenga SM, Sharp J, Strachan Z, Gray CM. Arts-based approaches to promoting health in sub-Saharan Africa: a scoping review. *BMJ Global Health*. 2020 May 1;5(5):e001987. [bmj.com](https://www.bmj.com)
5. Bradfield E. Subjective experiences of participatory arts engagement of healthy older people and explorations of creative ageing. *Public health*. 2021 Sep 1;198:53-8.
6. Santos-Beneit G, Fernández-Jiménez R, de Cos-Gandoy A, Rodríguez C, Carral V, Bodega P, de Miguel M, Orrit X, Haro D, Peñalvo JL, Fernández-Alvira JM. Lessons learned from 10 years of preschool intervention for health promotion: JACC state-of-the-art review. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*. 2022 Jan 25;79(3):283-98. [jacc.org](https://www.jacc.org)
7. Ryff CD, Kim ES. Extending research linking purpose in life to health: The challenges of inequality, the potential of the arts, and the imperative of virtue. The ecology of purposeful living across the lifespan: Developmental, educational, and social perspectives. 2020:29-58. [wisc.edu](https://www.wisc.edu)
8. Ewing R. The Australian curriculum: The arts. A critical opportunity. *Curriculum Perspectives*. 2020 Apr;40(1):75-81.
9. Poscia A, Stojanovic J, La Milia DI, Duplaga M, Grysztar M, Moscato U, Onder G, Collamati A, Ricciardi W, Magnavita N. Interventions targeting loneliness and social isolation among the older people: An update systematic review. *Experimental gerontology*. 2018 Feb 1;102:133-44.
10. Bragg LA, Walsh C, Heyeres M. Successful design and delivery of online professional development for teachers: A systematic review of the literature. *Computers & Education*. 2021 Jun 1;166:104158.
11. Talic S, Shah S, Wild H, Gasevic D, Maharaj A, Ademi Z, Li X, Xu W, Mesa-Eguigaray I, Rostron J, Theodoratou E. Effectiveness of public health measures in reducing the incidence of covid-19, SARS-CoV-2 transmission, and covid-19 mortality: systematic review and meta-analysis. *bmj*. 2021 Nov 18;375. [bmj.com](https://www.bmj.com)
12. Moniz T, Golafshani M, Gaspar CM, Adams NE, Haidet P, Sukhera J, Volpe RL, de Boer C, Lingard L. The prism model: advancing a theory of practice for arts and humanities in medical education. *Perspectives on medical education*. 2021 Aug;10(4):207-14. [springer.com](https://www.springer.com)
13. Pereno A, Eriksson D. A multi-stakeholder perspective on sustainable healthcare: From 2030 onwards. *Futures*. 2020 Sep 1;122:102605.
14. De Witte M, Orkibi H, Zarate R, Karkou V, Sajjani N, Malhotra B, Ho RT, Kaimal G, Baker FA, Koch SC. From therapeutic factors to mechanisms of change in the creative arts therapies: A scoping review. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2021 Jul 15;12:678397. [frontiersin.org](https://www.frontiersin.org)
15. Greenhalgh J, Manzano A. Understanding 'context' in realist evaluation and synthesis. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2022 Sep 3;25(5):583-95. [tandfonline.com](https://www.tandfonline.com)
16. Jensen A, Holt N, Honda S, Bungay H. The impact of arts on prescription on individual health and wellbeing: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Public Health*. 2024 Jul 9;12:1412306.
17. Manji I, Cepalo T, Ledesma S, Fallavollita P. Personhood, QOL, and well-being in people with dementia undergoing creative arts-based therapies: A scoping review. *Creativity Research Journal*. 2023 Feb 24:1-23.
18. Carney EA, Zhang X, Charsha A, Taylor JN, Hoshaw JP. Formative Assessment Helps Students Learn over Time: Why Aren't We Paying More Attention to It?. *Intersection: A Journal at the Intersection of Assessment and Learning*. 2022;4(1):n1. [ed.gov](https://www.ed.gov)
19. Kreutzer L, Hu YY, Stulberg J, Greenberg CC, Bilimoria KY, Johnson JK. Formative evaluation of a peer video-based coaching initiative. *Journal of Surgical Research*. 2021 Jan 1;257:169-77. [\[HTML\]](#)
20. Jesionkowska J, Wild F, Deval Y. Active learning augmented reality for STEAM education—A case study. *Education Sciences*. 2020 Aug 4;10(8):198.

21. Behnamnia N, Kamsin A, Ismail MA, Hayati A. The effective components of creativity in digital game-based learning among young children: A case study. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2020 Sep 1;116:105227. [[HTML](#)]
22. Feng S, Mäntymäki M, Dhir A, Salmela H. How self-tracking and the quantified self promote health and well-being: systematic review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*. 2021 Sep 21;23(9):e25171. jmir.org
23. Shehab M, Abualigah L, Shambour Q, Abu-Hashem MA, Shambour MK, Alsalibi AI, Gandomi AH. Machine learning in medical applications: A review of state-of-the-art methods. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*. 2022 Jun 1;145:105458. uts.edu.au

CITE AS: Mukamana Sandra Gisele. (2024). The Role of Arts in Health Program Evaluation. RESEARCH INVENTION JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN EDUCATION 4(2):34-38. <https://doi.org/10.59298/RIJRE/2024/423438>