

2020

Teaching for Musical Understanding Through the Core Music Standards: Creating, Performing, and Responding in the Elementary Music Classroom

Amanda Lynn Ijames

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/etd>



Part of the [Elementary Education Commons](#), and the [Music Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ijames, Amanda Lynn, "Teaching for Musical Understanding Through the Core Music Standards: Creating, Performing, and Responding in the Elementary Music Classroom" (2020). *Murray State Theses and Dissertations*. 170.

<https://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/etd/170>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Murray State's Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Murray State Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Murray State's Digital Commons. For more information, please contact msu.digitalcommons@murraystate.edu.

Teaching for Musical Understanding Through the Core Music Standards: Creating, Performing,
and Responding in the Elementary Music Classroom

By

Amanda Lynn Ijames

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The College of Education and Human Services

Department of Educational Studies, Leadership, and Counseling

at Murray State University

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

P-20 & Community Leadership

Specialization: pK-12

Under the supervision of Assistant Professor Landon Clark, Ed.D.

Murray, KY

August 2020

Acknowledgements

There are many individuals that I would like to thank for their continued support throughout the course of the doctoral program. First, I would like to thank my husband, Matt, for his continued support and patience. From the very first moment I considered applying for the program, to the end of the dissertation, he has always believed in me. Another source of support has been my daughter, Harper, as she brings light and joy into every aspect of my life. I hope that I am setting the example that she can do anything she puts her mind to, which is what my parents have always instilled in me. Their encouraging words and their enduring belief in me have helped me stay focused on and achieve my goals.

I have been very lucky to have the support of many other family members and friends that have listened and encouraged me along this journey, and I am very grateful for each one of you. I would like to thank Mr. McKeel for his continued support of me throughout this program and for being a mentor to me of what an administrator and P-20 professional should be. Thank you to my school leader and team members, Mr. Mallory, Ms. Hooper, Mrs. Ellegood, Mrs. Hicks, and Mrs. Waller for all of their patience and support.

I would also like to say thank you to Dr. Teresa Clark for her thoughtful and encouraging comments in my writings throughout the program as well as her perspectives that made me think in a new way, I have grown so much because of your teaching. Thank you to Dr. Landon Clark, chair of my dissertation committee, for his constant support throughout the dissertation process and for his willingness to watch Harper do her homework before dance class. Thank you to Dr. Mardis Dunham for your time and encouragement through the dissertation stage. Lastly, thank you to Dr. Todd Hill, I am so grateful to you for being part of my committee and providing another musical perspective on my research and also for encouraging me to continue performing.

Abstract

This study investigates the implementation, assessment, and instructional needs of elementary music educators of the First District of the Kentucky Music Educators Association in teaching for musical understanding through the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding of the Core Music Standards. The overarching goals of music education are to teach students to become musically literate and independent makers of music. The researcher conducted an online survey and interviews of members to determine their current instructional and assessment practices and their challenges so that an action plan could be created to assist elementary music educators. Through this study, the researcher determined that the members of the First District are diverse in their educational backgrounds and classroom situations, but the main needs of these educators were professional development specific to the core music standards and collaboration opportunities. Additionally, the research revealed the positive influence of the Orff-Schulwerk method on implementing the artistic processes in the elementary classroom. Professional development or certification in this method could provide elementary music educators pedagogy training and the opportunity to network with fellow elementary music educators so that they could build a strong network and support system in their efforts to obtain their goals of music education through teaching for understanding.

Keywords: Core Music Standards, artistic processes, Orff-Schulwerk

Table of Contents

Title Page	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Context.....	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Conceptual Framework.....	5
Research Questions.....	7
Significance of the Study.....	8
Definitions.....	8
Summary.....	10
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	12
History of Music Education.....	12
Teaching for Understanding	19
Teaching for Musical Understanding.....	29
Core Music Standards.....	34
Musical methods.....	44
The Role of Assessments.....	46
Implementation Challenges	55
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	62
Research Design.....	62

Purpose of the Study	62
Research Questions	63
Description of Population	64
Description of Instruments.....	67
Variables of the Study.....	70
Procedures for Data Analysis.....	71
Chapter 4: Research Findings	73
Purpose.....	73
Research Question	73
Study Participants	74
Survey Findings	80
Implementation	80
Assessment.....	84
Implementation challenges	86
Interview Participants	87
Interview Findings	89
Implementation	89
Assessment.....	100
Implementation challenges	109
Analysis.....	118
Diversity.....	119
Orff-Schulwerk method	121
Summary	122

Chapter 5: Discussions and Conclusions	124
Summary	124
Conclusions.....	124
Implementation	124
Assessment.....	129
Implementation challenges	131
Relationship of Conclusions to Other Research	135
Implementation	135
Assessment.....	138
Implementation challenges	139
Discussions	141
P-20 Implications	144
Limitations of the Study.....	145
Recommendations for Future Research.....	146
Summary	146
References.....	147
List of Tables	160
Appendix A.....	161
Appendix B.....	164
Appendix C.....	165
Appendix D.....	167
Appendix E	171

Appendix F.....181

Chapter 1: Introduction

Context

The goal of music education is to engage students in musical experiences that will guide them to becoming independent musicians (Boardman, 1989; Pautz, 1989). Through musical experiences in creating, performing, and responding, students become musically literate, not just capable of reading and notating music, but capable of expressing their personal thoughts and ideas through music (Shuler, Norgaard, & Blakeslee, 2014). Additionally, musically literate students are more adept at understanding the musical decisions of others, and how those decisions are expressions of the composer's thoughts and feelings (Shuler et al., 2014).

Developing students' musical independence and literacy is the foremost responsibility of music educators (Boardman, 1989). The weight of this responsibility is heaviest on elementary music teachers, as they might be the only music educators a student ever encounters in their educational career, and the experiences in the elementary music classroom could spark a passion of music that can last a lifetime (Pautz, 1989). To accomplish the goals of creating musically literate and independent musicians, music educators must create experiences in music where students reach beyond learning about music to learning to think and act like musicians, through experiences based on creating, performing, and responding to music (Barrett, 1989).

The three artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding to music are the pillars of the Core Music Standards (CMS) which were introduced in 2014 (Zaffini, 2018). Previous standards, dating back to 1921, were based on expected competencies of what students should know or be able to do in music (Educational Council, 1921). The main educational focus prior to the CMS was on building the musical knowledge and skills of students rather than developing musical understanding and independence (Music Educators National Conference

[MENC], 1994). The adoption of the CMS in 2014 reversed the theoretical underpinning of all the previous standards by focusing on the artistic processes (Zaffini, 2018).

Music education standards changed throughout the years, but the focus on technical skills and performances remained the central outcomes desired from music education programs. With the focus on product instead of process, music educators began to realize that even though the standards were changing, students were not advancing in their musical understanding and it was time for change (MENC, 1994). The CMS, adopted in 2014, reflected the need for an emphasis on the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding as the foundations of music education (Nierman, 2016).

Developing, implementing, and assessing a music curriculum based on creating, performing, and responding to music can be a challenging task (Nierman, 2016). While each version of the music standards from 1921 to 2014 outlined the goals for music education, none provided a prescribed curriculum, method, or selected assessments to guide teacher instruction (MENC, 1994). The lack of these components has made teaching music education difficult. Teachers must determine curriculum materials, appropriate methods for instruction, and suitable means for assessing student understanding (MENC, 1994).

Prior to adoption of the CMS standards, music educators' goals were based on the success of local performances, meaning that if the students performed well, then they understood (Nierman, 2016). This philosophy retains the teacher at the center of the educational process as the students need to be led and told what to do and how to do it. Decisions regarding the selection, rehearsal, performance, and evaluation were all left to the teacher. Conversely, when students understand the musical processes, they become central to their own education and develop skills of metacognition, understanding what they know and areas they need more

assistance. Additionally, students increase their ability to transfer knowledge from one situation to another which build their musical independence (Wiggins, 2015).

Carl Orff, founder of the Orff-Schulwerk method for music education, stated, “Tell me, I forget. Show me, I remember. Involve me, I understand” (Long, 2013). Effective music education needs to be student-centered and student-led. What Carl Orff meant was that students will forget what teachers tell them but will remember experiences they have had, but when students are involved in the processes, they will understand. Through experiences in the processes, students can develop learner agency, a belief that they can affect their own learning (Bandura, 2006). When students develop learner agency, they are capable of exploring, interacting, and constructing their own understandings (Wiggins, 2015).

The statements made by Carl Orff indicate the foundational elements of one pedagogical approach to teaching music that can assist educators in teaching the artistic processes of the CMS. The Orff-Schulwerk method for music education focuses on creative musical experiences through performance and movement (Goodkin, 2001). This process-oriented approach to teaching elementary music education offers its own curriculum, the *Orff-Schulwerk: Music for Children*, first published in 1950 (American Orff-Schulwerk Association, 2019). To assist music educators in learning and implementing the Orff-Schulwerk method, there are certification courses available through higher education institutions and local Orff-Schulwerk chapters with professionals who present clinics and workshops in the approach and a national organization, the American Orff-Schulwerk Association, that provides materials and conference sessions, all of which can be great resources to music educators (Mead, 1996).

Other methods that music teachers could utilize to assist them in implementing a process-oriented approach are the Kodály and Dalcroze methods. The Kodály method incorporates a

spiral curriculum where concepts are revisited throughout the educational process at deeper and deeper levels of understanding (Bowyer, 2015). Kodály believed that students should be musically literate and incorporated the use of movable “do,” or tonic, to increase the aural perception of students before the visual representation (Bowyer, 2015), a shared philosophy of the Orff-Schulwerk and Dalcroze methods (Mead, 1996). The Dalcroze method emphasizes creative, expressive movement and improvisation, like the Kodály and Orff-Schulwerk methods. There are organizations and courses music educators can take to obtain specialized trainings in the Kodály and Dalcroze methods along with certifications, similarly to the Orff-Schulwerk method (Mead, 1996).

Along with decisions based on instructional pedagogy, music educators must determine what curriculum resources and methods of assessment to implement to show student understanding of the musical processes as outlined in the CMS (Nierman, 2016). These problems along with issues related to lack of instructional time, professional development to assist in understanding the CMS, tools for creating authentic assessments, and pressures for impressive musical performances, music educators might choose to not implement the CMS and remain focused on teaching for musical knowledge and technical skill (Kasser, 2014).

Purpose of the Study

This study is designed to research the understanding, implementation, and assessment of the artistic processes of create, perform, and respond as outlined in the CMS by elementary music educators teaching within the First District of the Kentucky Music Educators Association (KMEA) (Kentucky Music Educators Association, 2019a). There are thirteen counties within the First District with roughly 40 elementary music educators (T. Terry, personal communication, July 26, 2019). The First District members are the furthest, geographically,

from the KMEA professional development conference, held each year in Louisville, Kentucky. This three-day conference includes presenters on pedagogy, performance, and assessment from all over the country and performances from ensembles across the state as well as an expansive vendor exhibit where educators can see, discuss, and try new instruments, method books, and tools that could assist them in teaching for understanding.

Due to the fact that most professional development opportunities offered by KMEA are presented in Louisville which is part of the Twelfth District, over 200 miles away from some members in the First District, the researcher sought to determine the current level of understanding of the CMS by music educators in the First District, how they are currently implementing and assessing the artistic processes in their classrooms, and the potential hindrances to teaching for musical understanding through the artistic processes. Through obtaining this information, plans can be created to support the music educators in the First District, across Kentucky, and throughout the region as music educators strive to teach their students to be musically literate and independent makers of music utilizing the artistic processes of create, perform, and respond.

Conceptual Framework

Music is a complex field built on thoughts, feelings, and perceptions (MENC, 2001). Teaching students about the many facets encompassed in music is a difficult task. With so many terms, definitions, and skills linked with musical behaviors, it is easy for music teachers to become focused on knowledge and skill acquisition instead of teaching for musical understanding. Additionally, without multiple pedagogies, music teachers can struggle with the best method for teaching based on the artistic processes (Wiggins, 2015).

Historically, one of the best methods for any content area or skill was the apprenticeship model. In this approach, a master models a skill and explains all aspects related to the skill while the apprentice observes. As the apprentice learns, they take over more and more of the duties with the scaffolded support of the master until they are able to complete the task on their own. This apprenticeship model has been adapted to the educational setting as cognitive apprenticeship (CA). Music educators can emulate aspects of apprenticeship by modeling musical behaviors and creating experiences where students can participate. Teachers can use these experiences to explain musical decisions and provide opportunities for students to show their understanding and take ownership of their learning through the musical processes gradually taking on more and more responsibility (Collins, Brown, & Holum, 1991).

Through these experiences and the support of the teacher, students develop their musical knowledge, understanding, ability to transfer their understanding from one situation to another, develop their metacognition, and become musically literate and independent. A cognitive apprenticeship model can allow music educators a plan for creating musical experiences, based on the artistic processes described in the CMS, that will lead to their ultimate goals of music education (Collins et al., 1991).

Teachers could have difficulty understanding and implementing the CMS as they are based on the artistic processes and not musical knowledge or abilities, especially for teachers focused on preparing for performances (Nierman, 2016) as the CMS do not detail the instruction of fundamental skills such as singing and playing instruments (Kasser, 2014). Additionally, educators might be unaware of the resources developed to support them in teaching and assessing the artistic processes.

Research Questions

This study focused on the application of the three artistic processes of create, perform, and respond of the CMS in elementary music classrooms of First District KMEA educators. To determine the understanding, implementation, assessment, and potential barriers music educators in this area experience in teaching for musical understanding utilizing the artistic processes, three research questions were developed. Additionally, secondary questions were created to assist in the categorization and discernment of the data collected. The research questions were:

Q1. How are the artistic processes of create, perform, and respond being implemented in elementary general music classrooms?

-What pedagogical music methods are utilized (Kodály, Orff-Schulwerk, Dalcroze)?

Q2. How do elementary general music educators assess student learning through the artistic processes?

-What formative and summative assessment models are being utilized?

-How are music educators currently implementing the Model Cornerstone Assessments provided by the National Association for Music Education, if they are aware of them?

Q3. What are the barriers faced by elementary general music educators in teaching for musical understanding?

-What kind of professional development opportunities are music educators participating in that have helped them either understand or implement the CMS?

-How much instructional time are music educators provided and what steps are taken to protect those educational minutes from disruptions or schedule changes?

-What affect do performances have regarding the time educators have to teaching for musical understanding versus preparing for performances?

Significance of the Study

Through this study, the researcher will determine the level of understanding of the CMS, the implementation of the three artistic processes, and the assessment strategies utilized by the elementary music teachers in KMEA's First District. The educational backgrounds, teaching histories, and specializations of the music educators in the First District can provide insight into the types of teaching methods and assessment models that are currently being utilized in the elementary classrooms. Hindrances that music educators face in teaching for musical understanding utilizing the CMS can be discovered so that a plan of action can be created to reduce the difficulties occurring in teaching music for understanding.

Educators that are accustomed to teaching for knowledge and skill might elect to ignore the CMS artistic process-based learning methods instead of teaching for understanding, encouraging student-led learning environments. Additionally, teachers that have been unable to attend professional development activities presented across Kentucky at KMEA conference clinics may not perceive themselves able to teach the artistic processes. Teachers might be unaware of the resources available to assist with planning, implementing, and assessing lessons based on the artistic processes and the support groups designed to help teachers through the transition to teaching for musical understanding.

Definitions

The following definitions are provided to maintain consistency in understanding the terms utilized throughout the study.

- *CA*: Cognitive Apprenticeship is a method for teaching utilizing the tools of modeling, scaffolding, fading, and coaching until students can complete their goals independently (Collins et al., 1991).

- *CM*: Comprehensive Musicianship is a theory of teaching music that is based on learning through whole works of literature instead of individual components of pieces (Music Educators National Conference: National Association for Music Education [MENC: NAfME], 1973).
- *CMS*: Core Music Standards, adopted in 2014, were designed based on the artist processes for music, visual art, theatre, dance, and media arts (Shuler et al., 2014).
- *KMEA*: Kentucky Music Educators Association is an organization that strives to support music educators and their students and is affiliated with the National Association for Music Education (KMEA, 2019b).
- *MCA*: Model Cornerstone Assessments were created to guide music educators in the creation of authentic assessments in the artistic processes detailed in the CMS (Parkes, 2018).
- *MENC*: Music Educators National Conference was the name of the national music educators association from 1934 (Mark & Gary, 1992) to 1998, when it became MENC: The National Association for Music Education (National Association for Music Education [NAfME], 2019a).
- *MMCP*: Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project sought to teach for musical understanding through discovery-based learning experiences (Moon & Humphreys, 2010).
- *NAEP*: National Assessment of Educational Progress for Music was a combination of written and performance-based assessments designed to share the benefits of music education with the public (Philip, 2001).

- *NAfME*: National Association for Music Education is the current name of the professional organization that has supported music educators through publication, professional development, and the creation of music standards since its origination in 1907 (NAfME, 2019b).
- *NCCAS*: National Coalition for Core Arts Standards is a partnership of multiple national arts and educational arts organizations, founded in 2011, to support the creation of national arts standards (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards, n.d.).
- *NSAE*: National Standards for Arts Education were the first national standards for music education, created in 1994, that outlined what students should know and be able to do in the arts (MENC, 1994).
- *OTL*: Opportunity to Learn standards began in 1994 as an accompaniment to the NSAE that outlined the requirements for either basic or quality music programs (MENC, 1994). There are also OTL standards associated with the CMS (NAfME, 2015).
- *UbD*: Understanding by Design is a framework for designing an educational curriculum in a backward approach that begins with the stated outcomes or goals, followed by the assessments that will show students have achieved their goals, and finally the activities the students will engage in (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

Summary

Teaching for musical understanding through the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding can be a challenge for music educators accustomed to teaching knowledge and skill acquisition. The difficulty in transitioning from the previous standards and the lack of understanding the CMS have caused some music educators to decide to not implement the CMS (Zaffini, 2018). Through the cognitive apprenticeship model and a focus on

the processes, music educators can develop procedures for planning, implementing, and assessing student growth (Collins et al., 1991). As students take on more and more responsibility for their learning, students become musically literate, develop their metacognition and ability to transfer understanding to new situations, and become musically independent; achieving the overarching goals of music education (Suchanova, 2011).

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Music has been an integral part of public schools in America since 1837 (MENC, 1994). Throughout history, the challenge has been to create a balanced, sequential, and comprehensive music curriculum. For years the goal of music education was to foster a love or life-long enjoyment of music (Pautz, 1989). These aesthetic goals, a history of skill and knowledge-based standards and teaching practices, and a lack of support and funding from school systems, has held back music education from reaching its highest potential (Boardman, 1989; Mark, 2002, Piersol, 2000).

History of Music Education

The role of music in the United States educational system has changed over the past two centuries. Before the 1830's, many schools in the United States offered music instruction as a supplement to core education courses (Mark & Gary, 1992). Through petitions from the citizens of Boston, Massachusetts and the Boston Academy of Music, the Boston School Committee approved the appointment of a vocal music educator, Lowell Mason, for the public schools of Boston in 1838 (Zinar, 1983). Through this decision, music was first incorporated into the public-school curriculum and supported with funds, the same as other subjects such as English or mathematics. These decisions then led to the appointment of Lowell Mason as the superintendent of music for the Boston schools. The incorporation of music as a curriculum subject began to spread across the United States, but usually remained only within grammar schools (Mark & Gary, 1992).

While enjoyment of music was cited by early supporters as the value of music in education, the primary goal of the educators during this time was teaching students how to read music. The role of the elementary teachers was to teach the musical elements. Homeroom

teachers became responsible for these tasks as music specialists played a supervisory role. The music specialists would rotate through the schools to assess the students' progress, improve their singing quality, and provide new learning materials for the general education teachers (Mark & Gary, 1992).

In an effort to fulfill the need for a music curriculum, Lowell Mason created a graded music series, *The Song Garden*, to supply teachers with materials to help children achieve their goal of learning to read music (Colwell & Heller, 2003). The series was based on rote music education, teaching the concept before teaching the symbol. For years, music education in the public schools was knowledge-based, repetitious drill of musical skills. In the late 1800's, Colonel Francis W. Parker stressed educating the whole child and drill-based music education began to be replaced with experiences in music designed to motivate children to develop musical skills and enjoyment in music that would span a lifetime (Mark & Gary, 1992). Colonel Parker believed that to enjoy music, students must create it, that students must sing and play to construct their understanding and appreciation (Cooke, 2005). This educational ideal was later supported by progressive movement philosopher and educational reformer, John Dewey.

In his book, *Moral Principles in Education*, John Dewey (1909) wrote, "Who can reckon up the loss of moral power that arises from the constant impression that nothing is worth doing in itself, but only as a preparation for something else" (p. 25-26). With the support of such a powerful educational figure such as Dewey, music educators emphasized more musical experiences in their curriculum (Mark & Gary, 1992). This change was difficult as music supervisors were expected to be both musicians and teachers, and furthermore, generally had no training from the normal schools that trained educators of that time (Mark & Gary, 1992).

Professional organizations. In 1907, the Music Supervisors National Conference (MSNC) was founded as an organization for supporting music education in the United States (National Association for Music Education [NAfME], 2019b). In 1934, the organization changed its name to the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) (Mark & Gary, 1992), again in 1998, when it became MENC: The National Association for Music Education, and finally, in 2011, as the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) (NAfME, 2019a).

At the St. Joseph, Missouri meeting of MSNC in 1921, the members of the education council reported recommendations for the improvement of music education in public schools. The goal of this meeting was to align the music curricula with that of the core subjects taught in schools, including reading, writing, and mathematics, to show how integral music education is to all children, not the select few. This set of expected competencies for students in music was known as the Standards Course in Music. Each standard statement outlines what the students should be able to do by the end of their sixth-grade year with more specific goals for individual grade levels leading up to their sixth-grade year. Each year's goals build upon the foundation of previous years' studies. Some of the goals of the Standard Course in Music were to provide enjoyment in music through listening and expression; to build children's singing voices for pleasure and expression; to develop the aural skills of students in pitch and rhythm; the continued development of singing and correction of students that are off the tonal center; and to develop sight-reading skills. Additionally, set aims, materials, procedures, and attainments were listed for individual grades from first through eighth grades. These sections of the Standards Course in Music provided the educators with a list of materials necessary for instruction, methods for teaching such as singing by rote and teaching musical syllables for the younger grades and increases in the older grades to include ear-training exercises, two-part singing, and

sight-singing. The attainments section included statements of what the students should be able to do such as sing pleasingly a repertory of 30-40 rote songs, sight-sing, sing individually, recognize standard musical compositions aurally, and sing in multiple parts (Education Council, 1921).

In 1940, at the Los Angeles, California meeting of MENC a pamphlet known as the *Outline of a Program for Music Education* was adopted that detailed singing, rhythmic, listening, playing, and creating as the five basic musical activities. This document assisted music educators in creating consistency in music education programs across the nation. Additionally, it increased the minimum recommended daily music instructional time from the 1921 Standards (Mark & Gary, 1992). In 1921, the minimum daily instructional time for music was 15 minutes for primary grades and 20 for intermediate grades (Education Council, 1921). In 1940, the times increased to 20 minutes for kindergarten through third grade and 25 to 30 minutes for fourth through sixth grades (Mark & Gary, 1992).

With the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1953, and the launching of Sputnik by the Russians in 1957, an era of school reform began. During this time, the federal government began taking an active role in the school curriculum by implementing policy measures to increase the emphasis on teaching skills in reading, writing, and mathematics, which posed a threat to music education. The Yale Seminar on Music Education in 1963 was designed to propose improvements to music education, but the analysis of music education was performed by musicologist, composers, and performers instead of music educators. MENC decided they must take an active role to prepare the music education profession to succeed in the current times of change, and in the future (NAfME, 2000).

MENC's response to the Yale Seminar on Music Education was the Tanglewood Symposium of 1967, held in Tanglewood, Massachusetts (NAfME, 2000). This symposium convened a diverse group of music educators, philosophers, educators, scientists, philanthropists, musicians, and representatives of government (Mark & Gary, 1992). Through this symposium, the Tanglewood Declaration was developed, which called for music education be a core subject in the school curriculum. Additionally, the declaration stated that the integrity of music should be retained, that music education should include all styles, forms, and cultures, and that adequate time must be provided for music instruction (Mark & Gary, 1992).

After the Tanglewood Declaration was made, MENC needed to develop a plan to implement their vision. This was done through the Goals and Objectives (GO) Project of 1969 (Mark & Gary, 1992). The two overarching missions of the GO Project were for MENC to create and offer programs and activities that would build and enlighten the public about music and for the music education profession to implement comprehensive musicianship programs for all students, in all schools, at all ages, while supporting quality preparation of teachers to utilize the most effective and influential techniques and resources (NAfME, 2000). Through the GO Project, thirty-five specific objectives were outlined with eight objectives selected for immediate attention. Objective two stated that teachers should develop curriculums that correlates the activities of performing, creating, and listening to music to the goal of enhancing the development of diverse musical behaviors in students. Objective five stated that standards should be developed to ensure that music education is taught by individuals that are well trained in music education. These objectives, along with the others outlined in the GO Project, created avenues for music education to obtain the goals outlined in the Tanglewood Symposium (Mark & Gary, 1992).

The School Music Program: Description and Standards. The goals of the GO Project were met through conference sessions, MENC publications, committee meetings, and the creation of the National Commission on Instruction, which published *The School Music Program: Description and Standards* in 1974. This document was developed to serve as a resource for school administrators, preservice and current music educators, parents, and other community members about quality music programs. The goals of this book were to provide a description of what a quality school music program should be, so that program offerings could be evaluated and to provide a set of standards for curriculum, staff, scheduling, facilities, and equipment for a school music program to assist a school in determining potential changes needed. This document was not a curriculum guide, but instead a tool for evaluating current school music programs as either achieving basic or quality program status in an effort to plan future improvement of the school music program (MENC, 1974).

In the document, a quality music program was described as having standards for performing, organizing, and describing music at every level based on the elements of music and from a diverse body of literature to promote the understanding of the musical concepts. These understandings are developed through a range of experiences with the elements of music. Other factors influencing a successful school music program are the need for daily music instruction with adequate time, space, resources, equipment, with limitations on the sizes of music classes, and the need for instruction by a music specialist (MENC, 1974). MENC revised these standards in 1986 (Mark & Gary, 1992). Through this document, school systems throughout the country made efforts to reach at least the basic level described in the report (Mark & Gary, 1992).

National Standards for Arts Education. In January 1994, the National Committee for Standards in the Arts presented the United States' first national voluntary standards for K-12 arts

education (MENC, 1994). The arts standards were published as the *National Standards for Arts Education* (NSAE). These standards were developed from a consensus of stakeholders and organizations representing teachers, parents, artists, government officials, businesses, and professional organizations about what students should know and be able to do in the arts fields as a result of their K-12 arts instruction. The creation of the standards for music, dance, theatre, and visual arts were supported by the United States Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities (MENC, 1994).

In March of 1994, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act passed which was the first time that the arts were established as disciplines which every young American should be able to demonstrate competency (Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994). MENC published *The School Music Program: A New Vision* to create a clear vision of what music education is, to provide a framework for creating a comprehensive and sequential music curriculum, and to create an avenue for improving the music curriculum. The NSAE included nine content standards for music at three different levels; kindergarten through fourth grade, fifth through eighth grade, and ninth through twelfth grade. Within each content standard there were several achievement standards that detail levels of attainment for the standard, or detail how students will demonstrate a level of attainment (MENC, 1994).

National Core Arts Standards. In June 2014, NAFME and the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (NCCAS) published the National Core Arts Standards (NCAS) for music, dance, theatre, visual arts, and media arts (Ihas, 2015). These standards can be utilized as a framework for creating individual state standards for music education (Nierman, 2016). The NCAS were created after responses from teachers and state departments across the country,

asking for more detailed standards, especially what students should be learning at each grade level (Zaffini, 2018).

Throughout history, the goal of music education has evolved from students gaining pleasure from experiences to becoming musically literate, independent musicians (Zaffini, 2018). According to NAFME's Strategic Plan (2017), their mission is "to advance music education by promoting the understanding and making of music by all" (p. 1). Separate from all the previous standards that focused on skills and knowledge, the NCAS emphasize conceptual understanding (Ihas, 2015).

Teaching for Understanding

Understanding learning, from a scientific approach, includes learning processes, learning environments, teaching strategies, cultural perspective, and other factors that can contribute to learning (Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning [CDSL], 2000). In the education field, many curriculums have placed an emphasis on memorization of facts instead of understanding (CDSL, 2000). The goal of education must be to transition students from obtaining factual knowledge to usable knowledge that can be transferred, which deepens their understanding of a subject matter (CDSL, 2000).

Learning processes. Piaget (1973) stated, "To understand is to discover, or reconstruct by rediscovery, and such conditions must be complied with if in the future individuals are to be formed who are capable of production and creativity and not simply repetition" (p. 20). Piaget believed that learning is constructed understanding and those understandings are constructed through experiences (Wiggins, 2015). Experiences alter brain structures, and through specific experiences, specific effects occur in the brain, therefore, the brain is shaped by experiences (CDSL, 2000). As life is experienced through the five senses, individuals construct an

understanding of their experiences (Wiggins, 2015). Zull (2002), explained that a learner links a new experience to previous experiences through reflection and analysis before acting on their new understanding of the experience.

Piaget believed that these constructed understandings make up a network of interconnected webs called schema (Wiggins, 2015). Piaget determined that children's cognitive development occurred in stages, each involving different schemas (CDSL, 2000). Following the lines of schema theory, metaphor theory states that we understand experiences in terms of what we already know (Wiggins, 2015). Both theories are based on the concept that understanding is constructed through experiences. This idea has become almost universally agreed upon as the way people learn in the 21st Century (CDSL, 2000; Krahenbuhl, 2016; Shively, 2015; Wiggins, 2015). What is most vital is the ability to encourage and enable students to construct their own understanding (Wiggins, 2015).

Educators must be aware that that while understanding is constructed through experiences, no two people have the same exact set experiences (Hallen & Papageogi, 2016). Teachers must set the context for the experiences to prevent misunderstandings, knowing that when new experiences are closely linked to previous experiences, concepts are easier for learners to understand (Wiggins, 2015). One method a teacher can utilize to check for misunderstandings is through the use of focused questions (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Through student feedback, teachers can discover assumptions, problems, and missing components that can lead to misunderstandings (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

Differences in experiences and backgrounds can also lead to misunderstandings. Minimal differences in cultural experience or knowledge can affect student learning (CDSL, 2000). Students with no prior experience with a concept may disengage from the lesson, become

disruptive, or completely misunderstand a concept (Wiggins, 2015). Teachers who do not share similar experiences with their students can have difficulty assisting students in making cultural or community connections to their learning, but parents can help fill in the gap since they typically share more experiences with their children (CDSL, 2000). Additionally, if the learning environment is structured for students to support each other, then other students can model concepts and serve as a support for fellow learners, since peers often have a stronger base of shared experiences (Wiggins, 2015).

Children are naturally intuitive, imaginative, and diverse, utilizing multiple strategies for acquiring knowledge (Alvarez, 1989). Music and the other arts are natural tools for expression of children, especially in the first seven years of life. Piaget identifies the preoperational stage of development as occurring from ages three to seven. Children in the preoperational stage are egocentric, only understanding concepts in relation to themselves and their prior experiences. Alvarez (1989) stresses the importance of developmentally appropriate learning experiences, especially during early childhood, as solely cognitive experiences can cause students to try and handle information that they are not yet emotionally or physically capable of handling, even if intellectually they are capable. Instead, providing appropriate affective, cognitive, and psychomotor experiences can lead to children's intellectual and emotional stability. Early childhood experiences serve as the building blocks for future development and involvement in learning or experiences, such as music (Alvarez, 1989).

Bruner discovered that learning is an active process for children, where they construct new knowledge based on what they already know (Ihas, 2015). Bruner believed that even the most complex topics could be understood by young children if structured and taught appropriately (Bruner, 1960). His spiral curriculum entailed a process of revisiting concepts

multiple times throughout a child's educational career, each time adding complexity to the topic, allowing the students to create connections between the new and previously learned content (Bruner, 1960). Bruner also hypothesized that learning occurred in three stages; enactive, manipulating objects; iconic, manipulating images of the original objects; and symbolic, manipulating representations of the original objects through the use of culturally-accepted labels (Wiggins, 2015).

Vygotsky's view of childhood development was based around a social constructivist view, stating that all learning takes place in a social context, with people at the heart of the learning process. Prior to Vygotsky, many theorists had not considered the role of others in the learning process. In this view, everything that is learned, is learned first at the inter-psychological level and then later at the intra-psychological level, meaning that learners first construct knowledge through interacting with another person and then move to learning at an independent level (Wiggins, 2015; Raw, 2014). Vygotsky also described that children's learning takes place in the child's zone of proximal development (CDSL, 2000). This is the area where the learner is not quite ready to work independently but, with proper guidance and support, work toward a solution to the problem (Vygotsky, 1978). With the support of teachers, learners can achieve greater levels of proficiency than they could have on their own (Wiggins, 2015; Wass & Golding, 2014). According to Macy (2016), it is the responsibility of educators to bridge learning theories and educational practices within complex learning environments to support the understanding and needs of their students.

Learning environments. The learning environment is vital to the learning process. In traditional educational settings, a teacher calls upon a student to answer a question as a way for the student to practice or show their knowledge. This is generally information that the teacher

already knows. Many curriculums support knowledge building as they attempt to cover a multitude of content-area topics briefly, instead of in-depth coverage of fewer topics, which would allow students to develop understanding of the key concepts within the field. Experts arrange their knowledge around big ideas in the field (CDSL, 2000).

Learner-centered environments have teachers who understand that learners must construct their own meanings, based on beliefs, previous understandings, and cultural histories they bring into the classroom. Teachers in learner-centered classrooms pay close attention between the subject matter and the learner as they construct their understandings. Children in solely learner-centered environments can lack the basic knowledge and skills required to function effectively in society. There must be a balance between knowledge-centered and learner-centered teaching strategies to promote understanding and develop the skills required to become a functional member of society (CDSL, 2000).

Learning environments must be supportive of students in their own zones of proximal development, since this is the place where effective teaching occurs. Students must feel safe inside their learning environment to be able to take risks as they stretch beyond their comfort level with a concept. Students reaching beyond their zone of proximal development require the support of the teacher. If learners do not feel safe taking risks in a learning environment, then students may choose not to participate in learning experiences, which hinders their capacity to learn. Through working with an expert in a safe learning environment, learners can take risks, develop understanding, become experts, and, eventually, transition to independent learners (Wiggins, 2015).

Role of the teacher. Teachers are responsible for creating a learning environment that fosters student learning and self-discovery (Wiggins, 2015; Anagün, 2018). Research has shown

that learning is enhanced when teachers have an awareness of the knowledge and beliefs that learners bring into a classroom, use this knowledge to develop instruction, and then closely monitor students' changing conceptions throughout the learning process (CDSL, 2000).

Children have prior knowledge of many experiences but may require prompting to be able to apply what they know in a new situation (CDSL, 2000).

Teachers must also be careful to recognize incomplete or misunderstandings of concepts that students may bring into the learning environment (CDSL, 2000). Expertise in a field does not guarantee an effective teacher, in fact, experts can forget what is difficult and what is easy, which can make learning troublesome for children (CDSL, 2000). Being an effective music teacher requires an in-depth understanding of both music and the processes of learning. As teachers, all actions we take should be based on our understandings of how students learn (Wiggins, 2015).

According to Bruner's theory, teachers should ask more questions, instead of providing answers. Teachers must take on many roles in the classroom to facilitate the learning process: coach, guide, mentor, model, advocate, cheerleader, resource, and sometimes, even referee. As teachers develop learning experiences, they must be aware of the power they hold in their position. Teachers can unknowingly take away student independence by creating learning experiences that are too simplistic in nature, or in which the teacher makes all the decisions (Wiggins, 2015). Students must be active participants in their learning experiences which encourages them to construct their own understandings and develop independence (Suchanova, 2011).

Learner agency. Researchers have found that children can learn almost anything through effort and will (CDSL, 2000; Aparicio, Bacao, & Oliveira, 2017; Weisskirch, 2018).

This motivation to learn is one component to Bandura's social learning theory that emphasizes the importance of the social aspect on learning, specifically the use of modelling in the learning process (Maric et al., 2017). In this process, students learn through three steps, observing a model so that behaviors can be reproduced; identifying with the behavior so learning can be internalized; and reproduction of the behavior by utilizing the understanding developed through observation and identification with motivation to continue the learning process through reinforcement (Horsburgh & Ippolito, 2018). In his research on the role of the learners play in the educational process, Bandura (2006) stated that learners must possess a sense of learner agency, a belief that they have the ability to interact and affect their own learning instead of being mere passive participants. Through this agency, learners can have a sense of control over their education. If students are unsure of what they should be doing, then they cannot have a sense of responsibility in the educational process. To obtain learner agency, learners must understand the goals of the learning experiences and how those experiences link to prior understandings. Additionally, the learners must have time and space to explore, interact, and construct their own understandings without the teacher taking control of all aspects of the learning experience (Wiggins, 2015).

Teachers must be cognizant of their power in designing and executing lessons. When teachers make all the decisions, or limit opportunities for students to make decisions, teacher power can hinder education (Wiggins, 2015). Bruner (1960) stated:

...at each stage of development the child has a characteristic way of viewing the world and explaining it to himself. The task of teaching a subject to a child at any particular age is one of representing the structure of that subject in terms of the child's way of viewing things. (p. 33)

One way to accomplish this goal is using scaffolding, where the novice and the teacher work side by side (Wiggins, 2015; Collins et al, 1991). In the scaffolding process, learners take responsibility for performing tasks that they are capable of completing and the teachers provide support by fill in any missing information the students might need. Teachers and learners should work together on new learning experiences from a foundation of shared understandings, including prior knowledge, ideas about the problem to be solved, and possible solutions, processes to solve the problem, and ways of knowing they have achieved their goals. Through this shared understanding, teachers can provide more effective scaffolding during the learning process by stepping in when students need support or stepping back when learners become more independent. Additionally, the process of scaffolding can assist learners in developing their metacognition (Wiggins, 2015).

Metacognition. Metacognition is a self-awareness of what a learner understands and their perception of ways they learn best (Gonullu & Artar, 2014). Through metacognition, students also develop an understanding of what they do not understand (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Pogonowski (1989) stated that the three types of knowledge that are important for metacognition are declarative, procedural, and conditional. Declarative knowledge relates to facts while procedural knowledge is gained when students develop the ability of knowing how to do something. Procedural knowledge comes from experiences and interactions with concepts. Teachers must be explicit in helping students in developing the ability to know what they need and to identify paths to get help in attaining their goals. Lastly, conditional knowledge is what helps learners determine when an approach to a problem is working and when an alternative is needed. When teachers consider all three levels of metacognition in the activities they plan and the questions they ask, their teaching will reinforce students' metacognition (Pogonowski, 1989).

Additionally, teachers must guide students to recognize changes in their understanding through the learning experiences, this reflection is key to increasing their metacognitive skills (Tanner, 2012).

Transfer. Bruner (1960) stated that “Learning should not only take us somewhere; it should allow us later to go further more easily” (p. 17). The difficult undertaking for the educational system is to prepare students to become independent learners, to reach beyond what is taught in the classroom and be able to seek out and learn new concepts on their own (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Possessing the ability to transfer understandings from one situation or subject to another is key in achieving this goal (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

Educators should be aware that children use multiple strategies to solve a problem (CSDL, 2000). Researchers have found that the most effective transfer occurs when there is a balance between general principles and specific examples (CDSL, 2000). Bruner (1960) stated:

Learning initially not a skill but a general idea, which can then be used as a basis for recognizing subsequent problems as special cases of the idea originally mastered. This type of transfer is at the heart of the educational process—the continual broadening and deepening of knowledge in terms of basic and general ideas. (p. 17)

Covering too many topics in a short time can impede learning and, therefore, the ability to transfer (CSDL, 2000). Additionally, students learning only singular sets of facts that are not organized or connected to other knowledge or understandings prevents transfer (CSDL, 2000). Unconnected facts are often forgotten (Bruner, 1960). To facilitate transfer, teachers must provide students with in-depth experiences that enable students to organize knowledge and forge a network of connections (CSDL, 2000).

When students organize information into conceptual frameworks or schemas, the potential for greater transfer occurs (CDSL, 2000). These networks allow students to apply learning from new experiences to previous understandings and be able to relate concepts more quickly (CDSL, 2000). Bruner stated that the difficulty in fostering transfer is that understanding a concept in one way does not mean that students will be able to understand it in other ways (as cited in Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Teachers must assess the connections that students make during experiences and assist them in making new connections while addressing faulty misconceptions (CDSL, 2000). For successful transfer, students should be able to use their understandings creatively, malleably, and confidently (Dávila, 2015). Transfer should occur with limited support or guidance from the teacher (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

To encourage transfer in the classroom, teachers must be realistic about the amount of time it takes for students to develop understandings of complex concepts (CDSL, 2000). The first step for a teacher to encourage transfer is to connect new experiences with prior experiences through the use of schema (Boardman, 1989). Students will develop the ability to predict and understand how to act in the new situation based on the link between the new and previous understandings (Boardman, 1989). Some learning experiences are effective for memory but not for transfer while other experiences encourage both memory and transfer (CDSL, 2000).

Cognitive apprenticeship. Throughout history, teaching and learning occurred through apprenticeships. An apprenticeship is a method for learning a physical, concrete skill. The four main steps in an apprenticeship are modeling, scaffolding, fading, and coaching. First, the apprentice learns by observing the master model a task. Then the apprentice takes over small portions of the task with coaching from the master as they scaffold what support the apprentice requires for success which develops their learner agency. Finally, the support is faded as the

apprentice takes over more and more responsibility until they can complete a task independently (Collins et al., 1991).

During traditional apprenticeships, the task is clear and the processes the master uses are visible to the learner. In education, the thinking processes teachers use to solve problems are not always visible to the learner. A cognitive apprenticeship is a method of instruction that strives to make the thinking processes of the teacher visible to the learner. To achieve this goal, teachers must position abstract curriculum tasks into contexts that students can understand. Through general contexts, students can experience both concrete and abstract ideas where they can develop commonalities across the experiences. These connections promote students to transfer understanding from one experience to another. Additionally, students can develop metacognition, their ability to assess their own understanding, which will allow them to assess when certain skills are applicable and when they are not (Collins et al, 1991).

Through cognitive apprenticeship, students develop problem-solving abilities, transfer capabilities, and their metacognition, all of which lead to independence (Collins et al., 1991). Ultimately, teachers must decide which strategies to implement into their classroom that foster understanding within the domains of their content areas (Collins et al., 1991). Cognitive apprenticeship is a method which could promote musical understanding (Weidner, 2018).

Teaching for Musical Understanding

Knowledge is comprised of facts and concepts; skills are techniques, procedures, and methods; but understanding requires inquiry, development, and reflection. When students understand, they can explain, interpret, apply, develop metacognition, and synthesize their learning. The challenge for educators is to learn to move from knowledge attainment to developing students' understanding (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Wiggins (2015) asserted that

music was one of the least concrete concepts due to its complex and nonliteral nature. Due to the abstract nature of music, determining appropriate methods for developing musical understanding can be difficult (Wiggins, 2015). Bruner (1960) stated:

Limiting instruction to a steady diet of classroom recitation supported only by traditional and middling textbooks can make lively subjects dull for the student. The objectives of the curriculum and the balances means for attaining it should be the guide. (p. 88)

Comprehensive musicianship. Even though standards for music education date back to 1921 and curriculum to the 1930s, the focus for music educators during these times were on the development of basic skills and performances, resulting in little changes over the decades (MENC, 1994). Music educators, aware of the lack of growth in their field and striving for improvement, have implemented various methods for improving the connections between music and society (Mark & Gary, 1992). In 1965, the Comprehensive Musicianship Project sponsored a seminar that was designed to examine and develop methods for improving education programs for music educators (Stevens, 1966). The concept of Comprehensive Musicianship (CM) developed through these evaluations of how educators were being taught to teach music to their students (Stevens, 1966).

The concept of CM is based on the belief that teaching and learning music is more than the sum of its parts (MENC: NAfME, 1973). In CM, the focus of music education should be on the literature as a whole, instead of a singular focus in the areas of analysis, composition, or performance (MENC: NAfME, 1973). The four elements of music that were defined in CM were pitch, duration, intensity, and timbre (Norris, 2010). Through the CM approach, students receive a well-balanced music education curriculum, where students can synthesize concepts and

forge connections between the musical activities of analysis, composition, and performance, within the context of musical literature (MENC: NAfME, 1973).

During the same time as CM was developing, music educators were pushing to develop a discovery-learning based music curriculum for K-12 public schools as learning theories such as CM do not provide a specified curriculum for music education (Moon & Humphreys, 2010). The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project (MMCP), founded and directed by Ronald B. Thomas, included musicians, educators, and innovative institutions. The focus of the MMCP was to develop a sequence for creating musical understanding through a discovery-learning approach that utilized Bruner's spiral curriculum design. In the MMCP, students learn to think like musicians by acting like musicians. This approach focused on the elements of dynamics, timbre, form, rhythm, and pitch. Utilizing musical works, teachers would present a musical problem for students to explore. A curriculum for teachers was developed through the MMCP, the *MMCP Synthesis: A Structure for Music Education*, but this was not a method book with prescribed activities, rather, a flexible guide that teachers could use as a framework to develop lessons (Moon & Humphreys, 2010).

The MMCP did not focus on conceptual learning for the elementary aged students, as it was believed that it was not developmentally appropriate at this stage (Moon & Humphreys, 2010). Additionally, the MMCP did not provide strong standards-based criteria for assessing student progress, instead, the focus was on the students having opportunities to experiment with music (Moon & Humphreys, 2010). The foundational beliefs of the MMCP were that if music is an expressive and creative artform, then students should experiment with expressing themselves creatively through music (Mark & Gary, 1992). The MMCP did, however, focus on teacher education. Workshops and in-services were implemented to train music educators to teach

inquiry through composition, plan a curriculum, and understand the educational philosophies that undergird the MMCP. Some in-service programs would meet weekly for up to 20 weeks, but these meetings were voluntary (Moon & Humphreys, 2010).

The MMCP and CM both grew out of a call for educational progress in a progressive time in educational history (Moon & Humphreys, 2010). Both concepts were researched, advertised, and presented in music educator journals, but CM, a larger project, gained the support of MENC. Another potential reason for the lack of adoption of the MMCP by teachers and school districts is that music educators were not comfortable with teaching creativity through composition and the lack of standards-based criteria for assessment (Moon & Humphreys, 2010). With the support of MENC, the concepts of CM continued to affect music education (Norris, 2010).

Even through the advances made in MMCP and CM, the 1974 Standards remained focused on teaching concepts through the elements of music based on experiences in performing, organizing, and describing (MENC, 1974). The principles of CM were finally integrated into the 1994 NSAE music standards, which shifted focus from knowledge or understanding about the elements of music into a focus on musical behaviors, which were stated in terms of what the students should be able to do with music as a result of their educational experiences (Norris, 2010). The previous musical activities of composition, performance, and analysis were transformed into musical behaviors of singing, playing, improvising, creating, responding, and reading music (Norris, 2010).

The nine standards outlined in the music NSAE were based on knowledge and skills, stating the students should be able to sing, perform, read, improvise, compose, read and notate, listen and describe, evaluate, understand relationships with the other arts, and understand

relationships with culture and history (MENC, 1994). Like all standards dating back to 1921, the standards were based on the universal assumptions that students would have access to music education and adequate support for music educators would be provided. Additionally, the standards were not a prescribed curriculum, rather a framework to guide curricular decisions. Music educators were responsible for selecting appropriate repertoire and teaching materials, evaluating student progress, and determining the best methods for instruction to achieve the goals outlined in the NSAE (MENC, 1994).

The NSAE music standards incorporated the tenets of CM by stipulating curricular goals for music education (Norris, 2010). The first step for music instructors was to design and implement a curriculum that encouraged students to develop understanding of each musical element in a sequential method, similar to Bruner's spiral curriculum design. The next step in designing a music curriculum required educators to select and implement a cognitive approach through which students could develop an aural understanding of the musical elements and related vocabulary. Lastly, all experiences were to be connected to musical literature (Norris, 2010). The challenge music educators faced was to execute a curriculum as it was intended by the standards (MENC, 1994).

Norris (2010) stated that one of the biggest problems in curriculum and instruction is failure to contextualize the understanding of the musical elements the students are studying into authentic literature. Wiggins (2015) asserts that musical concepts, such as the elements of music, should be taught within the context of whole musical works since students understand parts in relation to a whole. This holistic approach to teaching music encourages students to make connections between the pieces and the whole, as well as developing an understanding for the processes of music. Holistic methods are designed to reflect real-life experiences in

problem-solving and critical thinking. To encourage musical understanding, students must be engaged in or with music through the context of real-life, problem-solving experiences, where they can work alone and with peers, seeking teacher support when needed. Through these experiences, students learn to take active roles in their education, develop independence, and expand their metacognition (Wiggins, 2015).

Music educators have always been dedicated to improving their methods and standards, sometimes with the support of legislation such as the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994, which identified the arts as a core subject (MENC, 1994). While the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 did not remove the arts as a core subject, legislatures and policy makers turned their focus to assessments and accountability in subjects such as mathematics, science, and English (Shuler et al., 2014). This change of concentration created a lack of attention in the arts, causing decreased funding, larger workloads, and limited instruction time for the arts (Sabol, 2010). To combat these issues, music educators attempted to promote their field through the positive outcomes associated with education in music such as increased achievement scores on standardized tests (Droscher, 2014). Additionally, NAFME and music educators desired to make the music standards more authentic and specific to demonstrate their alignment with the common core trend in society, which led to another revision of the music standards (Zaffini, 2018).

Core Music Standards. The NCCAS oversaw the creation of the 2014 NCAS for music, visual art, theatre, dance, and media arts (Shuler et al., 2014). The NCCAS included professional organizations from all art forms in the creation of these standards. The standards were developed to be adopted or adapted by state and local school districts. The CMS were developed through a transparent, research-based method with feedback from practicing educators at every level and in every specialty across the music education field. The NAFME standards

writing committees and subcommittees had more than 1,800 years of experience teaching pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade music and 540 years of experience in general music. A two-year review process was utilized along with focus groups to provide feedback from practicing teachers on areas for refinement. All this work was completed without federal government funding, aside from a small grant provided through the National Endowment for the Arts, which provided feedback on the CMS from some professional artists (Shuler et al., 2014).

The first goal in the development of the CMS was specificity, which was met through the outlining of grade level specific knowledge, skills, and standards (Zaffini, 2018). In previous standards, the goals were stated in terms of what students should know by the end of lower or upper primary, middle school, or high school instead of specific grade-level goals (Zaffini, 2018). According to McTighe and Wiggins, the NCCAS invited Jay and Daisy McTighe to consult in the inclusion of discovery-based, higher-order thinking skills into the CMS, based on the framework designed by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe in their book, *Understanding by Design* (as cited in Burrack & Parkes, 2018, p. xii). The CMS were designed based on the philosophies presented in the Understanding by Design (UbD) model (Nierman, 2016).

Understanding by design. The UbD philosophy is based on a backward design method for curriculum planning (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Through their research, Wiggins and McTighe (2005) discovered that teachers tend to focus on what they are teaching instead of the students should be learning, beginning curriculum planning with a focus on what activities they will teach and what materials they will use instead of what the students will learn, or their curricular goals. The backward design utilizes a three-step method where teachers identify desired outcomes or goals, determine suitable evidence of goal attainment, and lastly, develop learning experiences and instructional methods (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

In the first step of the UbD framework, teachers identify their desired results, including goals, enduring understandings, essential questions, and knowledge or skills students will acquire. In identifying these desired results, teachers must consider national, state, and local standards. Teaching to meet these standards can cause problems since teachers often feel that the standards are too specific or too vague. Through identifying the big ideas within the standards, teachers can more effectively design a curriculum (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

Enduring understandings are the key conceptual understandings within a subject that teachers desire for students to obtain and retain throughout their life (Nierman, 2016). Accompanying enduring understandings are essential questions, which assist students in discovering the enduring understandings (Shuler et al., 2014). The knowledge and skills section of the framework is designed for teachers to list facts, concepts, techniques, methods, and procedures the students will be exposed to throughout the curriculum (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). After stating the desired results, teachers work through the UbD framework to determine appropriate evidence of understanding before detailing the experiences and learning activities they will utilize to obtain their goals (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

Artistic processes. The second goal of the CMS is authenticity. To obtain this goal, the CMS focus on teaching students to become musically literate through the artistic processes that musicians use every day; create, perform, and respond (Zaffini, 2014). The focus on artistic processes is not a completely new addition to the CMS, MENC stated, in their publication, *The School Music Program: A New Vision*, which outlined the foundation for the NSAE, that creating, performing, and responding were fundamental music processes (MENC, 1994). Although, the emphasis in the CMS is on process rather than product as it has been for decades (Shuler et al., 2014). By focusing on the musical processes, music education advances beyond

knowledge and skill acquisition, to deeper understanding and musical mastery (Nierman, 2016). While the artistic processes were embedded in the NSAE, they were not clearly expressed as the foundations for music education, rather the standards focused more on activities, skills, and knowledge the students should obtain (Shuler et al., 2014).

The CMS reversed the theoretical underpinning of the previous standards to focus on the artistic processes as a supporting structure for the standards, then embedded the nine previous standards of the NSAE within the artistic process framework (Beegle, 2016). While the other art forms identify a fourth process, connecting, NAFME views this process as integrated into all three of the other artistic processes, as music educators naturally connect what is taught in music to other disciplines (Zaffini, 2018). Shown in Table 1 are the eleven anchor standards which support the three artistic processes. These standards are consistent across all arts disciplines, which are connected to the enduring understandings and essential questions linked to the overarching artistic process which are detailed in Appendix A (Payne & Ward, 2018). There are two or three anchor standards per artistic process, with each anchor standard having several performance standards per grade-level (Beegle, 2016). Each artistic process is broken down into several parts, which are termed process components, these are specific to the artistic process (Zaffini, 2018).

Table 1

Core Music Standards

Artistic Processes	Anchor Standards
Creating	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generate musical ideas for various purposes and contexts. 2. Select and develop musical ideas for defined purposes and contexts. 3. Evaluate and refine selected musical ideas to create musical work(s) that meet appropriate criteria.

Table 1. Core Music Standards (continued)

Performing	4. Select varied musical works to present based on interest, knowledge, technical skill, and context. 5. Develop and refine artistic techniques and work for presentation. 6. Convey meaning through the presentation of artistic work.
Responding	7. Perceive and analyze artistic work. 8. Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work. 9. Apply criteria to evaluate artistic work.
Connecting	10. Synthesize and relate knowledge and personal experiences to make art. 11. Relate artistic ideas and works with societal, cultural, and historical context to deepen understanding.

With the transition of the standards away from what students should know and be able to do in music, to what students should understand, the artistic processes help music educators focus on musical experiences that develop deeper understanding (Stewart, 2014). Wiggins (2015) states that it is not enough to talk about music with students, to encourage musical understanding, students must be involved in the processes directly. When students are engaged in the artistic processes, teachers are able to identify what students already know and what aspects of understanding concepts they are lacking or have misunderstood (Wiggins, 2015).

Teachers should design initial experiences with the artistic processes based on experiences the students have had previously. One method for constructing experiences based on concepts is through the teaching of the musical elements. In utilizing a holistic approach, music is comprised of elements such as rhythm, melody, form, timbre, dynamics, and tempo. Through experiences in the musical elements, students can construct deeper understanding of music as a whole by exploring how the individual elements interact with each other. Once learners construct musical understandings, they learn to act as musicians. This is accomplished through experiences in the artistic processes (Wiggins, 2015).

Through their participation in the artistic processes, students' understanding of musical concepts grows deeper and more connections are constructed (Wiggins, 2015). With each experience in creating, performing, and responding, students can construct new conceptual understandings that are built upon prior understandings. To develop richer understandings of musical concepts, all musical teaching should occur through the artistic processes and utilize whole, authentic musical works instead of implementing exercises to incorporate the processes (Wiggins, 2015; MENC: NAfME, 1973). Additionally, the incorporation of the artistic processes, can assist students in improving their metacognition if teachers design and implement musical experiences to encourage its development (Pogonowski, 1989).

Create. Wiggins (2015) states that music is a creative process, whether students are listening, performing, or creating original music through composition or improvisation. The artistic process of creating incorporates how musicians conceive, expand, and complete original musical ideas through improvisation or composition (Zaffini, 2018). The process components listed in the standards are imagine, plan and make, evaluate and refine, and present. Teachers should understand that through the creative process for composition, students may have to revisit a previous step in the process before moving on to the next step (Zaffini, 2018).

When designing a creative experience for students, teachers should connect the new experience to prior performing or listening experiences. One method for connecting musical experiences for students is through creating a point of entry for students. In this approach, educators select a musical element as a point of entry, select an artistic process to utilize, and then determine a means of evaluating student understanding (Wiggins, 2015).

Composition is when students engage in preplanned performance of original musical ideas (Brophy, 2001). Arranging is a type of composition where students change already

composed music by reorganizing or altering musical ideas to create a new musical piece. Learners must be able to understand the concepts behind the original piece of music to be able to arrange them in a new way (Wiggins, 2015). Composing and arranging skills are methods for students to show their musical understanding (Riley, 2016; Wiggins, 2015). When designing composition activities, teachers must ensure that the project is clearly outlined so that students understand what they need to do to be successful. The goal of composition in the CMS is not the final product, but that students understand the processes involved in creating a composition (Wiggins, 2015).

When composing or improvising, students make musical decisions about essentially all elements of music (Riley, 2016). All aspects of a musical work are interrelated and interconnected, all elements of music are linked to each other and the whole. As students engage in the artistic processes of composing or improvising, they develop musical understanding and that musical understanding allows perceptive participation and critical musical thinking in composing and improvising experiences (Wiggins, 2015).

Many aspects of composing and improvising overlap. Like composition, improvisation is a way for students to share their musical thinking, but in an unplanned way (Brophy, 2001). Students create their ideas during a performance, where, through experience, students increase their ability for musical thought and understanding (Wiggins, 2015). To encourage success in improvisation, music educators need to create a safe and encouraging classroom environment where students feel comfortable creating and presenting musical ideas (Hickey & Webster, 2001). Students' creativity can be hindered if they do not feel safe and supported (Wiggins, 2015).

To create an encouraging environment, teachers must support all improvisational efforts (Hickey & Webster, 2001). Students can learn through their peers, when teachers take the time to discuss the aspects of successful improvisations (Wiggins, 2015). There are many methods for creating improvisational experiences for students but working within a musical element such as a chord progression, can provide students adequate time to think and prepare (Wiggins, 2015; Coulson & Burke, 2013). When artists at the professional level improvise, they typically plan ahead, utilizing musical elements to structure their musical ideas (Shuler et al., 2014). Young students often have more trouble ending an improvisational thought than beginning, if the set parameters have not been too restrictive. Students are also successful at improvisation when considering the musical elements of mood and texture (Wiggins, 2015).

When learners discover that they are capable of creating music, they use music as an expressive outlet in their lives and view themselves as musicians (Wiggins, 2015). Unfortunately, students often lack opportunities to practice compositional and improvisational skills as many teachers do not feel they possess the necessary skills required to teach students in these creative areas (MENC, 1994; Hickey & Schmidt, 2019). Lack of experience and confidence are two of the main hindrances of creativity in music (Wiggins, 2015).

Perform. In performance, teachers typically make all the decisions from selection and analysis of the musical elements in the piece to rehearsal, evaluation, and refinement of music before the performance. The CMS call for students to be involved in all of these performance aspects. Through the responsibility of making performance decisions, students take on the authentic, real-life role of musician. The process components outlined in the standards under the perform process are select, analyze, interpret, rehearse, evaluate and refine, and present (Zaffini, 2018).

When students perform, it is possible that they can only pay attention to their individual part, ignoring how their part combines with the whole. Through performance critique, students develop an understanding of how individual parts relate to the whole. Students also learn from each other as individual students' perspectives and ideas are shared, creating an atmosphere where students can reach outside of their own perspective and develop new understandings. Additionally, students begin to monitor their own progress and the progress of group, increasing their metacognitive abilities (Pogonowski, 1989).

Respond. Responding to music requires more than simply listening to music, it requires a level of musical understanding. The process components incorporated in the respond process are select, analyze, interpret, and evaluate. Through these steps, students can develop the capacity to understand music and musical decisions made by composers and performers and develop the ability to make their own musical choices (Zaffini, 2018).

In the beginning, teachers should select listening examples that are short enough that the students can remain focused on the task while listening to the piece multiple times. Additionally, whole pieces should be utilized for listening experiences, whenever possible, as the composer intended the work to be heard. Excerpts of pieces can hinder students from hearing entire musical ideas and lead to misunderstandings about pieces of music. When excerpts are unavoidable, teachers should ensure that listening selections encompass the composer's full musical ideas (Wiggins, 2015).

Listening experiences for younger students should be potentially appealing, as such pieces usually have dramatic changes in tempo, dynamics, instrumentation, or other musical elements. Through listening to pieces multiple times and identifying changes in musical elements, students develop a deeper understanding of how musical pieces are composed and how

composers make musical decisions. Listening experiences should also contain many opportunities for students to listen to music from multiple styles, genres, and historical and cultural contexts (Wiggins, 2015).

Music educators often play a piece of music and ask students to listen for a specific element of music (Pogonowski, 1989). To develop musical understanding, teachers must implement teaching strategies where students can share their thoughts about the music instead of simply answering questions (Pogonowski, 1989). For young students, teachers should provide students the ability to respond to music through movement or graphical representation of what they heard (Wiggins, 2015). These experiences help students develop a means for starting conversations about the music they heard (Wiggins, 2015). For older students, developing responding skills can be accomplished using unfamiliar works of music, where the students can share their perceptions, and teachers can fill in the students' descriptions with musically accurate terms and definitions to encourage understanding of the student's intended thoughts (Pogonowski, 1989).

Teachers must be encouraging to all responses to listening activities (Pogonowski, 1989). When students know that their responses to music will be heard and valued by the teacher and class, students listen more carefully and broadly. Through students' responses and teacher guidance, students develop their metacognitive abilities and become more aware of their own perceptions about music (Pogonowski, 1989). Lastly, listening and responding activities are most effective in developing musical understanding when they are linked with creating and performing experiences (Wiggins, 2015).

The three artistic processes must be supported by a strong foundation in conceptual understanding. These understandings of the broad concepts and detailed components of music

allow students to understand that all musical experiences can be both processes and products, necessitating the need for authentic experiences in music (Wiggins, 2015). Ultimately, the implementation of the CMS and the three artistic processes is dependent on the teacher (Shuler et al., 2014). Music educators set the stage for students to develop musical understanding through their experiences in creating, performing, and responding (Shuler et al., 2014).

Musical methods. Teachers can utilize multiple methods for implementing musical experiences in creating, performing, and responding. Throughout the history of music education, Kodály, Orff-Schulwerk, and Dalcroze have been some of the strongest influences in developing methods for teaching fundamental musicianship skills to children (Bowyer, 2015). Music educators might have been taught some of these methods in their studies and some even have specialized training and certificate programs available for teachers (Mead, 1996).

Kodály. Zoltan Kodály believed that every child had the right to learn the basic elements of music (Bowyer, 2015). Through this foundational belief, Kodály developed and implemented a national music curriculum for the public schools in Hungary. Kodály emphasized musical literacy, the abilities to read, notate, and create music. Like Vygotsky, Kodály founded his method on the idea that musical experiences should correspond to the capabilities of the students at their point of development (Bowyer, 2015). Kodály stated, “To teach a child an instrument without first giving him preparatory training and without developing singing, reading and dictating to the highest level along with the playing is to build upon sand” (Holy Names University, n.d.).

The tenants of Kodály’s method are that a child’s musicality should be developed to the fullest extent; students should be musically literate; music from the student’s heritage, like folk songs, stories, and rhymes, should be integrated into their curriculum; and that authentic,

professional pieces of music should be analyzed, performed, and listened to so that musical appreciation that is based on understanding of music is developed. The Kodály method utilizes movable “do” solfege, rhythm syllables, hand signs, and movement as means to develop students’ audiation skills, hearing without the presence of sound. Musicianship is developed based on the theory that sound should precede symbols; that skills, concepts, and terminology should all be developed aurally before visually. The Kodály method emphasizes a spiral curriculum, where students develop deeper understanding through connection of new, more complex musical concepts to previously learned concepts (Bowyer, 2015).

Orff-Schulwerk. Another method of teaching the foundational aspects of music was designed by Carl Orff (Mark & Gary, 1992). Similar to Kodály, Orff focused his method on developing the musicality of students through active music experiences that begin with aural perception before visual representation (Goodkin, 2001). The Orff-Schulwerk approach emphasizes improvisation and creative experiences through performance and movement (Goodkin, 2001). As children experience through play, they are independent and control their own actions as they make decisions of how and why (Alvarez, 1989). Carl Orff stated, “Since the beginning of time, children have not liked to study. They would much rather play, and if you have their interests at heart, you will let them learn while they play” (Leone, 2002). Another benefit to this type of learner-centered approach is that it allows a teacher to pay close attention to the specific skills, beliefs, and feelings that a learner brings into an experience and their development through the experience (CDSL, 2000).

Dalcroze. Émile Jaques-Dalcroze, a Swiss composer and musician, was a gifted improviser who discovered children’s innate musical ability to move to music, the study of which, he called eurhythmics (Mead, 1996). Prior to this discovery, music education was

focused on teaching techniques instead of musicality (Mark & Gary, 1992). The Dalcroze method, like Kodály and Orff-Schulwerk, encouraged aural perception, creativity, and improvisation (Mead, 1996). The pillars of the Dalcroze approach are solfege, eurhythmics, and improvisation with all three being intertwined in the curriculum (Mead, 1996). Since classrooms and resources vary from school to school, music educators often combine aspects of multiple teaching methods into their curriculum (Mark & Gary, 1992).

The Role of Assessments

Assessment is a key component in determining if the overarching goal of music education, to develop independent musicians, has been achieved (Boardman, 1989). Assessment is the process used to inform educators and students regarding who has mastered skills or developed understandings, who still requires support, and which content areas students need to be retaught (Wiggins, 2015). For years, assessments were designed to test student knowledge by asking questions designed to determine if students had acquired facts pertaining to a content area (MENC, 1994). With the implementation of the NSAE in 1994, MENC stated that music educators must exceed the goal of knowledge attainment toward a goal of knowledge synthesis through the implementation of higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills (MENC, 1994). Additionally, the NSAE called for school districts to develop and implement reliable, valid, and suitable tools for assessing students learning of music (MENC, 1994).

With the implementation of the NSAE and the push for authentic assessments across the field of education, music educators felt the demands for accountability in meeting the Standards (MENC, 2001). Authentic assessments require demonstration of a skill or specific behavior outlined in the objective instead of a written representation through paper and pencil test (MENC, 1994). While generating a paper and pencil test covering musical terms is easier than

developing an authentic assessment based on music processes or behaviors, they are not authentic assessments that evaluate student understanding (Fiese & Fiese, 2001). Even though music is a performance-based content area, music educators should be careful that their assessments are not solely based on students' performances in playing and singing (Foley, 2001). Instead, music educators are tasked with assessing all aspects of the standards (Foley, 2001), which can be difficult with the complexity and subjective nature of music (MENC, 2001).

Throughout the implementation of the NSAE, teachers struggled to design and utilize assessments in the music education classroom (MENC, 2001). Major factors hindering the use of authentic assessments were lack of time, the number of students to assess (MENC, 2001), and teacher perception (Lopez, 2001). Music educators typically have limited instructional time with numerous students which means implementing assessments consumes valuable instructional time and scoring assessments for so many students can be a daunting task (MENC, 2001). Additionally, music educators are typically responsible for school performances throughout the year which deters educators from taking the time to complete assessments (Hamann, 2001). Lastly, music educators can become rigid in their methods of teaching and assessing, feeling that it is unnecessary to change what has worked in the past instead of adapting the perception that there is always room for improvement (Lopez, 2001).

Political forces are also key factors that shape instruction and assessment (Philip, 2001). Education is governed by political, social, and economic forces that make policy decisions that affect curriculum and instruction based on data from program assessments (Philip, 2001). The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Music Assessment was designed to correspond to the NSAE (Nierman, 2001). The nine musical standards were grouped into the three themes of creating, performing, and responding for the NAEP Music Assessment

(Nierman, 2001). The NAEP utilized a combination of performance-based assessments and more traditional formats including multiple-choice, true-false, and matching questions (Philip, 2001). Even through the implementation of the NSAE and the creation of the NAEP which has positive effects on the public's perception of arts education, few curriculum or instructional changes occurred in the music education field as a result of their implementation (Philip, 2001).

Assessing for understanding. The CMS transitioned music education away from what students should know and be able to do in music toward a focus on measurable and attainable musical learning experiences based on three artistic processes (Hayes, 2013). With students engaged in creating, performing, and responding on a daily basis, teachers and administrators can assess student growth in the process, not just the final product (Shuler et al., 2014). This change of focus from accentuating the process instead of the product is a result of the backward design utilized in the CMS (Burrack & Parkes, 2018).

In the UbD framework, educators begin by identifying their goals, based on national, state, or local standards (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). While teachers can get overwhelmed by the multitude of standards or their lack of clarity, it is important for educators to remain focused on the enduring understandings and essential questions within the content standards (Davila, 2017). Enduring understandings are the big ideas students should understand about a content area and the essential questions guide students' discovery about their understandings (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Through the enduring understandings and essential questions, teachers are able to set goals and determine appropriate assessments (Shuler et al., 2014). Teachers should determine assessment methods before considering the curriculum activities they will use to teach (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Through working backward, teachers are more cognizant that their

lessons, units, and courses are all designed based on the desired outcomes. (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

When considering assessment methods, teachers should begin by asking themselves ‘What should the students be able to understand when they leave the classroom?’, ‘What evidence can be used to determine their ability to understand?’, and then putting themselves in the role of the student, ask, ‘Why is this important?’ and ‘Who cares?’ (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). When teachers consider these questions, they help ensure that their teaching does not include a list of facts, ideas, and activities, instead, teachers design curriculum based on learning goals, big ideas, and essential questions that lead to understanding (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

In designing assessments utilizing the UbD framework, teachers should be aware that many teachers tend to focus on the accuracy of knowledge and participation rather than the students’ ability to transfer understanding. Authentic assessments are performance-based tasks where students can transfer understanding based on real problems instead of repetition of facts. Students that know which facts to use when, show understanding. This is the goal, for students to be able to transfer an understanding to new and unknown situations (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

The UbD model encourages the use of varied assessment tools since assessment should be an ongoing process of collecting evidence, instead of a one-time snapshot of student learning. Teachers can become stagnate in their use of the same few assessment types and these usually include paper and pencil processes. To assess for understanding, teachers should utilize more oral assessments, portfolios, concept webs, and constructed responses. Additionally, the UbD model encourages the use of self and peer evaluation. During self-evaluations, students can

explain the decisions they made, support their choices, and reflect on their learning experience, all of which deepens understanding (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005).

Assessing during musical experiences. In the cognitive apprenticeship model, teachers strive to make that which is unseen in the teaching process visible for their students to help develop their understanding (Collins et al., 1991). To determine the success of this goal, teachers must determine what the students understand, and to what extent (Wiggins, 2015). This is the goal of assessment, for both the teachers and the students to understand the level of understanding acquired, to guide further instruction and to be able to identify when goals are obtained (Wiggins, 2015).

In designing teaching experiences, educators must develop multiple opportunities for students to show the knowledge, skills, and understanding that they have developed. Through doing so, teachers can make decisions regarding pacing, readiness for new content, and the need to revisit previously learned content areas. Asking questions is a powerful method of ongoing assessment of student understanding. Through questions, student thinking becomes visible, allowing for teachers to alter lessons to fix misconceptions, or to delve deeper into a content area. Another powerful tool is self and peer assessment. When students share their musical decisions, fellow students can obtain new ideas for their later creative musical experiences because the better they understand why their peers made musical decisions, the better equipped they are to make their own decisions. Additionally, the student sharing develops their metacognition being able to detail what they understand and identify areas for growth (Wiggins, 2015).

Teachers are responsible for knowing the musical progress for each child in their classroom, which is a daunting task as they can see a large quantity of students each day.

Teachers who build assessments into their daily routines in the music classroom, are more aware of the progress of their students, and, therefore better equipped to speak of the progress of individuals with students, parents, and administration. A useful method for getting to know the individual musical abilities of students is to incorporate small-group or independent activities where the teacher can observe and guide students while they gather information on the growth of their students. Ideally, musical experiences would begin with an entry point through a musical element where students either engage in creating, performing, or responding; where the experiences are based on authentic or whole pieces of music; within the context of whole-group, small-group, or individual activities; that are assessed through a variety of methods designed throughout the musical experience (Wiggins, 2015).

Model Cornerstone Assessments. When musical understanding is your goal, the most effective assessments are authentic, performance assessments where students are creating, performing, or responding independently, without teacher guidance (Wiggins, 2015). To assist teachers in creating authentic performance assessments, the Model Cornerstone Assessments (MCA) were created (Parkes, 2018). According to Wiggins and McTighe, designers of the UbD framework, MCA are assessment measures that anchor the curriculum based on the enduring understandings (Nierman, 2016).

During the writing process of the CMS, the need for authentic, research-based assessments to align with the new Standards was realized, which spurred the collaboration between members of the standards writing team, NAFME, the Society for Research in Music Education, the Assessment Special Research Interest Group, and kindergarten through twelfth grade music teachers to develop, test, and revise MCA for music (Parkes, 2018). Music and the arts, unlike other content areas across the nation, are not included in the standardized assessment

and evaluation processes, instead MCA can be used as a guide for teachers as they develop authentic classroom assessments (Shuler et al., 2014).

The MCA are currently available for elementary grades two and five in all three artistic processes of create, perform, and respond (Parkes, 2018). The goals for early elementary level students in kindergarten through second grade are a combination of listening, singing, playing percussion instruments, and moving (Johnson, 2018). Students, especially in grades kindergarten through fourth, learn by doing (MENC, 1994). Through these experiences, students should also experience creating new musical ideas and improvisation (Johnson, 2018).

These foundational skills are built upon in upper grades. While upper primary students still experience singing, performing on instruments, reading musical notation, listening to music, and creating music through composition and improvisation, students at the upper primary level are also developing their accuracy and consistency as musicians who can incorporate movement and dance into music. The use of recorders and Orff instruments for students to experience rhythmic, melodic, and harmonic notation is utilized at the upper primary level along with a stronger focus of musical symbols (Odegaard, Ruybalid, & Newell, 2018).

Each MCA includes a description of the purpose for the assessment along with a summary of the content, approximate time to prepare and complete the assessment, and the prerequisite knowledge and skills the students should possess prior to taking the assessment. Many of the MCA also include methods for preparing students for the engagement in an MCA activity. Each MCA that is based on an artistic process and its corresponding anchor standards, enduring understandings, and essential questions. The MCA is outlined utilizing the performance indicators for the artistic process and the individual performance standards for the grade level of the MCA. Additionally, the MCA task is outlined for the educator into three

sections including instructional preparation, classroom environment necessary for the task, and the method for administering the assessment and collecting the data. The MCA provides music educators with printable assessments and rubrics tied to the artistic processes, performance standards, and performance indicators. (Parkes, 2018).

The MCA, while requiring some skills and content knowledge, provides a framework for students to demonstrate their understanding in the three artistic processes as they relate to their own personal and cultural influences (Parkes, 2018). MCA should provide opportunities for students to demonstrate their mastery within an artistic process by transferring knowledge to alternate musical experiences in authentic ways (Nierman, 2016). The MCA have sample assessment activities which teachers can use verbatim or adapt for use as either formative or summative assessments based on the goals and objectives set by the teacher, school, or district in applying the CMS (Nierman, 2016). The integration, modification, or rejection of the MCA is completely up to the music educator (Shuler et al., 2014). Music educators must determine if and how to apply the MCA models into their classrooms to assess student understanding (Nierman, 2016).

The goal of the MCA is an integration of assessment methods into learning experiences, based on the artistic processes, that focus on student understanding and transfer that utilize authentic musical literature (Nierman, 2016). Teachers must assess and forge connections between students' perceptions of learning experiences in the artistic processes to guide musical understanding (Wiggins, 2015). The MCA can assist music educators in uncovering student understanding but should not be used to compare students' knowledge and skill attainment between classrooms, districts, or states (Parkes, 2018). Additionally, the MCA were not designed to assess curriculum, which is not standardized across the nation, or as means to

evaluate teacher or program effectiveness (Nierman, 2016). Instead, the MCA were developed to assist teachers in determining areas of growth for students (Nierman, 2016).

Through the use of the research-based MCA, teachers eliminate the need for external evaluation and standardized testing (Parkes, 2018). The MCA endured a pilot study and necessary revisions before being published for music educators to use (Burrack, 2018). Teachers do not always know the reliability or validity in the assessments they use in their classrooms (Burrack, 2018) and many assessments utilized by educators endure little, if any, testing for reliability and validity (Wesolowski, 2018b). Many assessments utilized by teachers are formative, evaluating areas for student growth, and teachers often view these assessments as informal, and therefore, they are not necessarily concerned with the reliability or validity of the assessments (Dixson & Worrell, 2016). Instead, educators are attempting to determine areas that students are struggling and topics that need to be retaught. Ultimately, teachers must be cognizant of their goals for conducting each assessment, how they will use the results, and the reliability and validity of assessments so that an appropriate tool can be selected and utilized (Dixson & Worrell, 2016).

Reliability refers to the consistency of an assessment across achievement levels, while validity shows the degree to which an assessment measures what it is designed to measure (Burrack, 2018). The analysis of the reliability of the MCA shows consistency across the rubrics when utilized by music educators (Burrack, 2018). Additionally, the second and fifth grade MCA showed overall construct validity (Wesolowski, 2018a). Ultimately, the goal of the MCA is to provide a method for assessing student growth toward their mastery in the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding to music that will assist students in become musically literate and independent (Nierman, 2016).

Implementation Challenges

Throughout history, some music educators have felt that the standards are unattainable (Norris, 2010). For this reason, there are music educators across the United States who have chosen to not implement the CMS (Zaffini, 2018). Some teachers have stated that they, themselves, do not understand them (Zaffini, 2018). Other teachers have mentioned that they feel the CMS focus too much on artistic processes and self-reflection, and not enough on student acquisition of concrete musical skills and knowledge that they can apply to perform musically (Kasser, 2014).

Kasser (2014), states that the NSAE provided expected outcomes and allowed the teachers to determine how to achieve the goals, while the CMS tell teachers what to do without expected musical outcomes. For teachers whose focus was on preparing students for performance, the emphasis on processes instead of product is difficult to understand and implement (Nierman, 2016). Another difference that teachers might notice between the two sets of standards is that the CMS do not reference singing, playing, or other fundamentals of music-making (Kasser, 2014). The main challenges to the implementation of the CMS are the need for applicable resources, lack of instructional time to teach through the processes, and a need for professional development opportunities to assist teachers in implementing the CMS.

Resources. Beginning in 1994, standards for curriculum, scheduling, staffing, facilities, equipment, and materials, called *Opportunity-to-Learn Standards (OTL)*, were published by MENC to indicate areas of need for music educators to teach (MENC, 1994). The 2014 OTL Standards were created by the Council of Music Program Leaders of NAFME as the requirements necessary for music educators, schools, and districts to provide meaningful opportunities to reach

the ultimate intent of the CMS, for every American student to have the opportunity to obtain musical literacy (NAfME, 2015).

Each category in the OTL Standards is outlined through a rubric which details basic and quality programs. Through this rubric, teachers, administrators, and other decision-makers can review their current achievement level of either basic or quality in the following areas: curriculum and scheduling, materials and equipment, and facilities, each at the specific grade level and content areas taught. Under the each of the OTL standards are individual indicators including teacher qualification and load, professional development and evaluation, instruments, accessories, and technology. Utilizing the rubric and summary sheet, an improvement plan specific to the needs of the school and classroom can be developed to help ensure that all students are receiving quality programs, supported by the CMS toward a goal of independence through music literacy (NAfME, 2015).

A key focus for the NCCAS in creating the CMS was to provide supplemental materials to assist music educators in implementing and advocating for their programs (Shuler et al., 2014). To help obtain these goals, a web-based platform was created to provide information and resources for music educators across the United States (Hayes, 2013). Through the NAfME website, teachers can obtain assistance in curriculum design and lesson planning within the CMS (Bartolome, 2015). When music educators need assistance, they can contact the Council for General Music, a liaison between educators and NAfME leaders (Bartolome, 2015).

Through the Council for General Music, educators can share their experiences, perspectives, and needs so that NAfME can better serve their educators (Bartolome, 2015). Additionally, there is a forum where educators can ask questions and advice, share teaching tools and strategies, and collaborate with fellow music educators across the country as well as share

their struggles and successes in teaching music through the artistic processes (Bartolome, 2015). Through communication and collaboration, music educators gain the support necessary to keep the profession moving forward (Bartolome, 2015).

Time. When music education began, there was no prescribed schedule or amount of time that should be included for music education, this decision was up to the individual schools (Mark & Gary, 1992). In the 1940 publication of the *Outline of a Program of Music Education*, the minimum daily minutes for music education for kindergarten through third grade was 20 minutes and 25 to 30 minutes for grades fourth through sixth (Mark & Gary, 1992). At the Tanglewood Symposium in 1967, the members called for adequate time for music instruction (Mark & Gary, 1992).

Music educators can feel that incorporating the creative artistic process through improvisation, composition, or arranging is a daunting task due to time constraints and performance expectations placed upon the music educator from school and community stakeholders (Kasser, 2014). Due to the lack of time in some music classes and the self-perspective of teachers that they are not capable of being creative or teaching creativity, music educators might elect to not include these artistic processes into their curriculum (Norris, 2010). Additionally, many teachers have not received training in how to teach composition or improvisation (Kasser, 2014).

Other school factors impact the amount of time music educators have with their students throughout the school year. Instructional time for music education can be lost due to mandatory testing, safety drills, field trips, and assemblies. The teaching methods and assessments outlined in the CMS take a substantial amount of time and require educators to work with individuals or small groups, with the large classes that sometimes occur in the music classroom, this

compounds the pressure teachers feel about the lack of time to achieve musical goals (Kasser, 2014).

While elementary teachers can have the feeling that they are constantly fighting the clock, there are ways to help ease the stress off elementary music educators. Music educators need to share the responsibilities of learning with their students, understanding that student-centered learning takes time. Music educators need to stop fighting the clock and focus on the development of understanding of their students in the artistic processes and praise critical thinking as much as correct answers. When students learn through discovery, they value music and gain the essential musical understandings required to become musically literate, independent music-makers for a lifetime (Pautz, 1989).

Professional development. Due to the lack of inclusion of music in state and national accountability programs or standardized tests, many administrators have not assessed whether music educators have implemented or complied with the CMS or determined if students have achieved proficiency within the Standards (Shuler et al., 2014). In a 2007 survey conducted for MENC, the results showed that a majority of teachers were at least familiar with the NSAE (Shuler et al., 2014). These trends could be due to the fact that the NSAE were voluntary and state or local school districts could elect to implement them or not, possibly creating a history of low implementation for the standards (Shuler et al., 2014). Or it could be a history of disorganized, infrequent, and unpredictable professional development for educators leaving music teachers with little or no support in trying to meet the NSAE (Schmidt & Robbins, 2011).

While implementing the 2014 CMS compared the 1994 NSAE can be overwhelming due to the change from nine standards to 17 standards, teachers must remember that the focus is not on the individual performance standards, but the three artistic processes (Burrack & Parkes,

2018). Teachers must transition their focus from individual performance standards to the larger picture of artistic processes which are broken down into process components, each with only one or two performance standards attached (Zaffini, 2018). This can be difficult as many formalized workshops for professional development focus on pedagogy instead of how to integrate the methods into the classroom (CDSL, 2000). Wiggins and McTighe (2005) state that professional development should focus on the foundations of teaching and learning, the processes. Quality professional development can assist music educators in understanding, implementing, and assessing student growth (Schmidt & Robbins, 2011).

Shuler et al. (2014) stated that teachers who implemented their curriculum with the NSAE and encouraged musical independence within their students, should have little difficulty implementing the CMS, however, if music educators have focused on skills and knowledge building instead, they might have a harder time transitioning to teaching for musical understanding. Luckily, NAFME has provided some guidelines to support teachers who have struggled with implementing the CMS (Zaffini, 2018).

First, the CMS have provided grade-level specific performance indicators, grades pre-kindergarten through eighth, which outline specific goals for each grade, instead of the prior standards that have two clusters, lower-primary and upper-primary which could confuse teachers as to what students should achieve by a certain grade level (Shuler et al., 2014). Teachers should be aware that the knowledge and skills their students possess might not align with the grade-level specific standards outlined in the CMS (Zaffini, 2018). If this occurs, music educators should begin at the current level of their students and progress through the artistic processes and standards as the students are able, while supporting student learning and engagement in musical experiences (Zaffini, 2018).

Secondly, the CMS provide an opportunity for teachers, schools, and districts to adapt the specific standards to meet the needs of the students while maintaining authentic to the enduring understandings and essential questions outlined in the CMS (Zaffini, 2018). When developing the CMS, the committee discussed the issue of creating standards that were too vague, leaving the interpretation of the meaning behind the Standards up to the educator or too detailed, creating implementation issues (Shuler et al., 2014). To assist music teachers in learning and adapting the CMS, educators across schools and districts are encouraged to collaborate on reimagining the Standards to fit the needs of their students (Zaffini, 2018). While uncovering and adapting the CMS, the OTL Standards, and their corresponding MCA for their classrooms can be a difficult task, teachers must be willing to take risks and reach out of their comfort zone in order to develop and grow as a teacher, although this is not what educators are used to doing (CDSL, 2000).

Music educators who are struggling to implement the CMS should begin with one artistic process, one grade level, while focusing on teaching for understanding through engagement in musical experiences within that process. After achieving understanding, they should gradually add more process components, additional artistic processes, and grade levels (Zaffini, 2018). Teachers should ask for colleagues to observe their implementation of the artistic process into a lesson as peer feedback provides essential support and guidance for teachers (CDSL, 2000). Wiggins and McTighe (2005), stated that educators who participate in peer review sessions generally agree that sharing and discussing curriculum and assessment topics with their colleagues to be beneficial.

Whether formalized meetings or happenstance conversations, teachers can teach each other, and some of the most beneficial professional development occurs when educators interact

with each other (CDSL, 2000). Learning how to effectively implement the artistic processes into their curriculum might be difficult for teachers, but true learning is always difficult as we construct new understandings based on previous understandings and new experiences (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). If educators are constantly surrounded by collaborative peers, teachers will be less resistant to change as the fear of failure or criticism fades (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). When educators support each other, courage to try new teaching approaches builds throughout the school (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Hopefully, through this courage, and a culture of communication and collaboration, the hindrances to implementing the artistic processes within the CMS can be overcome, leading to an achievement of the goal of musically literate and independent life-long makers of music (Shuler et al., 2014).

Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Design

A qualitative study was conducted to research elementary general music educators' current implementation, evaluation, and problems in teaching for musical understanding. The researcher utilized a survey, adapted from a previous study, and interviews to obtain data. The adapted survey used in this research study came from the thesis, "Teaching for Musical Understanding in North Dakota through Standards 3, 4, and 7" (Eckroth-Riley, 2005). The current researcher altered the survey to fit the current CMS as the thesis was conducted in 2005, during the duration of the NSAE (Music Educators National Conference, 1994). Table 2 provides a comparison between the NSAE and the CMS standards. While the NSAE consisted of nine individual standards, the CMS contain eleven anchor standards that span all artforms, grouped into three sections, one for each artistic process which embed the previous NSAE within this framework (Beegle, 2016).

Table 2

Comparison of Standards

National Standards for Arts Education	Core Music Standards Creating-Anchor Standards
3. Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments.	1. Generate musical ideas for various purposes and contexts.
4. Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines.	2. Select and develop musical ideas for defined purposes and contexts.
7. Evaluating music and music performances.	3. Evaluate and refine selected musical ideas to create musical work(s) that meet appropriate criteria.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore how music educators are teaching and assessing for musical understanding through the implementation of the CMS and their

corresponding artistic processes of create, perform, and respond (Zaffini, 2018). According to previous research, some educators have elected to not implement the CMS due to lack of understanding (Zaffini, 2018), while others have felt that the standards are unattainable (Norris, 2010). Additionally, with the transition from the previous standards that focused on musical knowledge attainment and skill acquisition to the CMS focused on teaching through the artistic processes, some educators have stated that the CMS lack fundamental music instruction (Kasser, 2014). Through the responses of the online survey and subsequent interviews, the researcher endeavored to develop a comprehensive picture of the implementation, assessment, and needs of elementary music educators in the First District of the KMEA in teaching for musical understanding so that an action plan could be created and implemented to support the teachers in teaching for musical understanding. First District of the KMEA is comprised of thirteen counties in far western Kentucky including, Crittenden, Caldwell, Trigg, Lyon, Livingston, Marshall, Calloway, McCracken, Graves, Ballard, Carlisle, Hickman, and Fulton counties (Kentucky Music Educators Association, 2019a).

Research Questions

The three questions the researcher investigated are:

Q1. How are the artistic processes of create, perform, and respond being implemented in elementary general music classrooms?

-What pedagogical music methods are utilized (Kodály, Orff-Schulwerk, Dalcroze)?

Q2. How do elementary general music educators assess student learning through the artistic processes?

-What formative and summative assessment models are being utilized?

-How are music educators currently implementing the Model Cornerstone Assessments provided by the National Association for Music Education, if they are aware of them?

Q3. What are the barriers faced by elementary general music educators in teaching for musical understanding?

-What kind of professional development opportunities are music educators participating in that have helped them either understand or implement the CMS?

-How much instruction time are music educators provided and what steps are taken to protect those educational minutes from disruptions or schedule changes?

-What affect do performances have regarding the time educators have to teaching for musical understanding versus preparing for performances?

Description of Population

The research studied elementary general music educators within the First District of the KMEA. This group of music educators, located in far western Kentucky, is the furthest from the KMEA home in Richmond, Kentucky. The annual KMEA Conference is held in Louisville, Kentucky and the Kentucky Orff-Schulwerk Association is located in Lexington, Kentucky. With all the established associations and the largest professional development workshops located on the other side of the state, the researcher selected music educators from the First District for study to determine their implementation, assessment, and needs moving forward in teaching for musical understanding.

A description and invitation to the Teaching for Musical Understanding online survey was sent out, through the First District KMEA email list serve, to all elementary general music educators in the district. There are roughly 40 elementary music educators in the First District, some teaching at multiple elementary schools (T. Terry, personal communication, September 18,

2019). The description, informed consent document, and link to the online survey was sent out at the beginning of January and remained open until February 5, 2020.

The researcher was notified by a potential participant that the First District KMEA email containing the research description, informed consent document, and survey was filter by their school district and was sent to their spam folder, instead of their inbox. To avoid the email filters of school districts sending the research survey to spam or junk folders, the Elementary Chair for First District KMEA sent the survey again utilizing their school email account. The survey was sent out a total of five times throughout the month of January and the beginning of February. The survey closed at the end of the day February 5, 2020.

The data collected was coded to uncover similarities, differences, and overall trends in the participants' demographics, implementation, assessment, and needs in teaching for musical understanding utilizing the CMS. The demographic information asked in the survey was to determine the participants' experience level in teaching elementary music, their type of certification, additional pedagogy trainings they might hold, their basic knowledge of the CMS, which grade levels they teach and how many minutes they have each grade level a week, and their perceptions and practices in implementation and assessment of the CMS in their classroom as well as their potential needs for improvement. Of the roughly 40 elementary music educators in the First District of the KMEA, 16 responded to the Teaching for Musical Understanding survey.

As part of the initial research survey, participants could indicate their willingness to participate in an interview or focus group by providing their email address so the researcher could contact them. Nine participants of the survey indicated their willingness to continue their participation in the research by providing their email addresses. The researcher determined that

interviews would be conducted instead of focus groups, due to potential scheduling conflicts and potential lack of in-depth information and understanding of how the CMS function in each participant's classroom. With the annual KMEA conference, held at the end of the first full week in February, and need for some individuals to drive long distances to participate in a focus group, the researcher decided to conduct interviews instead. Additionally, this decision was made to provide an opportunity for the researcher to obtain richer data on how all the artistic processes functioned in each participant's classroom as well as get a deeper understanding of how each elementary music educator utilizes assessments and their individual needs for their classroom, school, and students in teaching for musical understanding through the CMS. If focus groups were conducted instead of interviews, there was a potential for gaps in the data as participants might not have felt comfortable discussing their methods and situations with peers that implement, assess, and have different needs or thoughts about the CMS. Due to these concerns, the researcher determined the best research design that would provide deeper contextual understanding of how the CMS are implemented and assessed in multiple classrooms across members of the First District was to conduct individual interviews (Maxwell, 2013).

The researcher emailed each of the nine potential interview participants to determine their preferred method of contact; email, phone, or text message; their preferred method for interview, in-person or through Zoom, an online conferencing platform; and a date and time that would be convenient for them. Reminder emails were sent out once a week throughout the month of February to any participant that had not yet responded to the original email from the researcher. Of the nine potential interview participants that provided their email in the original survey and the researcher emailed, eight responded with their preferences and interviews were set up. Six

participants preferred an in-person interview and two elected to have their interview through the online conferencing platform, Zoom.

Throughout the research process, the researcher remained professional and took all necessary steps to maintain confidentiality in both the online survey and individual interviews through the use of informed consent documents. All data was secured, from the online survey results, interview audio recordings, researcher's notes, and interview transcriptions, on a password protected computer with encrypted research files, or within a locked filing cabinet. Even with all confidentiality and security measures in place, there is still some risk that participants of the interviews could share information outside of the interview with their music educator peers in their district or with whom they have personal contact. All potential risks and benefits from the study were outlined in the informed consent documents included in the email with the link to the Teaching for Musical Understanding survey and reviewed and signed prior to each interview. Additionally, all participants were told that they were free to leave anytime without any adverse effects. Participants were also made aware that they would not be paid or receive any benefits for their participation aside from snacks and bottled water during interviews. Lastly, all participants were informed that names and other identifying characteristics such as schools or districts where they work would not be utilized in the study to protect the participant's anonymity.

Description of Instruments

The online survey, adapted to correspond to the CMS, from the thesis, "Teaching for Musical Understanding in North Dakota through Standards 3, 4, and 7" asked participants questions regarding their demographics, implementation, assessments, and needs regarding the National Core Music Standards (Eckroth-Riley, 2005). The survey, approved by the Institutional

Review Board, was altered to align the questions with the CMS as the original version was developed for the NSAE. The demographic portion of the survey included information such as educational history and type of teaching certification, additional pedagogical certifications, number of years teaching, if they have taught at other levels aside from elementary, number of years at current position, if they have taught in another state, grade levels taught and how many minutes per week they have each grade level, if they have a copy of the Core Music Standards, and where or if they received training on the Standards.

The second portion included a Likert scale for participants to determine their strength of agreement or disagreement with a series of statements regarding their implementation of the standards. Questions included if music teachers implement the CMS, if they include creating in their weekly planning, if they include performing in their weekly planning, if they include responding in their weekly planning, and then also if they include the artistic processes monthly in their planning. Other questions in this section included if teachers have a student-centered environment, and if teachers include improvisation, composition, and arranging into their lessons. Questions were also developed to ascertain the perceived comfort level of elementary music educators in teaching the artistic processes and incorporating assessments. Lastly, the survey asked teachers to mark the areas they perceive they need assistance in to better implement the CMS into their classrooms.

The researcher identified participants from the survey responses that were willing to participate in in-person or online interviews. The researcher set up the interviews at the convenience of the participants. The researcher provided snacks and bottled water for the in-person interviews. All participants consented to the researcher audio recording the session to maintain the integrity of the participant's perceptions of the implementation, assessment, and

needs in teaching through the CMS in their elementary music classroom. Participants that elected to have online interviews through the Zoom platform were emailed the informed consent document prior to the meeting day and time. These participants printed the consent form, signed and dated the form, and then scanned the document before emailing it back to the researcher. The researcher printed out the document to keep in the locked filing cabinet with all other informed consent documents.

The interview protocol was a series of open-ended questions about the participants' perceptions of teaching to the CMS in their classroom. The protocol questions were based on the three overarching research questions based on implementation, assessment, and support needed to teaching for musical understanding through the CMS. The interview protocol for the first research question of implementation were developed to gain an understanding of how each participant included the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding in their classroom as well as any methods that they use that assist them in implementing the processes. Additionally, participants were asked if they had a method for incorporating the processes into their lesson planning and how they encourage a student-centered classroom.

For the second research question of assessment, interview participants were asked open-ended questions regarding how assessment is conducted in their classrooms. Participants were asked about what formative and summative assessments methods they use, how they implemented the Model Cornerstone Assessments into their lessons, and their overall perception on how assessment was conducted in their classroom.

For the last research question, the interview protocol asked participants about their individual needs or barriers they face to implementing and assessing the CMS as it relates to their classroom. Participants were asked what the most difficult part of teaching to the CMS was

for them in their classroom, what specific training they have had on the CMS, how often they are able to collaborate with fellow elementary music educators, and their needs for continued growth.

Through the data gathered in the Teaching for Musical Understanding survey and the in-depth interviews of eight elementary music educators in the First District of the KMEA, the researcher coded the data, by research topic, to determine similarities and differences in the implementation, assessment, and needs of the participants. Through this coding, the researcher identified themes in relation to how the artistic processes are implemented, how assessments are conducted, and the needs of individual teachers based on their experience, school situation, time they see each class, resources, and their needs to continue teaching the CMS. This research was conducted so that an action plan could be created and implemented to support the teachers of the First District of the KMEA in obtaining the music education goal of teaching students to be literate and independent makers of music (Shuler et al., 2014).

Variables of the Study

Elementary general music educators in the First District region of the KMEA have many similarities and differences. The researcher utilized the Teaching for Musical Understanding survey to obtain data on the music teachers' educational and additional certification backgrounds which could impact their ability to teach through the artistic processes, their experience in teaching elementary general music, their level of implementation of the processes and assessments, and their needs to be better supported in teaching for musical understanding. The data from the survey also provided some insight as to the grade levels that different educators were responsible for teaching and the amount of time that they see each class which could

greatly impact their ability to teach for understanding and students' ability to learn (CDSL, 2000).

As an elementary music educator within the First District of the KMEA organization, the researcher remained cognizant of researcher bias and took appropriate steps to remain professional and remove personal feelings, desires, and professional practices from the survey and interviews. Having this connection to the area and some teachers in the organization could have encouraged elementary music educators to participate in the research and assisted participants in feeling comfortable talking openly and honestly with the researcher, having a feeling that the researcher understands since they are also an elementary music educator in the First District of the KMEA. Additionally, participants that know the researcher could feel more comfortable providing richer data since there was an established comfort level with the researcher and a foundational belief that the researcher wants to determine methods for supporting them in teaching for musical understanding through the artistic processes (Maxwell, 2013).

Procedures for Data Analysis

Following the collection of the survey data, the researcher coded the data to look for trends in years of teaching elementary music, educational history, additional pedagogical certification, amount of time each grade level has in music class each week, teacher's perceived implementation of the artistic processes and assessments, and the needs of teachers to continue to teaching for musical understanding. The audio recordings from the individual interviews was transcribed into a computer document and responses from each participant were assigned a text color. After all interviews were transcribed and color coded, the responses were organized by research question to discover themes among participant responses. Each participant's responses

were color coded to retain the integrity of the participant's statements across the research topics and to allow the researcher to uncover similarities and differences among statements made by the eight participants. The researcher utilized this data as well as the survey data to help determine the causes for implementation or lack of implementation, the methods of assessments utilized in the elementary music classrooms, and hindrances or needs of the participants to teaching for musical understanding through the artistic processes outlined in the CMS.

Chapter 4: Research Findings

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine how elementary music teachers in the First District of the KMEA are teaching for understanding utilizing the three artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding as described in the CMS. Particularly, this study researches how these music educators implement and assess the processes and any potential barriers that teachers may face in teaching for musical understanding. Through the outcomes of this study, an action plan can be created and implemented to support music educators in the First District in teaching for understanding and to overcome any barriers in teaching the artistic processes of the CMS.

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to determine the understanding, implementation, assessment, and barriers music educators in the First District of the KMEA in teaching for understanding through the three artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding as outlined in the CMS. The research questions were:

Q1. How are the artistic processes of create, perform, and respond being implemented in elementary general music classrooms?

-What pedagogical music methods are utilized (Kodály, Orff-Schulwerk, Dalcroze)?

Q2. How do elementary general music educators assess student learning through the artistic processes?

-What formative and summative assessment models are being utilized?

-How are music educators currently implementing the Model Cornerstone Assessments provided by the National Association for Music Education, if they are aware of them?

Q3. What are the barriers faced by elementary general music educators in teaching for musical understanding?

-What kind of professional development opportunities are music educators participating in that have helped them either understand or implement the CMS?

-How much instructional time are music educators provided and what steps are taken to protect those educational minutes from disruptions or schedule changes?

-What affect do performances have regarding the time educators have to teaching for musical understanding versus preparing for performances?

Study Participants

All First District KMEA members teaching at the elementary level were emailed the research survey. Of the roughly 40 elementary music educators in the First District, 16 participated in the online survey. Table 3 describes the type of teaching certification of the survey participants. Currently, in the state of Kentucky, individuals can obtain teaching certificates in integrated, vocal, or instrumental music for grades primary through twelfth grade (Educational Professional Standards Board, n.d.). Six participants of the survey indicated they have a teaching certification with an instrumental emphasis and five with a vocal emphasis. Of the participants who responded "Other" in the survey, one stated that they had a Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education with an emphasis in music, two stated that their degree was both vocal and instrumental, one participant specified a certification in K-12 Music, and one participant indicated their degree was in K-5 Elementary Education.

Table 3

Teaching certifications of survey participants

<u>Certification</u>	<u>Count</u>
K-12 Instrumental Emphasis	6
K-12 Vocal Emphasis	5
Other	5

Table 4 describes the number of years of experience the participants have teaching elementary music. Nearly half of the participants of the survey, seven of the 16, had between one and ten years of experience teaching elementary music. This is equal to the number of individuals with 11 to 20 years of experience. There were only two educators with 20 to 25 years of experience teaching music education. There were no participants of the survey whom have taught more than 25 years as an elementary music educator.

Table 4

Years of experience teaching elementary music

<u>Experience</u>	<u>Count</u>
1-5 years	5
6-10 years	2
11-15 years	3
16-20 years	4
21-25 years	2

Table 5 indicates the highest level of educational training each participant has completed. Eight of the participants hold a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree in Music Education, four have a Master of Arts in Music Education, and four identified as having a degree falling under the other category. Of these, one participant has a Bachelor of Arts in Music

Performance, one a Bachelor of Music Education, and one participant completed all coursework for a Bachelor of Music Education but did not complete student teaching and ultimately changed majors to elementary education. None of the participants marked that they had a doctorate in music education. Lastly, one participant specified that they have a Bachelor of Arts in Music Education with a Master of Arts in Teaching.

Table 5

Highest level of educational training

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Count</u>
BA/BS in Music Education	8
MA in Music Education	4
Ph.D. in Music Education	0
Other	4

Table 6 describes any additional certifications that participants might have in teaching music methods. Five participants indicated that they had Orff-Schulwerk Level I certification with one participant also having Orff-Schulwerk Level II certification. No participants indicated having had Orff-Schulwerk Level III certification. Additionally, none of the participants had any Kodály or Dalcroze certifications. Participants did indicate having other trainings; two participants have had Early Childhood training, one with Conversational Solfege training, and another with training in First Steps in Music Education. Ten participants selected “Other” in the survey, with seven having no additional certification in music education methods. Of the last three participants who marked “Other” on the survey, one had training in Modern Band Summit, one in the Harmony Road Music School, and the last included their Master of Arts in Education as additional certification.

Table 6

Additional certifications

<u>Certification</u>	<u>Count</u>
Orff-Schulwerk Level I	5
Orff-Schulwerk Level II	1
Orff-Schulwerk Level III	0
Kodály Level I	0
Kodály Level II	0
Kodály Level III	0
Dalcroze	0
Early Childhood training	2
First Steps in Music Education	1
Conversational Solfege	1
Other	10

Table 7 describes where participants received training or information regarding the CMS. Eight of the participants received training from an undergraduate course and one from a graduate course. Four participants had received information or training through a district in-service and seven from a music workshop. Three participants obtained information or training from a state conference and one participant from a national conference. One participant indicated that they obtained information from a journal or newsletter while five participants responded that they have received no training or information regarding the CMS. All but one participant did indicate that they own a copy or have access to the CMS document.

Table 7

Training and information on the CMS

<u>Event</u>	<u>Count</u>
Undergraduate Course	8
Graduate Course	1
District In-service	4
State Conference	3

Table 7. Training and information on the CMS (continued)

<u>Event</u>	<u>Count</u>
National Conference	1
Music Workshop	7
Journal or Newsletter	1
No Training	5

Table 8 describes the grade levels that the participants teach. 15 out of 16 participants teach kindergarten, first, second, and third grades. 12 participants teach fourth grade and 11 teach fifth grade. Five participants indicated that they teach other grade levels than those designated on the survey. Of those other responses, participants specified that they taught sixth grade, sixth grade and choir, sixth and seventh grades, fifth grade choir and fourth grade recorder, and preschool ages three to five.

Table 8

Grade levels taught

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Count</u>
Kindergarten	15
First Grade	15
Second Grade	15
Third Grade	15
Fourth Grade	12
Fifth Grade	11
Other	5

Table 9 indicates the number of instructional minutes participants have with each grade level weekly. As indicated in Table 8, some participants do not teach all grade levels. There was one response per grade in the lower primary levels, kindergarten through third grade, representing that an individual does not teach that grade level. In the upper primary levels, fourth and fifth grades, there were four that did not teach fourth grade and five that did not teach

fifth grade. There were no responses in any of the grade levels that the instructional minutes per week were less than 30 minutes. In the lower primary grades, 11 participants responded that they have between 46 and 60 instructional minutes, three have between 30 and 45 minutes, and one participant has more than 60 instructional minutes per week. In the upper primary grades, four participants indicated that they 30 to 45 minutes a week for fourth grade and only three had that number of instructional minutes in fifth grade. There were seven responses that participants had between 46 and 60 minutes a week and only one response with more than 60 instructional minutes per week.

Table 9

Instructional minutes per week by grade level

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Count</u>
Kindergarten	0	1
	<30	0
	30-45	3
	46-60	11
	>60	1
First	0	1
	<30	0
	30-45	3
	46-60	11
	>60	1
Second	0	1
	<30	0
	30-45	3
	46-60	11
	>60	1
Third	0	1
	<30	0
	30-45	3
	46-60	11
	>60	1

Table 9. Instructional minutes per week by grade level (continued)

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>Minutes</u>	<u>Count</u>
Fourth	0	4
	<30	0
	30-45	4
	46-60	7
	>60	1
Fifth	0	5
	<30	0
	30-45	3
	46-60	7
	>60	1

Survey Findings

Participants of the survey were asked to indicate their strength of agreement or disagreement on a four-point Likert scale with a series of statements regarding their implementation, assessment, and barriers to teaching the artistic processes outlined in the CMS. For each statement, participants could respond that they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed.

Implementation. The survey results show that the establishment of the CMS have affected the teaching of half of the participants. Seven of the participants agreed that the CMS affected their teaching, with another one strongly agreeing. The same number of participants disagreed and strongly disagreed about the affects the CMS had on their teaching as agreed and strongly agreed. Almost the same responses were shown when participants were asked if they had changed their teaching to reflect the CMS with only slightly higher results in the agreement. All participants agreed that their classrooms were student centered with seven indicating a strong agreement.

Create. When asked if they included the artistic process of creating into their monthly lesson planning, 15 agreed, with six showing a strong agreement and only one participant disagreed. When another question asked participants if they included creating in their weekly lesson planning, there were still nine in agreement but only four whom strongly agreed and three that disagreed. 14 participants indicated that they are comfortable teaching the artistic process of creating with seven in strong agreement. Of the two responses that disagreed, one was strong.

Participants were then asked to indicate what creating activities they incorporate into their classrooms. Table 10 shows the types of creating activities and the strength of agreement or disagreement of the participants in their inclusion of the activities. Overall, small and large group activities, composition without notation, and improvisation were selected as the activities used for creating with 15 participants either agreeing or strongly agreeing. Stories, individual activities, composition with notation, problem-solving skills, and iconic composition for younger students followed as the next most agreed upon activities. Seven participants indicated that arranging was an activity that they disagreed on utilizing with six participants disagreeing and one strongly disagreeing. Technology or the use of computers was also an activity that participants disagreed on utilizing with two strongly disagreeing on its use, four disagreeing, seven agreeing on its use, and only three strongly agreeing.

Small group and large group activities received the highest number of participants who strongly agreed followed by individual and improvisation activities. Stories, composition with notation and without notation were the next highest activities where participants strongly agreed to utilizing them in creating activities. Arranging was the lowest ranking of participants that strongly agreed on using them in their classroom. Technology and the use of computers was the highest activity where participants disagreed on using them with four disagreeing on their use

and two strongly disagreeing. Aside from technology and computers, arranging was the only other activity where a participant strongly disagreed with the incorporation of the activity in their classroom. The other highest-ranking activities where participants disagreed on their use were arranging with six responses, iconic composition for younger students with five responses, and problem-solving; technology and computers; and composition with notation, each with four responses.

Table 10

Types of creating activities

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Stories	4	10	2	0
Small/ Large Group	9	6	1	0
Individual	6	7	3	0
Composition (with notation)	4	8	4	0
Composition (without notation)	4	11	1	0
Iconic Composition (younger students)	3	8	5	0
Problem-solving	3	9	4	0
Technology/ Computers	3	7	4	2
Improvisation	5	10	1	0
Arranging	2	7	6	1

Perform. All music educators surveyed agreed that they incorporate performing activities on their monthly lesson plans, with nine strongly agreeing and seven agreeing. Conversely, when asked about including performing activities in their weekly lesson plans, only 11 participants agreed, five strongly agreeing and six agreeing, and five participants indicated disagreement. When asked about their comfort level teaching performing, the surveyed teachers responded with eight indicating a strong agreement, seven agreeing, and only one disagreeing.

The participants were asked to indicate what performing activities they incorporate into their classrooms. Table 11 details the types of performing activities and the participants' strength of agreement or disagreement in their incorporation into their classrooms. Singing and performing on instruments were the activities most strongly agreed upon in incorporation, each with 11 strongly agreeing and five agreeing followed closely by small and large group activities with 10 strongly and six agreeing. All participants agreed on using movement and dance as performing activities with seven strongly agreeing and nine agreeing. The only performance activity where participants disagreed in its incorporation was individual performance with six strongly agreeing, eight agreeing, and two disagreeing.

Table 11

Types of performing activities

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Movement/ Dance	7	9	0	0
Singing	11	5	0	0
Performing on Instruments	11	5	0	0
Small/ Large Group	10	6	0	0
Individual	6	8	2	0

Respond. When asked about including responding activities into their monthly lesson planning, 15 participants agreed, with six indicating a strong agreement, and only one participant disagreeing. These numbers changed slightly when asked about incorporating responding activities weekly with two participants strongly agreeing, 11 agreeing, and three disagreeing. 15 participants responded that they feel comfortable teaching the artistic process of responding with six strongly agreeing and nine agreeing. Only one participant indicated disagreement in feeling comfortable teaching responding in their classroom.

Table 12 details the participants' agreement to the incorporation of different responding activities into their classrooms. All participants agreed that they provide responding activities through verbal response and question and answer activities with significantly higher strong agreement in verbal response activities with nine participants over the five that strongly agreed with conducting question and answer activities. The replies for both individual and written responses were mixed. For individual response activities, three strongly agreed, nine agreed, three disagreed, and one strongly disagreed. One individual also strongly disagreed with incorporating written responses and there were more participants who disagreed with including individual responses than written responses. Overall, written responses received the lowest number of agreement reactions with only 10 and the most disagreement with their incorporation with six.

Table 12

Types of responding activities

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
Verbal	9	7	0	0
Written	2	8	5	1
Question/Answer	5	11	0	0
Small/ Large Group	5	10	1	0
Individual	3	9	3	1

Assessment. Survey participants responded to a series of questions regarding their assessment practices. Thirteen of the participants agreed that assessments are embedded as part of their lesson plans with three strongly agreeing and three disagreeing. All but one participant agreed that they provide self-reflection opportunities for their students, with six of those strong agreements. When asked about the use of performance assessments with rubrics for recording

purposes, 10 participants responded in agreement and six responded that they disagreed, both with one strong marking. There were 10 responses in agreement, four strong, that the participants provided opportunities for their students to set their own growth goals, while only six disagreed. When asked if they utilized student portfolios to demonstrate student growth, only two responded in agreement, one strongly, and 14 disagreed, three strongly. Only two participants responded that they utilize the Model Cornerstone Assessments in their classrooms, one strongly while 14 responded in disagreement with four strongly disagreeing to their use.

Then the participants were asked to respond to statements concerning assessment and the CMS at the district level. When asked if their school district's curriculum had changed to reflect the CMS only five participants agreed with that statement while 11 disagreed, two strongly. Only one participant strongly agreed with the statement that they, or their district, had developed a standards-based report card that was representative of the students' musical understanding in relation to the CMS. Eight participants disagreed with this statement and an additional seven strongly disagreed. Overall, the survey participants indicated a comfort with assessing students' progress in their classroom as 15 responded in agreement with five being strong and only one participant disagreed with the statement.

Survey participants were then asked to identify types of assessments that they regularly use in their classrooms. Table 13 details the types of assessments used in the elementary music classrooms by the participants of the study. Performance assessments were the assessment type with the highest responses with 15, followed by rubrics with 12, checklists with 11, and paper and pencil assessments with nine responses. Three individuals indicated that they utilize journaling and one responded that they maintain student portfolios. Additionally, there was one response in the other type of assessment category where a participant responded that they use a

Classroom Performance System, which is an interactive technology that allows students to respond to assessment questions utilizing a remote (Technology Resource Teachers, n.d.).

Table 13

Types of assessment

<u>Assessment</u>	<u>Count</u>
Checklist	11
Rubrics	12
Portfolios	1
Journaling	3
Paper and Pencil	9
Performance	15
Other	1

Implementation challenges. The last main topic participants were asked to respond to were the possible implementation challenges that they face in teaching the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding of the CMS. Table 14 details the responses of the participants to these potential barriers. The largest portion of the responses was a lack of instructional time with 13 responses. The next largest barrier was a lack of collaboration with other music educators in teaching the CMS with 11 responses. The third largest implementation challenge indicated was a lack of professional development with seven responses. Other factors that were identified as barriers to teaching the artistic processes were a lack of understanding of the CMS (two responses), a lack of comfort in teaching the responding (three responses), and a lack of comfort in teaching the creating processes (two responses). None of the participants indicated a lack of comfort in teaching the performing process.

Table 14

Barriers to teaching the CMS

<u>Barriers</u>	<u>Count</u>
Lack of time	13
Lack of comfort teaching creating	2
Lack of comfort teaching performing	0
Lack of comfort teaching responding	3
Lack of professional development	7
Lack of understanding the CMS	2
Lack of collaboration	11

The final question of the survey asked participants if they would be willing to participate in a small focus group or interview regarding their implementation, assessments, and instructional needs in teaching the artistic processes of the CMS. Of the 16 survey participants, nine responded that they would be willing to participate in a focus group or interview.

Interview Participants

All nine survey participants that indicated their willingness to participate in focus groups or interviews were contacted through the email address that they provided at the end of the survey. Multiple emails were sent out at the end of January and February 2020. All but one participant responded to the researcher and interviews were planned. The eight interviews were conducted between the months of February and March 2020. Participants were asked the same interview questions regarding their implementation, assessment, and challenges in teaching for musical understanding through the artistic processes of the CMS, but based on their responses, they may have been asked follow-up questions which might not have been necessary in all interviews. To protect the confidentiality of the statements made and the anonymity of the participants, all names and identifying characteristics have been removed from the research report and individuals were assigned a participant letter for consistency and continuity.

Table 15 provides data on the teaching experience, highest level of music education, type of teaching certification, and additional pedagogical certifications for the participants. Half of the participants have between one and five years of experience, and one each with six to 10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and 20-25 years of experience. Four of the participants hold a Bachelor of Arts or Sciences in Music Education, three have a Master of Arts in Education, and one participant has a Bachelor of Arts in Music Performance. Seven participants have a K-12 teaching certification, four instrumental and three vocal emphasis, and one has a K-5 elementary education certification. Three of the participants have their Orff-Schulwerk Level I certification, one of whom also has a certification in Kindermusik. Participant H also has training in the Harmony Road method while other participants do not have any additional certifications.

Table 15

Participant education, experience, and certification

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Teaching Experience</u>	<u>Highest Education in Music</u>	<u>Teaching Certification</u>	<u>Additional Certifications</u>
A	1-5	BA/BS in Music Education	K-12 Instrumental	None
B	1-5	BA/BS in Music Education	K-12 Instrumental	None
C	6-10	Master of Music in Education	K-12 Instrumental	Orff-Schulwerk Level I, Kindermusik
D	20-25	Master of Arts in Education	K-12 Vocal	Orff-Schulwerk Level I
E	16-20	BA/BS in Music Education	K-12 Instrumental	Orff-Schulwerk Level I
F	11-15	Master of Music in Education	K-12 Vocal	None
G	1-5	BA/BS in Music Education	K-12 Vocal	None
H	1-5	BA in Music Performance	K-5 Elementary Education	Harmony Road

Table 16 details the grade levels taught by the participants as well as the number of instructional minutes per week that the participants have each grade level. Three of the participants teach kindergarten through fifth grade, two also teach sixth grade. One teacher teaches kindergarten through seventh grade. Participants B and F teach kindergarten through third grade while Participant F also teaches preschool. The number of instructional minutes also varies across the participants, but all see their students for at least 30 minutes a week and Participant E is the only one who has more than 60 minutes of instruction time a week. The time that Participant H has with lower primary students, 30-45 minutes, is different than the amount of time with upper primary students, 46-60 minutes.

Table 16

Participant grade levels and instructional time

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Grade Levels Taught</u>	<u>Minutes per Week</u>
A	K-6	30-45
B	K-3	46-60
C	K-7	30-45
D	K-5	46-60
E	K-6	>60
F	PreK-3	46-60
G	K-5	46-60
H	K-5	30-45 (K-3) & 46-60 (4-5)

Interview Findings

Implementation. Participants were asked a series of questions regarding their implementation practices for creating, performing, and responding and how the CMS have affected their planning and instruction. Additionally, participants were asked if they have a student-centered classroom or utilize any instructional methods to assist them in their implementation of the CMS.

Question 1: How have the Core Music Standards focus on the artistic processes affected your teaching?

Concerning the effects of the CMS on teaching the artistic processes, Participant E shared that prior to the implementation of the CMS, the focus was on the program review and the state standardized testing. They continued by explaining how the CMS provided more freedom for them to teach to the standards without the lessons being driven by the content of the test. In this way, “I have a lot more choice about...how I get...the students to perform, to create, to respond and what I am teaching them,” stated Participant E. Two other participants explained that the implementation of the CMS caused them to take the time necessary to create curriculum maps for each grade level, detailing when the standards would be covered and allowing them to organize their lessons to ensure that all standards and processes were covered. Participant F continued to explain that their curriculum map was also aligned with the standards and concepts being taught in the general education classrooms because it “reinforce[s] the regular classroom and then it enhances my classroom as well, allowing the students to partner their reading, their math...with music.”

Some participants have struggled in implementation of the CMS due to lack of understanding or training. A couple of participants mentioned that while they have read through and try to follow the CMS, some of the language makes them difficult to implement. One participant stated that the jargon used in the standards makes them difficult to interpret. Another participant shared that they are not a certified music educator. They explained that they have a Music Performance degree and a certification in Elementary Education, but that they lacked the musical training in the pedagogies learned in music education courses, which has made teaching through the processes more difficult. They stated that they rely on their musical background and

educational training in elementary education to support them as they have tried to understand and teach to the CMS.

Participant D shared that prior to teaching the CMS, their focus was on teaching the musical elements and now they utilize those elements as a framework for their curriculum, but their curriculum is based on creating. They stated that the “most important [aspect to] brain development and...education is, the creating.” Additionally, this participant shared that they try to have their students respond more since the implementation of the CMS by listening to masterpieces and determining ways of having their students respond to those pieces, whether physically or aurally.

Other participants simply stated the importance of students having the opportunities to experience the artistic processes of creating and performing so that they can continue to develop their skills as growing musicians. Two participants shared that responding was a struggle for them to incorporate while Participant G shared that they start with responding and then move to performing and then creating due to the fact that the students must first understand what they are experiencing before they can create music of their own.

Question 2: How do you implement the artistic process of creating in your classroom?

All participants indicated they implement creating into their classrooms, but the methods varied by participant. Participant F explained their process for creating by beginning with simple popsicle sticks stating,

...they create a rhythm...everybody gets a set of rhythm sticks [and] we start there and then we progress through that process, then we move to different instruments and we moved to the...rhythm being written, first as ta [and] ti-ti...they draw a straight line ta then three lines...[for] ti-ti, and the we transfer that over to notes and beats...the building

block process. I don't focus a lot on a specific melody, now that may be odd and that's okay, but I would rather them [improvise a] melody [to their composed rhythm].

Participant F continued by explaining that they set the parameters for their creating exercises but allow the students to decide the instruments that they use. Similarly, Participant E provides opportunities for their students to create movements, scripts, and accompaniments for their annual Christmas programs. Additionally, they incorporate lessons where older students create songs for their recorders or keyboards and the younger students can compose simple melodies using *sol* and *mi* solfege cards or movements to create new sections of a song, which can all be performed.

Other participants shared how they implement the creative processes by having the students create their own ringtones for their cell phones; class or group compositions, which can be scaffolded to individual compositions; or other movement-based activities. Another participant explained they begin by having the students respond to a performance as a basis to build the student's creativity. The students begin with the known and then create utilizing the skills and knowledge they have from previous experiences. Only one participant mentioned that they focus on improvisation instead of composition, although they mentioned that they would like to add more composition into their lessons. Concerning improvisation, Participant D shared about their use of drum circles in the classroom by saying,

...the ultimate goal is a completely improvised, organic, musical experience...where [we] all have different instruments, we hear a beat, and then they've practiced making up their own thing and then we just [improvise]...sometimes you get the sweet spot where everyone's playing their own thing and you can feel the pulse of the beat and it sounds really good.

Multiple participants stated that the Orff-Schulwerk method of music learning was influential to their processes of teaching creating. A couple of participants mentioned a desire or plan to obtain their Level I certification in the Orff-Schulwerk method this summer or in the near future. One participant stated a desire to research more into the Kodály method while others mentioned the importance of solfege and audiation as methods to help their students create. None of the participants focused on their students' abilities to correctly write down their works as part of the artistic process of create. Participant F stated that,

[the students] may not be able to...specifically write it down on a staff, but they can perform it, and I'm okay with that, because they'll learn when they move over to the intermediate school for fourth and fifth grade, they're going to be processing more of the...notes...and [then] the lightbulb will...go off a little bit better for that.

Question 3: How do you implement the artistic process of performing in your classroom?

Participant D stated that music is “a performing art, so [performing is]...inherent to almost everything that we do.” They continued to explain their process for performing by stating,

...in the beginning of class, I introduce a concept, whether it's new or whether it's leftover from the last class period...and then generally, we are either singing or we're playing instruments, or both, or we're moving through dance and we're just working toward performance. So, it's the process of refining...and assessment. A verbal assessment...giving feedback, do it again, until it's refined. Sometimes...I record that...and let them see that and assess themselves.

Similarly, Participant F explained,

...I've got 60 minutes, which I'm blessed with...so I divided it up into sections. First ten minutes or so...target...instruction...then 20-25 minutes, depending on what they...need to create their project, and then the last 20 minutes...they present it. Some items, I do individually only, some items, I do as a group.

Most participants stated that they have formal and informal performances. The formal performances include Christmas or Holiday concerts, Spring concerts, and other performances for the parents and community members such as at Parent Teacher Organization events.

Participant H explained that their school provides an opportunity for parents and grandparents to tour the classroom and have the students perform and explain what they learn in music class. Additionally, their district has a Spring Sing showcase where the elementary, middle, and high school choirs each perform for parents and the community, including at least one combined piece with everyone performing.

Seven of the participants stated that they have informal performances during their classes either performing for each other, individually or in groups, or for teachers or administrators. Multiple participants explained that they utilize the Orff-Schulwerk method for these informal performances. Participant D expressed that since they have their Level I Orff-Schulwerk Certification, that they approach performing "through a lens of Orff...[it]...informs most every lesson that I have." Additionally, they explained that while they are not trained in Kodály, that they do use the solfege hand signs which have been helpful for teaching their students to sight-singing. Only Participant G stated that they select their performance pieces based on the skills and lessons the students have learned in class explaining, "...I try to make the programs reflect what we're already learning in class," instead of saying, "...oh, that would be good for performance...so, I'll teach this, I would rather it be the opposite."

Question 4: How to do you implement the artistic process of responding in your classroom?

Participant D explained that, "...it's hard to have students, especially kindergarteners, five-year-olds, sit there and listen to a masterpiece...and follow a visual...it's not realistic."

They continued that, "instead, I use a book of musical masterpieces with choreographed activities with ribbons, scarves, and parachutes." Multiple participants also shared that they use movement as a method for students to respond to music, especially for younger students.

Participant C stated, "I want them to feel it more physically, I feel like it makes more sense for them [be]cause they're little." Other responses that participants mentioned were questioning, prompting students to listen for certain elements in a song, games, and performance-based responses utilizing instruments. Participant H indicated that they use written responses, even for younger grades by utilizing listening glyphs. They explained, that listening glyphs are where students color "based on what they hear...if you hear percussion in this song, color this section a certain color...[and that] usually [there's] a place for, did you like this song..."

Multiple participants did indicate that they utilized written response methods for older students. Two stated that their students respond after big performances while others provided questionnaires or specific prompts for their students. One of these participants incorporated the think, pair, share technique for students to work through responding to performances. Other participants that incorporated written responses utilized free writing while listening to music as a response technique.

A few participants indicated that the Orff-Schulwerk method was helpful in implementing the artistic process of responding as the process is built into the method. One participant stated that they do not want to spend a lot of time on response, so the Orff-Schulwerk method helps protect their instructional time. Another participant stated that through the Orff-

Schulwerk method and movement, the students were able to listen and respond to what they heard, either by creating their own movements or using the specific movements the teacher provided for their students. Only one participant mentioned using the Kodály method for responding, indicating the usefulness of the solfege syllables.

Question 5: What are your procedures for incorporating the artistic processes into your lesson planning?

Participant A stated that they try to incorporate the artistic processes “as often as possible, in our class, because that is what music is all about...being creative, performing for an audience, and responding to music. So, those three things are really critical in developing any skill, but especially music...” They went on to explain their procedure for the processes in their lessons saying,

...a lot of times we will respond first to something, so that way it...gives them a preface to ‘why do you want to create?’, ‘why do you want to perform?’...because, [listen to] this performance, how awesome was this?, how did this make you feel? We want to do that as well; we want to provide somebody with the opportunity to experience what we just experienced.’ And being on the other side, being the performer, instead of the audience is a completely different experience...then after we...respond to that, then we create, we say...‘what can we do to create this feeling for our audience?’...and then...we perform what we created. Then we...go back to respond...[and] say, ‘how did we do?...what can we do to make it better next time?’ and that is really the artistic process for everything, is going back and saying what can we do better, and fixing it...in my class...we do...respond, create, perform, [and] respond again.

Two other participants explained that they follow a curriculum map with the standards. Participant C explained their process stating, “I went through and I made sure that in every month there is a standard that is creating, performing, and responding. Now, usually they’re doubled up on creating.” Participant D stated that they utilize the elements of music to develop their lesson plans and through those elements, determine how to incorporate the artistic processes. Three other participants stated that they did not have a method for ensuring that they taught through the artistic processes. One of these participants stated that they felt that including creating, performing, and responding into their lesson planning was ingrained but that they were not deliberately trying to plan for teaching the artistic processes, while another shared that it is their goal to have a method for documenting the artistic processes while lesson planning and they intend to do this next school year.

Question 6: In what ways have your trainings in the Orff-Schulwerk, Kodály, and Dalcroze, or other methods helped you in implementing the artistic processes, if you have received any additional trainings?

Participant C explained how their Orff-Schulwerk Level I certification affected their implementation of the artistic processes by stating that,

...it effects probably every part of my teaching just because it’s comfortable and it works, and I feel a strong connection to where the kids are...as far as their learning...when I start with them really young, before they really have the labels of...rhythm...they understand words, they understand how words sound...they’re learning how those work...together...with the syllables...and I feel [Orff is] a really easy way to meet my kids where they are, to be able to get them to understand what I want them to learn...instead of just throwing this random...picture at them...here’s a quarter note,

figure it out...if I'm able to connect it to something that they're comfortable with then...they are able to understand it better and I feel like my kids are...able to move quicker or have a better sense of rhythm just because of that and...I feel like it makes it more valuable than just me doing this random stuff...it meets them where they are...

Participant D explained,

...The Orff method completely changed my philosophy of teaching. When I went through that two weeks of training...my philosophy shifted from learning the more cerebral parts of music for my students, like theory and aural skills and history and things like that, chord structure, to...the Orff method. Play, sing, move, and learn through those things instead of learning through more cerebral...this is what a triad looks like...my philosophy shifted to more of an immersion in creating and the students playing the music and learn through the experience...

Other participants explained that their professional development in the Orff-Schulwerk method have assisted them in teaching in the music classroom. Participant C stated that prior to their certification in Orff-Schulwerk, when they were first teaching that they, "had no idea what to do..." Three participants stated that they were young in their career or a first-year teacher, and have not yet had the opportunity to become Orff-Schulwerk certified, but they all stated a desire to get trained as they thought it would help them in their music instruction, one which has their training scheduled for this upcoming summer. Another of these participants shared their excitement for the Orff-Schulwerk method based on professional development opportunities being offered in the surrounding area by the new Quad-State Orff Chapter. A third participant explained that they are wanting to get their Orff-Schulwerk certification since they have so many

Orff instruments in their room that they have noticed their tendency to utilize those instruments in their teaching.

None of the participants expressed any comments about having additional trainings in the Kodály or Dalcroze methods, although Participant F stated that they used Kodály rhythm counting in their classroom. Participant C also stated that while they mostly use Orff-Schulwerk, they do utilize the Kodály solfege syllables and some Dalcroze movement, but that this overlaps with their Orff-Schulwerk training.

Question 7: How do you encourage a student-centered classroom?

Many of the participants stated that they provide opportunities for the students to select a piece of music to learn next from a list of options; add sections to the music, props, or movements; or provide leadership roles in their classrooms where the students lead the classroom as the teacher. Only one participant stated that their classroom was not student-centered, but that they were trying to discover ways to make it more student-led in the future.

A few participants mentioned the use of centers as a means for creating student-centered classrooms. Participant C stated,

...I do a lot of stations [with older students] and they like that. I like being able to do that [because] I can turn that over to them...and...[it] helps them become more independent...[to] figure it out on their own...experience...be able to explain...I like how stations can...provide them the opportunity to do things without me telling them everything.

Participant E shared their difficulty with a student-centered classroom saying, “it’s hard, because, with some classes, it works really, really well, but if...you have discipline issues...[it can] ruin that. We have some really severe behavior issues this year...in some classes...[they

are] not very student-centered because they can't handle it." Conversely, Participant F shared their experience with student-centered classrooms explaining,

I let them do it on their own and then I let them perform it on their own...I always at least have a target for them to shoot for and then I just turn it over to them. I don't know how your class works, but mine is noisy all the time, every day, all day, they're all over the carpet, there in corners here and in corners there, they're doing this, they're doing that, constant movement, constant something going on in the music room. Some of the...kids with behavioral issues in the regular classroom...don't have any problem...here because they're not sitting behind a desk or they're not sitting [on] the carpet, they're up moving around, so when...I do give them the freedom...I typically don't have to...do anything but just make sure that they're corralled and they're not being crazy goofy...

Assessment. Interview participants were asked questions regarding their goals and practices in assessing student growth in the artistic processes. Additionally, participants were asked their perceptions regarding their current assessment practices.

Question 1: What are your instructional goals for implementing the artistic processes?

Participants were asked about their instructional goals in implementing the artistic processes of create, perform, and respond into their classrooms. Multiple participants stated that they used observation to conduct assessments which allowed them to instantly assess student understanding. One participant stated that their goal is to achieve a student-centered classroom where the teacher can observe and assess what the students know and do not know so that they could make instructional changes. Another participant agreed that through assessment, they can individualize instruction, but stated that they start instruction with assessments first, with their goal in mind. Participant E stated,

...[I] start with the end goal...I want them to be able to do, and then I think of how I am going to assess that, and then I back up and think, now what do I need to teach them, what experiences do they need to have to be able to do that goal.

Participant F agreed that instant feedback was helpful in assessing student understanding of the learning targets and instructional goals, and stated, "...as I make my way around the classroom, then I'm able to assess instantly did they get it, did they understand the target, and number two, are they rehearsing and practicing to be able to perform." Additionally, this participant also desires alignment with regular education classroom goals and creates experiences to encourage an overlap of skills. Participants then described their individual goals for each of the three artistic processes.

Create. Participant D explained, "My goals for creating are that they use...a part of their brain that they are not necessarily accustomed to using in the...core academic classroom." The participant continued explaining that,

...I want them to come into my classroom, have mallets in their hands or an instrument in their hand and feel confident in creating on the spot...and have the confidence to do that [be]cause improvisation and creating is one thing, but...I know there are students that...can do it but lack confidence... So, that is my goal, to give them the confidence to be vulnerable enough to put it out there in front of the class...

Another participant explained that they assess students by walking around the room and monitoring student progress in their creating or composing activities by asking questions to help guide students' processes. They stated that writing the learning target for the day on the board for reference helps students remain focused and provides them with a method for self-assessing their progress. Participant B explained that creating in their classroom is directed through

questions about how to arrange or build upon a song asking, “how can we make it different?, could we add our own words?, who would like to change?, who had an idea for this rhythm right here, what could we add under it?”

Perform. Participant B shared their goal for performing by stating, “I want every kid to perform in some way before they leave my classroom...whether it be a small group...or individually.” Another participant explained that through performance, another level of assessment is possible. They stated that they were able to see if students could rhythmically perform their compositions utilizing musical behaviors or if they were simply reading the text. The participant explained that through student performance and assessment, the teacher can provide feedback and guidance to the student guiding them to meeting their overarching musical learning target. Another participant explained that performing assessments are often linked to written assessments in their classroom so that they can gauge understanding of the concept and not just a skill. Participant D explained their goals for performance stating,

...I want my students to feel like the things that I give them to perform, whether they’ve created it or whether I have...chosen something for them, I want them to feel proud of it, I want them to feel like it’s quality. I want them, and if it’s for public performance, I...want them to feel like they have a desire to show it to the public, to their parents, to the community...to their teachers.

Respond. While most participants explained that their students responded in some way in music, not many detailed their goals for students in this artistic process as they did for creating and performing. One participant stated that they use centers as a method for student responses as creating smaller groups of students assisted in the students’ abilities to respond to musical questions. Another participant stated they were not positive that they reached the goals of the

artistic process for responding. They stated that their goal was for students to “not just listen to a piece of music, but to be able to critically listen...can they understand what they are hearing, why they like it, why they don't.” Also stating that they are not positive that they achieve this goal as they are unsure of the ability of their students to understand and articulate those thoughts, even though it is their goal that the students could explain their thoughts and feelings through responses to music.

Question 2: How do you plan assessments in your classroom?

One participant explained that with their younger students, they planned to have assessments at the end of each nine-week grading period and knew the general topic of assessment for each period. They explained that with their older students, they plan more assessments and utilize a daily checkmark grade as they are required to submit grades through an online grading system for their older students. Another participant explained that they typically do not plan assessments for the first lesson in a unit as concepts are being introduced, but plan on utilizing questioning techniques in subsequent lessons to assess what students remember and know. Participant G stated that they have thought a lot about how to incorporate more assessments into their lessons and is working on a plan for next year. They continued by explaining their plan to focus on a concept a month, or longer if needed, and during the last lesson, utilize centers. Through these centers, students can be assessed in small groups allowing for the teacher to determine if students need more time with the current concept or if the class is ready to move on to the next concept.

Participant F was the only participant to state that assessment was purposefully built into their lesson planning. They stated that intentional assessments were the only method for them to know if students were grasping the concepts and to have proof of student learning. Other

participants stated that they are constantly assessing but do not have time to plan formal assessments since they only see their students once a week. Instead, these participants utilize observations and track student progress using notes in their lesson plans to indicate classes that are behind. Participant C stated that they do not necessarily want their students to know when they are being assessed because they do not want the students to feel judged and that the assessment data is more for the teacher in planning instruction than for the students.

Participant D explained that music assessment is vastly different than other academic areas since it is a performing art and that individual performance is the best method for assessment, but unrealistic due to the time constraints of seeing students for less than an hour a week. They stated that, “you cannot have a performance assessment [each class], for that’s all you would do.” They did state that assessment is vital to musicians, but the assessment is more in the style of a rehearsal which is based solely on constant and continual assessment, but that is sometimes hard for other people in other academic subjects to understand. Participant D did state that they have tried to add more quantifiable assessments to their lesson planning using remote clicker answering devices that allow students to select the correct response to a melody sung or a rhythm performed by the teacher. Additionally, this participant explained that they utilize weekly personal reflection from rehearsal assessments to help guide their next week’s lesson plan.

Question 3: How are assessments of the artistic processes used in your class?

Participant A stated that they use assessments of the artistic processes to create their curriculum and to ensure that students are learning and “becoming better musicians...even if they don’t pursue being a musician [that] giving them those basic abilities to perform, or to read music, or whatever it may be...help build and create my curriculum to achieve that goal.”

Another participant explained that while performance assessments can take a long time, that they view them as important because they allow the teacher to know how each student is progressing. To help students, some participants stated that they utilize games to conduct assessments. They stated that most students do not know that they are being assessed when they utilize games.

Participant C explained that in their classroom, creating is typically an informal assessment that could include short concerts at the end of a class or be more formal with written compositions if the lesson continued for multiple weeks. They continued and stated that performing assessments are based on rubrics, but the results are more for the teacher than for the students. Participant C then shared that responding is their most formal assessment because most of the time the students are using paper assessments where students are drawing or writing individually.

Question 4: What formative assessment methods do you use in your classroom?

Most of the participants indicated that they utilized checklists, rosters, or a notepad for performance assessments, looking for larger musical skills and behaviors. Participant E explained that they had struggled with assessment for their younger students for a long time, but now, they utilize assessment charts and by the end of the year, students will have all had a chance to answer musical questions, allowing students multiple turns if they do not yet know the answers, asking only a few students each class period. Some participants also mentioned using questioning techniques with verbal feedback as formative assessments or simply asking the students to self-assess by indicating their understanding with a thumbs up, thumbs to the side, or thumbs down.

Multiple participants stated that they use rubrics as formative assessments. Participant D stated that they utilize an empty rubric for class activities which can be filled in with the daily

learning targets. They continued, explaining that sometimes they take the time to fill out the rubric, having the students self-assess, while other times they simply use a quick rating scale from three to one, where three indicates that there were no improvement needed, two shows that some refinement is needed, and one that there is a lot of work to do to meet the learning goals. Another participant explained that they liked using rubrics because they could keep the student rubrics and compare and contrast student understanding of the material to determine the needs of the students for the next lesson.

A few participants mentioned utilizing small groups for formative assessments. Some use centers or listening stations with worksheets or student notebooks for assessments, although multiple participants shared that they do not use traditional paper and pencil assessments. Participant D stated that, "I don't ever do paper and pencil, I figure they do that all day long and I don't want them to have to pick up a pencil in my classroom." This sentiment was shared by Participant G, who stated that while paper and pencil was what came into mind first when considering a formative assessment, that they did not want to use paper and pencil in their classroom, even though they did not feel that there was necessarily anything wrong with someone doing so. They continued to explain that they wanted to find a different way to conduct formative assessments because music class should not be like every other class. Additionally, Participant G stated that they know they need to do more formative assessments and that they plan on making this an area of growth in the future.

Overall, Participant E explained that the type of formative assessments used depends on the activities of each lesson and that not all activities or lessons are assessed. Participant D stated that formative assessment in music changes into a rehearsal assessment structure when the classes are preparing for a performance, where feedback and formative assessments occur almost

constantly throughout the lesson. Participant H described formative assessments as having “your finger on the pulse of what, [students] know and don’t know, and then that tells me what to go back the next week and hit again.”

Question 5: What summative assessment methods do you use in your classroom?

When asked about the summative assessments utilized in their classrooms, many of the participants stated that they were the same as the formative assessments, that they used rubrics, checklist, or performance-based assessments, while others stated that they utilize more written assessments. Participant A stated that summative assessments were vital to them as they provide an overview of the instruction for the year and can indicate areas for professional growth.

Many of the participants shared that they do not give grades for music, some do give a rating such as satisfactory or needs improvement, while others do not have anything on the report card. Participant C stated that a positive of not giving grades was that they were able to control the types of assessment and felt that made the assessments more authentic but also stated that some students feel that they do not have to participate since they do not receive formal grades. Another participant stated that some of their assessments, like those of students playing recorder, are not included in their grade calculation, so in one manner, summative assessments for their classroom are scarcely there. Lastly, Participant F had another view on summative assessment by stating that while they do not give grades, the music program is assessed every time the students perform for the school and community.

Question 6: How do you utilize the Model Cornerstone Assessments in your classroom?

Out of all eight individuals interviewed, only one participant indicated that they knew what the MCA were, while the rest of the participants had not heard of them. The one

participant that had heard of the MCA also stated that they did not utilize them in their classroom due to lack of instructional time.

Question 7: What are your feelings on how assessments of the artistic processes are conducted in your classroom?

The feelings of the participants on how they currently conduct assessments in their classrooms varied. Some simply stated that there is always room to improve their current methods while others stated that they generally do the same lessons each year, but with different students and while they do alter their lessons, sometimes the students understand and sometimes they do not. Another participant indicated that they are not good with assessment with all of their students, but the most important thing is that students are participating and trying their best. Only one participant stated their feelings that their current assessment strategies worked for them and that their administrators agreed, saying that overall their methods worked for their students in their specific situation.

Participant H stated that assessment was a struggle for them since they are required to conduct so many other assessments in their additional roles as resource teacher and reading interventionist at their school. They stated that they know they do not do enough assessments in the music classroom. Another participant explained that their goal is not assessment based, but for the students to love music and want to continue being active in music outside of the classroom setting. Some participants discussed their training on conducting assessments in the music classroom. Participant D stated,

...I don't know that...I've actually ever [been] trained on how to do assessments in the music classroom other than just the model of what I have seen which is, if you are in a

rehearsal, you just rehearse. And there's a specific way you do that...I have my own style of rehearsing; it's just based on continuous...feedback.

Another participant shared that they feel that, in a way, assessment does not really matter since the main goal is not performance, but that the students are working through the artistic processes and while the final product might not be perfect, they can make the connection to similar activities later in the year and put their knowledge and understanding to use.

Participant D continued that they have listed assessment as a professional goal the last couple of years and through that focus, they have included more quantitative assessment methods.

Participant G shared that they desire to grow in their assessment methods out of a desire to know what the students know so that each student can be,

...equipped to be a musical person for the rest of their life because...especially...where [I am]...the socioeconomic level is not very high and some of [the students], this might be the only music that they get, and so, I really want them to be prepared...to be more musical beings, and be able to know where to find access...if they need it.

Implementation challenges. Participants were asked about their specific challenges or needs in teaching the artistic processes of the CMS. Specifically, participants were asked about their opportunities to collaborate with fellow elementary music educators or to attend professional development sessions based on the CMS.

Question 1: What are your largest concerns in teaching through the artistic processes?

A concern shared by multiple participants was classroom management. One participant shared that students in their classroom can tend to be lazy or unengaged in activities while another shared concerns about teaching creatively in their school with larger class sizes which

has led to teacher and student frustrations. Additionally, classrooms with increased numbers of students with special needs has been expressed as a concern. Participant E stated,

...a lot of...these kinds have special needs. And I used to...feel like [I had] a lot more...freedom to let the kids be creative but...if I've got five groups and they're all making up their own instrumental part and you've got a kid crawling under the keyboards and you've got a kid leaving the classroom, or you've got a kid that [is] breaking the sticks in half...that's a huge barrier, and that ha[s] gotten worse over the years.

Conversely, Participant F stated,

...I don't have any problems teaching [the processes] in the classroom at all...and it doesn't make any difference if it's a student with an IEP or not, they're [going to] get the same as a student who doesn't have an IEP. I felt 100% ready to go for the classroom when I...left college, [earned my] Master's degree, jumped in, I didn't have any problems.

Time was a concern mentioned by almost all participants as a barrier to teaching through the artistic processes. One participant stated that time was a large concern since they are also responsible for other jobs within their school causing a spilt in focus and a lack of time. Due to their certification in other areas, more responsibilities are often placed upon them, making teaching music through the processes harder. Participant D mentioned that if given more time, they would be able to accomplish more but they expressed that they did believe that their amount of time was typical of most elementary music educators in the area. Participant F stated, "I'm blessed to have 60 minutes and not 50 minutes or 40 minutes, that would totally change how I have to do things because I wouldn't have as much time."

The last main concern for the participants was a lack of professional development. One participant stated that they had self-doubt in their ability to teach through the processes while another stated that they needed help understanding the CMS. Participant G stated that if they understood the standards better, then they would be better equipped to teach. Another participant explained how balance of the artistic processes was their largest concern. Participant B explained,

...my biggest concern [is to]...make sure that all three of [the processes] are present in my classroom. I don't want an unbalanced classroom, so to speak, and sometimes, I feel like it can get that way easily, if you are good at one of them. If you find what you are good at, what your students respond to really well...then it's easy to fall into, well, that's what I'm going to do every week. So, you just have to push yourself and make sure your planning is careful enough that you are hitting all three. So, I really try to always make sure that [I teach] all three and I reflect, I am...making them perform, they are creating here, and they are responding. So, I try to mentally...check through while I am planning with that to make sure they are all there, but it is a struggle sometimes.

Other struggles that participants mentioned were a need for more space. Participant E explained that they teach at a good school with plenty of resources but would like more space to do more movement activities. They continued, that more space would make it easier for their students with sensory issues to avoid becoming overwhelmed by the noise and sounds that come with a creative classroom. Lastly, Participant F explained that lack of funding was a concern for them since they have had to take more and more time to ask for business sponsorships or complete grant applications to obtain funding for materials for their students and that has made teaching through the process more difficult.

Question 2: What kinds of professional development have you had on the Core Music Standards?

Most participants shared that they have received no professional development on the CMS. Multiple participants explained that they have attended the Share Day that is annually presented by the First District of the KMEA elementary teachers. Some participants stated that the CMS were covered while others stated that they were not. Participant C stated that they may have had some training while still in college, but they did not receive formal training, just information on where to find the standards.

Participant D explained that they attend the KMEA conference annually and that there is usually at least one quality session that they can take back information, skills, or techniques from and implement in their classroom. They also stated that they, personally, seek out professional development such as their previous Orff-Schulwerk Level I certification that they feel was “influential in changing [their] philosophy of music education [because it] does a lot with creating, performing, and responding” and the World Music Drumming clinic being held this summer at Murray State University. Participant F also typically attends the KMEA conference and has been able to obtain professional development from this conference. Similarly, Participant F also attends additional professional development held by elementary music educators across their district which they stated was helpful to their teaching through the artistic processes.

Question 3: How have the Core Music Standards affected your teaching of the artistic processes in your classroom?

Participant A explained that the CMS were like a roadmap outlining what they should be teaching in each grade level while Participant B shared that they have encouraged them to plan better, to incorporate all processes into their lesson planning. They continued stating,

I'm sometimes out of my comfort zone...I appreciate it in that way, since I am actively thinking about [the standards and] it's pushing me to...make my lessons more engaging...where [the students] are doing all three and they are doing more elements, that make[s] it challenging for them.

This thinking was shared with another participant who stated that the CMS made them think more about creating and responding since they were already very comfortable teaching performing.

Participant C believes that the CMS were created at an ideal point in their career as they had been teaching for a few years with the focus on survival and only utilized the previous standards for formal observations. They continued explaining that it was not until they were asked to complete a curriculum map under the CMS that they studied them. This participant realized that the CMS were standards laid out similarly to their teaching methods and could help them organize their instruction and differentiate their lessons. Additionally, Participant C explained that prior to the CMS their teaching was not very balanced, and their teaching methods not varied, and now they work toward developing multiple areas of intelligence with their students.

Only one participant shared that the CMS did not have a major effect on their teaching. Instead, they explained that the larger affect, in their opinion, was that music was no longer a tested content area for school accountability scores. The change from preparing students to complete a state test or collecting evidence for the subsequent Program Reviews that were required by the state affected their teaching more than the change in the music standards.

Question 4: How do the pressures for performance affect your implementation and assessment of the Core Music Standards?

Multiple participants mentioned that they feel pressures to present performances that meet the high expectations of themselves, their administration, and their communities.

Participant B shared that they are expected, as the music teacher, to present programs every year and that some have confused these performances with what they teach in their classroom every week. They continued, saying, that they while they want quality programs and they are a priority, it is not their main focus. Another participant shared their stress about attaining the same level of success or reaching a higher level each consecutive year in their performances because now that is the expectation of the administration or community. However, Participant E feels differently since their entire school supports their Christmas program as the small surrounding community wants the program to run smoothly, so everyone offers their assistance and is flexible concerning schedules and the needs of the students to prepare and present the show.

Not all schools are as flexible and accommodating. Another participant stated that time management concerning schedules are very difficult when it comes to performances. This sentiment was shared with another participant that mentioned the stress of the second quarter of the year due to all the practicing for their Christmas program and multiple holiday related interruptions. Overall, the largest pressure the participants faced in presenting performances was the loss of valuable instructional time. Participant C stated that they lose almost two months of instruction to prepare for their holiday programs and while they try to connect as many standards to the program instruction as they can, they felt that they could have taught the standards much quicker through their normal instructional methods instead of through program practice.

Another participant stated that if they only saw their students once a week, that they would not

be able to succeed in teaching the artistic processes, but since they see their students more often, they are able to separate classroom instruction and rehearsals for performances.

Participant A expanded on their stress for continued high quality performances saying that they were worried about losing their job if they did not succeed. They shared that it is a pressure that they do not often discuss but one they feel from within and from their administration. They stated,

...my job is easily...something that they would cut in a heartbeat, and unfortunately, at...the school I am at now, we actually just had a discussion about... [being] overstaffed...that they may have to do some cuts...and so, I have to really make sure that I stand out, so that if they have that meeting, they don't say...we can just have a regular classroom teacher take 15 minutes to teach music...so, [there is] pressure...that I stick out and that I am irreplaceable.

Question 5: How often have you been able to collaborate with fellow elementary music educators on the Core Music Standards?

Most participants stated that they had not had many opportunities to collaborate with fellow music educators on the CMS specifically. Multiple participants mentioned that they attend the share day presented by elementary music teachers in the First District of the KMEA but that the standards are not typically the focus of those meetings even though the collaboration was valuable. Participant H also stated that the annual Honor Choir Festival, hosted by the First District of the KMEA, was also a time when they were able to discuss music education practices with fellow teachers, but not specifically the CMS.

Participant G shared that there is another music educator in their district that they feel comfortable talking to about the CMS. This district-level communication was also discussed by

Participant F who shared that all the elementary music educators in their district constantly communicate and collaborate. They did share that one problem in collaboration within their district was that not all the elementary schools taught the same grade levels, some were kindergarten through fifth grade while others were kindergarten through third grade which causes some limitations in the collaboration across the entire district, but overall, Participant F felt that their collaboration was extremely helpful and effective. This type of collaboration is not possible for music teachers like Participant C, who is currently the only music educator in their entire district.

When asked about collaboration, Participant D stated that when the CMS were established, they worked through them by themselves, without any training or collaboration with fellow music educators. They continued saying,

I rarely hear music teachers talk about them. We are talking about Orff methods, or the, specific...pedagogical practices that we have, or...introducing new activities. But, it's rarely about the CMS. And we don't have any...accountability, so whether I teach the core music standards or not. I mean, I want to have a warm feeling in my heart that I did and I want to feel like I'm following the rules, because I'm a rule follower, but at the same time, no one really cares if I do or not...there's no accountability.

Question 6: What do you need to feel more comfortable teaching through the artistic processes of the Core Music Standards in your classroom?

While many participants discussed time concerns in previous comments, only two referred to time as something they needed to assist them in teaching the artistic processes. Participant F stated that they would like a dedicated person to teach dance and drama so that they could solely focus on music instruction and then collaborate when necessary and Participant E

stated that they did not have the time to document the incorporation of the artistic processes into their lesson planning. While they are currently not required to do this by their administration, Participant E stated that taking the time to document where and when they teach the processes would hinder their ability to teach due to the amount of time it would take away from class instruction. Although, they did say that they felt they could document those activities if they had to, but that no one looks at their lesson plans or curriculum.

Many participants mentioned the need for more opportunities to collaborate with fellow music educators. Participant G even mentioned that it was helpful to them to participate in the interview process of this research project because it allowed them to talk through things they had already been considering related to the CMS. Another participant explained that through collaboration with their more experienced music colleagues, that they could ask questions and determine areas for continued growth.

Participant C stated,

I think it would be nice to be able to sit down [with peers because]...some of the language in the standards is so confusing...I have my interpretation of what the standards [mean, but]...because they write it to sound as fancy as they possible can, which I understand, they're trying to make it intellectual...legitimize what we're doing, but at the same time, when we get down to day to day, I need to teach my kids and this board of music...specialists, or whatever has created [the CMS] and then I read one and I [ask], 'what does this even mean?'...I would like to sit down and [understand] how [to] interpret this...I'm by myself, I don't have anybody to collaborate with.

Almost all participants stated that additional professional development would be helpful to them. Multiple participants indicated that they wanted CMS specific professional

development to improve their understanding of the Standards, similarly to the thoughts of Participant C. Participant G stated that the language used in the standards was confusing and Participant H felt overwhelmed trying to research the standards without the support of professional development. Another participant agreed that some professional development on the CMS would be helpful, but they did not want this to be routine, but an informational session with someone who helped develop the Standards or someone that was very knowledgeable about the CMS.

Other participants mentioned professional development more generally. Participant D mentioned that they are always wanting to learn and grow and that is one reason that they continually seek out professional development opportunities, especially in music pedagogy and methods. Another participant mentioned a plan to obtain their Orff-Schulwerk Level I certification but also stated that they are not convinced to follow any one method in their classroom.

Lastly, only one participant stated that additional funding would assist them in teaching through the artistic processes. This same participant stated that they would also like to have a separate room for their keyboard lab since they currently must pull their keyboards out from the wall when they want to use them and then push them back at the end of the lesson. Having a second room, would help them have more dedicated spaces for different activities.

Analysis

This study looked at the implementation, assessment, and needs of the elementary music educators in the First District of the KMEA. Through the survey and subsequent interviews, themes have emerged in these researched areas. The first main theme across the research questions is that the music educators of the First District of the KMEA that participated in this

study are all different in their implementation, assessment, and needs in teaching for understanding through the artistic processes of create, perform, and respond. The second theme that was revealed by the research was that the Orff-Schulwerk method of music education positively affected participants in their abilities to implement and assess, especially for those participants that had Orff-Schulwerk certification, but trainings and professional developments in the Orff-Schulwerk method were also beneficial for those that participated in such activities.

Diversity. In both the survey and the interviews, the research indicated that the elementary music educators of the First District of the KMEA are very diverse in their backgrounds, understanding, implementation, assessment, and needs concerning the CMS. From their years of experience teaching music in the elementary classroom, type of degrees earned, additional certifications held, to the grade levels they teach and amount of time they see each class, the participants of this study and their individual circumstances affect their understanding and abilities in teaching the artistic processes outlined in the CMS.

Implementation. The diversity of the participants was shown in the survey responses to questions regarding their implementation of the artistic processes. Some teachers indicated that the CMS changed their teaching while others indicated they did not change. There was also variation in the activities that participants utilize in their classrooms for teaching creating, performing, and responding. Only one interview participant mentioned improvisation as means for creating.

Although the research revealed that the participants of this study are very diverse in their implementation practices, there were some areas of similarity. All survey participants agreed that their classrooms were student-centered and most agreed that they feel comfortable teaching the artistic processes and incorporate them into their monthly lesson planning while the majority

of the interview participants stated that they did not have a method for documenting the artistic processes in their planning.

Assessment. Participants' responses to their assessments of the artistic processes were also diverse. Survey participants' responses to their assessment practices were divided but more aligned concerning the types of assessments utilized in their classrooms with performance assessments and rubrics being the most common. While many interview participants utilize formative assessments, few incorporate summative assessments and only one had heard of the MCA. Many participants focus on the rehearsal model for classroom assessments. Only one interview participant stated that their assessments are designed and integrated purposefully.

Implementation challenges. While most participants in the survey agreed that time was a large barrier, this was not the largest concern for the interview participants as all stated that they had at least 30 minutes a week. Other participants had at least an hour or more a week. Some participants did state that if they had less time in their current schedule then time would be a barrier to teaching the artistic processes. A few participants stated that time was more of a barrier when trying to prepare students for formal performances as most lose a significant amount of instructional time for rehearsals, program practices, and performances.

Only a couple interview participants stated that they struggled with understanding the CMS. Classroom management was another area where interview participants disagreed. Some stated that this was a concern in teaching though the artistic processes while other stated that their teaching focusing on the CMS have helped students with behavior problems in other classes engage and focus in their music classroom. A couple of interview participants also mentioned a desire for additional space for students to spread out for movement or creating activities and only one mentioned the need for additional funding for instruments or materials. The largest

implementation challenge that most survey and interview participants agreed upon was the need for additional collaboration.

Almost all survey participants indicated that collaboration was a need to support them in teaching the CMS through the artistic processes. Most of the interview participants stated that having the ability to discuss with their music education peers would assist them in understanding, implementing, and assessing the CMS. Only one participant stated that they have effective collaboration with their fellow elementary music educators in their district. Another participant shared that they were the only music educator for their entire K-12 school district. Most participants also mentioned that CMS specific professional development would be helpful in understanding the Standards, but some also stated that they would not like this to be an ongoing occurrence, that they preferred methods or pedagogy based professional development.

Orff-Schulwerk. Another reoccurring theme uncovered by the research was the importance of the Orff-Schulwerk method for music instruction. Five participants in the survey, of which three agreed to be interviewed, had their Orff-Schulwerk Level I certification. Throughout the research on implementation of the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding, these participants expressed the positive affect this method has had on their ability to teach for understanding. Additionally, other interview participants mentioned the usefulness of Orff-Schulwerk based professional development sessions that they have attended and many of the interview participants that do not have Orff-Schulwerk certification mentioned a plan or desire to obtain this certification soon.

Participants mentioned how the Orff-Schulwerk Level I certification changed their entire philosophy of education to an emersion model where students learn through experiences and that those experiences are effective because they occur at age-appropriate levels within the students'

current developmental stage. Many participants shared that through singing, playing, moving, and creating that their students developed a deeper understanding of the artistic processes and helped developed musical skills and behaviors that they transfer to other similar experiences. One participant even stated that prior to taking their Orff-Schulwerk Level I certification that they did not know how to teach elementary music and through their training, that they were already teaching through the artistic processes of the CMS and were able to transition to the new Standards easily. While some participants mentioned using the hand signs, solfege syllables, or the rhythm counting system of the Kodály method, Orff-Schulwerk was the reoccurring method that has had a large influence on many of the elementary music educators in the First District of the KMEA whether through their own certification process or participation in Orff-Schulwerk based professional development sessions.

Summary

The elementary music educators of the First District of the KMEA have diverse educational backgrounds, teaching certifications, pedagogy certifications, experience, and classroom designs, all of which affect their abilities to teach the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding in the CMS. Even through these differences and their individual challenges, these elementary music educators strive to continue their professional growth by seeking out and participating in professional development activities and trying to collaborate with peers. The Orff-Schulwerk method of music education may be a valuable pedagogical tool that many of these teachers can pursue to meet their desires to continue to improve their abilities in implementing and assessing the artistic processes of the CMS and to overcome their implementation challenges specific to their classroom and students. The Orff-Schulwerk method could serve as a foundation of support for the elementary music educators of the First District

and those individuals already trained in the Orff-Schulwerk method could serve as the pillars for collaborative support that the music educators have deemed necessary through the findings of this research.

Chapter 5: Conclusions, Discussions, and Suggestions for Further Research

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the understanding, implementation and assessment practices, and the individual needs of the elementary music educators teaching in the First District of the KMEA so that an action plan could be created to assist these educators in teaching for musical understanding through the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding as outlined in the CMS. Through the online survey and subsequent interviews two main themes emerged. First, the elementary music educators of the First District are diverse in their educational backgrounds, additional pedagogy certifications, years of experience teaching elementary music, grade levels they teach, number of instructional minutes a week per class, methods they use to implement and assess the artistic processes, and their individual needs. The second reoccurring theme of this research is the impact of the Orff-Schulwerk method of music instruction on teachers of the First District's abilities to implement the artistic processes of create, perform, and respond in the elementary classroom.

Conclusions

Implementation. The first research question of this study was designed to determine how the elementary music educators in the First District implemented the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding in their classrooms and if there were any methods that assisted them in their implementation. Additionally, participants were asked how the CMS affected their teaching and if they changed their teaching as result of the new Standards. The results of the survey were divided on these topics with half of that participants saying that the CMS affected their teaching and they changed their instruction and the other half indicating that the CMS did not affect their teaching, and they did not make any instructional changes. The

disagreement on these topics is not surprising since the CMS were released in 2014 and five of the 16 participants have only been teaching for five years or less and another two participants 10 years or less. Additionally, the state of Kentucky only adopted the CMS in June of 2015, less than five years ago (NCCAS, 2017). Almost half of the survey participants have been teaching for 10 years or less and have either never taught or had limited teaching experiences under the NSAE before the transition to the CMS.

As for the instructional changes caused by the CMS, a participant explained that the previous focus on the state standardized test for arts and humanities and the following Program Review accountability system that were required by the state of Kentucky restricted their instruction more than the CMS, and that through the removal of the testing and the Program Review requirements, that they had the freedom to determine the best methods for teaching music. Conversely, Participant D shared that they believe that there is no accountability with the CMS. This lack of accountability could explain why most interview participants did not have a method for incorporating the artistic processes into their lesson plans, although most stated that they did follow the CMS or that the processes were embedded in their teaching methods. Some participants indicated that time was a factor for them in formally planning for the processes and others stated that they still use the elements of music as a framework for their planning but incorporate the processes through their instruction of the elements. Only a few participants explained that the CMS helped them organize their instruction by creating curriculum maps to ensure that all standards were taught and that students received a balanced instruction based on creating, performing, and responding.

Create. All survey participants indicated that their classrooms were student-centered. Interview participants explained that they provide students leadership opportunities in their

classroom through centers, opportunities for students to lead the class as the teacher, and providing the students choices regarding music selection or ways to add to the music they are creating. Most participants agreed that they felt comfortable teaching the creating processes even though it was ranked the lowest out of all three artistic processes. This could be that music educators are more accustomed to performing and responding to performances than creating music.

While the most common activities teachers used to engage students in the creating process were small and large group activities, composition with and without notation, stories, and improvisation, through the interviews the participants' comments focused around creating movements and guiding the students through the process of composition with only one participant indicating improvisation as a method for creating, but they also mentioned that they want to add more composition into their instruction. Additionally, none of the participants mentioned the incorporation of arranging as a means for creating or the use of technology in their classrooms.

Most survey participants disagreed with the use of technology as a method for teaching the artistic process of creating. Instead, the participants shared that the Orff-Schulwerk method was the most influential pedagogy for engaging students in creative experiences. Many participants indicated that they set the parameters for the creating activity and then allow the students to create on their own or in groups with the support of the teacher. One participant indicated that their students' audiation abilities from solfege training, part of the Kodály method, also assisted them in creating their compositions.

Perform. The artistic process that participants indicated that they incorporated the most and were the most comfortable teaching, was the process of performing. With all participants

having some form of a music education or music performance degree, the participants inclusion and comfort with performing is an expected result. Participant D explained that they utilize a rehearsal method in their classroom where there is a continuous cycle of perform, evaluate, and refine. Other participants shared this evaluation of their classrooms and indicated that verbal feedback was essential to their students developing performance abilities while a few mentioned the use of student self-assessment in the performing processes as essential to the growth and musical understanding of the students.

The most common activities participants use for performing in their classroom were singing and playing on instruments, small and large group activities, and then the incorporation of movement or dance. The Orff-Schulwerk method was mentioned by multiple participants as being very beneficial to informal performances allowing students to perform what they created while another mentioned their use of the Kodály hand signs for sight-singing.

All participants mentioned the use of informal and formal performances. Informal performances included students performing for each other or their teachers, parents, and administration within their classroom. Formal performances included holiday concerts, performing at Parent Teacher Organization events, and spring concerts for the school and community. Interestingly, only one participant stated that they select their formal performance repertoire based on what the students have learned in class so that the formal performance would reflect the student's growth and learning in the classroom. Research has shown that historically, music educators selected pieces for the purpose of rehearsal and performance instead of for the purpose of student learning and presentation of that learning (Wiggins, 2015; MENC, 1994; Zaffini, 2018). This process of selection, rehearsal, refinement, and performance was based on the prior music standards that focused on building musical knowledge and skills instead of

developing musical understanding and ultimately, independence (MENC, 1994). The goal of the CMS reversed this prior thinking to focus on the artistic processes as means of developing musical understanding and independence (Beegle, 2016). This finding of the study could indicate that some participants struggle with implementing the theories based in the CMS for public performance, and instead retain the prior method of teaching the music for knowledge and skill rather than understanding and independence. This could be due to the pressures that many participants stated for quality performances and a lack of confidence that the public or administration would understand the underpinnings of the CMS that focus on the process instead of the product (Shuler et al., 2014).

Respond. Most participants indicated that they incorporate responding activities weekly in their classrooms and all but one felt comfortable teaching the artistic process of responding. Verbal responses and question-answer techniques were the most common responding activities incorporated by participants with mixed results for individual and written responses. Multiple participants stated that they do not do written work because music is a performing art and inherently different than other academic classes and that they do not want to use paper and pencil in their classrooms. Interview participants explained that they utilize movement activities as a method for response, especially for younger students, as sometimes students have difficulty listening and following along to pieces of music, even with visual listening guides. Participant C explained that they desire their students to feel the music and respond physically since that is a more appropriate way to respond at their developmental level. Participant A shared that they often ask students to listen for certain elements of the music as a method to get students engaged in the music and provide a focus for student responses to the music.

As with the artistic processes of creating and performing, participants indicated the effectiveness of the Orff-Schulwerk method in having students respond to music. Participants explained that responding to music using the Orff-Schulwerk method was easy for the students to do and teachers to assess, as well as it did not take up a lot of valuable instructional time. While participants mentioned the use of the Kodály hand signs and solfege syllables as helpful to their implementation of the artistic processes, the use of the Orff-Schulwerk method was transformative. Participant D explained,

...The Orff method completely changed my philosophy of teaching...my philosophy shifted from learning the more cerebral parts of music for my students, like theory and aural skills...to...the Orff method. Play, sing, move, and learn through those things...my philosophy shifted to more of an emersion in creating and the students playing the music and learn through the experience...

The influence of the Orff-Schulwerk method in teaching for understanding, especially in young children, was explained by Participant C who explained that the Orff-Schulwerk method meets their students at their current developmental level and allows students to build upon their knowledge and use their skills instead of just providing terms and definitions. They continued by saying that the Orff-Schulwerk method allows for connections to be made and understandings transferred. Three of the interview participants already have Orff-Schulwerk Level I certification and multiple other participants indicated their desire or plans to become certified which could greatly impact their abilities to implement the artistic processes into their classroom.

Assessment. The second research question of this study was designed to determine how the elementary music educators in the First District assess student learning through the artistic processes. Most participants utilize performance assessments, self-reflection, rubrics or

checklists, and only roughly half use paper and pencil assessments. While most survey participants indicated that they were comfortable assessing their students in the artistic processes, very few utilize or have even heard of the MCA. Additionally, not many interview participants could explain their formative from summative assessments in their classrooms, saying that they are pretty much the same or that they do not use summative assessments.

One reason that could explain these findings could be due to a lack of training in assessment practices specific to music. Participant D explained that they were never trained on how to conduct assessments in the music classroom other than their personal experience of being in the rehearsal setting. Other participants expressed a lack of confidence in their assessment practices. Multiple participants stated that they do not give grades or formal assessments while others shared that performance-based assessments take a lot of time and it is unrealistic to assess each class period. Overall, the participants articulated their goals for assessment were that students improve, develop their musicality, and focus on the processes and not the product as the student's experiences in their elementary classroom could be the only music their students ever receive. The use of assessments in the majority of the interviewed participants was refinement for student performance.

Most participants did explain that they are constantly assessing their students and use those assessments to inform curriculum decisions. One participant stated their assessments were purposeful while another explained that they start with their instructional goals in mind and then determine how to assess student learning and lastly, plan the experiences students need to obtain the instructional goals. While most of the assessment practices in the classrooms of the elementary music educators of this study were varied and typically formative, the participants were able to explain their instructional goals for the artistic processes.

Create. For the artistic process of creating, the participants desired their students to be able to use parts of their brains that they typically do not use in other academic areas and to feel confident in their abilities to create. Through the guidance and support of the teacher, the participants wanted the students to develop their musical independence to be able to understand the learning target and self-assess themselves throughout the creative process.

Perform. The participants stated their desires for students to perform often in their classroom in various ways both informally and formally. Participant D stated that they wanted their students to feel proud of their performance and have a genuine desire to perform for others. Another participant explained that they can assess student understanding at another level through student performance of music that they created. Additionally, when students write down what they are performing, participants shared that they are better able to assess student understanding of concepts and not just skills.

Respond. In assessing the artistic process of responding, participants were not as descriptive with their goals. Instead they described their use of centers as means to create smaller groups that allow for easier assessment of student understanding. Another participant explained that it is a difficult task for students, especially young students, to critically listen to a musical masterpiece, understand what they are hearing, and be able to express their thoughts or feelings as these abilities might be above the students' developmental level.

Implementation challenges. The final research question asked about the instructional needs the music educators faced in teaching for understanding through the artistic processes. The current research showed that a lack of time was the largest barrier, followed by a need for more collaboration with fellow elementary music educators, and additional professional development specific to the CMS.

Time. While time was the largest barrier of the participants of the survey, it was not the most mentioned need by interview participants. This could be because two of the eight interview participants stated that they had at least an hour a week with each class. These two participants did state that if they had less instructional time with their students, then time would be a barrier for them in teaching through the artistic processes. When time was mentioned by the interview participants as an instructional challenge, it was in relation to the pressures for performances. Many participants stated that they lose a significant amount of instructional time when preparing for Christmas concerts and that while some mentioned that they try to continue teaching the CMS through their concert music, they indicated that could have more efficiently and effectively taught the standards another way, if not for the required performances.

Pressures for performances are a large concern for multiple interview participants. Not only regarding the amount of instructional time to prepare and present but the pressure for the students to succeed in the eyes of the school, administration, and community as well as the difficulties that come with scheduling performances and other interruptions during the Holiday season. Other teachers shared that fellow educators in the building do not understand what teaching music entails aside from preparing for a performance, while others feel that their jobs rely on a positive perception from student performances. Only one participant stated that they had a support system in their school and community for their programs to succeed and that everyone offered to help and adjust their schedules to meet the needs of the students in preparing and presenting the performance. Maybe this is due to the small-town where this participant is located or other factors such as a collaborative school environment, but this was the only participant that also had additional instruction time specific for program preparation and therefore did not feel any pressures regarding performances or lack of instructional time.

Collaboration. When asked if they collaborated with fellow elementary music educators, most participants indicated that they did not, outside of the annual Share Day professional development presented by the First District elementary music members. This Share Day is an opportunity for elementary music educators within the First District to come together to participate in music lessons presented by members of the group to share instructional ideas and activities with each other and provide an opportunity for members to communicate and collaborate with fellow elementary music educators (T. Terry, personal communication, March 24, 2020).

Aside from the Share Day, collaboration among participants of this study is low. One reason collaboration might be limited is that some school districts within the First District are very small and have only one or two elementary music educators. One of the participants of this study is currently the only music educator in their entire school district. Being the only music educator in a district or even a building can make collaboration more difficult. Only one participant mentioned continued collaboration with other elementary music educators within their district. The district that they are a part of has multiple elementary schools, each with their own music educator, which might make collaboration easier for members of this district.

Even though only one stated that they currently collaborate with fellow elementary music educators, many stated a desire to communicate with others regarding the CMS. Multiple participants mentioned working through the CMS on their own and having difficulty with the language and understanding what exactly they needed to do to meet the Standards. If these participants could get together to discuss the CMS and their individual interpretations, then a deeper understanding could develop from the participants asking questions and sharing their thoughts and ideas. One participant even mentioned that through the interview process of this

research study that they gained a better understanding of their next steps in improving their instruction of the CMS simply by talking through their goals and current processes in implementation and assessment.

Professional development. Collaboration might be one key to overcome the challenges the elementary music educators face in teaching for understanding through the CMS. Discussing their interpretations and problems teaching the CMS with each other is one way to help the educators of the First District. Another is through professional development sessions with someone that helped develop the standards or another individual that is highly trained or knowledgeable on the CMS. Many participants indicated that this kind of professional development would be helpful to them as most of their current professional development is not based on the CMS, rather on pedagogy. Most participants stated that they attend the Share Days, but most lessons presented by the members are not typically linked to the CMS. A couple participants stated that they attend the KMEA conference each year and typically find a session or two that are valuable, but again, these sessions are not generally based on the CMS but rather pedagogy or activity based.

While other participants mentioned the challenges of classroom management in teaching through the artistic processes with large class sizes or students with behavior problems or special needs, others stated this was not a problem. Only one participant stated that funding was an issue for them, and a couple desired more space for students to use for movement or creative activities. Overall, the largest concerns for elementary music educators in the First District of the KMEA are a lack of professional development, collaboration, and time.

Relationship of Conclusions to Other Research

Implementation. All participants stated that their classrooms were student-centered which research has shown is the most effective means for music education. Through student leadership and decision-making, students develop their learner agency, their understanding that they can affect their own learning (Bandura, 2006). Through participating in their learning experiences and making decisions, learners construct their own understandings and their ability to transfer their learning to new situations which increases their musical independence (Wiggins, 2015).

Create. All participants stated that they were comfortable teaching the performing process but a small amount were not comfortable teaching creating and responding. Participant B explained,

...my biggest concern [is to]...make sure that all three of [the processes] are present in my classroom. I don't want an unbalanced classroom, so to speak, and sometimes, I feel like it can get that way easily, if you are good at one of them. If you find what you are good at, what your students respond to really well...then it's easy to fall into, well, that's what I'm going to do every week. So, you just have to push yourself and make sure your planning is careful enough that you are hitting all three.

The literature supports this finding as Moon and Humphreys (2010) found that some music educators were not comfortable teaching creativity. To become comfortable teaching creativity, teachers must reach out of their comfort zones and be willing to take risks, which is not what educators are typically used to doing (CDSL, 2000). This lack of confidence in teaching the creative process was also shown with a lack of improvisational activities shared by the participants of this study.

Only one interview participant stated that they utilize improvisation as a method for teaching students the process of creating. According to Wiggins (2015), the two main reasons that teachers might not teach the creative artistic process are lack of experience or confidence. This lack of experience and confidence in composition and improvisation can cause teachers to limit the experiences they include in their lessons for students to learn the processes as the educators do not feel they are capable of teaching these skills (MENC, 1994).

While there was a lack of improvisational activities mentioned by participants of this study, most did mention including compositional activities into their classrooms. Multiple participants stated that they scaffolded their lessons to teach the process of composition to their students. The approach the participants explained in their interview followed the cognitive apprenticeship model where the learners, with the guidance of their teacher, slowly learn the process of composing and as they develop their skills, they slowly take on more and more responsibility until they are able to complete the entire process on their own (Collins et al., 1991). Through this scaffolded approach, learners develop their independence, metacognition, and their ability to transfer their understandings from one situation to another (Wiggins, 2015). Participant E explained that their goals for implementing the creative process was not based on the product but rather the process, because even if the composition the students created was not perfect, their students were able to make the connection between similar composition activities later in the year and could apply their knowledge and understandings about music to the new experience.

Perform. The process components listed in the CMS under the performing process are select, analyze, interpret, rehearse, evaluate and refine, and present (Zaffini, 2018). Prior to the adoption of the CMS, these processes and decisions were all conducted by the teacher (Wiggins,

2015). With the implementation of the CMS, students are now supposed to be included in these process components. Participants of this study shared many ways that they include students in the decision-making processes of their classrooms from selecting songs, discussing the music, preparing the songs, and then performing. Many participants mentioned the rehearsal process, and a few explained that they incorporated student self-assessment into their process. Research shows that through performance critique that students develop their metacognition, ability to relate parts of music to the whole, a wider perspective, and a deeper understanding through participating in discussions that evaluate performances (Pogonowski, 1989).

Respond. Many participants of this study expressed the usefulness of the Orff-Schulwerk method in its ability to provide instruction at the developmental level of their students, or their zone of proximal development (CDSL, 2000). Vygotsky (1978) described this area where students still need guidance and support as they are not yet ready to be independent. Students develop their understandings when they participate in experiences at or slightly above their level where they can reconstruct their understandings based on their experiences (Wiggins, 2015). Through the Orff-Schulwerk method, many participants engage their students in movement experiences to respond to music since it is difficult, especially for young students, to listen to a musical masterpiece and respond orally to what they heard. The participants stated that they encourage students to express what they heard through movement by creating their own movements for sections of the music. This concept is supported by the research which states that learning is most effective when responding activities are closely linked with creating and performing experiences (Wiggins, 2015).

Another responding technique utilized by participants of this study was prompting students to listen for specific elements in the music. Participant A explained that by asking

students to listen for a designated element in the music, it helped their students remain focused and provided a method for them to respond. Pogonowski (1989) explained that this technique helps students develop musical understanding, but students must share their thoughts and perceptions of the music and not just answer questions.

Music educators encourage their students to develop musical understandings based on their experiences in creating, performing, and responding to music (Shuler et al., 2014). The musical methods of Orff-Schulwerk, Kodály, and Dalcroze overlap in many areas including aural perception before visual representation, creativity, and movement (Mead, 1996). Many participants of this study incorporate the Orff-Schulwerk method through the integration of movement and games into their lessons as means of instruction, performance, and assessment (Goodkin, 2001).

Assessment. While Boardman (1989) states the importance of assessment in determining if the goal of developing independent musicians has been met, the participants of this study are not all confident in their assessment practices. Many participants shared their perceptions that they are constantly assessing using the rehearsal method or that they utilize checklist or rubrics, but very few mentioned using any summative assessments. Some stated that their formative and summative assessments were the same while others stated that they did not really conduct summative assessments as they are not required to give grades. Other participants expressed that performance assessments were difficult to conduct due to a lack of time (MENC, 2001).

Participant E explained that when they plan units, they begin with their goals in mind, then work backward to determine how they will assess if their students reached their goals, and finally, they plan the experiences that the students need to obtain the goals. This method described by the participant explains the UbD framework, detailed in the literature, which is also

the basis for the creation of the CMS (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). The UbD model encourages the use of authentic assessments (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Research has shown that authentic assessments, those where students demonstrate a specific musical behavior or skill based on a learning objective, are the most effective assessments for students to demonstrate their understanding of the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding (Wiggins, 2015).

The MCA are research-based assessments designed to assist music educators in assessing student understanding and growth in the CMS (Parkes, 2018). The MCA, aligned to the CMS and the artistic processes, provide the educator with a lesson description, time to prepare and complete the assessment, any knowledge or skills the students must already have to be successful in the task, and scoring rubrics (Parkes, 2018). Unfortunately, only one interview participant had even heard of the MCA and only two survey participants of this study indicated using the MCA in their classroom. The MCA could be helpful for teachers of the First District as they are fully adaptable to the goals of the music teacher and needs of the students (Shuler et al., 2014).

Implementation challenges. Research has revealed time (Kasser, 2014) and a lack of resources (NAfME, 2015) are two main barriers to teaching through the artistic processes. While most survey participants mentioned time as barrier to the artistic processes, it was not the focus of the interview participants. Some interview participants stated that time was an issue in conducting performance assessments or when preparing for programs, but overall it was not their largest concern. None of the participants mentioned a lack of resources as a barrier to their implementation of the CMS but one did mention that they work to seek additional funding for resources through grants which also takes time away from lesson planning.

The largest concerns identified for elementary music educators of the First District were a lack of opportunities to collaborate with fellow elementary music educators and insufficient professional development opportunities, especially related to the CMS. This finding is supported by Kasser (2014) that stated that music educators lacked training in teaching the creative artistic processes of composition and improvisation. Some participants indicated that they had difficulty understanding the CMS and had to work through the Standards alone which meant they had to rely on their own interpretation of the CMS to guide their instruction. Zaffini (2018) stated that lack of understanding of the CMS has caused some educators across the United States to decide to not implement them at all.

While none of the participants of this study stated that they did not implement the CMS, many stated a desire for professional development and collaboration to better understand the standards so that they could implement them more effectively in their classrooms. One participant even stated the importance of the elementary music experience for their students as they might be the only music classroom that their students ever experience since they are located in a low-income area and opportunities in the arts are limited. Pautz (1989) explained that in situations similar to this, the responsibility is on the elementary music educator to create a passion or enjoyment of music that can last a lifetime. This sentiment was elaborated on by another participant that stated their goal was to encourage their students to love music and continue participating in music outside of the classroom.

Overall, the participants of this study desired more opportunities to participate in professional development opportunities where they could collaborate with fellow music teachers. Schmidt and Robbins (2011) explained that there is a long history of insufficient professional development for music educators that often leave the educators without proper support.

Additionally, obtaining professional development based on the CMS is difficult as the majority of workshops are typically based on pedagogy instead of how to integrate the standards into the classroom (CDSL, 2000). The findings of this study support the research on this topic as most participants stated that the professional development opportunities that they have attended are based on music methods or activities and not the CMS. Even if the professional development opportunities that elementary music educators attend are not based on the CMS, the ability to network and forge connections with peers can be beneficial as those educators can build their own support system (CDSL, 2000). This concept was shown in this study as most participants indicated that they attend the Share Days provided by the First District elementary music educators.

Discussions

The findings of this study indicate a need for more collaboration among First District elementary music educators and more specific professional development opportunities on the CMS on implementation and assessment. The one professional development opportunity that the majority of the interview participants indicated attending were the Share Days hosted by First District elementary members. These Share Days are intended as a way for members of the First District of the KMEA to obtain professional development specific to elementary music, to build collaboration among district members, and for individuals to share their expertise with their peers (T. Terry, personal communication, March 24, 2020). According to Todd Terry (personal communication, March 24, 2020), Elementary Chair for the First District of the KMEA, the Share Days allow members of the district to observe their peers who are exemplary models of pedagogy and share lessons based on different methods including Orff-Schulwerk, Kodály, and Dalcroze.

Another helpful professional development opportunity for music educators in the First District could be the newly established Quad-State Orff Association. As this study has shown, the most influential methodology for music educators in this region has been the Orff-Schulwerk method. This finding is supported by the substantial international research which has shown that the Orff-Schulwerk method of music instruction is effective in teaching the artistic processes (Kwon & Lee, 2012; Sogin & Wang, 2008; Bilen, 2010). Some research has even stressed the importance of incorporating or increasing the instruction in the Orff-Schulwerk method for undergraduate music educators so that they will be better equipped to implement the method and standards when they enter the classroom (Spurgeon, 2004). Unfortunately, until just this past year, the only Orff-Schulwerk Association in Kentucky was located across the state in Lexington affiliated with the University of Kentucky. For members of the First District, this made obtaining professional development or certification in the Orff-Schulwerk method more difficult. The newly established Orff-Schulwerk Association, associated with Murray State University located in western Kentucky, provides an opportunity for First District members to attend content-specific professional development closer to home.

On August 24, 2019 the Quad-State Orff Association was founded to provide current and future music educators in the area the support to collaborate and teach music that would encourage their students to develop musical understanding based on the Orff-Schulwerk method along with other methods including Kodály and Dalcroze (J. Eckroth-Riley, personal communication, March 19, 2020). According to the Quad-State Orff President, Mrs. Joan Eckroth-Riley (personal communication, March 19, 2020), this chapter began to give music educators in the rural parts of the Quad-State area an opportunity to communicate and collaborate without having to travel so far. Mrs. Eckroth-Riley continued saying,

The fact that we are able to gather on a regular basis and help support each other is crucial. So many of us are all alone in our rural districts, so just being able to talk to others who struggle with the same issues and support each other is beneficial. Also, having access to world-renowned music educators helps keep us up to date on new teaching ideas and techniques for our classrooms.

The benefits of content-specific professional development through the Quad-State Orff Chapter based not only on the Orff-Schulwerk method but the Kodály and Dalcroze methods as well could greatly impact the implementation of the artistic processes of the music educators of the First District. Mrs. Eckroth-Riley (personal communication, March 19, 2020) explained that obtaining her Orff-Schulwerk Level certifications changed her teaching as they,

...gave me a bigger picture of what we can help our students achieve. It gave me the permission to give up control of my classroom and allow the student to give their input and shape the direction of the lesson. When I allowed my students to bring to ask the important questions, they became the drivers of the lessons and began to ask the big questions themselves. Automatically, my classroom became a place of exploration, joyful participation, higher order thinking, and collaboration.

Additionally, by bringing music educators from the surrounding areas together and providing them time to communicate and collaborate, they will be able to build a network of professionals that can assist them when they are in need of support (J. Eckroth-Riley, personal communication, March 19, 2020).

Through the Share Days and the collaboration at professional development meetings provided by the Quad-State Orff Chapter, members of the First District could build a strong network of communication with each other and music educators around the area. Through these

connections, a deeper understanding the CMS could occur and music educators might feel more comfortable reaching out when they need support (Bartolome, 2015).

This study also revealed that assessment is another area where First District educators need support. While most use multiple forms of formative assessments, some do not intentionally plan for assessment or formally document student growth. Kasser (2014) stated that a lack of professional development and tools to create authentic assessments are challenges to implementing the CMS. Almost none of the participants of this study had even heard about the MCA which are provided by the NAFME to assist music educators in assessing student performance and understanding in the artistic processes of the CMS (Parkes, 2018). Through the collaborative network and additional professional development, information, application, and adaptations for the MCA could be provided for members of the First District to help assist them in conducting summative assessment and documenting the growth of their students in understanding and development of their musical literacy and independence which are the overarching goals of music education (Boardman, 1989; Pautz 1989; Zaffini, 2018).

P-20 Implications

The P-20 philosophy is grounded on the four pillars of leadership, implementation, innovation, and diversity (*Doctorate of Education in P-20 and Community Leadership*, 2017). Through this study, the diversity of the elementary music educators in the First District was shown. These educators have diverse educational and teaching backgrounds, methods for implementing and assessing the CMS, and needs for continued improvement of classroom instruction and assessment to support student learning. To assist the First District elementary music teachers, and potentially music educators in surrounding areas, innovation, implementation, and leadership must be shown. Through the newly established Quad-State Orff

Chapter, there are opportunities for networking, communication, and collaboration which are vital to any P-20 initiative. With careful organization, innovation, and strong leadership, the Quad-State Orff Chapter meetings and professional development opportunities offered can be tailored to the needs of the music educators within the First District and surrounding areas so that they are equipped, empowered, and supported to implement any changes necessary for success in their individual classrooms.

Limitations of the Study

Of the roughly 40 elementary music educators within the First District of the KMEA, 16 participated in the online survey portion of this study and eight of those participants continued their participation in the research process and were interviewed. While the participants of the study and subsequent interviews were from counties around the First District and had diverse backgrounds and years of experience, the overall participation in this study was not high enough for the results of this research to be generalizable to the entire First District population or to other districts across the state.

Additionally, the diversity of the participants and the multiple variables that affect each participant's individual teaching situation make any results difficult to generalize across the members of the First District, let alone the region or state. Even with the difficulty of generalizability, the findings of this study indicate that the elementary music educators that participated in the study from the First District desire to continually improve their teaching pedagogy and methods so that they are teaching their students to be independent makers of music. Through communication, collaboration, and content-specific professional development, these needs can be met, although each educator will have to tailor their network and the

information they obtain from professional development sessions to their specific needs and teaching situation.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study was conducted in far western Kentucky because the First District is the furthest from the home of the KMEA, the location of the annual KMEA conference, and the Kentucky Orff-Schulwerk Association. The first recommendation for future research would be to conduct a mirror study on members of the far eastern KMEA districts, Eight and Nine, to determine similarities and differences in their implementation, assessment, and needs in teaching the artistic processes of the CMS as many counties in this area of are also rural (KMEA, 2019a). Secondly, a study could be conducted to examine the relationship between attending state or national music conferences and teaching practices in implementation and assessment of the CMS. The next recommendation would be to enlarge this study to include the entire state of Kentucky to obtain a deeper understanding on how music educators across the state are teaching and assessing the CMS. Through these findings, a more elaborate network could be built to share and support music educators from areas with fewer collaborative or professional development opportunities. Lastly, the researcher recommends repeating this study of the First District in five to 10 years to determine the effects of the formation of the Quad-State Orff Chapter on the implementation, assessment, and needs of the elementary music educators of the First District of the KMEA.

Summary

Teaching for musical understanding through the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding of the CMS is a difficult undertaking. Music educators of the First District need a collaborative network that they can rely on to support them as well as continued

professional development on musical pedagogy such as the Orff-Schulwerk method. Through the support of their continued learning and their network of peers, these music educators can continue to encourage students to create, perform, and respond to music which will enable and encourage them to become independent and musically literate makers of music.

References

- Alvarez, B. (1989). Musical thinking and the young child. In E. Boardman (Ed.), *Dimensions of musical thinking* (pp. 57-64). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- American Orff-Schulwerk Association. (2019). *Carl Orff and Gunild Keetman*. Retrieved from <https://aosa.org/about/orff-keetman/>
- Anagün, S. (2018). Teachers' perceptions about the relationship between 21st Century skills and managing constructivist learning environments. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11*(4), 825-840.
- Aparicio, M., Bacao, F., & Oliveira, T. (2017). Grit in the path to e-learning success. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *66*, 388-399.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *1*(2), 164-180.
- Barrett, J. (1989). Core thinking skills in music. In E. Boardman (Ed.), *Dimensions of musical thinking* (pp. 45-56). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Bartolome, S. J. (2015). The new National core music standards in practice: Your classroom, your voice. *General Music Today*, *28*(2), 4.
- Beegle, A. C. (2016). The new National core arts standards and world music. *General Music Today*, *30*(2), 33-35.
- Bilen, S. (2010). The effect of cooperative learning on the ability of prospect of music teachers to apply Orff-Schulwerk activities. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *2*(2), 4872-4877.

- Boardman, E. (1989). The relation of music study to thinking. In E. Boardman (Ed.), *Dimensions of musical thinking* (pp. 1-7). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Bowyer, J. (2015). More than solfège and hand signs: Philosophy, tools, and lesson planning in the authentic Kodály classroom. *Music Educators Journal*, 102(2), 69-76.
- Brophy, T. S. (2001). Developing improvisation in general music classes. *Music Educators Journal*, 88(1), 34-41+53.
- Bruner, J. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burrack, F. (2018). A case for validity and reliability. In F. Burrack & K. A. Parkes (Eds.), *Applying model cornerstone assessments in K-12: A research-supported approach* (pp. 181-184). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Burrack, F., & Parkes, K. A. (Eds.). (2018). *Applying model cornerstone assessments in k-12 music: A research-supported approach*. Reston, VA: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Holum, A. (1991). Cognitive apprenticeship: Making thinking visible. *American Educator*, 15(3), 6-11, 38-39.
- Colwell, C. M. & Heller, G. N. (2003). Lowell Mason's "The Sound Garden" (1864-66): Its background, content, and comparison to a Twentieth-Century series. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(3), 231-244.
- Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. (expanded edition). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Cooke, F. J. (2005). Colonel Francis W. Parker: His influence on education. *Schools: Studied in Education*, 2(1), 157-170.

- Coulson, A. N. & Burke, B. M. (2013). Creativity in the elementary music classroom: A study of students' perceptions. *International Journal of Music Education*, 31(4), 428-441.
- Dávila, A. (2017). [Review of the book *Understanding by design* (2nd ed.), by G. Wiggins & J. McTighe]. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 19(1), 140-142.
- Dewey, J. (1909). *Moral principles in education*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin. Retrieved from <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015002236316&view=1up&seq=42>
- Doctorate of Education in P-20 and Community Leadership* (2017). [Program handbook]. College of Education and Human Services, Murray State University.
- Dixson, D. D. & Worrell, F. C. (2016). Formative and summative assessment in the classroom. *Theory into Practice*, 55(2), 153-159.
- Droscher, E. (2014). Music education benefits. *NAfME News*. Retrieved from <https://nafme.org/music-education-benefits/>
- Eckroth-Riley, J. (2005). *Teaching for Musical Understanding in North Dakota through Standards 3, 4, and 7* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of St. Thomas: St. Paul, MN.
- Educational Council. (1921). A standard course in music. *Music Supervisors' Journal*, 7(5), 10-24).
- Educational Professional Standards Board. (n.d.). *Division of educator licensure and quality*. Retrieved from <http://www.epsb.ky.gov/mod/page/view.php?id=92>
- Fiese, R. K. & Fiese, R. E. (2001). Music teaching and assessment. In Music Educators National Conference (Ed.), *Spotlight on assessment in music education* (pp. 13-15). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

- Foley, B. (2001). Performance assessment: Applications for general music. In Music Educators National Conference (Ed.), *Spotlight on assessment in music education* (pp. 16-19). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Gonullu, I. & Artar, M. (2014). Metacognition in medical education. *Education for Health*, 27(2), 225.
- Goodkin, D. (2001). Orff-Schulwerk in the new millennium. *Music Educators Journal*, 88(3), 17-23.
- Hallen, S. & Papageorgi, I. (2016). Conceptions of musical understanding. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 38(2), 133-154.
- Hamann, K. L. (2001). Assessment tools for the music classroom. In Music Educators National Conference (Ed.), *Spotlight on assessment in music education* (pp. 23-25). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Hayes, C. C. (2013). What do you know about the National common core arts standards and other professional development? *General Music Today*, 27(1), 4-5.
- Hickey, M. & Schmidt, C. (2019). The effect of professional development on music teachers' improvisation and composition activities. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 222, 27-43.
- Hickey, M. & Webster, P. (2001). Creative thinking in music. *Music Educators Journal*, 88(1), 19-23.
- Holy Names University. (n.d.). Kodály center: The Kodály vision. Retrived from <http://kodaly.hnu.edu/the-kodaly-vision.cfm>

- Horsburgh, J. & Ippolito, K. (2018). A skill to be worked at: Using social learning theory to explore the process of learning from role models in clinical settings. *BMC Medical Education, 18*(1), 1-8.
- Ihas, D. (2015). The National Core Music Standards and conceptual understanding of playing skills. *American String Teacher, 65*(4), 36-39.
- Johnson, D. C. (2018). Grade 2 model cornerstone assessments. In F. Burrack & K. A. Parkes (Eds.), *Applying model cornerstone assessments in K-12: A research-supported approach* (pp. 17-38). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kasser, K. (2014). Some concerns about the core standards. *Music Educators Journal, 101*(2), 21-23.
- Kentucky Music Educators Association. (2019a). *KMEA districts and fall meeting dates*. Retrieved from www.kmea.org/districts/
- Kentucky Music Educators Association. (2019b). *President's welcome*. Retrieved from <https://kmea.org/welcome/>
- Krahenbuhl, K. S. (2016). Student-centered education and constructivism: Challenges, concerns, and clarity for teachers. *Clearing House, 89*(3), 97-105.
- Kwon, O. S. & Lee, O. J. (2012). The effects of the Orff approach to music education programs on young children's musical expressiveness. *Korean Journal of Child Studies, 33*(1), 165-181.
- Leone, D. (2002). Langley schools music project: Innocence and despair (REVIEW) Retrieved from <https://pitchfork.com/reviews/albums/4685-innocence-and-despair/>

- Long, A. (2013). Involve me: Using the Orff approach within the elementary classroom. 2013 Awards for Excellence in Student Research & Creative Activity- Document 4. Retrieved from http://thekeep.eiu.edu/lib_awards_2013_docs/4
- Lopez, C. (2001). Assessing elementary improvisation. In Music Educators National Conference (Ed.), *Spotlight on assessment in music education* (pp. 32-34). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Macy, L. (2016). Bridging pedagogies: Drama, multiliteracies, and the zone of proximal development. *The Educational Forum*, 80(3), 310-323.
- Maric, M., Sakac, M., Lipovac, V., Nikolic, S., Raicevic, J., & Saracevic, M. (2017). Teachers and social learning as a factor of modern educational competencies. *Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy*, 11(2), 233-245.
- Mark, M. L. (2002). A history of music education advocacy. *Music Educators Journal*, 89(1), 44-48.
- Mark, M. L. & Gary, C. L. (1992). *A history of American music education*. New York, NY: Schirmer.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mead, V. H. (1996). More than mere movement: Dalcroze eurhythmics. *Music Educators Journal*, 82(4), 38-41.
- Moon, K., & Humphreys, J. T. (2010). The Manhattanville music curriculum project: 1966-1970. *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education*, 31(2), 75-98.
- Music Educators National Conference: The National Association for Music Education. (1973). Contemporary music project. *Music Educators Journal*, 59(9), 33-48.

- Music Educators National Conference. (1974). *The school music program: Description & standards*. Reston, VA: MENC
- Music Educators National Conference. (1994). *The school music program: A new vision*. Reston, VA: MENC.
- Music Educators National Conference. (2001). Introduction. In Music Educators National Conference (Ed.), *Spotlight on assessment in music education* (pp. 1). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- National Association for Music Education. (2000). *Vision 2020: The housewright symposium on the future of music education*. Retrieved from <https://nafme.org/about/history/vision-2020-the-housewright-symposium-on-the-future-of-music-education/>
- National Association for Music Education. (2015). *Opportunity-to-learn standards*. Retrieved from https://nafme.org/wp-content/files/2014/11/Opportunity-to-Learn-Standards_May2015.pdf
- National Association for Music Education. (2017). *Strategic Plan*. Retrieved from https://nafme.org/wp-content/files/2014/06/Strategic-Plan_revised-2016.pdf
- National Association for Music Education. (2019a). *History and leadership*. Retrieved from <https://nafme.org/about/>
- National Association for Music Education. (2019b). *NAfME's History, the evolution of music education- and Taylor Swift!* Retrieved from <https://nafme.org/nafmes-history-the-evolution-of-music-education-and-taylor-swift/>
- National Association for Music Education. (2015). *Opportunity-to-learn standards*. Retrieved from https://nafme.org/wp-content/files/2014/11/Opportunity-to-Learn-Standards_May2015.pdf

- National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. (2017). *The status of arts standards revisions in the United States since 2014: A publication of the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards*. Retrieved from <https://www.nationalartsstandards.org/sites/default/files/The%20Status%20of%20Arts%20Standards%20Revisions%20in%20the%20United%20States%20Since%202014%20FINAL.pdf>
- National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. (n.d.). *The National Coalition for Core Arts Standards archives*. Retrieved from <https://sites.google.com/nccas.org/nccas-wikispace>
- Nierman, G. E. (2001). Creating, performing, and responding in music: A look at the Nation's report card. In Music Educators National Conference (Ed.), *Spotlight on assessment in music education* (pp. 52-53). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Nierman, G. E. (2016). Model cornerstone assessment: A key component of standards implementation. *Music Educators Journal*, 102(3), 6-8.
- Norris, C. E. (2010). Introducing creativity in the ensemble setting: National standards meet comprehensive musicianship. *Music Educators Journal*, 97(2), 57-62.
- Odegaard, D., Ruybalid, M. J., & Newell, M. K. (2018). Grade 5 model cornerstone assessments. In F. Burrack & K. A. Parkes (Eds.), *Applying model cornerstone assessments in K-12: A research-supported approach* (pp. 39-52). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Parkes, K. A. (2018). Model cornerstone assessments. In F. Burrack & K. A. Parkes (Eds.), *Applying model cornerstone assessments in K-12: A research-supported approach* (pp. 1-7). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Pautz, M. P. (1989). Musical thinking in the general music classroom. In E. Boardman (Ed.), *Dimensions of musical thinking* (pp. 65-72). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Payne, P., & Ward, J. (2018). Connections to higher education in music. In F. Burrack & K. A. Parkes (Eds.), *Applying model cornerstone assessments in K-12: A research-supported approach* (pp. 185-194). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Philip, F. (2001). Arts education assessment: The journey and the destination. In Music Educators National Conference (Ed.), *Spotlight on assessment in music education* (pp. 54-59). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Piaget, J. (1973). *To understand it to invent: The future of education*. New York, NY: Viking Press.
- Piersol, J. R. (2000). Wiley Housewright on music's changing times. *Music Educators Journal*, 86(5), 29-31.
- Pogonowski, L. (1989). Metacognition: A dimension of musical thinking. In E. Boardman (Ed.), *Dimensions of musical thinking* (pp. 9-19). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Raw, L. (2014). Psychology and adaptation: The work of Jerome Bruner. *Linguaculture*, 2014(1), 89-101.
- Riley, P. (2016). iPad apps for creating in your general music classroom. *General Music Today*, 29(2), 4-13.
- Sabol, F. R. (2010, September). No Child Left Behind: A study of its impact on art education. *The AEP Wire* Retrieved from <http://www.aep-arts.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/AEP-Wire-09-2010-Sabol-NCLB.pdf>

- Schmidt, P., & Robbins, J. (2011). Looking backwards to reach forward: A strategic architecture for professional development in music education. *Arts Education Policy Review, 112*(2), 95-103.
- Shively, J. (2015). Constructivism in music education. *Arts Education Policy Review, 116*(3), 128-136.
- Shuler, S. C., Norgaard, M., & Blakeslee, M. J. (2014). The new National standards for music educators. *Music Educators Journal, 101*(1), 41-49.
- Sogin, D. W. & Wang, C. C. (2008). Music activity reports by music teachers with varying training in Orff Schulwerk. *International Journal of Music Education, 26*(3), 269-278.
- Spurgeon, A. (2004). Proposed changes for the undergraduate elementary music education curriculum. *General Music Today, 17*(3), 28-32.
- Stevens, H. (1966). Comprehensive Musicianship (Book Review). *Music Educators Journal, 53*(2), 87-88.
- Suchanova, J. (2011). Synthetic cognitive apprenticeship model: Possible way to enhance students' metacognitive skills. *Coactivity: Philology, Educology, 19*(2), 206-213.
- Tanner, K. D. (2012). Promoting student metacognition. *CBE- Life Sciences Education, 11*(2), 113.
- Technology Resource Teachers. (n.d.). *Classroom performance system*. Retrieved from https://education.fcps.org/trt/cps_remotes
- The Goals 2000: Educate America Act, Pub. L. No. 103-227, 108 Stat. 125. (1994).
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Wass, R., & Golding, C. (2014). Sharpening a tool for teaching: The zone of proximal development. *Teaching in Higher Education, 19*(6), 671-684.
- Weidner, B. N. (2018). Achieving greater musical independence in ensembles through cognitive apprenticeship. *Music Educators Journal, 104*(3), 26-31.
- Weisskirch, R. S. (2018). Grit, self-esteem, learning strategies and attitudes and estimated and achieved course grades among college students. *Current Psychology, 37*(1), 21-27.
- Wesolowski, B. C. (2018a). Examination of the psychometric qualities of the model cornerstone assessments. In F. Burrack & K. A. Parkes (Eds.), *Applying model cornerstone assessments in K-12: A research-supported approach* (pp. 151-179). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Wesolowski, B. C. (2018b). Methodology for examining the psychometric qualities of the model cornerstone assessments. In F. Burrack & K. A. Parkes (Eds.), *Applying model cornerstone assessments in K-12: A research-supported approach* (pp. 141-150). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Wiggins, J. (2015). *Teaching for musical understanding*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Zaffini, E. D. (2018). A deeper glimpse into the National Core Arts Standards for general music. *General Music Today, 31*(3), 57-60.
- Zinar, R. (1983). Highlights of thought in the history of music education Lowell Mason 1792-1872. *American Music Teacher, 32*(6), 22.

Zull, J. E. (2002). *The art of changing the brain: Enriching teaching by exploring the biology of learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

List of Tables

Tables	Page
1. Core Music Standards	37
2. Comparison of standards.....	62
3. Teaching certification for survey participants	75
4. Years of experience teaching elementary music.....	75
5. Highest level of educational training	76
6. Additional certifications.....	77
7. Training and information on the CMS.....	77
8. Grade levels taught	78
9. Instructional minutes per week by grade level	79
10. Types of creating activities	82
11. Types of performing activities	83
12. Types of responding activities	84
13. Types of assessment.....	86
14. Barriers to teaching the CMS.....	87
15. Participant education, experience, and certification	88
16. Participant grade levels and instructional time	89

Appendix A

Core Music Standards

Artistic Processes	Anchor Standards	Enduring Understandings	Essential Questions
Creating	12. Generate musical ideas for various purposes and contexts.	The creative ideas, concepts, and feelings that influence artists' work emerge from a variety of sources.	How do musicians generate creative ideas?
	13. Select and develop musical ideas for defined purposes and contexts.	Musicians' creative choices are influenced by their experience, context, and expressive intent.	How do musicians make creative decisions?
	14. Evaluate and refine selected musical ideas to create musical work(s) that meet appropriate criteria.	Musicians evaluate, and refine their work through openness to new ideas, persistence, and the application of appropriate criteria.	How do musicians improve the quality of their creative work?
		Musicians' presentations of creative work is the culmination of a process of creation and communication.	When is a creative work ready to share?
Performing	15. Select varied musical works to present based on interest, knowledge, technical skill, and context.	Performers' interest in and knowledge of musical works, understanding or their own technical skill, and the context for a performance influence the selection of repertoire.	How do performers select repertoire?
		Analyzing creators' context and how they manipulate elements of music provides insight into their intent and informs performance.	How does understanding the structure and context of musical works inform performance?
		Performers make interpretive decisions based on their	How do performers interpret musical works?

		understanding of context and expressive intent.	
	16. Develop and refine artistic techniques and work for presentation.	To express their musical ideas, musicians analyze, evaluate, and refine their performance over time through openness to new ideas, persistence, and the application of appropriate criteria.	How do musicians improve the quality of their performance?
	17. Convey meaning through the presentation of artistic work.	Musicians judge performance based on criteria that vary across time, place, and cultures. The context and how a work is presented influence audience response.	When is a performance judged ready to present? How do context and the manner in which musical work is presented influence audience response?
Responding	18. Perceive and analyze artistic work.	Individuals' selection of musical works is influenced by their interests, experiences, understandings, and purposes. Response to music is informed by analyzing context (social, cultural, and historical) and how creators and performers manipulate the elements of music.	How do individuals choose music to experience? How do individuals choose music to experience?
	19. Interpret intent and meaning in artistic work.	Through their use of elements and structures of music, creators and performers provide clues to their expressive intent.	How do we discern the musical creators' and performers' expressive intent?
	20. Apply criteria to evaluate artistic work.	The personal evaluation of musical work(s) and performance(s) is informed by analysis, interpretation, and established criteria.	How do we judge the quality of musical work(s) and performance(s)?
Connecting	21. Synthesize and relate knowledge and	Musicians connect their personal interests,	How do musicians make meaningful

personal experiences to make art.	experiences, ideas, and knowledge to creating, performing, and responding.	connections to creating, performing, and responding?
22. Relate artistic ideas and works with societal, cultural, and historical context to deepen understanding.	Understanding connections to varied contexts and daily life enhances musicians' creating, performing, and responding.	How do the other arts, other disciplines, contexts, and daily life inform creating, performing, and responding to music?

Appendix B

Internal Review Board Approval

**Institutional Review Board**

328 Wells Hall
 Murray, KY 42071-3318
 270-809-2916 • msu.irb@murraystate.edu

TO: Landon Clark, Educational Studies Leadership and Counseling
FROM: Jonathan Baskin, IRB Coordinator JB
DATE: 11/26/2019
RE: Human Subjects Protocol I.D. – IRB # 20-090

The IRB has completed its review of your student's Level 1 protocol entitled *Teaching for Musical Understanding through the Core Music Standards: Creating, Performing, and Responding in the Elementary Music Classroom*. After review and consideration, the IRB has determined that the research, as described in the protocol form, will be conducted in compliance with Murray State University guidelines for the protection of human participants.

The forms and materials that have been approved for use in this research study are attached to the email containing this letter. These are the forms and materials that must be presented to the subjects. Use of any process or forms other than those approved by the IRB will be considered misconduct in research as stated in the MSU IRB Procedures and Guidelines section 20.3.

Your stated data collection period is from 1/1/2020 to 11/25/2020.

If data collection extends beyond this period, please submit an Amendment to an Approved Protocol form detailing the new data collection period and the reason for the change.

This Level 1 approval is valid until 11/25/2020.

If data collection and analysis extends beyond this date, the research project must be reviewed as a continuation project by the IRB prior to the end of the approval period, 11/25/2020. You must reapply for IRB approval by submitting a Project Update and Closure form (available at murraystate.edu/irb). You must allow ample time for IRB processing and decision prior to your expiration date, or your research must stop until such time that IRB approval is received. If the research project is completed by the end of the approval period, then a Project Update and Closure form must be submitted for IRB review so that your protocol may be closed. It is your responsibility to submit the appropriate paperwork in a timely manner.

The protocol is approved. You may begin data collection now.

**Opportunity
afforded**

murraystate.edu

Appendix C

Email Consent Document

Dear Colleague,

My name is Amanda Ijames, I am an elementary music educator and doctoral student at Murray State University working on my Ed.D. in P-20 & Community Leadership. For my dissertation research I am focusing on teaching for musical understanding through the artistic processes outlined in the Core Music Standards.

The study will focus on the musical practices of the elementary First District Kentucky Music Educators Association members regarding their implementation, assessment, and needs in teaching the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding. I am seeking elementary music educators who would be willing to complete the survey that is linked to this email.

Additionally, I am looking for participants for small focus groups or interviews that will allow a more in-depth look into the implementation and assessment practices and needs of elementary music educators in teaching the processes outlined in the Core Music Standards.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and though the data from the survey will be utilized in the dissertation, your name or identifying characteristics will not be used and all information gathered will eventually be destroyed. All data from the survey along with researcher notes will be stored in a password protected computer or in a locked filing cabinet. The survey should take no longer than fifteen minutes to complete and participation in this survey will not provide any course credit. If you elect to participate in this study, you may discontinue at any time without prejudice.

I am hoping that this study will benefit all elementary First District Kentucky Music Education Association educators as well as music educators across the state in creating a comprehensive music curriculum that guides students to become musically literate and independent students.

If you have any questions concerning the study, please call me at (270) 314-8876, or email me at astuart@murraystate.edu or you may contact the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. Landon Clark at (270) 809-6968, or through email at lclark23@murraystate.edu. Thank you for your consideration in participating in this study.

If you consent to participate in this survey, please click the link below. If you chose to not participate you may ignore or delete this email without prejudice from the researcher.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Murray State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you should contact the MSU IRB Coordinator at (270) 809-2916 or msu.irb@murraystate.edu.

Sincerely,

Amanda L. Ijames

Appendix D
Interview Consent Document
Consent Form

Informed Consent Document for Research

Principal Investigator: Amanda L. Ijames

Date: 11-2-2019

Study Title: Teaching for Musical Understanding through the Core Music Standards: Creating, Performing, and Responding in the Elementary Music Classroom

This informed consent document applies to adults.

Name of participant: _____ Age: _____

The following information is provided to inform you about the research project and your participation in it. Please read this form carefully and feel free to ask any questions you may have about this study and the information given below. You will be given an opportunity to ask questions, and your questions will be answered. Also, you will be given a copy of this consent form.

1. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY: To determine how elementary music teachers are planning, implementing, and assessing musical understanding through the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding in the Core Music Standards. Additionally, to identify potential barriers in teaching for musical understanding that elementary music teachers are experiencing to be able to identify and create a plan to support them in teaching for musical understanding.

2. WHAT WE WILL ASK YOU TO DO: We will ask you to answer questions in a small focus group setting regarding your experiences teaching for musical understanding using the Core Music Standards. The focus group should last less than an hour.

Agree to voice-recording Disagree to voice recording

3. EXPECTED COSTS: Nothing.

4. RISKS OF PARTICIPATION: Emotional discomfort, potential breaks in confidentiality from fellow participants.

5. BENEFITS OF PARTICIPATION: Add to the body of knowledge teaching methods and practices to encourage teaching for musical understanding under the Core Music Standards through focusing on the artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding.

6. COMPENSATION: Bottled water and snacks.

7. VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION: You can withdraw at any time without prejudice from the researcher.

8. CONFIDENTIALITY: While I strive to retain strict confidentiality, I cannot control what other participants say after the focus group is completed. All data will be stored on a password protected computer or locked in a filing cabinet. Data will be securely retained for three years before being destroyed.

9. WHOM TO CONTACT:

Dr. Landon Clark

3227 Alexander Hall

270-809-6968

Murray State University

Amanda Ijames

65 Starview Trail

Murray, KY 42701

270-314-8876

STATEMENT BY PERSON AGREEING TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

I have read this informed consent document and the material contained in it has been explained to me verbally. All my questions have been answered, and I freely and voluntarily choose to

participate in this study under the conditions outlined above. I also acknowledge that I have received a copy of this form.

Date Signature of volunteer



The dated approval stamp on this document indicates that this project has been reviewed and approved by the Murray State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the Protection of Human Subjects. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you should contact the MSU IRB Coordinator at (270) 809-2916 or msu.irb@murraystate.edu.

Consent obtained by:

Date Signature

Printed Name and Title

Appendix E
Survey Protocol

Teaching for Musical Understanding Survey

KMEA First District Elementary Music Teachers

I. Demographics

1. Including this year, how many years have you been a general music educator?
 - 1-5 years
 - 6-10 years
 - 11-15 years
 - 16-20 years
 - 20-25 years
 - More than 25 years
 - Other _____
2. What type of teaching certificate do you hold?
 - Provisional
 - K-12 Instrumental Emphasis
 - K-12 Vocal Emphasis
 - Other _____
3. What is your highest level of training in the music education field?
 - BA/BS in Music Education

- MA in Music Education
 - Ph.D. in Music Education
 - Other_____
4. Please mark any further training you have received. (Select all that apply)
- Orff Level I
 - Orff Level II
 - Orff Level III
 - Kodály Level I
 - Kodály Level II
 - Kodály Level III
 - Dalcroze
 - Early Childhood training (Kindermusik)
 - First Steps in Music Education
 - Conversational Solfege
 - Other_____
5. Do you own a copy, or have access to the Core Music Standards document?
- Yes
 - No
6. Where did you receive information/training about the Core Music Standards?
- Undergraduate Course
 - Graduate Course

- District Inservice
- State Conference
- National Conference
- Music Workshop
- Journal or Newsletter
- No training on the Standards
- Other _____

7. Please mark all grade levels that you currently teach in elementary music.

(Select all that apply)

- Kindergarten
- First Grade
- Second Grade
- Third Grade
- Fourth Grade
- Fifth Grade
- Other _____

8. On average, how many minutes of instructional time do you have weekly

with each Kindergarten class?

- I do not teach Kindergarten
- under 30 minutes
- 30-45 minutes
- 46-60 minutes
- more than 60 minutes

9. On average, how many minutes of instructional time do you have weekly with each First-Grade class?
- I do not teach First Grade
 - under 30 minutes
 - 30-45 minutes
 - 46-60 minutes
 - more than 60 minutes
10. On average, how many minutes of instructional time do you have weekly with each Second-Grade class?
- I do not teach Second Grade
 - under 30 minutes
 - 30-45 minutes
 - 46-60 minutes
 - more than 60 minutes
11. On average, how many minutes of instructional time do you have weekly with each Third-Grade class?
- I do not teach Third Grade
 - under 30 minutes
 - 30-45 minutes
 - 46-60 minutes
 - more than 60 minutes
12. On average, how many minutes of instructional time do you have weekly with each Fourth-Grade class?

- I do not teach Fourth Grade
- under 30 minutes
- 30-45 minutes
- 46-60 minutes
- more than 60 minutes

13. On average, how many minutes of instructional time do you have weekly with each Fifth-Grade class?

- I do not teach Fifth Grade
- under 30 minutes
- 30-45 minutes
- 46-60 minutes
- more than 60 minutes

II. Standards Implementation

14. Please indicate the strength of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The Core Music Standards have not affected my teaching.	○	○	○	○
I have changed my teaching to reflect the Core Music Standards.	○	○	○	○
I include the artistic process of CREATING in my	○	○	○	○

MONTHLY lesson plans.				
I include the artistic process of PERFORMING in my MONTHLY lesson plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I include the artistic process of RESPONDING in my MONTHLY lesson plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I include the artistic process of CREATING in my weekly lesson plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I include the artistic process of PERFORMING in my weekly lesson plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I include the artistic process of RESPONDING in my weekly lesson plans.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My classroom is student-centered.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am comfortable teaching the artistic process of CREATING in my classroom.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I am comfortable teaching the artistic process of PERFORMING in my classroom.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am comfortable with teaching the artistic process of RESPONDING in my classroom.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. I provide performing activities through:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Movement/Dance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Singing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Performing on instruments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Small/large group activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Individual activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. I provide creating activities through:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Stories	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Small/large group activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Individual activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Composition with notation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Composition without notation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Iconic composition for younger students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Problem-solving activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Technology/computers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improvisation activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arranging activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17. I provide responding activities through:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Verbal response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Written response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Question/answer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Small/large group activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Individual activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

III. Assessment

18. Please indicate the strength of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

19. What types of assessment do you regularly use in your classroom? (Select all that apply)

- Checklists
- Rubrics

- Portfolios
- Journaling
- Paper and pencil assessments
- Performance assessments
- Other_____

IV. Instructional Needs

20. Please indicate the barriers you face in teaching the artistic processes of the Core Music Standards (Select all that apply)

- Lack of time
- Lack of comfort teaching the creating process
- Lack of comfort teaching the performing process
- Lack of comfort teaching the responding process
- Lack of professional development
- Lack of understanding of the Core Music Standards
- Lack of collaboration with other music educators in teaching the Core Music Standards

V. Focus Group Participation

21. Would you be willing to participate in a small focus group or interview regarding your implementation, assessment, and instructional needs in teaching the artistic processes of the Core Music Standards?

- Yes
- No

22. Thank you for your interest in participating in a small focus group or

interview regarding the Core Music Standards. Please provide your email below and you will be contacted by the researcher to set up a time and place at your convenience.

Appendix F

Interview Protocol

KMEA First District Elementary Music Educators Focus Group/Interview Protocol

Q1: How are the artistic processes of create, perform, and respond being implemented in elementary general music classrooms?

- What pedagogical music methods are utilized (Kodály, Orff, Dalcroze)?
 1. How have the Core Music Standards focus on the artistic processes affected your teaching?
 2. How do you implement the artistic process of creating in your classroom?
 - Are there certain methods that you use that assist you in incorporating creating processes in your classroom?
 3. How do you implement the artistic process of performing in your classroom?
 - Are there certain methods that you use that assist you in incorporating performing processes in your classroom?
 4. How do you implement the artistic process of responding in your classroom?
 - Are there certain methods that you use that assist you in incorporating creating processes in your classroom?
 5. What are your procedures for incorporating the artistic processes into your lesson planning?
 6. In what ways have your trainings in the Orff, Kodály, Dalcroze, or other methods helped you in implementing the artistic processes, if you have received any additional trainings?

7. How do you encourage a student-centered classroom?

Q2: How do elementary general music educators assess student learning through the artistic processes?

- What formative and summative assessment models are being utilized?
- How are music educators currently implementing the Model Cornerstone Assessments provided by the National Association for Music Education, if they are aware of them?
 1. What are your instructional goals for implementing the artistic processes?
 2. How do you plan assessments in your classroom?
 3. How are assessments of the artistic processes used in your class?
 4. What formative assessment methods do you use in your classroom?
 5. What summative assessment methods do you use in your classroom?
 6. How do you utilize the Model Cornerstone Assessments in your classroom?
 7. What are your feelings on how assessments of the artistic processes are conducted in your classroom?

Q3: What are the barriers faced by elementary general music educators in teaching for musical understanding?

- What kind of professional development opportunities are music educators participating in that have helped them either understand or implement the Core Music Standards?

- How much instructional time are music educators provided and what steps are taken to protect those educational minutes from disruptions or schedule changes?
 - What affect do performances have regarding the time educators have to teaching for musical understanding versus preparing for performances?
1. What are your largest concerns in teaching through the artistic processes?
 2. What kinds of professional development have you had on the Core Music Standards?
 3. How have the Core Music Standards affected your teaching of the artistic processes in your classroom?
 4. How do the pressures for performance affect your implementation and assessment of the Core Music Standards?
 5. How often have you been able to collaborate with fellow elementary music educators on the Core Music Standards?
 6. What do you need to feel more comfortable teaching through the artistic processes of the Core Music Standards in your classroom?