

ASSESSMENT

Special Research Interest Group

Summer Issue 2015

Assessment, in particular, measurement of student achievement and teacher evaluation, is an important component of music teaching and music teacher education. This issue features several research project underway across the country, an invitation to work collaboratively with your colleagues on relevant issues, and professional updates and conference information.

CALL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS and INVITATION TO JOIN:

- The NafME Assessment SRIG publishes a newsletter annually. We accept articles, book reviews, and news items.
- Invite your colleagues to join the Assessment Special Research Group. To join, they simply go to the NafME SRIG website and follow the directions: <http://musiced.nafme.org/resources/special-research-interest-groups-srigs>
- Our NafME SRME SRIG Liaison is Steven M. Demorest, Professor, Music Education, Henry and Leigh Bienen School of Music, Northwestern University, 711 Elgin Road, Evanston, IL 60208-1200. He can be reached at sdemorest@northwestern.edu.

Website:

<http://assessmentsrig.weebly.com/>

VOLUME 29

Contents

CALL FOR PROPOSALS 2016 Music Research and Teacher Education National Conference	Page 2
Jeffrey Ward Assessment SRIG Future Vision	Page 3
Kelly Parkes and Fred Burrack National Pilot for the Model Cornerstone Assessments associated with the new National Standards for Music Education	Page 4
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS Chair Elect of the Assessment SRIG	Page 8
FEATURED RESEARCH Keitha Lucas Hamann EdTPA Validity for Program Evaluation	Page 9
Jessica Ingrassellino Teacher Attitudes toward National Core Arts Standards	Page 10
Daniel Johnson and Martin Fautley An International and Developmental Comparison of Assessment Practices in the United States and England	Page 11
Bret P. Smith Challenges and Opportunities in Music Teacher Evaluation	Page 12

Call for Proposals

Please consider submitting a proposal focused on Assessment, Measurement, and/or Evaluation

2016 Music Research and Teacher Education National Conference

March 17-19, 2016

Westin Peachtree Plaza, Atlanta, GA

Submission deadline: October 1, 2015

The biennial NAFME Music Research and Teacher Education National Conference provides a forum for music education researchers, music teacher educators, program leaders, music administrators, curriculum specialists, K-12 teachers, and graduate students in music education to encounter new, original, and high-quality research and pedagogical innovations that advance music education, thus shaping the future of the discipline and profession.

The Assessment Special Interest Research Group invites applicants to submit proposals focused on Assessment, Measurement, and/or Evaluation to the three branches of the conference.

- Society for Research in Music Education (SRME) will consider proposals related to a broad range of music education research.
- Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE) will consider proposals of research and practices pertaining to music teacher education.
- Council of Music Program Leaders (CMPL) will consider proposals that are administrator/leadership-oriented.

Multiple submissions of the same proposal will not be permitted. All approaches to scholarship are welcome.

Submission Process

Authors are asked to submit a proposal of up to 500 words and an abstract of no more than 50 words by completing the online application form available through the NAFME website. The proposal should contain no clues as to author identity or institutional affiliation. The submission deadline is October 1, 2015, 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time. Extensions will not be granted. The web portal will be available by June 15, 2015.

All proposals must be submitted for review through the NAFME online submission process. Applicants will:

- (1) Designate one NAFME society or council for adjudication:
 - Society for Research in Music Education (SRME)
 - Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE)
 - Council of Music Program Leaders (CMPL)
- (2) Designate a format (see Formats and Guidelines above)
- (3) Select and supply keywords that best represent the topic area of the research.

Submitters whose presentations are accepted will confirm their acceptance by preregistering for the conference. Notification of acceptance will be sent to the primary author by December 4, 2015. Specific information about presentations, posters, and other requirements will be communicated to authors following acceptance.

For questions or assistance, please contact: Adriane Darvishian, NAFME, 800-336-3768 FREE, ext 218 or via e-mail to adrianed@nafme.org.

Assessment SRIG Future Vision

Jeffrey Ward, DMA
Chair-Elect, Assessment SRIG

This past April the Assessment SRIG distributed a survey with the goal of creating a future vision based on the needs and interests of the membership. 33 members participated in the survey, sharing their current research interests. The work of our colleagues is very exciting and a few of them were asked to share summaries and abstracts of their work for this newsletter, which you will find beginning on page 9.

30 respondents also expressed an interest in participating in inter-university research projects. In order to facilitate this collaboration, we are establishing research subgroups by areas. These research subgroups will be led by the SRIG members listed below, who will create virtual meeting opportunities and face-to-face meetings at the upcoming SMTE Conference at UNC-Greensboro in September and at the NAFME Conference in Atlanta in March. The research subgroups are:

Teacher Licensure and Evaluation: Doug Orzolek (dcorzolek@stthomas.edu)

Model Cornerstone Assessments: Phillip Payne (ppayne@ksu.edu)

Higher Education Music Admissions: Jeff Marlatt (jmarlatt@su.edu)

Program and Institutional Assessment: Jeffrey Ward (wardj@ecu.edu)

If you are interested in collaborative research in one of these areas, please send an email expressing your interest to the area facilitator. I think this is an exciting time for our SRIG and I hope that you will engage with your colleagues!

National Pilot for the Model Cornerstone Assessments associated with the New National Standards for Music Education

Dr. Frederick Burrack and Dr. Kelly Parkes

Background behind the Model Cornerstone Assessments

In June of 2014, the new National Standards were published. The structure of the new standards was developed by the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards and based on artistic processes inherent to all of the arts: Creating; Presenting/Performing; Responding; and Connecting. This approach embraces the former national standards through artistic processes engaged by students.

The standards were developed *by the profession for the profession*, written by a team of professional music educators and vetted through a two-year inclusive public review process. The primary difference seen in the new standards is that they emphasize conceptual understanding integrated in the process of creating music, performing music, and responding to music with knowledge and skills as a means to a greater end, instead of the end in and of itself. By reflecting the processes in which musicians engage, students will be enabled to understand music as it relates to their personal experience. Each of the three *artistic processes* are divided into a sequence of *process component* with multiple performance standards¹.

- **Presenting/Performing:** select, analyze, interpret, rehearse, evaluate, refine, present;
- **Creating:** imagine, plan, make, evaluate, refine, present
- **Responding:** select, analyze, interpret, evaluate

When the *process components* are viewed individually, it appears to be a list of 17 with a longer list of independent performance standards. On the contrary, each sequence reflects a step taken by musicians in a particular artistic process. It is these three *artistic processes* through which we guide our students to engage. The exciting aspect of these new standards is that one or more of these artistic processes can be applied into any music classroom or performance setting, and are applicable at every developmental level. If embraced by music teachers, they will provide a framework that closely match the goals unique of specialized classes as well as traditional music courses. For this reason, the *performance standards* are presented in a grade-by-grade sequence from pre-K through grade 8, and discrete strands of musical experience associated with middle and high school music classes, such as Traditional Ensembles, Emerging Ensembles, Harmonizing Instruments, Music Composition/Theory, and Technology.

The inclusion of Research Advisors (RAs) from the Assessment Special Interest Research Group on the sub-committees of the NCCAS Music Standards Writing Teams was initiated to inform the development of the standards and lead the development of learning assessments for standards-based music classrooms. Sub-committee participation in turn gave the RAs a deep knowledge of the Understanding by Design (UbD) Framework and background aims of the NCCAS. The RAs were selected from higher education institutions, researchers and teacher educators with specialized knowledge in assessment practices. Their work focuses on creating Model Cornerstone Assessments that reach across grade bands and course strands aligned (K-2, 3-5, 6-8, traditional ensembles,

¹ Enduring Understandings and Essential Questions. In *National Association for Music Education*. Retrieved August 6, 2014, from www.nafme.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Core-Music-Standards-EUs-EQs-Definitions.pdf

emerging ensembles, harmonizing instruments, theory/composition, and technology).

Documentation of student learning is an expectation of 21st century education and in many states, a requirement for teacher evaluation. In education, what is assessed signals what is valued.

Model Cornerstone Assessments are curriculum-embedded and intended to engage students in applying their knowledge and skills in an authentic and relevant context. They are meant to focus upon what we want our students to be able to do with the knowledge and skills they have learned and honor the intent of the Music Performance Standards.

Cornerstone assessments serve as more than just a means of gathering assessment evidence. They embody valuable learning goals and worthy accomplishments of students becoming increasingly sophisticated across the grades. These assessments also provide a basis for collecting benchmarked student work that illustrates the nature and quality of student achievement envisioned in the standards.

To begin development of assessment tasks that reflect the process components and performance standards, a review of work already published were reviewed. This review included, but was not limited to assessments from the [CT Common Arts Assessment Initiative](#), the [Washington State Performance Assessments](#) and the assessments reviewed by the [Colorado Content Collaborative](#). Although it was recognized that the assessments illustrated in these examples had not necessarily been tested for validity, reliability, or implemented across a variety of classrooms and contexts, they assisted in articulating assessment strategies useful for the Model Cornerstone Assessments. Content specifications were reviewed to determine if any tasks and/or rubrics matched and could be appropriate for measuring student learning for the New Music standards.

Each RA, in collaboration with the writing sub-committees, developed the Model Cornerstone Assessments for each artistic process by adapting assessments from published sources and creating new additional assessment measures to cover the remaining process components. Structures and instructional characteristics of the Model Cornerstones were designed to integrate into current practice. The hierarchical and vertical nature of the standards across the K-12 continuum provided a strong framework for the Model Cornerstone Assessments already consistent across the school music instructional sequence in the United States school systems. Once assessments and protocols were designed and vetted, IRB was approved through a central IRB office. The signed approval was provided for individual institute, of which they were able to accept for each RA.

The Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the initial pilot was to identify the utility of the assessments. The Research Advisors obtained evidence of validity, the degree to which the assessments reflect student learning and achievement authentically (as understood by teachers), and the extent that the assessments might adapt into various teaching contexts.

Teachers involved in the pilot received instructional assistance, professional development, and training in scoring student work in order to improve score comparability across administration conditions, performance tasks, and student populations.

The Pilot

The pilot is intended for public school teachers to identify usefulness of the assessments and provide

suggestions that can enhance their applicability and effectiveness. The National Association for Music Education put forward a call to all members and researchers who would like to be involved in piloting the new standards and the Model Cornerstone Assessments in K-12 settings². This open survey was sent via email to the NAFME membership and to state MEA members through each state's leadership. This survey allowed all that followed the link to view the Model Cornerstone Assessments and collected contact information of those that completed and submitted the survey. It also asked how many years they have been teaching, the NAFME region in which their school is located, the size and socio-economic status of their school district, which grade levels and cornerstone assessment they would like to pilot, if they have had any prior experience in administering externally designed assessments, and hesitations they may have in participating in the pilot. A second survey was completed as a commitment for the pilot with foundational questions pertaining to opportunity to learn, teacher perceptions, instructional goals, and teacher confidence to administer the assessments. These were used to select the three-hundred participants that were equally representative from NAFME regions, school size, socio-economic status, and Opportunity to Learn settings.

The Fall 2014 pilot was focused on identifying issues associated with instructional planning, instructional experiences, and resulting student achievement associated with the Performing MCA in grades 2, 5, 8, and ensembles; clarity and ease of administration of pilot protocol; ways that the MCA was adapted to fit context; and suggestions for improvements to be implemented in the Spring. During the Fall, further solicitation for participation continued until there were multiple (or at least one) pilot sites from each state; representations from population differences, SES demographics, ethnic populations, variations of Opportunity to Learn, and other emergent categories; and equal MCA administrations.

Each pilot site teacher agreed to administer the MCA as requested in the protocol with designated sections allowing options for documented adaptations to context. In addition to completing the pre, during, and post survey questions, the requested materials included: (a) individual student scores for each process component assessment, (b) examples of student work for each achievement level of each process component, and (c) accompanying teacher scoring of student work. Student scores (rubrics evaluating musical performances, assignments from in class work, test scores) were submitted to the researchers for aggregate data analyses. Each teacher provided anonymous examples of student work in the following achievement levels: Emerging; Approaching standard; Meeting standard; and Exceeding standard.

The Spring 2015 pilot continued with the addition of the MCAs for 2nd Grade Creating; 5th grade Creating and Responding; 8th Grade Creating; and Theory/Composition at the proficient level. When collected, each teacher scored two sets of student work from another unidentified school. All collected examples of student work were scored by the RAs to provide consistency. One set of student work was scored by the SEADAE benchmarking committee after the Spring semester. Following the scoring, the selected student work was used for benchmarking purposes and as illustrative examples. As student achievement scores are amassed and examples of student work collected, analysis is currently seeking evidence of the extent to which the MCAs were capable of being reliably administered, if they authentically reflect student learning and achievement, and the extent that they can reasonably be integrated into current music teaching.

Pilot teacher response data was collected through two pre-pilot surveys and one post-pilot

² Interest Survey. In *Model Cornerstone Assessment Pilot*. Retrieved August 6, 2014, from https://kstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6ofT98LqKfDQnid

survey using Qualtric survey tool. Student work samples, excel spreadsheets of student scores, and teacher perceptions during the pilot were collected. The teacher questions focused on instructional intent, observed student response, curricular impact, and adaptations made to the MCAs to fit curriculum. The post-pilot survey identifies changes in teacher perception, conceptions of transferability and educational impact, and suggestions for improvements. As a result of each semester's pilot, feedback from the participating teachers provides guidance for enhancements made to the MCA, rubrics, and/or protocols as appropriate for action research. Revised MCA's will be administered Fall, 2015 and Spring, 2016 to affirm if the MCAs are acceptable and applicable for the needs of schools prior to a national dissemination.

During Summer 2016, all pilot data may be analyzed to identify the reliability of the assessments, along with the cognitive domains associated with each process component of the MCAs and interactions across Artistic Processes using Item Response Theory (IRT). Qualitative and quantitative analyses are planned. Teachers will score their own students' work, and blind-score work from their own students as well as those taught by other teachers. Statistical analyses are planned to establish intra- and inter-judge reliabilities. Content validity will be addressed comprehensively both within grade bands and across grade bands for all process component constructs. Context validity (Skinner, 2012) will be examined to identify factors that might influence a teacher's ability to administer the assessment and provide some evidence of external validity across a variety of settings, students, teachers, and contexts. The pilot will also provide evidence of consequential validity and the impact of the assessments on the participants' instructional time and responsibilities for producing performances and programs.

We hope the findings will illustrate how measurement can best be accomplished in the artistic processes (perform, create, and respond). In education, what is chosen for assessment signals what is valued. In other words, the evidence that is collected tells students what is most important for them to learn. If it is not assessed, it will likely be regarded as unimportant. Examples of student achievement will be provided to illustrate the type of evidence that can show attainment of desired learning. Jay McTighe (2011) described the characteristics of cornerstone assessment: "They are curriculum embedded (as opposed to externally imposed; they recur over the grades becoming increasingly sophisticated over time, they assess understanding and transfer via genuine performance, and are evaluated with established rubrics. They are intended to engage students in applying knowledge and skills in authentic and relevant contexts."

Additional piloting schools are needed for the full pilot in Fall 2015. The advantage for teachers to participate is the opportunity to experience the new standards and the Model Cornerstone Assessments prior to public dissemination. Please encourage your colleagues teaching elementary and secondary students to participate in piloting one of the MCA in the fall. They can request to participate in this piloting process by going to: https://kstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_9S0S2RlSn0udN1b

Model Cornerstones can be seen at:

<http://www.nafme.org/my-classroom/standards/mcas-information-on-taking-part-in-the-field-testing/>

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Chair Elect – Assessment SRIG 2015-2017

We are seeking nominations from Assessment SRIG members for the Assessment SRIG Chair-Elect through February 1, 2016. Please email Frederick Burrack (Current SRIG Chair at fburrack@ksu.edu) to nominate a colleague or self-nominate. Nominees are to provide a 250 word statement of their interest in the SRIG leadership, a current biographical summary of 150 words, and a photo for the ballot. We will vote online in mid February – early March 2016 and disseminate the results at the 2016 Music Research and Teacher Education National Conference Assessment SRIG meeting.

Duties

- Assist in organization and planning of SRIG activities.
- Prepare initiatives for the SRIG for upcoming Chair responsibilities.
- Accept the position as Chair for 2017-2019

Email Nominations to:

Frederick Burrack
Assessment SRIG Chair
fburrack@ksu.edu

Featured Research

EdTPA Validity for Program Evaluation

Keitha Lucas Hamann, University of Minnesota

EdTPA, a teacher performance assessment, was designed by a team from the Stanford Center of Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) “to answer the essential question: Is a new teacher ready for the job?” (<http://edtpa.aacte.org/faq#51>). Used in 34 states for various purposes, in Minnesota the edTPA is one of several assessments required for teacher education program evaluation.

SCALE has established moderate validity for the edTPA as an evaluation of general teaching skills through examinations of content and construct validity, job analysis, and bias and sensitivity review (SCALE, 2013). Reliability averaged .92 for adjacent agreement ratings and .83 for Cohen’s kappa. Taken together, the validity and reliability evidence of the edTPA support its use as one of multiple measures of general teaching effectiveness, but is it a valid measure for determining music teacher education program effectiveness?

First, the edTPA must be a valid assessment of music teaching readiness. Three indicators include alignment of the edTPA with state teaching standards, connection of the knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) required in music teaching practice, and connection to exemplary models of music education. The language of Minnesota Arts Standards, such as “Artistic Processes” (create, perform, respond) and “Artistic Foundations” (knowledge, skills, and contextual understanding), are strongly reflected in the edTPA tasks and rubrics. Of concern is that the KSAs in the edTPA often differ from the observed practices of cooperating teachers. However, the KSAs do align with more comprehensive and democratic models of music teaching such as those advocated by Allsup (2007), Miksza (2013), or Sindberg (2009).

Second, the edTPA must support the development of teacher candidates and identify programmatic strengths and weaknesses. Initial anecdotal observations within our program indicate that using the edTPA has furthered the music teaching readiness of our students. For example, music teacher candidates move more quickly from focusing on their own practice to attending to the student learning, use more varied assessment strategies to define what they are listening for or observing in the classroom, and are more aware of the various levels of musicianship and ability within a class; thus, they are better able to adapt instruction to meet immediate student needs. As well, edTPA rubrics were helpful in identifying programmatic weaknesses in academic language development, differentiation of instruction, and assessment (especially challenges between group and individual assessment strategies), which are similar to the findings in the Performing Arts Field Test (SCALE, 2013).

Concerns. The edTPA is a time-consuming task that can interfere with full preparation and immersion in the student teaching experience. Careful planning such as the Six-Week plan implemented at the University of Minnesota can expedite movement through the edTPA requirements so that students can spend the remaining weeks in a placement completely immersed in the experience. Second, requiring students to pay hundreds of dollars to complete an assessment used for program evaluation raises ethical and practical concerns beyond the scope of this essay.

The edTPA is moderately valid for program evaluation as required in Minnesota. However, examination of edTPA validity for other purposes is urgently needed.

References

- Allsup, R. E. (2007). Democracy and one hundred years of music education. *Music Educators Journal*, 93(5), 52-56.
- MDOE. (2009). *Minnesota Academic Standards: Arts K-12*. Roseville, MN: Minnesota Department of Education.
- Miksza, P. (2013). The future of music education: Continuing dialogue about curricular reform. *Music Educators Journal*, 99(4), 45-50.
- SCALE. (2013). *2013 edTPA Field Test: Summary Report*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity.
- Sindberg, L. K. (2009). Intentions and perceptions: In search of alignment. *Music Educators Journal*, 95(4), 18-22.

Teacher Attitudes toward National Core Arts Standards

Jessica Ingrassellino

The new National Core Arts Standards for all arts disciplines were launched in 2014. The standards were written by teams representative of several states, and collaborative meetings and spaces were set up for discussion and sharing (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards). Despite this, music teachers seeing these standards for the first time have casually expressed confusion at the omission of upper level general music standards, as well as frustration that the standards specified seem both vague and unattainable in today's educational climate (National Core Arts Standards).

To better understand the impact that these standards are likely to have on the classroom environment, an online survey will be conducted of music educators from every state, asking them about their attitudes toward the standards. Using Likert-type and short response questions, specific areas investigated will include the level of appropriateness of the standards for grade level, the clarity and usefulness of the standards for the teacher, and the adequacy of areas of music curriculum coverage.

Survey results will be analyzed and shared with the music education community in order to make further recommendations about how music teachers can and should be supported in addressing, adapting, and using the new National Core Arts Standards in their curriculum, given the challenges many already face using classroom assessment (Russell & Austin, 2010).

References

- National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. Retrieved from <http://nccas.wikispaces.com/Meeting+Archives>
- National Core Arts Standards. Retrieved from <http://nationalartsstandards.org/>
- Russell, J. & Austin, J. (2010) Assessment Practices of Secondary Music Teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*. 58(1), 37-54

An International and Developmental Comparison of Assessment Practices in the United States and England

Daniel Johnson, UNC-Wilmington, USA

Martin Fautley, Birmingham City University, UK

In this assessment practice study, we approach the issue from both international and developmental perspectives. Although England and the United States share a number of commonalities, there is also room for significant differences in understanding and operationalizing assessment issues in the general music classes between the two countries. In England, where a statutory National Curriculum places composing, performing, and listening at the heart of music education, statutory level of attainment statements dictate music assessment. In the American context, issues for the general music teacher include state-level expectations as well as national standards.

We are conducting this exploratory study to compare the assessment practices of general music teachers in the United States and England by age/grade level (elementary vs. secondary school). More specifically, we are examining ways teachers articulate their own assessment practices in combination with differences in nationality and students' developmental level. Our qualitative methodology includes open-ended responses to a researcher-designed, open-ended survey and in-depth, semi-structured interviews with select participants to explore their written responses more fully. We are using a modified grounded theory approach to analyze the open-ended survey responses and interview transcripts in order to identify and understand emergent themes (Grove, 1988; Jansen, 2010). First, we analyzed the data using a downward coding process or differentiation, identifying the diversity within the data. Then we used upward coding or synthesis, looking for patterns and themes contained in the data (Jansen; Patton, 2002). For triangulation, we conducted member checks to provide internal validity for these findings (Creswell, 2008).

Three themes have emerged regarding assessment strategies: teachers observing students, teachers asking questions, and the level of student participation. Participant responses tend to be clustered at either the macro- or micro-level, including emergent themes of poetic, big picture goals as well as specific musical concepts and detailed fundamentals. We also identified several trends demonstrating how practice and assessment are misaligned in both the English and American general music classrooms. Implications for the profession include how an emphasis on performance displaces higher-order thinking and in-depth understanding of musical concepts. The findings of dissimilarity between the jurisdictions are not unsurprisingly compounded by significant differences in terminologies employed, and plasticity of meanings of certain key terms. Things taken for granted in an American context prove to be highly problematic in an English one, and vice versa. This has significant implications for future researchers undertaking this sort of study, and it is important to note that in this case one of the co-researchers came from each jurisdiction, therefore we/they could operate simultaneously as insiders and outsiders, thus distributing the locationality of the study.

Among the first of its kind, this study highlights the need to develop and extend this line of research. Implications for music education include learning lessons about the commonalities and differences of assessment practices from international perspectives. Recommendations for further research include investigating assessment practices in terms of learning and doing goals (i.e.

cognitive and psychomotor learning outcomes) to develop a more complete understanding of American and British music educators' teaching practices.

References

- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd Edition), Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Grove, R. (1988). An analysis of the constant comparative method. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 1(3), 273 - 279. doi:10.1080/0951839900030105a
- Jansen, H. (2010). The logic of qualitative survey research and its position in the field of social research methods. *Forum Qualitative Social Research: Socialforschung*, 11(2), Art. 11. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitativeresearch.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1450/2946>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Challenges and Opportunities in Music Teacher Evaluation

Bret P. Smith, Central Washington University

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness remains a central issue for the music education profession, as it is an element of teacher candidate selection, training, licensure, recruitment and hiring, and continued employment. Practitioners in each era of American public education have identified and utilized criteria for predicting or documenting teacher effectiveness, with the number of different elements reaching the thousands. Current approaches warranting attention include the edTPA (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 2015), being used for initial licensure in some form in 38 states; the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model (Marzano, Toth, & Schooling, 2012); the framework of Danielson (1996), and the recommendations of the Measures of Effective Teaching project (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2013). NAFME (2013) has also developed materials and recommendations for teacher evaluation in the music class.

Advocates and critics of various approaches confront a fundamental question of validity: How well do any of these measures correlate with one's definition of effectiveness, in present or future? Of particular concern to music educators are mandates of "value-added" measures as elements of teacher evaluation. Statements from RAND, the Economic Policy Institute, Educational Testing Service, National Academy of Science, and the National Academy of Education express the belief that value-added measures are currently not robust or accurate enough to substantially warrant inclusion in high-stakes decisions (Baker et. al, 2010). This warning has not prevented states from including student growth measures in their licensure requirements (Hull, 2013; Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2013).

Several research directions could be fruitful within music education. The predictive validity of the Performing Arts edTPA should be examined when a large enough data set is available--such studies have been promised by the developers (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity, 2015). Current Model Cornerstone Assessments are under development by the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards, which may provide a foundation for student-growth measures within the music classroom that address the artistic processes of creating, performing, responding, and connecting (State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education, 2014). Auguste, Kihn, and

Miller (2010) suggested that a "talent gap" in American public education warrants efforts to recruit and retain top college students in teaching careers. Continued attention to identifying predictors of pre-service and in-service teaching success among music majors seems important. Gordon (2011) provided an overview of a number of teacher evaluation options, including the often-neglected element of student voice, which could be investigated within the context of music teaching and learning. One theme emerging from some of the contemporary literature is the importance of an attitude toward professional growth, rather than identification of *ineffective* teachers in a simplistic manner (American Institutes for Research, 2012; Marzano, Toth, & Schooling, 2012). An evaluation system, over time, can be viewed as a possible contributor to a pattern of increasing effectiveness across a teaching career. Research studies in these areas will likely benefit from institutional or organizational support for large-scale work over a period of time.

References

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (2015). *edTPA*. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org>
- American Institutes for Research (2012). *Final cross-case analysis of teacher and principal summative ratings: Prepared for the Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction*. Retrieved from http://tpep-wa.org/wp-content/uploads/TPEP_Crosscase_Analysis_Summative_Ratings.pdf
- Auguste, B., Kihn, P., & Miller, M. (2010). *Closing the talent gap: Attracting and retaining top graduates to careers in teaching: An international and market research-based perspective*. New York: McKinsey & Co. Retrieved from http://mckinseysociety.com/downloads/reports/Education/Closing_the_talent_gap.pdf
- Baker, E. L., Barton, P. E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H. F., Linn, R. L., Ravitch, D., Rothstein, R., Shavelson, R. J., & Shepard, L. A. (2010). *Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers*. EPI Briefing Paper #278. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.epi.org/files/page/-/pdf/bp278.pdf>
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2013). *Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET Project's three-year study*. Retrieved from http://metproject.org/downloads/MET_Ensuring_Fair_and_Reliable_Measures_Practitioner_Brief.pdf
- Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gordon, G. L. (2011). *Improving student performance through teacher evaluation: The Gallup approach*. Washington, DC: Gallup Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/strategicconsulting/150233/improving-student-performance-teacher-evaluation-gallup-approach.aspx>
- Hull, J. (2013). *Trends in teacher evaluation: How states are measuring teacher performance*. Retrieved from <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/teacherevalreview>
- Marzano, R., Toth, M., & Schooling, P. (2012). *Examining the role of teacher evaluation in student achievement: Contemporary research base for the Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model*.

- Blairsville, PA: Learning Sciences International. Retrieved from <http://www.marzanocenter.com/files/MC-White-Paper-20120605.pdf>
- National Association for Music Education (2013). *Workbook for building and evaluating effective music education in the school ensemble*. Reston, VA: National Association for Music Education (NAfME).
- Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (2013). *Washington teacher/principal evaluation project*. Retrieved from <http://tpep-wa.org/about-tpep/legislation/essb-5895/>
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (2015). *SCALE response to inquiries about predictive validity and edTPA*. Retrieved from <https://scale.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/edTPA%20Predictive%20Validity%20response%202015.pdf>
- State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education (2014). *National core arts standards: Model cornerstone assessments*. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalartsstandards.org/mca/music>

Reminder

2015 Symposium on Music Teacher Education

Toward a Stronger, Richer Community
September 17 – 19, 2015
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

*For comments, suggestions, or future submissions to this newsletter, please contact the
Chair or Chair Elect of the SRME Assessment SRIG*

FREDERICK BURRACK, CHAIR

JEFFREY WARD, CHAIR ELECT

Professor of Music Education
Chair of Graduate Studies
Director of Assessment
226 Anderson Hall, Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66506
Ph: 785 537 4483 Email: fburrack@ksu.edu

Associate Professor
Associate Director, School of Music
Associate Dean for Assessment
College of Fine Arts and Communications
East Carolina University
Ph: 252-328-4281 Email: wardj@ecu.edu