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POLICY, STANDARDS, AND ASSESSMENT IN MUSIC EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY OF AN URBAN DISTRICT’S ARTS ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

MELISSA HELENE GNIBUS

ABSTRACT

It is written in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) that the arts are a “core academic subject” and therefore, the arts as a “core academic subject” in conjunction with the start arts standards should be assessed. Large-scale arts assessments exist at the national and state level but the extent to which school districts have created arts assessments at the local level remains unknown.

This is a case study of Metro Public Schools’ district-wide arts assessment entitled Metro Arts Assessment Model (MAAM). A trilogy of policy, standards, and assessment in relation to Metro Public Schools’ (MPS) district-wide program of assessment of arts learning from its commencement to its closure is explored and analyzed in great detail.

The process of planning, development and implementation with ethnographic interviews, observations, and document analysis is documented in this thesis. This study took a total of four years to complete from the first interview with Michelle Channon, Senior Program Director for the Arts for Metro Public Schools on March 1, 2004 until the last e-mail exchange with Channon on April 14, 2008 that clarified information. During these four years the following ethnographic research techniques were used to garner information for this thesis: eleven months of observations, which included a total of fourteen meetings with the music teacher participants, consultants of MAAM, and
Channon; interviews and follow-up e-mails with Channon and Jonathan Carter, lead consultant of MAAM; phone and e-mail interviews with various music educators involved with large-scale arts assessments; and correspondence with the Massachusetts Cultural Council.

The following major findings and conclusions are made based upon primary ethnographic sources and various types of secondary sources. A district-wide arts assessment is a substantial challenge to execute. There are not many sources or existing district-wide arts assessments for a coordinator of such a project to refer to and use at the district level. Thus, the coordinator must possess a strong arts background and have significant administrative and political skills to execute the creation and implantation of a district-wide arts assessment. Michelle Channon possessed all of these qualifications.

The most illuminating findings were discovered during the observations. Channon miscalculated her music teacher’s abilities and knowledge of music and assessment to create the music portion of the district-wide arts assessment without significant help from Channon and consultants. This, coupled with the personal interactions of the music teachers, had Channon and her consultants completing most of the music portion of the district-wide arts assessment when it was supposed to be a project completed by the music teachers.

Thus, if one were to create a district-wide arts assessment, they must have all of the qualities Channon possessed and make sure that the music teachers are capable of creating a district-wide arts assessment from an assessment, musical knowledge, and maturity perspective.
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Chapter One

Context, Standards, and Policy

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

An intricate relationship exists among policy, standards, and assessment in the field of music education. Ten years ago, the authors of “Goals 2000: Educate America Act” officially recognized the arts as a “core academic subject,” when the members of the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations lobbied the federal government for their inclusion. At that time, it was the position of the members of the Consortium that arts learning according to the national standards for the arts could be measured through assessment. Eight years later, the authors of The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, upheld the arts as a “core academic subject”, which caused some administrators in school districts across the nation to create assessments for the arts and to administer them in accordance with local needs. Yet, as accountability and testing became the new educational practices, school district officials still cut the arts in favor of more instruction time in language arts and math, even though visual art, theatre, music, and dance were now considered “core academic subjects.” Ironically, the authors of NCLB favored testing at all levels in all “core academic subjects” including music.

---

1 All footnotes are designated with a number, which can be found at the bottom of the page they occur. They are in chronological order and start back at number one at the beginning of each chapter. All endnotes are designated with a roman numeral in chronological order and can be found after the last page of each chapter. Each chapter will start with number “1.” In general, the footnotes give additional information about the text and the endnotes give the actual cited resource. All of this information will pertain to the entire thesis.

2 The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 will be referred to as NCLB from here on.
In this thesis, the author examines how a Senior Program Director for the Arts in one large urban school district, the Metro Public Schools in Metro, Massachusetts, recognized this aspect of NCLB and created a district-wide arts assessment intended both to justify the presence of arts in the district curriculum and to evaluate instruction in the arts curriculum.

**A SHORT HISTORY OF POLICY, MUSIC EDUCATION, AND THE STANDARDS FOR THE ARTS**

*A Nation at Risk: The Imperative For Educational Reform*, was a report from President Ronald Regan’s National Commission on Excellence in Education, published in 1983. The authors made “researched claims” that our nation was in great cognitive peril. Overseas competition in all fields - especially technology, its authors claimed, would soon trump America’s domination if the educational system were not fixed. Recommendations from the authors were made to focus on reading, writing, arithmetic, and science.  

One common denominator among these four content areas of the federal government’s focus was that they could all be assessed quantitatively. Quantitative data could be compiled and tracked by educational researchers to assure the continuance of those content areas in a child’s education. The arts can be assessed quantitatively as well but that was not the focus of *A Nation at Risk* in that the authors were more concerned about the global technological race that has nothing to do with the arts. The

---

3 Pseudonym, all participants in the study were assumed anonymity as to their identity and place of employment as a condition of participation.
consequences for the arts (dance, art, music, and theatre) were potentially severe, since they were not included in the academic “core.”

This posed two dilemmas for music education, an assessment dilemma and a financial dilemma. Music educators do not have a strong history in formal assessment and evaluation. Two opposing arguments contend either that music is an “escape” from formal assessment or that music learning must be assessed like other content areas in order to remain a credible “academic” subject. The second dilemma was that of financial security. The promise of financial stability that could be gained by which being included in federal government education policy might bring required, like other core subjects, formalized assessment. So, the “protection” of this umbrella had strings attached.

In 1986, the members of MENC and the American Council for the Arts (ACA) moved in favor of financially stability with federal restrictions, and agreed to assess music in learning in schools like the other content areas in order to be part of the education reform movement. The members of these organizations knew that in order for the arts to remain in a child’s curriculum in the dawn of the new age of accountability that they would need to unite and organize a coalition to lobby for the inclusion of arts in the ever narrowing curriculum at the national level. In 1988, an organization called the National Coalition for Education in the Arts (NCEA) was formed including MENC, ACA, and thirty-one leaders of arts and arts education organizations. The members of NCEA created a mission: “…to develop and monitor policy affecting education in the

---

4 The arts were mentioned in the report but were not considered a “core academic subject”. They were mentioned in passive manner.
arts.”

The members of MENC established the National Coalition for Music Education (NCME) in 1990 “to raise awareness of the value and importance of music in education.” This coalition was comprised of the National Academy of Recording Arts & Sciences, Inc., and The International Music Products Association (NAAM).

It would take nine years before NCEA, NCME, and other arts advocates’ voices were heard from members of these and other organizations and individuals on Capitol Hill, when they “successfully advocated the inclusion of arts education in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (Public Law 103-227).”

Before the members of the coalition could lobby for the inclusion of the arts in the national curriculum, the members of MENC realized that standards needed to be created “…specifying what students should know and be able to do in music…” As had been done in other subjects, the members of MENC called a meeting with the members of DAMT, a consortium comprised of members from the American Alliance for Theatre & Education, MENC: The National Association for Music Education, National Art Education Association, and National Dance Association. The members of the Consortium were aware that “the Act (Goals 2000: Educate America Act) called for education standards in these subject areas (English, mathematics, history, civics and government, geography, science, and foreign language), both to encourage high achievement by our young people and to provide benchmarks to determine how well they...”

---

5 In 1999, members of MENC changed its name from Music Educators National Conference to MENC – The National Association for Music Education. When the name was changed on the organization, the members also changed the organization’s policy perspective. The members’ prior focus was solely on music teachers. Currently, the member’s focus is: “(honoring the past) while reaching out to the nation as a whole” (Mahlmann 2002, 17). For space purposes, generally, The National Association for Music Education will be referred to as MENC with knowledge that MENC pertains to its new philosophies.
are learning and performing."**xiv**

In 1992, the members of the Consortium were given a total of one million dollars in grants from the U.S. Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the National Endowment for the Humanities to write the standards for the arts given the foundation: “what the nation’s school children should know and be able to do in the arts.”**xv** In 1994, the national standards were released for music, visual arts, dance, and theatre in the book, National Standards for Arts Education.**vi** From this point forward, the “arts” refer to Dance, Music, Theatre, and the Visual Arts.

Standards, in the National Standards for Arts Education, are defined as:

“consensus statements about what an education in the arts should contain...(and) provide a basis for student assessment, and for evaluating purposes, at national, state, and local levels.”**xvi** “The Standards stress that all competencies are interdependent…and encourage a relationship between breadth and depth so that neither overshadows the other. They are intended to create a vision for learning, not a standardized instructional system.”**xvii** The standards are further divided into content standards and achievement standards.

Content standards “specify what students should know and be able to do in the

---

**vi** In 1974, the members of the organization National Commission on Instruction published The School Music Program: Description and Standards, which came from the participants of the Tanglewood Symposium recommendation that the members MENC provide leadership in developing high-quality music programs in all schools. The authors of this book presented standards for curriculum, staffing, facilities, equipment, and levels of other kinds of support, and they described in the book the ideal school music program as a benchmark against which lay people and educators could compare the programs in their own schools (Mark 2000, 15).
arts disciplines." The authors wrote music standards to cover nine content areas that they felt were critical for a comprehensive music education including, but not limited to, music literacy and interdisciplinary education. xviii “Achievement standards specify the understandings and levels of achievement that students are expected to attain in the competencies, for each of the arts, at the completion of grades 4, 8, and 12.”

The national arts standards were voluntary when they were first created and they remain so until this day. Music standards were written by recognized music educators in the field lending them insight and credibility amongst professionals in the field.  

Though voluntary, the members of the consortium strongly encouraged music educators, school boards, and states to adopt the national arts standards in order for the arts to gain parity with other curricular subjects.

In 1996, the employees and various artists invited by the Massachusetts Department of Education created the Massachusetts Arts Curriculum Framework. The framework was adopted by members of the Board of Education in June of 1999. In November 1999, the second edition was published by the members of the Board of Education in response to revisions suggested by music educators, arts administrators, and musicians from the state of Massachusetts. xxi Unlike the national standards for the arts, there are ten standards instead of nine in which “standards 1-5 are discipline-specific, while standards 6-10 apply to all the arts disciplines.” xxii A closer read reveals that most

---

7 See Appendix One.
8 The writers of the Music Task Force were from MENC: The National Association for Music Educators and include: Paul Lehman (chair), June Hinckley, Charles Hoffer, Carolyann Linderman, Bennett Reimer, Scott Shuler, and Dorothy Straub (Consortium of National Arts Associations 1994, 138-9).
of the material in the Massachusetts frameworks is adopted directly from the national arts standards, with different wording.⁹

There are two more books of standards for music education that accompany the National Standards for Arts Education. They are the *Opportunity-to-Learn Standards for Music Instruction* (Appendix 2) and the *Performance Standards for Music Grades PreK-12: Strategies and Benchmarks for Assessing Progress Toward the National Standards* (Appendix 3). These documents complete a music standards trilogy, as it existed at the time of the study.¹⁰

During President Clinton’s first term (1993-1997) a new educational policy was in its infancy as a working concept and paper. Having caught wind of this and afraid that history might repeat itself, (i.e. that the arts would be left out of the education legislation), June M. Hinckley, then president of Music Educators National Conference: The National Association for Music Education, testified to the House Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families on July 15, 1999. Her testimony is included in the “Education and Secondary Education Act-Educating Diverse Populations” segment.³⁴ Her recommendations to Congress when they reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act were to:

Reinforce the concept of music and arts education as part of the core curriculum. Strengthen music and arts education programs authorized under Title X (in NCLB) by establishing a formal consultative role for arts educators in determining the nature, scope, and direction of these programs. Ensure greater access to school music programs for at-risk students. Prioritize funding so that arts education grants are available to schools. Make certain that federal funds that are

---

⁹ A three-way comparison of the arts standards at the national, state (Massachusetts), and local level (Metro Public Schools) will be discussed at length in chapter three.

¹⁰ A detailed discussion of Vision 2020 is in Appendix Four
directed to after-school arts activities are not used to replace in-school music and arts classes”
(U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Education et al., 302-03).

Hinckley’s plea to Congress in behalf of music education was not made in vain.

Seven years after the “Goals 2000: Educate America Act” was signed into law by
President Clinton, President George W. Bush signed The No Child Left Behind Act of
2001 (NCLB) into law in 2002 which, through its amendments and revisions, updated
and replaced much of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The
authors of the NCLB law adopted many elements from the “Goals 2000: Educate
America” act including having the arts named as a “core academic subject.”11 By
definition, any content area that is labeled as a “core academic subject” would be subject
to accountability through assessment by educators and lawmakers at all levels of
government.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB) DEFINED

The authors of NCLB redefined the role of the federal government in K-12
education in that the leaders of states and school districts now had more flexibility over
what to do with federal funding provided that achievement deadlines would be met to the
satisfaction of what was written in state laws and NCLB by state and government law
makers.xxv The NCLB authors’ mission statement of NCLB is “To close the achievement
gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.”xxvi The
deadline for achieving the goals stated by the authors of NCLB in their mission statement

11 Title IX, Part A, Section 9101 (1)(D)(11), NCLB defines the term “core academic subjects”:
“The term ‘core academic subjects’ means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign
languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography” (U.S. Congress. Senate, 2002).
No further definition in either law (NCLB or “Goals 2000: Educate America Act” and NCLB) was
provided to further define the arts.
is the 2013-2014 school year. According to former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education, Rod Paige, the four key principles of NCLB include:

- stronger accountability for results
- greater flexibility for states, school districts, and schools in the use of federal funds
- more choices for parents of children from disadvantaged backgrounds
- and an emphasis on teaching methods that have been demonstrated to work (U.S. Department of Education. Office of the Under Secretary, 2002).

School officials in Metro Public Schools responded to NCLB by choosing to focus on stronger accountability and an emphasis on teaching methods that had demonstrated success.

**ELABORATION ON NCLB**

The authors of many education reforms have had only a moderate impact on education and very little, if any, impact on arts and music education. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), in contrast, had been in effect since 2002 but the supporters and authors in its short history had already had a profound impact on education and the arts. Education officials in state and school districts all over the nation scrambled to fulfill the stringent requirements NCLB placed upon them. In some places, music programs and/or instruction time in music were reduced by school officials, when ironically, nowhere is it stated by the authors in NCLB to do so at the local, state, or national level.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 is a law in which its authors demands accountability from all parties involved in a child’s public education. The mission statement and the key principles cited by former U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige suggest that NCLB pertains to the improvement in test scores concerning the traditional three “R’s” of education (reading, writing, and arithmetic), but Paige himself has
declared this a narrow interpretation of NCLB. In a letter to superintendents regarding the arts as a core academic subject, Paige states:

As I travel the country, I often hear that arts education programs are endangered because of No Child Left Behind. It’s disturbing not just because arts programs are being diminished or eliminated, but because NCLB is being interpreted so narrowly as to be considered the reason for these actions. The truth is that NCLB included the arts as a core academic subject because of their importance to a child’s education. No Child Left Behind expects teachers of the arts to be highly qualified, just as it does teachers of English, math, science, and history (Paige 2004).

A further study of the law (that pertains to this thesis) supports Paige’s statement and interprets the term “core academic subjects” to extend beyond the traditional three “R’s” in education, to include visual art, dance, music, and theatre.

NCLB, THE ASSESSMENT OF THE ARTS, ADVOCACY, AND FUNDING

Having defined the arts as a “core academic subject”, some would say that this either entitles, or requires, depending on one’s persuasion, the arts to be assessed at the state level according to NCLB. The following is written by the authors of NCLB in Title VI, Part C, Section 411 (b)(2)(D):

…conduct additional national assessments and collect and report assessment date, including achievement data trends, in a valid and reliable manner on student academic achievement in grades 4, 8, and 12 in public and private elementary schools and secondary schools in regularly scheduled intervals in additional subject matter, including writing, science…and arts…

This may be enacted if the following is carried out successfully:

- students in grades 4 and 8 have been nationally assessed every 2 years in reading and mathematics and a report is written once the assessment data has been collected
- a national assessment has been conducted and assessment data has been collected and reported, including achievement data trends in grade 12 in regularly scheduled intervals, but at least as often as such assessments were conducted prior to the date of enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001
- time and resources must allow for this to happen (U.S. Congress. Senate, 2002)

Members in some arts advocacy groups such as The Arts Education Partnership (AEP) view this as an opportunity to advance the agenda of arts organizations and arts educators. They “encourage states to consider assessment in the arts as part of their
accountability systems, developing either state assessments or requiring local school districts to do so.”xxix This reinforces the concept that the arts are a “core academic subject” and should be included on the same level of importance with the reading and mathematics assessments.

With regards to advocacy in relation to assessment, other members in arts organizations, such as MENC, in the following expressed viewpoint, wants music teachers to be educated about policy affecting music education and to use it to justify its importance in schools:

…(Accountability) is the aspect that has led some educators to call the law (NCLB), “No students left untested.” States and school districts will overlook music assessment in favor of reading, mathematics, and later, science. (Their suggested strategy:) Lose no chance to point out to administrators and decision-makers that music, in addition to its inherent value for students, is associated with higher achievement on important measures such as the SAT math and verbal scores (The National Association for Music Education (c) 2002).

Former MENC president, Willie L. Hill, urged the members of MENC to be well informed about policy and to connect with fellow colleagues to make sure the voice of music education is heard at the local, state, and federal levels.xxx

The consequences of limited awareness of policy by music educators that pertains to music education was severe in Massachusetts when funding became an issue. Due to laws passed for smaller class sizes and increased instruction time for testing, the education budget for all expenses was cut by school officials for several school districts across the state of Massachusetts such as Malden, Gloucester, and Plymouth.xxxi NCLB was blamed by school officials for smaller class sizes and increased instruction time for the “three R’s” to increase MCAS (Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System)
scores, but again, the law was narrowly interpreted. Nowhere did the authors of NCLB write to eliminate the arts for increased instruction time in the “Three R’s.”

Overall, it can be assumed that many people in the music profession would agree with Samuel Hope, who is Executive Director, *ex officio*, of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), that, “Music education has a powerful ally: the force of music itself.” However, when that is not enough and music programs are cut, music must rely on human advocacy efforts to keep its place in a child’s curriculum.

Some prominent music educators believe that teachers who are knowledgeable about the political landscape can save their programs. Frank Battisti, who at the time of the article, “Teaching Music: The Leadership Component” was written, was (among his many positions) Conductor Emeritus of the New England Conservatory Wind Ensemble, believes that “a teacher lives in a political world, and politics are not necessarily ‘bad.’ A teacher with leadership ability has the political skills necessary to achieve goals that are helpful to his or her constituency.” Tim Lautzenheiser agrees with Battisti adding:

> Educational reform is a way of life. This is not an issue that will pass by and everyone will live happily ever after. All areas of study will continuously be challenged and reviewed. We, as music educators, will be required to come forward and offer our expertise, and to explain why music should be a part of the school day. In the moment in time, it would behoove us to be aligned with our fellow music compatriots (1993, 62).

---

12 A note about MCAS: One common misconception is that MCAS exams were created by employees of the Massachusetts Department of Education as a result of NCLB, yet MCAS exams predate NCLB by four years. The employees of the Massachusetts Department of Education began to administer MCAS tests in 1998, in which they are the result of the state of Massachusetts’ 1993 education reform act [Massachusetts Department of Education (c)]. Heidi Perlman, a spokesman for the Massachusetts Department of Education, emphasizes MCAS exams are “standards-based” tests as opposed to more rigid or formulaic “standardized tests” (Old Colony Memorial 2005).

13 Tim Lautzenheiser was formally a band director at Northern Michigan University, the University of Missouri, and New Mexico State University.
Lautzenheiser also raises many rhetorical questions about the responsibilities of the music educator to attend not only to the microcosm that surrounds them, but to the profession of music education as a whole. “We speak of harmony, blend, and balance, but do we exercise these important cooperative qualities outside the rehearsal?”

Hinckley’s testimony to House Subcommittee (on behalf of MENC), to have the arts included in NCLB, is proof that by following Lautzenheiser’s advice, music advocacy can be successful. In the end, a music educator must be aware of education policy that directly affects music education, and in this case, use assessment to their advantage to secure funding through strong advocacy.

**NCLB, METRO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND ASSESSMENT IN THE ARTS**

Michelle Channon, Senior Program Director for the Arts in Metro Public Schools, believed that NCLB had a direct effect on state budget cuts in education in Massachusetts. She said that lawmakers from the state cut all educational funding regardless of whether or not NCLB existed but it is possible it could have had a small or indirect effect on MPS. Channon cited four reasons a majority of music programs were not eliminated in MPS:

- schools operate on site-based management (principals hire employees)
- all schools must have at least one art form present
- parents have a powerful voice in MPS if a principal decides to cut the arts (they deem it important and demand that it be in their child’s life) (2004).

This does not mean that lawmakers interpreting NCLB in Massachusetts had no impact on the music program in MPS. Specifically to MPS according to Channon, the lawmaker of Massachusetts interpretations of NCLB influenced how school officials in MPS
viewed arts assessment in the K-12 music classroom. The author of this thesis explored the issues that school officials in MPS faced in implementing the directives of NCLB, the National Standards for the Arts, and the legislation’s implied assessment expectations to create the music portion of Metro Arts Assessment Model (MAAM).

---

2 Doug Most, “What Are We Doing to Our Kids?” *Boston*, 10 October 2003, 115.
4 Metro Public Schools, *Rough Draft of MAAM*, June 2005 (Date I received document).
5 Metro Public Schools, *Pilot Copy/1st Official Complete MAAM* (included paper copy and DVDs), February 2006 (Date I received document).
6 Metro Public Schools, *2nd Official Complete MAAM* (included paper copy and DVDs), August 2007 (Date I received document).
9 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid.
19 Ibid.
22 Ibid., 18.
Ibid.


xxi Ibid., 19.


xxiii Ibid., 19.


xxxvi Michelle Channon, Senior Program Director for the Arts for Metro Public Schools, interview by author, 2 March 2004, Metro, tape recording, Metro Public School Board Building, Metro.

xxxvii Ibid.

xxxviii Metro Public Schools, *Rough Draft of MAAM*, June 2005 (Date I received document).
Metro Public Schools, *Pilot Copy/1st Official Complete MAAM* (included paper copy and DVDs), February 2006 (Date I received document).

Metro Public Schools, *2nd Official Complete MAAM* (included paper copy and DVDs), August 2007 (Date I received document).
Chapter Two

Assessment is a complex and controversial issue in music education. Even at the national and state level with National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) there have been many revisions in the actual exams and resources that provide “how-to guides” to creating large-scale arts assessments. However, there is no existing guide specific to creating district-wide arts assessments at the local level. In this chapter I will define assessment terminology used in chapter three, delve into the debate about large-scale arts assessments, and present large-scale arts assessments, particularly at the national level in which they will be presented and evaluated in their historical context.

ASSESSMENT

Added to federal policy and the National Standards for the Arts, assessment completes the trilogy of factors central to Channon’s (of MPS) development of MAAM. After an extensive literature review, assessment definitions chosen for inclusion herein met the following three criteria: 1) the frequency with which they occurred in contemporary literature; 2) their acceptance and/or creation by members of MENC; and 3) their use within the case study of Metro Arts Assessment Model. There will be some evaluative commentary about the particular definitions from the professionals in the field of music education.

The members of MENC’s position on definitions:

Because the professional literature is inconsistent in its use of assessment-related terminology, it is important that the reader be familiar with the definitions used in this publication. “Assessment” is used here as a general term to describe the overall process of making analytical judgments. The process of assessment emphasizes discernment and discrimination; it is best carried out by using a
A more holistic definition/vision of assessment was given in the conclusion of Loretta Niebur’s study *Incorporating Assessment and the National Standards for Music Education into Everyday Teaching*:

Assessment is about more than children and teachers, although it must always be for them. It is about more than sending home papers, giving performances, or generating data for reports, as important as all of these things can be. Assessment is more than a scoreboard that dispassionately displays how closely an educational endeavor approximates compliance with a given set of criteria, regardless of how sophisticated and humane the criteria may be. Reading assessment like a scoreboard leaves half of the story untold. Assessment is a metaphor for what teachers and students do in classrooms and, unlike the relatively straightforward pronouncements of scoreboards, metaphors reach deep into their readers for meaning. Thus, all assessment whether statistically or artistically presented, whether carefully packaged or grabbed by handfuls from the classroom cries out for a human audience to complete its meaning. It begs for someone to attend a performance or listen to what a child has to say about her paper. It demands the dignity of submitting only reports that are likely to be useful and then having the information used as wisely as possible. Assessment is not only about asking and answering questions, but it is also about the reciprocal responsibility of listening respectfully to the answers. In short, educational assessment of any kind is an inescapably human endeavor and it should, above all, edify (2001, 158-9).

Richard Colwell best sums up assessment, “Good assessments provide data on the extent of success and failure but only hint at causes. Assessment, of course, has always been part of teaching and learning; what is new is its uses.”

According to Elliot Eisner in his essay, “Reshaping Assessment in Education,” there are five functions of assessment.

- (The first function of assessment): The U.S. National Assessment of Educational Progress performs a temperature-taking function. Its purpose is not to provide information about the performance of individual students or even individual school districts, but to describe the educational health of the century.
- A second function of assessment is a gate-keeping function (Ex: SAT).
- A third function of assessment is to determine whether course objectives have been obtained. In this, its classical use, assessment in schools is sometimes used for gate-keeping functions and sometimes to help teachers provide remedial help to students who need it.
- A fourth function of assessment is to provide feedback to teachers on the quality of their professional work.
- A fifth function of assessment focuses on the quality of the program that is being provided. Although the least prominent of assessment function, this function is arguably one of the most important. If the program’s quality is poor to begin with, the quality of teaching does not matter much; if it’s not worth teaching, it’s not worth teaching well (1998, 139).
All five of these functions were integrated by Channon into the Metro Arts Assessment Model, as will be discussed in chapter three.

Fiese and Fiese\(^1\) believe that assessments should be “real-world” assessments. Music and physical education are the only two disciplines where teachers can immerse the students right away in the “real-world” aspect of the discipline.\(^{iii}\) There should be multiple assessments (informal and formal) taken of the students throughout the school year to obtain a clear picture of their needs and progress.\(^{iv}\) As with Eisner, all of the Fiese’s recommendations were infused by Channon in Metro Public Schools district-wide arts assessment\(^{v}\) as will be discussed in chapter three.

“Therevaluation” is the act or process of determining the extent to which individuals or groups possess certain skills, knowledge, or abilities. Evaluation is the step in the assessment process at which a judgment is made, based on information collected.”\(^{vi}\)

There are two types of achievement evaluation:

- When a learner’s achievement is evaluated in relation to that of others, the evaluation is considered to be norm-referenced, that is, it compares the behavior (usually scores) of an individual on a given test to those of some normative group, usually either his or her classmates or a well-defined population of similar age, grade level, or experience. Decisions about an individual’s achievement therefore are partially dependent on the achievement of other learners. Achievement evaluation in relation to specific criteria rather than individuals is called criterion-referenced evaluations. Such evaluation is particularly appropriate for instructional programs that allow students to progress at their own rates of learning. Criterion-referenced evaluation usually is concerned with assessment of whether or not a student has achieved enough to satisfy the minimum competency requirements specified in the criterion statement (Boyle and Radocy 1987, 10-11).

According to Michelle Channon, the MAAM was criterion-referenced and minimally norm-referenced meaning that the student’s personal growth in the art form tested was

---

\(^1\) At the time of the article’s publication, Richard K. Fiese was a professor of music education at Houston Baptist University in Houston, Texas. Robin E. Fiese was a band director at Oak Ridge High School in Conroe, Texas.
more important (to Channon) than a comparison of that student’s performance on MAAM against other students’ performance in the district.

The purposes of evaluation in education include: “appraisal of student progress,” “identification and guidance of talented students,” “appraisal of the effectiveness of the teacher,” “appraisal of the educational process,” “motivation of student learning”, establishment and maintenance of standards,” and evaluation of the results of research. (All of the purposes can be categorized into formative and summative evaluations.)

Eisner extends the purposes of evaluation with his belief that:

Evaluation, however, should not be conceived of exclusively in terms of outcome assessment. Evaluation, it seems to me, should be regarded as an educational medium. The processes of teaching and the quality of what is taught, as well as their outcomes, are the proper subject matter of an adequate approach to educational evaluation. If the quality of the content being taught is poor, it does not matter much if the quality of teaching is good. Indeed, if the content being taught is pernicious, excellence in teaching is a vice (1998, 172).

Richard Colwell and Thomas Goolsby feel that music teachers neglect evaluation because it is heavily time-consuming. Evaluation must be comprehensive and systematic. Because music is largely subjective, evaluation must occur at greater frequencies. “Evaluation can prescribe the objectives, but it should not. The teacher’s and the school officials’ philosophy dictate what is important in music and what should be taught.”

According to Colwell:

Assessment when embedded in music instruction is formative evaluation because its primary purpose is to improve the performance and, one would hope, the learning. Despite the desire of

---

2 “Formative evaluations generally are concerned with program planning and development. Summative evaluations include not only assessments of performance groups and the achievement of individuals, but may also include attitudinal data form various perspectives: students, teachers, parents, the community, and other members of the profession, both within and outside the school district” (Boyle and Radocy 1987, 17-8).
arts advocacy groups to have “hard” data on music learning, there has been little interest in summative evaluation of learning in required music instruction and only slightly more interest in outcomes of elective music experiences” (2002, 1130).

Channon’s purposes for MAAM’s evaluation were both summative formative. She wanted to obtain both a behind the scenes view of what was being taught and also to see what the students are actually learning. Later, this information was to inform (extent unknown) program planning and development.\textsuperscript{xvi}

Furthermore, when writing objectives, the goal of Channon and the consultants was 1) that MAAM adhere to a national standard and 2) that it use Bloom’s taxonomy of learning, thereby focusing on the six major categories in Bloom’s Taxonomy: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.\textsuperscript{xvii}

Having found no suitable definitions for “traditional assessment”, I have defined traditional assessment as an assessment that involves multiple-choice, short answer, essay, and other traditional paper-and-pencil methods. The questions are highly objective and little creativity is involved.

Rubrics were used for three out of four sections of the music portion for MAAM.\textsuperscript{xviii} Rubrics are excellent for music educators to deduce what an assessment tests for. They are used for both traditional and authentic assessments. In more technical terms, “…a rubric is an assessment device that uses clearly specified evaluation criteria and proficiency levels that measure student achievement of those criteria. The criteria provide descriptions of each level of performance in terms of what students are able to do.”\textsuperscript{xix} On rubrics for music, for example, Colwell explains:

\begin{quote}
It refers to a tool for evaluation of performance in the areas of teaching, composing, conducting, improvising, singing, and playing. Such rubrics have seldom been subjected to the rigor required in assessment, and their misuse is potentially damaging to the assessment profession. They are
\end{quote}
most useful on items about which there is general consensus as to what constitutes excellence. (Colwell 2002, 1129).

**Authentic assessment is intrinsic to music.** Defined by Wiggins:

…authentic assessment should involve an authentic task and students should be asked to demonstrate their control over the essential knowledge being taught by using the information in a way that reveals their level of understanding. The evaluation criteria should be understood by the students from the start so that they can self-assess their work by applying the criteria (Wiggins 1989 qtd. in Montgomery 2001, 4).

Authentic assessment includes authentic tasks is defined as:

This is a real-life activity, performance, or challenge that mirrors those faced by experts in the particular field; it is complex and multidimensional and requires higher levels of cognitive thinking such as problem solving and critical thinking (Montgomery 2001, 4).

A few examples of these tasks concerning music include: composition, singing, playing an instrument, portfolios, etc.

“A portfolio is a collection of student work showing student reflection and progress or achievement over time in one or more areas.”

The advantage of a portfolio in determining student competence is that it can contain evidence from multiple indicators; the portfolio is not the assessment tool, but it contains the results of valid and reliable assessments and enough information about the student and instructional goals to allow for interpretation of these materials (Colwell 2002, 1150).

Kelly explains portfolios further:

Portfolios are excellent diagnostic tools, which can be used to adjust instructional content to meet individual needs, as a basis for ability grouping and one method for providing accountability in music programs. The use of portfolios make “teaching to the test” difficult due to the individualization. This factor may make this aspect of authentic assessment a more valid measure of teaching effectiveness (Kelly 1995, 27).

“Portfolio assessment includes a selective collection of student work and self-assessment that is used to show progress over time with regard to specific criteria.” Portfolios should include the student’s best work including writing samples with correct grammar,

---

3 Steven N. Kelly was an assistant professor of music education at Florida State University at the time his article was reprinted in *Spotlight on Music Education: Selected Articles From State MEA Journals.*
punctuation, etc., aesthetic assessments, interdisciplinary activities, quality performances, etc. The time frame should be over a school year to collect materials. 

In summary, the assessment definitions for the assessment terminology that will be used in chapter three are: assessment criterion-referenced, Bloom’s Taxonomy, rubric, “traditional assessment”, authentic assessment, and portfolio.

Music Assessment at the National and State Level

Although this thesis is about a district-wide arts assessment, no literature or documentation exists and there is no discussion from the music education field about the creation, history, process, implementation, and survival of a district-wide arts assessment that the author of this thesis has found as of April 15, 2008. Upon interviewing Stacey Low, an intern from the Massachusetts Cultural Council who was hired to compile a comprehensive review of national, state, and district-wide arts assessments, I learned that she too had difficulty gathering information about documented district-wide arts assessments and that she was denied access to MAAM. We concurred that the closest information that one could gather about district-wide arts assessments was through interviews and anecdotal reports. This thesis, then, is unique in that an outsider was given complete access to document the inception of the Metro Arts Assessment Model.

DEBATE ABOUT LARGE-SCALE ARTS ASSESSMENTS

There is considerable debate as to whether or not there should even be large-scale arts assessments at the national, state, and/or district level. Upon interviewing one teacher, Nieber found out that the teacher felt that teachers would teach to the test if there was a national or state music test. However, Christine Sezer, a music teacher who has
served on state large-scale assessment creation committee believes that philosophies and local curriculum guides (assessment can be assumed in this list as well) are inadequate to those at the state level. Michelle Channon was of the opinion that assessment training among music teachers would improve both teaching and learning in Metro, and it was on this belief that she designed the MAAM development strategy.

Individual music educators were not optimistic about the future of large-scale arts assessments. Michael George believed that state education officials would not fund assessment at the state level and that local districts must take it upon themselves (with help through MENC materials) to create an arts assessment. Frank Philip stated that it is difficult to find the correct way to create/perform large-scale arts assessments since they had not been in existence for a long period of time and there were not many samples to view. Boyle and Radocy believe that state-level tests have limitations in that they do not raise the standards, but may help to maintain the standards.

However, Garry Walker quotes Dr. Michael Riley, Superintendent of Schools, Bellevue Public Schools in Bellevue, WA (1998), who is positive about large-scale assessments if music teachers make the effort to assess in their classrooms.

It is important to understand the difference between assessments you use in making instructional decisions on a daily basis and the tools used for district, state, or national assessments. The assessment of regular student progress is used to make instructional decisions to enhance the learning for each student. Large-scale assessments are used to make decisions about programs and school districts based on statewide standards. Large-scale assessments take snapshots that only reflect a small portion of the total learning that takes place in each program. If assessment based

---

4 More anecdotal stories about teachers and their participation in large-scale arts assessments can be located in Appendix Five.

5 Garry Walker was a high school orchestra teacher in Bellevue, Washington and an adjunct professor of secondary music education at Seattle Pacific University at the time this article was reprinted in Spotlight on Music Education: Selected Articles From State MEA Journals. He was also a state representative at the SCASS Institute on Assessment in the Arts.
on clear criteria to measure both skill development and the ability to transfer concepts exist in each music classroom in the state, our students will be well prepared for any large-scale assessment that may become a part of the educational process in the future (Michael Riley qtd. in Walker 1999, 88).

Marcia McCaffrey, the Arts Consultant in the Office of Accountability with the New Hampshire State Department of Education, agrees with Riley to some extent. During our March 2006 phone interview she, being immersed in large-scale arts assessments, said that district-wide arts assessments and state-level arts assessments change places popularity wise as funding for such projects rises and falls like the stock market. At this time, district-wide arts assessments were the trend due to available funding. In her experience, she explains that this is because the state education officials do not have much control over the school districts.**xxix** Conditions were such in Massachusetts and Metro Public Schools fell into this category as well.

The debate about large-scale arts assessments will continue as long as educators still have disagreements about the national arts standards and assessment. In the meantime, there has been half a century’s worth of large-scale arts assessments that have been implemented. New York State has quite a history of assessing the arts. In 1955, education officials in New York State administered their 324th High School Examination on “Comprehensive Art” that included completion, matching, and a performance component (visual arts based).**xxxi**

In the 1970s, the State of Michigan developed a statewide assessment for art and music (grades 4-7-10) that employed individual performance activities that were scored by local arts educators. Led by Ed Roeber, then the head of the Michigan Department of Education’s Assessment Program, and based on his experience with the NAEP, the assessment proved that states could conduct and score a large-scale effort and deal with students in many forms using limited state resources. Like many efforts to make the arts part of the “system,” the Michigan assessment never achieved the status of a full assessment for all students due to budget and time concerns (Philip 2000, 58).
One year before education officials in the State of Michigan developed its statewide arts assessment for art and music, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (Nation’s Report Card) (NAEP) was formed and the creators paved the way for the first national arts assessment that was administered in the 1970s. These events are relevant because a large part of the Metro Arts Assessment Model (MAAM) was based upon the successes and failures of the members of NAEP and State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS).

THE NATION’S REPORT CARD AND NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS (NAEP)

“The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America’s students know and can do in various subject areas.” The members of NAEP use it to assess the core academic content areas of NCLB since 1969. Information related to academic achievement is made available to policy makers at all levels, educators, and the public. The arts portion of NAEP includes: music, visual arts, dance, and theatre. Students are assessed nationally in public and nonpublic schools.

Music and visual art were tested in 1974 and 1978 but the results cannot be compared to the 1997 NAEP because of the major differences between the tests. “The NAEP 1997 arts assessment was designed in conjunction with the newly developed voluntary National Standards for Arts Education.” Overall, for all four art forms, there were two types of exercises for the test: authentic tasks and constructed-response. This test tested students who had a wide range of musical training. Experienced music
educators were hired and trained to score the assessment. \(^{xxxviii}\) NAEP for the arts will be administered in 2008 and 2016 for grade 8 only. \(^{xxxix}\)

**NAEP’s Outcomes**

The reviews were mixed about the results for the NAEP 1997 arts assessment. Paul Lehman contended that since there are no criteria against which to judge NAEP, its effectiveness remains subjective. He believes that its very existence, and the fact that it was implemented by the federal government and many organizations, was a positive development. It demonstrated that large-scale assessments in music are possible, that music education is for all students, and that some students achieved a high level in music. However, some music educators felt that there was a lack of emphasis on performing and creating. The actual NAEP results were confusing to all and because of many factors, could not be reported in the traditional format. \(^{xl}\)

Richard Colwell agreed with Lehman to the extent that NAEP had little impact on music educators because they could not relate the outcomes of that assessment to their own music program. \(^{xli}\) However, Frank Philip believes that standards, Goals 2000 and NAEP were positive in terms of public relations for arts education. Because the arts could now be tested, the members of the federal government legitimized them and that showed that the arts are for the masses and not the talented few. \(^{xlii}\)

---

\(^{6}\) “The NAEP arts assessment was administered to students at grade 8 in schools across the country from January through March of 2008. The assessment measures skills in music and visual arts. Results will be reported in 2009” (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Educational Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences (d), Updated April 10, 2008).
Finally, Christina Schneider\textsuperscript{7} puts the 1997 NAEP results in an objective perspective and made suggestions for the future of the music portion of NAEP. Scoring and data from the exam were her two largest concerns, in that these should have been made clearer to the music education community so that music teachers could use the data. She suggested that NAEP be used as a research tool that would provide better information on how to administer large-scale arts assessments for the arts. Finally, she believed that changes needed to be made for the 2008 release of the music portion of NAEP. She suggested these changes should be made with input from the music education community to improve the exam.\textsuperscript{xiii}

The mixed reviews of the NAEP 1997 Arts Assessment appeared later in NAEP’s guide for recommendations on how to develop a large-scale arts assessment (recommendations not cited by these authors). The authors of the guide presented the positive and negative outcomes of the assessment and the challenges learned while creating and implementing it.

**NAEP’s Recommendations for Large-Scale Arts Assessment Development**

This section discusses the authors of the NAEP report’s recommendations for creating a large-scale arts assessment at the state and district level using the 1997 NAEP arts assessment as their case study. Their website is a series of links set up as a “how-to guide” to accomplish such an endeavor.

The authors outline six strategies to creating an arts assessment noting that the

\textsuperscript{7} Christina Schneider was an education associate in the Office of Assessment at the South Carolina Department of Education in Columbia at the time of the article’s publication.
creators field tested their exercises, tweaked them, and administered them in the official

test. The following strategies were taken into account by Michelle Channon while
creating MAAM:\textsuperscript{xlv}

\begin{itemize}
\item Strategy 1: “Devote as much time as possible to arts exercises” (U.S. Department of
\item Strategy 2: “Use authentic stimuli to build valid, engaging exercises…to assess students’ arts
  knowledge and skills…to respond meaningfully to assessment exercises”(Ibid., U.S.
\item Strategy 3: “Focus students to get them engaged in assessment exercises (meaningful
  response)…such as particular problems, themes, or works of art” (U.S. Department of
\item Strategy 4: “Create context and guidance for student performance. Students who take NAEP
  assessments receive no advance assessment preparation. Yet responding to, creating, and
  performing works of art demand intellectual, emotional, and often physical effort for which
  students must be prepared” (Ibid.).
\item Strategy 5: “Encourage students to be creative while making tasks clear and standardizable.
  The arts assessment was meant to elicit students' expressive, creative abilities. But assessment
  tasks also needed to supply students with clear directions that would yield scorable, comparable
  responses” (Ibid.).
\item Strategy 6: “Take into account practical constraints that may limit what students can be asked
  to do (Ex: varying facilities)” (Ibid.).
\end{itemize}

The NAEP “how-to” guide is comprehensive and valuable to all members of
organizations, states, and school districts that may want to attempt to create a large-scale
arts assessment. However, as was evident over the course of this case study, the
following must be taken into consideration because the reasons and conditions for the
NAEP arts assessment are far different than that of an organization, state, or school
district: a) design of assessment will be tailored to the needs of the people who are
creating the assessment; b) desired projected outcome will vary from locale to locale; c)
scores will be used for different purposes; d) students’ backgrounds will differ; and e)
logistic and time parameters of the assessment conditions will vary.
STATE COLLABORATIVE ON ASSESSMENT AND STUDENT STANDARDS (SCASS)

Indirectly linked to NAEP is SCASS ARTS Education Consortium (State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards) sponsored by CCSSO (Council of Chief State School Officers). In 1991 after the NAEP in the arts was announced, the Council of Chief State School Officers invited states to form a group to parallel and take advantage of the NAEP efforts. As the NAEP was being prepared, states interested in arts assessment began an effort to create appropriate arts assessments for state and local levels. The (SCASS) Arts consortium was initially formed with 15 states and, in 1994, participated in the development of NAEP assessment exercises. Today, a group of 13 states...continues the work” (Philip 2000, 58).

It “is the only state-based, nationally focused group addressing the development and refinement of arts education assessment materials for large-scale, district-level, and classroom-based assessment and professional development connected to the NAEP.” (They were involved in writing some of the 1997 NAEP assessment items). The members of the consortium collaborate at the local and state levels to compile the best arts assessment questions and models to help educate the members in the organization and outsiders on how to develop large-scale arts assessments and increase the quality of professional development in arts assessment. Only members may "beg, borrow, and steal" actual questions and procedures (which are posted on the web and heavily screened by an assessment committee) that other members have developed. Their greatest accomplishment in 1998 was a creation of a 450 page "how-to" guide on creating large-scale arts assessments at the state and local levels. Inside this guide are "lessons learned", and a collection of professional development assessment materials. The updated 2004 version is explained in detail in further discussions. Works in progress as of 2002-2003
include: enlarging the question pool with media items (live recordings, etc.) and constructed-response items, developing technology to assess students and collect their scores, and “develop an annotated bibliography of arts assessment research.”

SCASS access is not inexpensive. As of 2003-2004, each member state may only send two representatives to attend the tri-yearly conferences at a participation fee of $15,000. Marcia McCaffrey, the Arts Consultant in the Office of Accountability with the New Hampshire State Department of Education, has found a cost-effective solution. She pays the fee to join SCASS, goes to the meetings, returns, and holds workshops for her teachers, free of charge, teaching them what she learned from SCASS.

An update from Frank Philip, Director of Program Development and Operations in the Council of Chief State School Officers, revealed:

Currently, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Minnesota, Arizona, California, and Delaware (are) working on a system of item development using a website developed for the purpose. We are now primarily interested in the professional development necessary to help teachers create and use classroom-based, formative assessment to engage students in their assessments and inform the teaching and learning process [(b), 2006].

Education officials from two school districts will be receiving their services by May 2006: Phoenix Union High School District and Los Angeles Unified School District.

Through the communications with Frank Philip, the author was able to view the Item Pool and Item Development Training Package, which is an assessment manual for SCASS members.

This manual is intended for use by state SCASS member states in training the states’ SCASS Arts Item Pool item developers. The training manual describes a step-by-step process for drafting items and for critiquing items during and after the development process. The manual also includes handouts that can be reproduced for item development training and item writing, and it tells how/when to use each handout. This document is not intended to cover every possible detail of item development, but it does attempt to cover most of the major issues to be aware of in developing high quality multiple-choice selected-response items and constructed-response items.
with preliminary scoring criteria (CCSSO/SCASS Arts Education Assessment Consortium 2004, Introduction: 1).

The author is not permitted to reveal or cite any sensitive test information and information on how to create a wide-scale arts assessment. Much of the information, however, is similar to the assessment definition literature review and information from the NAEP “how-to guide,” discussed previously.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I have defined assessment terminology used in chapter three, delved into the debate about large-scale arts assessments, and presented large-scale art assessments, particularly at the national level in which they were presented and evaluated in their historical context.

Michelle Channon was somewhat influenced by NAEP and SCASS as is evident in the Metro Arts Assessment Model. However, there was one additional resource that was used by Channon to create MAAM. It is Nancy Pistone’s book entitled A Process Guide for Assessing Arts Education in School Districts and States. In chapter three, I discuss the ways in which Pistone’s book is interspersed with MAAM.

Viewed collectively, it is apparent from the foregoing explanations that assessment is a complex and controversial issue in music education. Even at the national and state level with NAEP and SCASS there have been many revisions in the actual exams and resources that provide “how-to guides” to creating large-scale arts assessments. However, there is no existing guide specific to creating district-wide arts assessments at the local level.

Policy, standards, and assessment have been discussed thus far. The confluence
of these three triggered Channon to create a district-wide arts assessment entitled Metro Arts Assessment Model for Metro Public Schools in Metro, MA. To the author’s knowledge, there is no literature that documents the process of the creation of a district-wide arts assessment, and this she seeks to fill that void through this thesis, so that other district education officials may learn from Channon’s experience from Metro Public Schools.

1 Metro Public Schools, Rough Draft of MAAM, June 2005 (Date I received document).
2 Metro Public Schools, Pilot Copy/1st Official Complete MAAM (included paper copy and DVDs), February 2006 (Date I received document).
3 Metro Public Schools, 2nd Official Complete MAAM (included paper copy and DVDs), August 2007 (Date I received document).
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7 Metro Public Schools, Rough Draft of MAAM, June 2005 (Date I received document).
8 Metro Public Schools, Pilot Copy/1st Official Complete MAAM (included paper copy and DVDs), February 2006 (Date I received document).
9 Metro Public Schools, 2nd Official Complete MAAM (included paper copy and DVDs), August 2007 (Date I received document).
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Chapter Three

PURPOSE AND DESIGN

The purpose of this case study was to document the creation of a district-wide arts assessment from its inception through phase one of implementation. I conducted research from the standpoint of the teachers’ role in creating the complete first draft of the assessment. My goal was to report what happened when the arts assessment was piloted and administered in the Metro school district. It is evident from my research that various factors influenced the need to create an arts assessment at the district level including: policy from all three levels of government, the national arts standards, the national discussions for a need for assessment in arts education, and the existence of large-scale arts assessments such as NAEP.

The Site and Participants

The Metro school district was chosen for a study site because it met several criteria I created before commencing on this study: the arts supervisor created a rough draft of a district-wide arts assessment began in the spring of 2004; it was located in proximity where I could attend all of the meetings, conduct formal and informal interviews, and easily obtain and review all relevant documents. In January of 2004, I learned from Michelle Channon, who was Senior Program Director for the Arts for Metro Public Schools, was planning to create a district-wide arts assessment entitled Metro Arts Assessment Model (MAAM). Since Metro Public Schools fit the site criteria, I obtained permission through Channon to observe the music teachers in MPS while they created their portion of the district-wide arts assessment from its planning stages through the
completion of the first draft. Although I hadn’t planned for the research to continue beyond 2006, I would also keep in contact until the MPS project was completed, which was in March of 2008. In turn, I agreed to the following terms and conditions: I would not record the process via audio or visual (I could record the interviews with Channon on an audio device); I had to use pseudonyms for the school district and all its participants; I could not individually interview the participants and quote them (any comments that were made that I included in the prose in the “Observation of MAAM” section came from either one and/or several of the participants); and last, since the testing materials are confidential documents, even the rough draft, I would not refer specifically to any of the questions and activities for the students in this thesis.

The main participants in this study included the following people: Michelle Channon, Senior Program Director for the Arts in Metro Public Schools; seven music teachers who created the music portion of the district-wide arts assessment: Tony Landers, Tom Chance, Hector Smith, Mitchell Goodman, Julia Monroe, Shelly Soffer, and Michael Conner; the external consultants for Metro’s district-wide arts assessment, Jonathan Carter (lead) and Jessica Lovegood. I served as a participant observer for a small portion of the observations. There were a few other people who participated in this study who held minimal roles. They are introduced throughout the report and discussion.

Data Collection and Analysis

I used ethnographic techniques to obtain data: formal interviews, informal interviews, observation of the teachers creating the district-wide arts assessment, observations of Channon and the consultants as they began the process of editing the
teachers’ work, field notes, audio recordings, and collection of artifacts.

**Interviews**

Data collection commenced with the first formal interview with the Senior Program Director for the Arts in Metro Public Schools, Michelle Channon. A formal interview was conducted by me with Channon on March 2, 2004, to provide me with a background about the arts in MPS before the observation of the music teachers began on June 24, 2004. In order to develop the interview protocols for Michelle Channon, I used the literature review topics as a guide to initiate the conversation. This included: local, state and national policy, *National Standards for Arts Education*, assessment (defined and issues of debate), and examples of large-scale arts assessments. Information that was ascertained from the first formal interview with Channon (2004) included: a) the reasons behind the creation of the district-wide arts assessment; b) history of the arts in the MPS school district in terms of policy and curriculum since Channon became the Senior Program Director for the Arts in Metro Public Schools; c) funding for MAAM; and d) a general background of her arts teachers (she was not sure who was going to participate at the time the interview was given, although she did send out invitations to ten music teachers, more could participate if they wanted to do so) in terms of education, professional arts experience, and years of K-12 classroom teaching experience.

**Documents**

Documents were collected by me throughout the case study beginning on March 2, 2004 through April 14, 2008. These included rough drafts of the actual assessment tool from MPS, the completed assessment tool from MPS, invitation advertisements to
all arts faculty in MPS, MPS City-wide Learning Standards, and all materials given to the teacher participants to create the arts assessment. The latter included: an assortment of large-scale arts assessments; arts standards from various states and countries including MPS, the National Standards for Arts Education, and Massachusetts; and literature that supported assessment in the arts.

**Observations**

Observations with the music teachers who created the district-wide arts assessment at Metro Public School took place from June 24, 2004 through March 16, 2005. There was no set schedule, as the next MAAM meeting was scheduled by the MAAM music participants and/or by Michelle Channon at the conclusion of each meeting. The meeting dates were as follows: June 24, 2004; June 25, 2004; October 11, 2004; November 30, 2004; December 1, 2004; January 3, 2005; January 28, 2005; February 2, 2005; February 9, 2005; February 16, 2005; March 2, 2005; and March 16, 2005. I attended every meeting except the one on January 3, 2005 when I attended a Florida Music Educator Association Conference about assessment on that date. I received the notes and the work they completed from that meeting from one of the music teacher participants, Hector Smith, via email. Channon and the consultants continued to meet almost daily on an impromptu basis, which made these meetings difficult for me to attend since I was a full-time graduate student at the same time. However, I was invited to them, and attended two meetings with Channon and the consultants that took place on May 13, 2005 and June 23, 2005.

Interviews (both formal and informal) were conducted by me with Channon and
Jonathan Carter about the progress of the district-wide arts assessments through April 14, 2008. Formal interviews with Channon via phone and e-mail took place on the following dates: March 2, 2004, June 28, 2005, January 21, 2008, and April 13, 2008. Only informal interviews were conducted with Carter via e-mail and after participant meetings during the observation of MAAM.¹

Analysis

After all of the data was collected, I selected the following analysis strategy to analyze each data source: sorting, grouping, coding, and developing themes. I used charts to record the observations of the music teachers after the data from those meetings had been sorted, grouped, coded, and developed into themes from the typed notes I took during the observations. I also used this strategy with the interviews, and the final MAAM (music portion) testing instrument (DVD and testing instructions for teachers).⁷ Finally, I cross-referenced the overlapping themes emerging from the interviews, documents, observations, with the analysis of the issues presented in the literature review, to form the basis for the following discussion.

ORGANIZATION AND CHRONOLOGY

Background and Preliminary Work by Michelle Channon

Before I can present the Metro Arts Assessment Model (MAAM) observation, I must provide a background about the arts in the school district to shed light on the conditions the Metro Arts Assessment Model participants faced when they joined the

¹ Please refer to Works Cited for specific information for each follow-up interview under Carter and Channon.
Long before the district-wide arts assessment initiative, administrators at Metro Public Schools created its own version of arts standards (City-wide Learning Standards) in 1997 (music was revised in 1999). This was one year after selected artists and educators, mainly from the state of Massachusetts published their state arts framework, *Massachusetts Arts Curricular Framework*, and four years after the national arts standards were published. The creators of the MPS arts standards (City-wide Learning Standards) based the MPS arts standards upon Lowell Mason’s 150+ year old philosophy “that music is fundamental to the educational development to all students.”

The creators of the City-wide Learning Standards employed a structure similar to the state and national standards, combining the national arts standards, performance standards, and Massachusetts arts standards. The authors of the national arts standards wrote that the content standards “specify what students should know and be able to do in the arts disciplines.” The national content standards are synonymous with “strands” in the Massachusetts arts standards. The content standards are identical in wording to the national arts standards’ wording.

The authors of the national arts standards wrote that the achievement standards “specify the understandings and levels of achievements that students are able to attain in the competencies, for each of the arts, at the completion of grades 4, 8, and 12.” These are labeled as “standards” by the authors of the Massachusetts arts standards. The authors of the City-wide Learning Standards’ did not line up the achievement standards with either the national standards or Massachusetts’s standards, for three reasons: 1) the
authors of the City-wide Learning Standards did not delineate grade levels in accordance with the Massachusetts or national arts standards; 2) Massachusetts arts content standards are vastly different in arrangement and wording; and 3) since local control is relatively strong in Massachusetts, the authors of MPS’s standards reflected what their students knew and were able to do in the arts, regardless of state or national norms.

It must be noted that the City-wide Learning Standards and the Massachusetts’ arts standards have been revised once by members of their respective revision committees whereas the national standards have yet to be revised by anyone which could account for some of the gaps between the national arts standards and Metro’s standards. Overall, most of the achievement standards are identical between the three documents, though they have different placement by the authors within the content standards.

The most important part of the standards at the state and district level in regards to this thesis is the author’s intent to include their insistence for assessment. The education officials in the state of Massachusetts leave it up to education officials in each district to decide how to assess their students, recommending a balance of traditional and authentic assessments, with one caveat:

Performance and portfolio assessments, which have recently been adopted by other disciplines, have traditionally been used in the arts. Merely completing a performance task such as a recital or assembling a portfolio, however, does not constitute an assessment of learning. Assessments must also employ the use of criteria based on the Learning standards as well as valid and reliable scoring procedures. When scoring criteria are made explicit, assessment is more likely to result in the improvement of student learning (Massachusetts Department of Education 1999, 17).

---

2 Grade level delineations for the national and Massachusetts arts standards: K-4, 5-8, 9-12; Citywide Standards: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12 (Consortium of National Arts Associations 1994; Massachusetts Department of Education 1999; Metro Public Schools 2001).
Whether consciously or subconsciously, in general, Channon followed the state education officials’ guidelines (and took note of the concerns) throughout the entire process of creating the Metro Arts Assessment Model.

Using the earlier City-wide Learning Standards as a foundation, the grassroots district-wide arts assessment endeavor for Metro Public Schools began with the vision of Michelle Channon, Senior Program Director for the Arts in Metro Public Schools. However, her vision did not originate at the local level. In 1998, Channon approached the officials in the state education department (in Massachusetts) to discuss the possibility of creating a large-scale arts assessment at the state level or having every district expressing interest in creating an arts assessment come together to work on their own like SCASS. The officials in the state education department declined. She appealed her case to the members of the arts advisory council at the state level by providing the committee members with copies of arts assessments she had collected from other states. According to Channon, the members of the committee could not come to a general consensus on what assessment should look like in the arts let alone delve into a creation of a large-scale arts assessment, therefore turning her down. “I could not convince them that we needed to invent our own assessment because if we didn’t, they [could be anybody from any background] are going to do it for us some point down the line and we need to know what our kids know and are able to do.”

Of course this is always a possibility. The research I have conducted about policy, standards, and assessment earlier in this thesis can be used to support her statement. However, education officials in Massachusetts are unique compared to the
state officials mentioned earlier in this thesis that participated in SCASS and other large-scale assessment projects. “Massachusetts believes in local control,” wrote David Marshall in an email interview. This might explain the reaction Channon received from state education officials. It must also be noted that Channon has taught and/or been an administrator in states where education officials supported and/or created large-scale assessments, which drove her ambition to create a large-scale arts assessment having seen them work.

Local control in Massachusetts means that school district officials can set their own policies for arts requirements at all levels. In 2001, a document entitled Local Graduation Requirements in Massachusetts Public High Schools was released by the education officials from the Massachusetts Department of Education. The education officials from the state of Massachusetts had collected high school handbooks from all types of schools (private, public, etc.) that revealed the schools’ curriculum and graduation requirements. The study conducted by the state education officials from the Massachusetts Department of Education had its 100% response rate. Their findings included: “One hundred of the 226 districts (44.2%) have an arts requirement, ranging from one-half year to four years. The majority (66%) of these 100 districts require one year of art in high school.

At the time of the study conducted by the state officials from the Massachusetts Department of Education, the Metro Public Schools education officials had a district-

---

3 David Marshall is the Massachusetts Arts Education Advisory Council co-chair and Program Manager of Education for the Massachusetts Cultural Council. The Massachusetts Cultural Council provided a grant for MAAM.
wide written policy about arts education in place. In 1994,\(^4\) *Metro Public Schools Arts Education Policy* was approved by the members of the Metro School Committee and was updated and revised by the members of the Metro School Committee in 2001. Among many expectations and responsibilities, the authors wrote: “(that it) requires the implementation and maintenance of the Metro Public Schools City-wide Learning Standards and Course Descriptions in Dance, Music, Theatre and Visual Arts to insure rigorous, sequential, standards-based instruction,” “establishes the arts as a core subject,” and that the authors wanted support for the role that arts administrators (Channon) provides for the arts in the school district.\(^{\text{xix}}\)

There are many requirements stated in the district-wide policy about arts education by the authors of the policy that are relevant to this thesis. Under requirements, part III, page 4, the authors wrote:

All schools will maintain minimum time-on-learning expectations in the Arts.

The following are **minimum** time allocations for arts instruction:

- **High Schools:** Every student should pass one full year or two half year courses of the arts for graduation. One elective in at least three different art forms (dance, music, theatre, and/or visual arts) should be offered each year.

- **Middle Schools:** Every student should receive the equivalent of 135 minutes per week throughout middle school in dance, music, theatre, and/or visual arts. Every student should receive dance or theatre instruction during their middle school experience.

- **Elementary Schools:** Every student should receive the equivalent of 90 hours of arts instruction each year or 120 minutes per week in dance, music, theatre, and/or visual arts (Metro School Committee, 2001).

\(^4\) Channon started her current position in August 1995 (Channon (i) 2006).
It was the intentions by the authors to justify the need for a district-wide arts assessment if every student receives the required training in arts during their thirteen years of schooling by this writing this single requirement.

Another requirement that is important to the discussion of the district school official’s arts assessment is the sequential and integrated arts instruction mandated by the authors of the Metro School Committee policy. To help administer the creation of the curriculum, the school district officials paid for all of the arts materials (textbook adoption) in SY 2002 and every five years after, provided that the individual responsible for finances in individual schools cover costs in intervening years. The elementary music textbooks were adopted by Channon and her music teachers in 2002 and the middle school music textbooks were adopted in 2003. A teacher committee selected the SilverBurdett/Pearson series from among six publishers for elementary and middle school. The lowest bid and teachers’ opinion were major factors in purchasing the series. The text included interdisciplinary studies, familiar songs (new and old) that the students would recognize, quality CDs to accompany the text, and folk dances that Channon said would benefit the schools whose administrators eliminated PE classes.

The final relevant requirement from the authors of the arts policy was that the paperwork would be kept to the bare minimum with annual reports from the individual

5 “The following formula should be used by schools to provide a minimum site-based allocation for the replenishment of arts materials, supplies and transportation:

- Elementary - 14% of per pupil supply expenditure
- Middle School – 15% of per pupil supply expenditure
- High School – 16% of per pupil supply expenditure

If more than one art form exists in a school, the minimum allocation should be divided among the arts teachers based on the number of students served by each respective teacher” (Metro School Committee 2001, 4-5).
schools’ officials and visits from the people who worked in the district office.\textsuperscript{xxi} This would ensure that district control would extend to the school level. Most important, it shows that Channon had a great deal of trust in her faculty to implement the district-wide arts policy.

On paper, one would seem to think that this would be fantastic for the arts. In a site-based management school district, where every principal has the authority to hire and fire personnel, it is surprising that these requirements are, for the most part, fulfilled to some extent by the principals. Just because it is a district policy doesn’t mean that every school principal in the Metro Public Schools district fulfills these arts requirements. (Parental pressure and the principal’s philosophy influence the extent to which the district’s arts requirements are met.) If the students in a school are fortunate, these requirements are completely fulfilled by the school’s principal.\textsuperscript{xxii} Out of 128 schools in the district, 75 of them have principals who have music programs in their schools and there were 102 music teachers employed as of June 2005.\textsuperscript{xxiii} Unfortunately, there are a few principals who have no arts in their schools whatsoever (but almost every school has at least one art form represented in the curriculum). However, all of the instruction is geared by the principals toward MCAS preparation and other standardized tests.\textsuperscript{xxiv} There is no excuse for the principals of the schools not to have any arts at all since the authors of the \textit{Metro Public Schools Arts Education Policy} wrote a clause that permits principals to petition the committee for a waiver to provide an alternative plan for their school.\textsuperscript{xxv}

From the policy standpoint, Channon believed that everything looked like it was in place for the officials in MPS to support the creation of a district-wide arts assessment
at my study’s outset. Channon’s first attempt before the textbook adoption to put together a district-wide arts assessment failed, because no one could agree on what should be assessed.\textsuperscript{xxvi} However, due to NCLB policy and assessment pressures by education officials at the federal level of government, and pressure exerted by the presence of state education officials implementing the state of Massachusetts’ frameworks, Channon succeeded with her second attempt.

Timing is everything for starting up new projects and Channon’s was perfect. At that time, school officials at Metro Public Schools had started district criterion-reference testing in English, math, social studies and science. During the year of Channon’s inquiry, the school district officials had already decided to add the arts, health, PE, and world languages to the myriad of required assessments administered during the school year at the district and state level. Based upon this situation, I raise an important question: How much assessment is too much assessment?

According to Alfie Kohn, “Our children are tested to an extent that is unprecedented in our history and unparalleled anywhere else in the world.”\textsuperscript{xxvii} This statement was certainly true in the Metro Public Schools. According to the staff of Metro Public Schools’ Office of Research, Assessment and Evaluation department, for the 2004-2005 school year, all students went through ongoing formative assessments with their classroom teachers, and the average student starting in grade three took about four state and district examinations per year. If a student was a special education or English as a second language student, s/he had to take more examinations. In addition to those
assessments, a student’s school could be chosen as a pilot school for NAEP, state, and/or the district officials requiring even more standardized tests.\textsuperscript{xxviii}

Channon contends that although kids are saturated with tests, there has to be some way to assess them in the arts and make some of the tasks fun, thinking that perhaps this would encourage the students to do self-study in the arts.\textsuperscript{xxix} This idea is elaborated upon by Nancy Pistone’s\textsuperscript{6} in her book entitled \textit{Envisioning Arts Assessment: A Process Guide for Assessing Arts Education in School Districts and States}. Pistone believes that performance related assessment, either live performance, video taped assessment, performance of a composition, etc. can be a large asset to arts education advocacy as well as be “fun” for the students. Through this assessment, music teacher(s) can not only show, but also ENGAGE important decision makers, i.e., legislators, parents, administrators, informing them that the arts are not to be justified for “entertainment” reasons. Of course most of those people feel that if a content area can be assessed, it is valid for a child’s education. Thus, the arts should be made available by school officials for “every child.”\textsuperscript{xxx}

It was a given that the students could be assessed in a performance format, making this district-wide arts assessment unique and possibly “fun,” unlike other content large-scale assessments. However, as an observer one wonders how much instructional time there was per year, and also how much the arts’ instruction time was lost to testing in other subjects. Add the district-wide arts assessment to the plethora of assessments

\textsuperscript{6} Nancy Pistone was the Arts Education Consultant for the Center for Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment for the Ohio Department of Education at the time \textit{Envisioning Arts Assessment...} was published.
and what happens to the students’ psyche in terms of being overwhelmed with all of the assessments? That dilemma remained a rhetorical question of mine, and perhaps the reader’s, throughout the course of this study.

Channon’s desire was fueled by the importance of assessing the arts, along with other reasons which will be revealed later, which allowed her to proceed with her district-wide arts assessment by first seeking the approval of her superiors. In 2003, Channon approached her supervisors, Deputy Superintendent of Teaching and Learning Richard Dole and Samuel Roxen, Director of Curriculum (her direct supervisor who was in charge of starting the testing in the other subject areas the year before), about the possibility of creating a district-wide arts assessment. She planned to use the small amount of money that was appropriated for teacher stipends to fund it, even if the arts assessment was written on a small scale.

Her justification to her boss for creating the assessment was that she wanted to assess the quality of instruction in the arts’ classrooms.

I wanted to be sure what’s happening is not just babysitting or camp art. That it is actually music, art, theatre or dance education. That we are actually TEACHING something and letting kids experience and see the art forms themselves and experience the art forms through doing (Channon (d), 2005).

Channon was not the only person who wanted a window on her teachers’ classrooms. Other people including her supervisors, parents, and even other teachers were approaching her wondering about the arts teachers who did not have public recognition either by MPS and/or present public concerts or exhibitions.xxxi

---

It should be noted that the superintendent of Metro Public Schools, Superintendent Stevenson, always supported the arts and the district-wide arts assessment. He wanted district-wide assessments in every core content area in MPS. (Channon 2004).
MAAM and the Pistone Text

Armed with the approval of her superiors and a valuable resource entitled *Envisioning Arts Assessment: A Process Guide for Assessing Arts Education in School Districts and States* by Nancy Pistone, Channon started the preparatory stages of the district-wide arts assessment.

The Pistone source was published by the members of the Arts Education Partnership and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). This book was designed by Pistone to be used by the coordinator of a large-scale arts assessment at the district or state level for the visual and performing arts regardless of their expertise in the arts and/or assessment. Concise at fifty-six pages, Pistone included conceptual, technical, and administrative decisions as well as design options, strategies, and activities for the coordinator to consider. Overall, Pistone believes that there has been a lot of work done on large-scale arts assessments and that the reader should draw on the strong points of the successes and learn from the failures of the creation and execution by the administrators of these assessments.

Pistone wrote and published her text after the 1997 NAEP arts initiative; therefore, she largely centered it on concrete examples and anecdotes from that particular large-scale arts assessment. This is not a surprise since it was published by the members of CCSSO who played a large role in the creation of the 1997 NAEP arts initiative. On a minute level, Pistone mentions examples and anecdotes from other large-scale arts assessments. After an extensive literature review by the author of this thesis, I believe that this book is the authority source for creating a large-scale arts assessment due to its
simplicity and flexibility. However, Pistone focus centered at the state level rather then the district level. Therefore, it requires the supervisor to scale-down and/or modify many of the suggestions to fit local needs. This book became the source Channon most relied upon to realize her large-scale arts assessment in Metro Public Schools. Therefore, references to the book will be interspersed with MAAM discussions from here on.

The effectiveness of the source, Channon’s modifications to the ideas presented in the source, and Channon’s attention to the source’s words of caution will be discussed.

Overall, according to Pistone, the three phases for creating a large-scale arts assessment are: “Planning, Development, and Implementation.” I have created and added a Preparatory phase based upon my observations in MPS of what was executed, what was conveyed in interviews, and participants’ interpretation of the Pistone text. Thus, I will present the four phases in the following order: Preparatory, Planning, Development, and Implementation with detailed explanations of the multiple steps within the phases. Channon executed a few steps within the phases out of order and blended them as she saw fit.

Channon completed many of the recommendations Pistone talked about before the Planning phase that I considered, and put in the Preparatory phase. This includes: looking at the other assessment tools her district uses, taking note of their content and structure, and analyzing other large-scale arts assessments, which would be included as step 5 in the Planning phase in the Pistone text. Channon also made many attempts to generate conversations about assessment among her arts teachers. Pistone also requires that the state and district officials have a set of arts standards established and
preferably in practice by music educators before a large-scale arts assessment may be conceived by arts supervisors at all levels.\textsuperscript{xxxvii} This had been already achieved by MPS education officials with the City-wide Learning Standards.\textsuperscript{xxxviii} Therefore the assessment can be linked with the standards by the creators, and nothing is arbitrarily put into the assessment by the creators that they did not seek to promote thinking skills applied to complex arts questions.\textsuperscript{xxxix}

Another important step in the Preparatory phase is that the supervisor should “take time” in planning and executing the large-scale arts assessment. “The large-scale assessment programs that were studied took three to five years from inception to final implementation, with a full year devoted just to planning.”\textsuperscript{xli} Criticisms from the studied large-scale assessment programs by Pistone included “too little time for building teacher and public support for the program.”\textsuperscript{xlii} It was apparent that Channon had been thinking of executing a district-wide arts assessment for a number of years, and had been taking notes from other arts administrators’ successes and failures from their large-scale assessments’, thus fulfilling Pistone’s step 5 in the Planning phase to “examine and learn from existing large-scale assessment and arts efforts.”\textsuperscript{xlii}

Pistone states in step two of the Planning phase: “establish the purpose of your arts assessment program.”\textsuperscript{xliii} This has already been discussed to some extent. Privately, Channon confided to me that her motives were to view her staff’s pedagogy skills, advocate for the arts, and improve her staffs’ assessment skills. Other reasons were revealed to her staff in the September 2004 monthly newsletter to recruit art teachers to MAAM. Channon wrote:
The goal of MAAM is to research and create arts assessment models in dance, music, theatre, and visual arts for district-wide implementation. MAAM is inspired by Superintendent Stevenson’s call to “...ratchet up the good things we are doing in teaching and learning” and Emeril Lagasse’s “Let’s kick it up a notch!” Both impassioned and pragmatic planning and implementation of the MPS Arts Education Policy has brought us to this point. We are eager to study, learn, discuss, argue, resolve, create, reflect and implement arts assessment tools that will give the arts parity in value with its sister core subjects (Metro Public Schools b, 2004).

That was Channon’s public justification for “establishing the purposes” of her district-wide assessment. xliv

Pistone recommends the following purposes to justify the arts assessment program:

For students: to determine student achievement in meeting arts standards/for graduation requirements; teachers: to improve classroom arts instruction; for schools: for school-wide accountability and to improve arts curriculum and programs; last, for district and state: to establish district/state profiles of student achievement in one or more of the arts disciplines (2002, 18).

The above quote was already mentioned previously in relation to MAAM’s district-wide arts policy and Channon’s personal reasons for creating this assessment tool. Other reasons pertaining to MAAM that were mentioned by Pistone will be revealed throughout the observation. It was also apparent that Channon did not want to prejudice me before the observation commenced.

Step four in the Planning phase corresponds well with the previously mentioned step in that Channon “created a timeline for accomplishing major milestones.”xlv It will be later discussed if Channon was “…realistic about the time required, consider(ed) (her) staff experience levels and available resources.”xlvii Of course, the time line was altered by Channon from Pistone’s model and was amended as the project commenced. Table 1 is a chart that blends Pistone’s model and MAAM’s timeline of events that actually took
place from the birth to the closure of MAAM.  

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Planning, Years 1 and 2 (2003-June 23, 2004) | • (City-wide Learning Standards are established and in practice since 1997)  
| | • Received permission from bosses to execute a district-wide arts assessment  
| | • “Selected planning/advisory team” (participants will be added and some will leave as time goes on)  
| | • “Determine all assessment design features including professional-development needs” (did not foresee the difficulties and time this added to the schedule…fell very short in this goal)  
| | • “Study effective district/state arts testing models”  
| | • “Develop framework and test/item specifications (blueprint) for the arts assessment” (deviated in that only a rough draft was devised…needed to see the competency of the participants)  
| Development, Year 2 and 3 (June 24, 2004 – March 16, 2005 with teachers; continued through the beginning of 2006 with coordinator, consultants, and selected teachers). This is where my observational research ends. | • “Engage arts teacher participation in all aspects of test development” (this was done to an extent)  
| | • “Establish regional sites for training test writers and scorers” (It was established later when all participants were active.)  
| | • “Generate a “pool” or bank of items/tasks; conduct pilot tests and

---

8 All of the information that is in quotations in the right hand column in Table 1 is quoted from the Pistone reference on page 20. The information in the left hand column came from my observations and all interviews with Michelle Channon.
refine them”
• “Provide regular updates to district about the assessment”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Implementation, Year 3 and 4</th>
<th>Full Implementation, Year 5 (February 2007 – March 2008, the discontinuation of MAAM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Beginning of 2006 – December 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Coordinate the field test by selecting schools and producing test booklets and materials” (The field test was only given in schools where the teachers participated in the Development portion of MAAM. Also, some of the materials were developed in the Development portion.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Conduct the field test” (Started with multiple choice and gradually trickled to the other portions of the assessment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Analyze field test data to select and refine items and scoring guides”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Announce the voluntary or required assessment system-wide with all details for enrollment and participation” (This was done since the inception of MAAM.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Administer the arts assessment during year-end state achievement tests” (MAAM administration is year-round)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Analyze data and report findings”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the Preparatory phase, Pistone recommends that the supervisor should

“understand the distinct phases of activity along with the assistance and funding required for each.”

Obviously all of the mentioned steps need to be properly funded by the arts supervisor. Arts supervisors may include but are not limited to the following expenses: consultant fees (“specialists versed in areas such as test format, measurement,
professional scoring, and reporting approaches”), teacher stipends, equipment (technology), and “specialized consumable supplies.”

Channon achieved this step quite well. She gathered a team of arts teachers to create the arts assessment after she received permission to commence on MAAM. She received an $8,000 grant dispensed for four years for a total of $32,000 from the members of the grant committee from the Massachusetts Cultural Council to add to the teachers’ stipends. Channon’s total expenditures far exceeded the grant and stipend money by more than ten times that amount. Channon used the MCC grant for consultants, teachers’ stipends, and a recording technician. She also matched the MCC money with district money and used the MCC grant money to leverage other income. To make up for the deficit, she dedicated a portion of her own budget for MAAM. What is commendable is that despite these added financial burdens Channon’s budget for the arts for MPS remained the same for ten years from 1998-2008.

The arts teachers were chosen from inside the district based upon their past participation in district arts events and projects (five teachers per art form). A letter was then sent out by Channon to all arts teachers. If they were interested in creating an arts assessment, they were more then welcome to do so. Next, two consultants were hired by Channon. This encompasses step one in the Development phase in the Pistone reference. Jonathan Carter was the lead assessment consultant for all four art forms. There were other consultants hired as MAAM continued but Carter continues to hold the most significant role. There was also a technology consultant that was hired from Berklee College of Music for string (music) and technology consultation. Technology
equipment and specialist supplies were purchased by Channon before the piloting of the exam.iii

It is logical to assume that the amount of funding an arts supervisor has, causes him/her to dictate the number and quality of consultants, teachers, etc. that are invited to participate in creating the district-wide arts assessment. Therefore, Pistone states in step number three in the Preparatory phase: “apply collaborative strategies from the onset.”liii

Specifically, because “formal assessment in the arts can be a volatile issue…the assessment agenda should be mutually determined and controlled by those with program responsibility and a vital interest in arts education…”livi

Logically, one can match this step with step number one in the Planning phase, which Pistone states: “identify members of a planning and design committee.”lv These people include:

- arts teachers for dance, music theatre, and visual arts…various grade levels and diverse backgrounds;
- State Education Department staff and consultants such as those for testing and measurement, and arts curriculum;
- school district administrators such as superintendents, principals, curriculum, and instructional supervisors;
- professional development regional facilitators; (parents are not involved in MAAM);
- higher education faculty in the arts and teacher education;
- community representatives such as members of relevant professional organizations, older art students, practicing artists, political arts advocates, and other program stakeholders (Pistone 2002, 17).

It is quite impossible to simultaneously organize that many people and have them have similar philosophies and background in a school district the size of MPS. However, every group was, at least, represented.

It is especially important to include arts practitioners in every step of the assessment because of the success of their participation in the creation of other large-scale arts assessments.
One promising model required that teachers be actively involved in developing, scoring and interpreting the assessments. Only in this way will those who must implement the system become fully committed to it. As one theory and practice study found, when teachers participate in making sense of student responses and the evidence of their learning, their understanding is deeper and more meaningful than if they relied on another person’s interpretation (Pistone 2002, 13).

This is where Channon deviated a little from the prescribed formula in Pistone’s book.

Many of the participants who developed the instrument would not be involved in scoring and interpreting the assessments. This was decided by Channon in the Preparatory phase for reasons explained throughout the rest of the paper which allude to teacher competency in assessment, content area, time, etc. It should be noted here that Channon began this project with the notion that this would be a collaborative project among her arts teachers with a small amount of input from herself and the consultants. She wanted her teachers to have ownership in the assessment tool.\(^{6i}\)

Another way in which Channon deviated from the previous mentioned step was that the blueprint for the test was worked out by Channon and her lead consultant, Jonathan Carter, before the arts teachers arrived for their first workshop, because Channon had a fair idea what her arts teachers knew about assessment and the arts. In the fall of 2003, in an arts assessment workshop, she asked her teachers:

> What is the quickest way you can find out that kids get something…one question you could really get something…What is the easiest way to think of that you can find out?’ They didn’t understand where I was going. What is the easiest way to assess? When you say assess everyone thinks: bubble sheet. Assessment should be occurring all the way through every lesson lots of different ways: observation, short answer, call and response, demonstration, etc. (Channon 2004).

She should have taken this as a warning that her arts teachers needed remedial help in assessment before she began the assessment project with full force.

Thus, Cannon and her consultants created the blueprint of the exam, which is heavily influenced by the authors of the NAEP, SCASS large-scale arts assessments and
the Pistone reference. Pistone covers a very general blueprint in Step three in the Planning phase: “develop guidelines for the design and implementation of the assessment” and “discuss these questions to determine your assessment program guidelines and characteristics”\(^9\). In Table 2, I completed the chart filling in the answers based upon the research.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic/Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Features</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Features</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Which arts disciplines will be assessed?”</td>
<td>• Dance, music, theatre, and visual arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Which grade levels will be assessed?”</td>
<td>• Grades 5, 8, and during required art course in high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Will the arts assessment be a stand-alone test or will fine arts questions be included on other subject area achievement tests?”</td>
<td>• Stand-alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “What type of test will it be? I.e., paper/pencil (written), performance or portfolio?”</td>
<td>• Written, performance, and portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Will the test be mandatory or voluntary for schools and districts?”</td>
<td>• Eventually, MAAM would have been mandatory for the entire district</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Test Development</strong></th>
<th><strong>Test Development</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “Who will develop the fine arts test?”</td>
<td>• Coordinator, consultants in the arts, arts teachers from all four arts areas with varied levels of experience in teaching and content area, practicing artists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) Everything in quotations marks in the left hand column in Table 2 is quoted by me from Pistone page 19. I filled in the right hand column from the observations and all interviews with Michelle Channon.
**Test Administration**

- “When will the assessment be administered?”

- “How will the arts test be administered?”

- “What professional development will be available to districts prior to administering the arts assessment?”

- “Are special education students included in the arts test?”

- “Are students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP) included?”

**Test Administration**

- The test would take the entire school year to administer. There was no specification when exactly each portion would be administered.

- By the classroom arts teachers throughout the district. Testing materials would be handed out sometime in the beginning of the school year.

- Many meetings and seminars were held to educate the teachers on how to administer the exam.

- Yes.

- Yes.

**Scoring and Reporting**

- “Who will score the fine arts tests?”

- “How will scores be reported?”

- “Who will receive test results?”

**Scoring and Reporting**

- This depended on the section but it would have been between the arts coordinator and the classroom teachers. The coordinator included some arts teachers to score the portions of the test that the other classroom teachers were not permitted to score.

- The teachers reported the scores to Michelle Channon. The portion that Channon scored was reported back to the classroom arts teacher.

- “Individual and group results were provided at the district, school and student levels.”

**Resources**

- “What resources will be available to...”

**Resources**

- Professional development
assist teachers in helping students perform well?”

Through a more detailed analysis of Table 2, one can focus on the logistics of the assessment, teacher training and trust, special education, and issues unique to teacher administrative employees of MPS. It was decided by Channon and her consultants that she would require the district-wide arts assessment to become a mandatory assessment tool for all arts teachers in the entire district to administer. In the case for music, it would be implemented in schools that have a music program by the music teacher.

The arts teachers who trained in the implementation and participated in MAAM would receive the incentives of a DVD player and camera (the equipment necessary for the art form to implement the assessment). This would be open to all arts teachers but it would not be mandatory.

The teachers would not get free equipment if they did not participate in the first year. As of March 2004, Channon had not decided on repercussions concerning the test scores if the teachers did not comply with administering the tool during the first year. However, one intrinsic repercussion was that equipment and money would be given only to schools with active music programs (in other words “schools that help themselves.”)

When asked what Channon meant by training her teachers, she explained: how to execute the test in the classroom, how to use the rubric, how to look at a student’s work and judge it fairly for it to correspond to a standardized grading scale, and student
preparation. She trusted her teachers to implement and grade the assessment but they needed prodding to learn what music assessment is all about. This arts assessment would give them formalized tools to do so. Channon hoped that they would create their own curriculum and assessments.\textsuperscript{ix}

The arts teachers would be given rubrics ahead of time but would not know what was being tested. During the creation, pilot and first year, she had to trust her teachers so that they would not be able to reveal any test material before hand (Statement of Honor), since the entire exam would be formatted on a DVD. For future test years, they would be able download the assessment on the day of the test.\textsuperscript{xix}

Other details about the test were explained: Special education provisions had not been considered as of June 25, 2005 by Channon and the consultants. Schools that had a high transient population would not be impacted with the students’ move within the Metro Public School district because the teachers would know the format and general content of the assessment tool. Teachers would use the demographic questions about the students to see individual results and compare the information in that MPS was a large urban school district with a large immigrant population. When asked what would happen if a school had a large immigrant population, Channon replied, “I don’t know…There will be demographic inquiries on the test, asking how many years they have had music at school…they will be able to aggregate that information (including the kids who had an art background and transferred into music).”\textsuperscript{xi}

Before the actual test construction can be discussed it must be noted that the test’s structure and content was created by Channon and the consultants before the framework.
The creation of a framework by either the arts administrators and/or the teacher test creators is required in step two of the Development phase in the Pistone book. I do not know if a framework was created by Channon and/or her consultants. It was never mentioned in the interviews with people I interviewed nor was it present during my observations. However, I do know that the music specialists did not know anything specific about a framework in the technical sense and did not work from one consciously or subconsciously.

The closest that the music specialists were to creating and using a framework was referring (not too often) with the City-wide Learning Standards and objectives. Pistone recommends that the assessment should be linked “to the same standards across district…schools.”

This also ensures that thinking skills in the arts disciplines are emphasized and that students are required to apply what they know to solve complex, arts-based problems. Successful assessments also forge strong links to curriculums and professional development (Pistone 2002, 14).

All of the standards were covered by the music teachers and Channon except the ones that integrated the arts with other content areas because the test writers wanted to keep the arts self-contained. There was too much content to cover with their specific art form, and it was hard to find out what to assess in their own art form let alone integrating it with other content arts.

From an academic point-of-view concerning the framework that the music specialists should have been working with, Pistone states in steps two and three in the Develop and Generate phase: “create a framework to capture the range of content in your arts standards” and “write test items and performance tasks with scoring guides based on
your framework specifications.” Pistone recommends that this should be the blueprint of the assessment. She also recommends that the test writers “…can use it to write and distribute questions among content strands that reflect the relative importance and value you give to each strand within an arts discipline.”

I have created the framework that the music specialists unofficially worked from based upon my observations and interviews, shown as Table 3. This was not a traditional framework and does not look like the framework Pistone used as an example in her book. However, this is a tangible example of the “framework” the MAAM music teachers worked from.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creating</th>
<th>Performing</th>
<th>Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tasks-on-demand</td>
<td>Tasks-on-demand</td>
<td>Multiple-choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Extended Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks-on-demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Pistone:

Test developers should consider allocating a greater percentage of testing time to the item formats that best elicit the range of student abilities valued by the arts content and performance standards and identified in your framework. For example, NAEP framework specifications recommended that the 1997 arts assessment be designed so that students spend 80-90% of the time working on constructed-response exercises and 10-20% of the time on multiple-choice questions (2002, 26).
It has been stated that the music specialists were not working from a framework. However, during the observations, the music specialists repeatedly expressed concern that the time allotted for each test component did not match the importance of each test component. Therefore, the test questions and activities for the students to complete had little to do with the framework,\textsuperscript{lxvii} which Channon and the music teacher ignore Pistone’s advice in step three in the Development phase “write test items and performance tasks with scoring guides\textsuperscript{10} based on your framework specifications.”\textsuperscript{lxviii}

At first glance, one would conclude that Channon focused on responding while creating the framework. However, two portions of the test were automatically equated by Channon to responding. Channon assigned the point value for the multiple-choice section fifty points. It could be concluded that it was Channon’s focus to have the MPS curriculum be centered on this component, that this was easily tested, and/or this was what Channon and her consultants and music specialists felt was the most important aspect of music for the students to remember. It must also be noted that music teachers would rightfully feel that tasks-on-demand and the portfolio were cumbersome in relation to time, resources, and complexity.\textsuperscript{lxix}

Last, and the most important part of the blueprint in the Planning stages, were the test components that Channon and her consultants created. The test components, structure, administration instructions, and parts of the blueprint of MAAM were approximately what Channon and her consultants agreed upon prior to June 24, 2004, the date when the music specialists began to work on MAAM.\textsuperscript{lx} What was interesting was

\textsuperscript{10} Scoring guides for MAAM are rubrics and the scoring key for the multiple-choice section.
that Chanon and the consultants led the music specialists and me to believe that the specialists were creating the test components, structure, administration instructions of MAAM, and parts of the blueprint.

The final music portion of MAAM was comprised of the following in terms of administering the exam by the music teachers in MPS and structure created by Channon, the consultants, and the music teachers. Channon required that students at grades five and eight (at the teacher’s discretion in middle school but preferably grade 8 and both grades five and eight in a K-8 school) would take the MAAM exam. This also included students who had an arts class in high school that counted for the graduation requirement. If they were in an Advanced Placement (AP) class that year, for example, AP music theory, they would not be tested twice. They would only take the AP exam.

Due to the fact that the test information was and still is the property of the arts administrators in the Metro district, only an overview of the district-wide arts assessment’s structure and content can be given by the author of this thesis. The total points that could be earned by students from the entire assessment are one hundred points. There were 25 multiple-choice questions worth 50 points plus 5 demographic questions that were to be administered by the music teacher during one class meeting. The extended response (essay) was worth 10 points, was graded by rubric by the music teacher, and should have taken up at least a half of a class meeting, which depended on how much instruction time the teachers had with the students. There were two tasks-on-demand worth 10 points each that included sight-reading for the first task and oral discrimination (major/minor, step/skip, sequence-scale). This would take another class
period to administer one-on-one (depended on number of students and instruction time). The snapshot portfolio was worth 20 points and was administered by the classroom music teacher over the course of the school year. The evidence selection was the responsibility of the teacher and student. (This component was designed by Channon and the music teachers to assess process and quality of product). Hence, this was the scoring guide Pistone presents on page twenty-six her text.

Students in the above mentioned grade levels would be tested and it would be up to the music teacher as to how many students would be tested and what grade levels they would test. Channon commented that regardless of the existence of MAAM, the arts teachers should be using these types of assessment in their classroom.

Last, the technical aspects of MAAM must be discussed. It was a criterion-referenced assessment with some norm. Channon made sure that MAAM included both traditional and authentic assessments. The multiple-choice and extended response sections represented the traditional assessments and the tasks-on-demand and portfolio represented the authentic assessment section in which rubrics were created by Channon and the music teachers for the classroom music teachers to assess the extended response, tasks-on-demand, and portfolio.

Observation of MAAM

June 24, 2004 at 9 am was the first meeting of the Metro Arts Assessment Model (MAAM) team. Representatives from all four art forms, Channon, the consultants, and a few MPS district office employee convened in the Summer Chambers. This corresponds with the Development phase, step one, in which Pistone recommends localities:
“organize test development teams experienced in the arts disciplines to be assessed.”

A letter was sent out to Channon’s entire staff modeling the one in Pistone’s book on page twenty-four. Ten music specialists from all grade levels and abilities as well as an external MPS music consultant showed up on the first day of MAAM. [The reason this was not mentioned earlier was because Channon did not know who would show up and participate from those she selected and which others that would join without a formal invitation from Channon. Those without the formal invitation were still welcome to participate in the creation of MAAM.] The following ten music teachers were present for the June 24, 2004 meeting: Tony Landers, Tom Chance, Hector Smith, Mitchell Goodman, Julia Monroe, Shelly Soffer, Michael Conner, Tracy Caros, Samantha Bose, and Darlene Johnston.\(^\text{11}\)

Each person was given a folder that contained an agenda for June 24 and 25, 2004; City-wide Learning Standards for their respective content area; a newsletter from Metro Public Schools entitled Focus which discusses assessment and piloted district assessments in English (the arts are not mentioned); and blank paper. Everyone was seated and grouped by the art form they represented. It was clear to me that the music faculty did not know each other well, because their interactions lacked in-depth conversation one would normally see from music educators who get together at meetings.

\(^{11}\) At this time I did not know the music teachers’ backgrounds because there was not enough time to interview them. I gathered this information at the October 11, 2004 meeting. The steady participants met regularly from October 11, 2004 – March 16, 2005. All of the other people from the June 24 and 25, 2004, meetings dropped out for various reasons including: lack of time, lack of information, and lack of interest.
and conferences. The participants inside the Summer Chambers represented a cornucopia of experiences and years of service in the arts and arts education.

The first speaker was Jonathan Carter (the consultant), introduced by Channon following a round-robin of biographical information from everyone. Led by Carter and Channon, the topic quickly turned to the point of the meeting – to begin creating a district-wide arts assessment. It became a pep-rally for the arts and arts assessment with anecdotal information from the audience. Carter turned the topic over to the details of assessment. He started by giving biographical information about his involvement with assessment in the arts. He has written eighteen criterion-referenced tests for SilverBurdett music series. He pointed out that most arts educators do not assess. He gave some background information on other large-scale assessments, and foreshadowed some of the problems the MAAMers would encounter. He contended that the bottom line for the arts assessment is for all participants to start with clear objectives and work with Bloom’s taxonomy. Before they broke up into their respective arts areas to work on the assessment questions, and after two and a half hours of Carter’s “crash course” in assessment, Carter reminded them to think of what their students SHOULD be able to do.

Carter worked with the music group for an hour showing them different large-scale music examinations. There was an hour for lunch and the music teachers reconvened to work on the test question sessions, in which they were assigned to create ten multiple-choice questions based upon Bloom’s Taxonomy. They started with multiple-choice immediately forgetting and/or ignoring what Carter had said about starting with clear objectives. Personality conflicts became apparent to me among the
group, and they split off into grade levels and music areas (band, Orff, etc.) to work on questions. Little seem to have been accomplished and some of the group left early, around 3-4 PM to go home, even though the workshop was scheduled to by Channon finish at 5 pm.

Day two, June 25, 2004, same time, same place, same individuals were present for music. More workshops and presentations were given concerning assessment with a host of different presenters for one hour and a half. The different presenters included Channon, Carter, and high-level MPS administrators who worked in assessment. Carter and Channon reintroduced the MAAM concept giving an overview of the work they completed the day before, to refresh the participants with a synopsis of MAAM, and to inform them of what lay before them in completing the MAAM project. The high-level MPS administrators who worked in assessment gave all the participants an overview about assessment and MPS: what the district-wide assessments in other content areas looked like, how the results were presented, and what they expected from the participants’ work for MAAM.

Again, teachers split off into their respective arts disciplines to work on their assignment they had not completed from the day before. Channon and Carter worked closely with the music group. They were constantly interrupted by the members in the group saying, “Is this right?” After they were given more resources including listening to NAEP samples and viewing arts assessment examples that Carter provided, they broke for lunch. After lunch, they worked for two more hours and left, one hour before the
scheduled ending time. The assignment was not completed and they did not set a date for
the next meeting.

Four months passed before the music MAAMers met again. This time they met at
the house of elementary general music specialist Julia Monroe on a school night, October
11, 2004. The meeting lasted for two hours and only three other people besides Julia
came, including Tony Landers (Pre-K general music), Tom Chance (elementary general
music, instrumental, and some vocal), and Mitchell Goodman (instrumental: middle/high
and Channon’s assistant at the district office). To make things easier for them, I served
as scribe while they created forty multiple-choice questions. While they created the
multiple-choice questions, they talked about potential grade levels to test, possibly
assessing teachers too if they were teaching to the test, what they should be teaching, and
textbook adoption. With regards to the multiple-choice questions, they talked about what
the music portion of MAAM was going to be testing: literacy or music, when they were
creating questions for lower elementary grades. It was suggested that if children could
not read words, they could look at the pictures. They also perused the City-wide
Learning Standards for an idea of what content to include in the MAAM multiple-choice
questions.

In general, they created basic that spanned thirteen grade levels and covered a
random sample of music knowledge in a total of forty-seven questions, fifteen of which
were “complete” questions. Most of the questions were written as notes rather than as
straight questions because no one could agree on the wording. There were about fifteen
“complete” multiple-choice questions that were created by the music teachers. When the
brainstorming was exhausted by the members present, the meeting adjourned and I e-mailed the group’s work to Michelle Channon.

On November 3, 2004, the same October group reconvened at the Metro Public School board building where they had had their summer assessment workshops for three hours. They were not in the Summer Chambers this time. They would continue to meet here until the end of the process when Channon and the consultants took charge. Channon worked with them throughout most of the meeting. She outlined the structure of the test as multiple-choice, writing sample (essay), portfolio, and on-demand (authentic tasks) (tasks-on-demand). For the first time, she mentioned that MPS’s adopted textbook was to be used as a resource to help them in their test creation and they were reminded also to consult the City-wide Learning Standards and use Bloom’s taxonomy. Channon increased the number of resources from the adopted textbook to the standards and taxonomy. It was clear that there was still no established leadership within the group. Therefore, Channon assigned more multiple-choice questions to write and have ready for the next meeting, and had them establish a meeting time and day for the next few meetings.

Shelly Soffer (middle school vocal and general music) and Michael Conner (middle and high school instrumental) joined the four MAAM music teachers on December 1, 2004. Everyone that attended the October 11, 2004, and November 3, 2004 MAAM meetings was present during the summer. Again, three hours were spent creating multiple-choice questions. Channon did not help them this time. The advice from Channon was adhered to, and twenty reasonable multiple-choice questions that
resembled the traditional form of multiple-choice questions were created by the participants. They were not categorized because they were created randomly by the participants. Not one of the questions corresponded with the higher levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy. No one present seemed to have realized how long the creation of an arts assessment would take. (This was mentioned a number of times in my presence by all of the participants during the meeting.) None of the other sections of the test were started by the participants. Again, no leadership was established within the group.

On January 3, 2005, I was not present to observe the music teachers at the meeting due to the fact that I went to the Florida Music Educators Association conference about music assessment in Tampa, FL. Everyone involved with the music portion of MAAM was e-mailed the minutes of the meeting from Hector Smith. They met at Summer Chambers for six and one half hours. Only Hector Smith (his first meeting since June, he teaches Pre-K general music), Mitchell Goodman, and Julia Monroe showed up from the core MAAM group of teachers. However, two more MPS music teachers showed up to contribute, but never participated before or since with MAAM.\textsuperscript{lxvii}

There was disagreement as to what constitutes elements of music (it was suggested in prior meetings to start here to categorize the multiple-choice questions). They began to brainstorm performance-on-demand questions (task-on-demand). Rhythm and melody multiple-choice questions were created by that meeting’s participants. At the end of the minutes of the January 3, 2005 meeting, there was a comment of Channon reminding them to use the adopted text as an additional resource.\textsuperscript{lxviii}
On the day of January 28, 2005 meeting that lasted for two and a half hours, city trains were out-of-service, and many people were tardy. One participant was very tardy. Julia Monroe, Mitchell Goodman, Tom Chance, Tony Landers, and Michael Conner were present. Their assignment for this meeting was to create the task portion (tasks-on-demand) of the assessment and its rubric. They developed a rough draft of the task portion of the assessment, tried out the activities they created on each other, and exited with ten tasks created.

This was the first time that the group noticeably was enjoying themselves. Mitchell Goodman took a leadership role. (I later found out that Channon had prodded him to do so). The teachers realized what they do not teach in the classroom. The standards, Bloom’s Taxonomy, and adopted text still were not used as resources that Channon asked to use. Nobody brought the text and Channon refused to provide it. The participants provided no explanation when Channon asked why they did not bring the text. When I informally asked Channon after the participants left why she would not provide the text for them, she said that she wanted the teachers to assume full responsibility for MAAM including bringing the required materials to complete the project. During the same conversation, Channon told me that the tasks they created looked like multiple-choice questions in action, not what Channon was looking for.

The next meeting took place a few days later on February 2, 2005 for three hours. Tony Landers, Tom Chance, Mitchell Goodman, Julia Monroe, and Michael Conner attended. The purpose of the meeting was to edit the tasks they created from the previous meeting and hopefully, finish the extended response and portfolio portion of the arts
assessment. They reviewed what they did for the on-demand tasks (tasks-on-demand) from the previous meeting, started the extended response portion of the assessment, and created the portfolio section minus the rubric.

A number of conclusions were reached from what I observed at the meeting and my informal interview with Channon after the meeting when she viewed their work. The music teachers did not follow Channon’s directions concerning the on-demand tasks (tasks-on-demand) that she had given and reminded the participants since the June 24, 2005 meeting. They had problems with the extended response section because they were not strong writers and the portfolio was not at all what Channon had in mind. Again, Channon’s advice was ignored. Still there was a lack of test writing skills, the ease of grading the assessment was a reoccurring issue, and the assessment was too simple (lack of Bloom’s Taxonomy).³³³

Seven days later on February 9, 2005, there was another MAAM meeting. Everyone who was present at the February 2, 2005 meeting was present at this meeting with the addition of Shelly Soffer appearing for a second meeting. This meeting’s agenda was the same as the last meeting. The tasks were edited by the music teachers, there was a large discussion on what middle school students should be able to do with the tasks created, Channon came in to clarify issues the music teachers had, they worked on the extended response, and were again stumped on the portfolio. It was clear from my observation that disagreement existed between the participants at this meeting, especially when it came to what middle school students should be able to do.
There was a large debate between Channon and Soffer with others joining in from time to time. Channon believed that students could do much more than what Soffer believed they could do. Instruction time, administrative support, and many other things were discussed. It became a large venting meeting. To add to the drama, Channon had many more comments about their MAAM work including the fact they were STILL ignoring the City-wide Learning Standards, their questions ranked low on Bloom’s Taxonomy, and they were not thinking creatively.

One week later, on February 16, 2005 another meeting was held for three hours. Tony Landers, Tom Chance, Mitchell Goodman, Julia Monroe, and Michael Conner attended. Diane Daily from the Massachusetts Cultural Council was present to observe a MAAM meeting. She was impressed, and continued to give them her support. Three people were late and only two people were doing their homework by creating multiple-choice questions. Again, no one brought the adopted text. Overall, not much was accomplished.

A bit of a fire was stoked under the music MAAMers at the March 2, 2005 meeting (three hours) by Channon. Carter and Channon reviewed the work they had completed so far and they reviewed their comments. Not much was created for middle school because it was under-represented by the lack of middle school music teachers who attended the meetings and the representative for middle school music did not attend many of the music MAAM meetings. They connected the extended response section to the standards and finished all the tasks, adding middle and high school. Channon came in to explain the portfolio again, they reviewed the visual artists’ work, and more arguments
ensued between Channon and the MAAMers, this time over scoring and how grading should look in a music teacher’s classroom, beyond the district-wide arts assessment.

Channon was firm in giving them a March 16, 2005 deadline to have the entire portion of the music assessment completed. Everyone left and Mitchell Goodman said he would do the rest of the work himself. Their assessment had little to nothing to do with Bloom’s Taxonomy. Channon said that this is representative of how they personally teach and assess. The meeting ended on an unstable note: the assessment was not completed and everyone was still confused. Some disagreed with Channon, others still did not understand what she wanted for the portfolio and other parts of the assessment.

The final meeting took place on March 16, 2005. Only Tony Landers, Tom Chance, Hector Smith, Mitchell Goodman, and Michael Conner attended. The purpose was to work on the portfolio and extended task. They “completed” all sections of the test. The portfolio was worked on during the meeting where Channon had to come in to explain it one more time. They did not seem open to including creativity, such as having the students create an opera, which is actually written in the City-wide Learning Standards as an example of projects that can be done in the music classroom.

At this point in the research period, the observations research ended. After this meeting, the consultants, Channon and Mitchell Goodman worked through the rest of the year, summer, and the next school year revising the music portion of the district-wide arts assessment. I was invited to, and attended, two more meetings with Channon and the consultants. I attended by invitation, due to the fact that they often had impromptu meetings or met when I had classes or other obligations.
Subsequent Meetings with Michelle Channon and Consultants

The first meeting that I attended with Channon and the consultants present was on May 13, 2005, about two months after the last teachers’ meeting. Michelle Channon, Jonathan Carter, Mitchell Goodman, and Jessica Lovegood (a consultant hired by Michelle Channon) attended the meeting. This meeting was located in a conference room on the same floor as Channon’s office in the MPS School Board building. During this meeting they examined what the music teachers accomplished on the music portion of the rough draft of MAAM. The conversation could be described as philosophical rather than critical. There were many rhetorical questions raised by those that were present based on the music teachers’ work on the rough draft of MAAM.\footnote{One can refer to this citation for all references to the MAAM rough draft in the section of “Subsequent Meetings with Michelle Channon and Consultants”: Metro Public Schools, \textit{Rough Draft of MAAM}, June 2005 (date I received document).} It must be noted that neither Channon nor any one of the consultants sat in on the meeting of MAAM with the music teachers except for the few occasions when Channon needed to redirect them, or when Carter worked with them in the first June 2004 meetings).

One of the rhetorical questions Channon and the consultants raised was based upon the fifteen questions on instrument and note recognition. They wanted to know: What should fourth graders know after four years of musical instruction? They agreed that the music teachers should have been asking this question throughout the entire process. The next question was: If you were a principal, what would you want your kids to be able to do or know in music? Finally they asked themselves aloud: What are the teachers really focused on? Are they excited about teaching? What about the objectives
Jonathan Carter mentioned that the participants completely ignored in forming the test questions?

Next, they concentrated on the overall construction and the content of the exam. With concern to the construction of the exam, they said that there needed to be more variety of types and topics of questions, that there should be more short answer/extended response questions in that the students should be asked to recall not just recognize, that there should be error detection rather then dictation because of time restraints, and that there should be tasks where the students perform and sight-read. The content of the exam was scrutinized. The comments included: the kids should know the basics of music such as skips, steps, repeated notes, leaps, etc.; across the board in all four art forms, the exam has to look somewhat similar, for example, with regards to tasks-on-demand, the student should perform, then have an extended response, play again, and do a comparison defending the performance with the proper music vocabulary; and last, the portfolio should include the creation and performance realm that the creators of NAEP asked for and reflect the state frameworks. The biggest concern was that there needed to be a sequence in instruction, not only in the exam, but in the classroom as well. It is evident that both lacked this.

As lead consultant, and one who worked most closely on MAAM with Michelle Channon, Jonathan Carter made many comments during this meeting. He summed up the entire meeting with these comments which seemed to reflect everyone’s thoughts. First, Carter said that the students must be successful at MAAM in order for the principals to “buy into” this assessment. MAAM should be a project created by the teachers, not those
in the “ivory tower,” however, since it had become the pet project of those in the “ivory tower,” it must be finished. The values in MPS reflected in MAAM should be important to professionals and MPS cliental, which include the principals, students, and parents. So as far as he could see, this was not the case.

Next, Carter talked about the assessment tool itself. He said that overall, school district officials should want to improve instruction and thus, the assessment would be formative, but in MPS current reality it was a summative assessment and would remain so. The test by no means would be an aptitude test. The creators should have created questions that would interest the students by warming them up. He wanted to avoid having the MAAM assessment tool test the students on the lowest level of Bloom’s taxonomy. Jessica Lovegood countered that MAAM should “warm-up the students’ brains” with easy questions, but Colwell retorted that he saw poor teaching practices in “rote and note.”

Carter then went onto criticize the rubrics that were created by the music teachers. He said that the students should be able to create their own rubrics. Rubrics should have clear-cut scores that define specific benchmarks for passing. Right now, the rubric assessment looked like it would be arbitrarily graded, or worse, those in the “ivory tower” (Channon and Carter) would be grading the students’ work with the rubrics.

To sum up the meeting, Carter ended with the topic of the quality of teachers and the arts standards in MPS. One of his largest complaints was that overall, it seemed like none of the teachers in MPS supported the arts standards at any level. Ultimately, the best, qualified teachers teaching music forty-five minutes daily should be the MPS
administrators’ goal. However, in his overall view, it seemed like the standards were far too advanced for the MPS teachers.

The next meeting that I attended with Michelle Channon and the consultants was on June 23, 2005. It took place in the same location as the last meeting. The same people attended. This time, the conversation was centered on Channon’s commitment to the education officials MPS including a writing and literacy component in the test and what the MPS students would be able to achieve in this area on MAAM. Channon wanted an extended response section in which the students commented on their own performances. Carter countered saying that musicians are not expected to know how to write as a definition of musicianship and that it would be pointless asking, “What are you testing, the students’ literacy and writing skills or the music skills?”

The music exam content focused on by the participants during this meeting was improvisation and composition. Carter felt that composition on computer was a low level of thinking according to Bloom’s Taxonomy. He believed that the students should have other students play their compositions to be more authentic. How do you grade composition? A child could write four measures of all quarter notes and call it a composition. How do you grade creativity in a composition and be objective? Can the students do improvisation at the middle school level? These were all questions that could not be agreed upon or answered by the individuals present because they were unfamiliar with the music teachers’ classrooms in MPS. They had views as to what should be taught but they did not know if it was actually being taught, and they did not think much was being taught in the music curricula in MPS. They all agreed that there should be
components on the exam independent of multiple-choice. The last rhetorical question asked before the meeting ended was: how are the teachers going to react to MAAM? The room was silent.

**The Follow-up Interview June 28, 2005 with Michelle Channon**

A formal follow-up interview was conducted with Michelle Channon on June 28, 2005. The first question involved the complications she observed from her arts teachers’ experiences while creating the assessment, since none of the delivery deadlines were met. Channon replied:

> Teachers didn’t do well due to lack of knowledge of assessment, communication problems, that they don’t do certain assessments in their classrooms, difference in opinion of what is to be tested and teachers used the meetings as venting sessions stating what is wrong with their schools.…
> …Weather also complicated matters (it was the coldest winter on record with seven snow days for blizzards) (Channon (d) 2005).

An observation was pointed out by the author that it was late into the MAAM meetings before the participants realized that the district-wide arts assessment was going to be mandatory. Channon replied, “They were told at the very beginning and never listened.”

When asked what Channon planned on obtaining from the results of MAAM and what she was going to do with them she said:

> The first year of the district-wide arts assessment will set the bar, but if the school does not improve the 2nd year, it will be bad. People will look at test score and ask why is there no average yearly progress.…
> …It is about improving instruction, not making a perfect score, and increasing student learning.…
> The first year will also identify gaps (Channon (d) 2005).

She was hopeful to be able to share with teachers, meaning she might have a meeting so that teachers can could review results and talk about score totals:
I want to do this because I don’t want the public comparing scores and I believe the teachers will have to sit down and talk about the results. (Channon’s immediate boss, Samuel Roxen, published the English language arts results on intranet that was only available inside the school district and would not be open to the public.)

...A workshop will be done given prior to the result release to explain the process. Two hours will be set as debriefing after test is given; and the test will be tweaked and changed; there will be additions to test bank of questions (Channon (d) 2005).

I then asked her how she thought the school district was going to react to the district wise arts assessment and she had this to say.

If done well it might create a little respect. I can’t speculate on how principals will feel and I hope it doesn’t take away from too much arts instruction because the students get so little. Only half of my arts teachers are in denial that the district-wide arts assessment is a reality and some are not aware of what it means. It could be a possibility teachers could get fired due to poor results. A more realistic possibility is that this maybe will alert principals to what is being taught in the arts classroom. However, I do not want my arts teachers fired based upon poor scores, which are attributable to lack of instruction time and a high transient student population (Channon (d) 2005).

Channon prophesied that the district-wide arts assessment would standardize the arts curriculum. Whether or not that would be a positive or negative development is for another discussion that is beyond the scope of the thesis. She hoped that the final outcome of MAAM would have the following effects: bring teachers together in study groups to discuss good instructional practices, create a network among the teachers, and create more participation in things like group festivals and joint performance projects around the city. Most importantly, she hoped her teachers would not feel isolated and the discussion would focus on student learning in the arts.

Finally, when asked if Channon could go back in time and change anything about the test or the process she went through over the past year she replied:

I would have picked three or four arts teachers to a team; would have made vocal and instrumental work together and have one representative from each level; would have paid them a wonderful stipend and have them work for one full week in June (she thinks that she would have received all input during that week rather then spread out in meetings throughout the year because there was a lot of time spent on communication difficulties); thinks the test would have been completed in March of 2005 (if she would have made the changes she suggested); and by meeting throughout the year, my consultants and I (possibility of some of the teacher participants) would have been
tweaking the test and video taping the chosen teachers teaching their classes which would have provided valuable information (Channon (d) 2005).

My research did not end after the interview with Michelle Channon on June 8, 2005. More research was needed to strengthen the thesis’ context. This is the point at which I included the research on large-scale arts assessments, interviewed Marcia McCaffrey, Stacey Low, and Frank Philip, and informally e-mailed Michelle Channon about the status of MAAM to include an update in 2006. The focus of the thesis completely changed with this information and was edited a number of times. I also received the completed MAAM assessment tool in 2006 and 2007. In July of 2007, I learned from Michelle Channon that she was leaving Metro Public Schools for another school district. (I also learned the extent to which she used the Pistone text.) I decided to see what MAAM’s final outcome would be, i.e. if it would continue under new leadership or be terminated. More formal phone interviews were conducted with Channon and informal e-mail questions with Carter in 2008 that revealed what happened to MAAM both while Channon was still the arts supervisor and after she left.

The Piloting and Administering of MAAM and Internal Administrative Changes at MPS

In a formal phone interview on January 21, 2008, Channon reported to me the final outcome of MAAM. During the 2004-2005 school year, Channon made the preparations to go forward with MAAM with the help of the Pistone text. The music teachers composed the rough draft of the music portion of the assessment. Later, Channon and her consultants spent a large quantity of time editing and rewriting the rough draft of MAAM. The editing from Channon and her consultants continued during
the 2005-2006 school year. In January of 2006, they implemented and piloted MAAM with all of the arts teachers in the school district. Thus, Channon and the consultants completed steps four and five in the Development phase in the Pistone text which are to “review assessment items to identify areas that require change or revision” and “pilot test the items and tasks in school district classrooms.”  

In step one of the Implementation phase Pistone states: “build your own assessment instrument.” In MPS, this consisted of a DVD and instruction manual being created and distributed to the teachers. The pool of questions, tasks-on-demand, and portfolio ideas had been gathered during the creation of the arts assessment.  

Channon had many challenges during the 2006-2007 school year. In the year of 2006, everyone in MPS was affected by major staff changes including the acquisition of a new superintendent. The support for MAAM at the district administrative level waned, as many senior personnel left MPS including all of Michelle Channon’s supervisors. On top of that, there were contract problems with the teachers in MPS, and so Channon could not hold in-service workshops for her teachers at all. Her teachers needed the Professional Development Points they would receive from her in-services. Of course, many of the in-services would have included MAAM. She held the in-services anyway regardless of any teacher contract negotiations going on around her at the time. If she had not done so, she would have lost the MCC grant and would have had to refund everything they had received from MCC. Plus, she wanted to see MAAM to its fruition.

13 Professional Development Points are points earned through teacher professional development, in-services, college courses, and additional degrees to sustain a teaching license in the state of Massachusetts.
The test was finally administered in 2007 in the 2006-2007 school year. By that time, over half of her teachers were trained to administer MAAM. Even though she had alluded to her staff that MAAM was mandatory, it was indeed “voluntary,” in the end.

After the test was administered, Channon and her consultants used the information from this test and all of the information gathered from the past three years to make inferences about music instruction in the MPS. They worked on strengthening all of the weak questions and performed an item analysis of the first year’s results. From the item analysis, they changed the wording and answers to the questions, especially if they could tell if the students were guessing, if the high achieving students were getting questions wrong, if the students did not answer the questions, and if the teachers themselves could not answer questions correctly.

After this was done, Channon and the consultants completed a percentage ratio analysis. It was concluded that the 2007 test was the best instrument designed thus far. Any person, school district, teacher, etc., could administer the exam with no problem.

Thus, this completed the rest of the steps from the Implementation phase in the Pistone text: “organize and administer the arts field test,” “score student responses and review field test results,” “coordinate and administer the assessment district or statewide,” and “analyze test data and report findings.”

Channon said that the band portion of the exam was by far the strongest portion in terms of creation and test results. However, when the teachers administered the exam, there were many teachers who did not turn in the entire exam to the district arts office and/or only administered one portion of the exam.
To return to the first interview with Channon, she said that the curriculum came first and then the assessment. At least that was her true intention. This was a step in the right direction because she would know what her teachers were teaching and that they were not wasting valuable instruction time. It was about guiding instruction and Channon and the consultants would use the testing results to learn if the instruction was good. She could perform a macro and micro-analysis by looking at the district as a whole, and then the individual teacher. From the results, she could ascertain that at the district level, for example, the students who took the music portion of MAAM could not identify different styles of music as simple as differentiating between a ragtime and a spiritual. Moreover, on a positive note, some teachers used the exam as an impetus to and develop their own personal classroom assessments, both authentic and traditional. This was a goal of Channon’s through the use of MAAM that was met.

The Dissolution of MAAM

During one of our last interviews, before this thesis was completed, I learned that Michelle Channon had moved on to another school district for the 2007-2008 school year. Mitchell Goodman was asked to take over her position as Interim Director for the Arts, but she was not certain if he took over permanently or if he held her position while the district officials sought another candidate. Goodman had not spoken to Channon since she left her position in the summer of 2007. Channon did not know much about what happened to MAAM except what she was able to find out through Jonathan Carter. When this interview took place on January 21, 2008, she said that she spoke to Carter and
he said that he was never contacted by officials at MPS to continue and complete his work as consultant to MAAM.\textsuperscript{lxxxix}

This apparently had no effect on the MCC grant. During Michelle Channon’s tenure, MAAM was paid for with monies from MCC, matching money from her arts budget, the school district, and donations. According to Channon, she used the MCC grant for consultant fees. If she would have used the MCC grant for the equipment such as the DVD players and cameras, it is likely that the arts administrator of MPS would have had to give the equipment back because it was not being used for its intended use, since MAAM was now either suspended or terminated.

Channon reported that she did, however, leave Mitchell Goodman with money in the arts budget to continue with MAAM, even though there was a budget freeze. It is not certain what Mitchell Goodman did about MAAM once Michelle Channon left. He would have had to fill out a contract for the 2007-2008 school year to continue to fund MAAM from the MCC.\textsuperscript{x} As of May 1, 2008, I contacted MCC and received no response as to what officially happened to their involvement in terms of funding and garnering information of the creation of district-wide arts assessment concerning MAAM for the 2007-2008 school year.

Finally, the office for the arts for MPS was moved into a school quite a distance away from the school board building. This seems to not be a positive move, according to Channon in that it shows that administrative officials at the district level at MPS do not value the arts in the school district like they did when Channon was the arts supervisor. Channon’s last thought about the MAAM project was that she views herself as a better
assessor of teachers as a result of the MAAM experience. She is saddened by the fact that she feels that she did not make a large impact upon MPS during her employment as Senior Program Director for the Arts for Metro Public Schools. She feels that no matter how hard she tried district officials were more focused on non-educational factors than curriculum.xci

My final correspondences were by phone on April 13, 2008 and e-mail on April 14, 2008, with Michelle Channon, during which she reminisced on a more positive note.

Even though I had to use the DVD players as a “carrot” to get my teachers to use MAAM in their classrooms, I feel that it was worth it....

…The portfolio was probably one of the best parts of the exam though it was time consuming. The kids learned a lot…..

….The kids thought MAAM was fun and got to be creative. They were not adverse to being assessed. Even though some of the test scores were not great, it was worth it....

…I believe that the MAAM project was innovative and that it could improve instruction by focusing on student achievement of standards based benchmarks....(Channon (n, o) 2008)

….I believe) having teachers go through the training changed/improved instruction for many teachers…it brought an awareness that I could not accomplish on my own” (Channon (o) 2008).

When Michelle Channon left MPS in August of 2007, Jonathan Carter remained as lead consultant to MAAM for MPS. Before Channon left, she reported that she indicated to Carter, and Mitchell Goodman agreed, that the initial idea was to have Carter revise the tests and do some piloting, pre, and post testing which would likely have used up the remaining money.xcii According to Carter, Goodman later called Carter and told him that he was going to eliminate the MAAM project in March of 2008. Therefore, these steps were not completed. Goodman did not mention to Carter what happened to the MCC grant.xciii Carter knows that “in the fall, officials in MPS were avoiding giving an answer and was telling officials at MCC that the project (MAAM) would continue on a scaled-back version. Whether that “story” was used by MPS officials to avoid
returning any (MCC grant) money, I don’t know.”
Carter also said that perhaps Mitchell Goodman wants “to put his own stamp on Arts in Metro Public Schools,” and he thought this would be a good time to do this due to the new high-level administration and superintendent. Carter believes that MAAM was “an important and innovative project,” but that “There are incomplete aspects of the project – scoring of tests and more.” So far, to his knowledge there have been no commitments to MAAM’s continuance on the large scale. So, at the close of this project in spring 2005, MAAM is either completely abolished, or indefinitely on hold.

---
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Chapter Four

Conclusions and Implications for Music Education

ANALYSIS

Analysis of the MAAM meetings

My analysis of this case study must commence with my analysis of the MAAM music teacher meetings, the actual testing device that the MAAM music teachers created and how it evolved into the final product. It can be concluded from the music teachers’ participation in the creation of the music portion of MAAM that Michelle Channon and Jonathan Carter had a monumental task of editing ahead of themselves.¹

My actual observation of the music teachers did not account for much analysis of MAAM because they did not contribute much to it, and the test information was itself, by agreement, confidential. This was especially the case in the following meetings: January 25, 2004; November 3, 2004; and January 28, 2005. The June 25, 2004 meeting was the second meeting, at which Jonathan Carter and Michelle Channon heavily assisted the music group. It turned out, however, to be another day of confusion, personalities clashing, and frustration by the music teachers. It was clear from the first meeting after June 25, 2004 on October 11, 2004, which of the music teachers from the June 2004 meetings were serious about creating the music portion of MAAM. In that meeting, I observed that the teachers’ prior knowledge of assessment was limited, and that the teachers did not create paper/pencil tests for their own classrooms. The random questions created during this meeting by the music teachers represented vast different areas of music education the teachers teach, and there emerged no leadership from the group to
deal with such systematic diversity.

During the November 3, 2004 meeting, the MAAM music participants received clarification to what they were supposed to do. However, there was a realization by Channon as to just how weak her teachers were in assessment, especially after she received October’s test questions.

The next meeting of note was the January 28, 2005 meeting. The teachers were supposed to be creating tasks-on-demand. Instead they produced creative multiple-choice questions disguised as tasks-on-demand. It is possible that the music teachers were looking for simplistic assessment in order to administer it on a wide scale. Another possible explanation is that they knew that they would have to administer the music portion of MAAM in their classrooms and did not want to spend time on an exam that could take a lot of classroom time to administer and score. They were also trying to create eight tasks-on-demand that would stretch across all grade levels. Therefore, it may have been that they were looking for the simple and easy way to create the music portion of MAAM, since this is how they approached the multiple-choice questions.

This was the first meeting where the MAAM music participants started to speak more freely about MAAM itself and their personal teaching conditions. They were starting to become a cohesive team where they would freely exchange ideas. There was a strong realization from this give and take from the music teachers that there were many music concepts that they did not each teach in their classroom. Some of the teachers did not use the standards at all in the classroom, nor in the MAAM assignment, because they do not feel comfortable with them.
While venting about their personal classroom problems the following issues were expressed by the music teachers: accessibility to materials, time to administer MAAM, and instruction time in general. During that meeting I asked this question to all of the MAAM participants when Channon was not in the room: Do you think MAAM will empower the arts teachers in MPS? All of them with strong conviction said absolutely not. Their feeling, moreover, was that this test was created by Channon to eliminate the weak teachers.

The February 9, 2005 meeting was significant in that Michelle Channon expressed her irritation to all of the music MAAM teachers. She was irritated because they had not brought in any of the materials they were supposed to bring with them, especially the textbook that they could have extracted some ideas for tasks-on-demand. It was also clear that the music teachers’ writing skills were limited, because they had difficulty creating the extended response questions. Channon confided to me that she knew that Mitchell Goodman would eventually do most of the work as the due date was in a couple of months for the MAAM music teachers to finish the creation of their portion of the exam.

The last meeting of note was the February 16, 2005 meeting, which can be described as somewhat of a fiasco. The music MAAM teachers arrived late, while guest Diane Daily from the Massachusetts Cultural Council who was invited to see them work on MAAM, waited for their arrival. Only two people from the group were doing their homework. Channon was frustrated and gave Mitchell Goodman full control over the music portion of MAAM. He would have to answer all of the e-mails from the
participants and edit and revise all of the work that was turned in from the participating teachers.

**Analysis of the final MAAM product**

The music portion of MAAM that was turned into Michelle Channon after the final meeting on March 16, 2005 reflected the meetings. About one half of the multiple-choice questions created by the music teachers during the meetings were accepted by Channon. However, that left no bank of questions to be used by Channon for future tests. The extended response portion was extremely weak. Channon thought that the authentic assessment portion of the music portion of MAAM was stronger, especially with the tasks-on-demand. However, there were not enough tasks-on-demand created to go through the editing phase with Channon and the consultants during which they had to create a pool of tasks-on-demand from which to choose. The portfolios were almost non-existent. The rubrics for the portfolios, tasks-on-demand, and extended response were in skeletal condition. Finally, for all four sections of the music portion of MAAM, there were not enough questions to cover each of the grade levels that were being assessed.

In sum, the final product from the music teachers was a skeleton of an exam lacking the following: assessment techniques for creating exams both traditional and authentic assessment including the actual text of the questions for all parts of the exam and directions to the examiner and examinees; cohesion within and between each section of the exam; references to the MPS curriculum and City-wide Learning Standards (arts); and reference to the adopted text *SilverBurdett* in MPS. It is also clear that the music teachers did not refer to existing large-scale arts assessments while creating the music
portion of MAAM. This would have helped them immensely in all of the categories mentioned previously where their final product had multiple shortcomings.

The final product is a substantial improvement over the rough draft the music teachers produced. Both the 2006 and 2007 exams contain a DVD of multiple-choice questions. Some of the completed multiple-choice questions that were created during the music teacher MAAM meetings were included in the final test. There are echoes of the drafts of multiple-choice questions in these exams as well. The directions for the students for the multiple-choice questions are read to them on the DVD and are printed on their actual test. The questions are multi-media containing pictures, short videos, and of course, music. There are three levels tested on the DVD: elementary, middle, and high school.

The extended response, tasks-on-demand, and portfolio directions were printed on paper to be distributed to the classroom music teachers. There are explicit directions on how to administer each section complete with rubrics for grading. It also includes student test sheets to be copied and handed out to the students. The questions and activities are also reminiscent of what the music MAAM teachers turned in on March 16, 2005. Some are the same, others heavily revised, and some newly created. This also tests elementary, middle, and high school. The difference is that sometimes the middle and elementary level examinations have the same test questions and/or activities and sometimes that is the case for middle school and high school. This is so that the questions are grade level appropriate in terms of literacy skills and performance ability.
The Pistone Reference

If it were not for Channon’s vision and her use of the Pistone text, the MAAM assessment tool would not exist. Channon spent at least six months prior to the first meeting of the MAAM participants rallying support for the exam from her superiors, securing funding, creating the blueprint, structuring MAAM, assessing her teachers’ assessment ability, wondering who was going to participate, setting the first meeting, and hiring consultants. Then Channon and Jonathan Carter (with little help from other consultants, teachers, and staff) spent the next two years editing, piloting, holding teacher professional development meetings, scoring, and analyzing the test scores from all four arts areas.

Thus, the bulk of the work on the music portion of MAAM fell to Michelle Channon and to a lesser extent, her lead consultant, Jonathan Carter. There was much preparatory work done that was essential for the creation of MAAM before the music teachers created their portion of the exam. Without the preparation, there would be no MAAM. Pistone backs this conclusion as well with her emphasis on the preparatory work. In actuality (based upon all of my observations of the music teachers), the music teachers had spent about 10% of the time needed to create their portion of MAAM, if that much.

This surprised me. I approached this case study by placing the emphasis on the music teachers’ work on the arts assessment. I too expected more meetings, more participation from the music teachers in and away from the meetings, and more knowledge in assessment from the music teachers. However, it can be concluded from
this research that the creation of a district-wide arts assessment should be used and viewed more as a professional development opportunity for arts teachers, not something that the arts teachers can be relied upon to produce with little help from an arts supervisor. In general, arts teachers need an extraordinary amount of guidance and professional development classes in arts assessment and curriculum development in order to be successful in developing a district-wide arts assessment. Furthermore, it is worth noting that some arts teachers do not hold education degrees. They were hired through various alternative certification programs. Therefore, they would not have the curriculum and assessment knowledge needed to go forth with a monumental task of participating on a district-wide arts assessment.¹

The Pistone reference must also be analyzed as well. Overall, the Pistone text is a fantastic resource. The charts and letters and especially the preamble to creating a large-scale arts assessment are thoroughly and concisely laid out. However, I must disagree with one crucial that Pistone makes. Pistone asserts that this resource can be used by anyone creating a large-scale arts assessment regardless of arts and supervision background.³

I disagree with this, especially from my experience with this case study. If it were not for the expertise that Michelle Channon had, MAAM would never exist. One has to be well-versed in at least one arts area and hire assistants who are well-versed in one’s deficient areas. Channon also had leadership skills, perseverance, and the vision of what the district-wide arts assessment would look like and how it would be administered. Assessment can be a project that can fall apart if one is not passionate about seeing it
through till the very end. Most important, Channon garnered the support of her superiors for the project because she herself had expertise in the arts, assessment, and supervision. I believe that this skill set would be necessary for any school district that attempts to create a district-wide arts assessment.\textsuperscript{vii}

**THEMES**

I ascertained themes from the Metro Arts Assessment Model which include: leadership, certainty over what really goes on in her teachers’ classrooms, content knowledge of participants, over-estimating the teachers’ abilities, lack of representation from different areas of music, human relationships, human nature, communication, and dialogue among music teachers.

Channon’s vision for the district-wide arts assessment was that of her teachers owning it. She wanted as little to do with it as possible in terms of creating it. One of her underlying motivators to “keep out” was to see what her teachers really knew about assessment.\textsuperscript{viii} It provided a cloudy mirror to see what her teachers did in the classroom. Leadership was assumed by her assistant, Mitchell Goodman, late into the project. This was in part natural and in part brought upon by Channon. When Goodman assumed leadership, the meetings became more efficient and the work was accomplished to the best extent possible within the timeline Channon had set according to the MCC grant. However, the lack of representation from the different areas of music thwarted the situation even further.

The mirror, though cloudy, revealed that most of the teachers did not assess in their classrooms and that they taught for breadth not depth. Content knowledge among
the participants combined is vast and somewhat thorough. This project revealed their strengths and weaknesses. Hence, Channon had over-estimated her teachers’ abilities both in assessment and in content knowledge.

The human element was just as important as the other factors mentioned above. As was mentioned before, most of the teachers did not know each other well or at all. This could have worked out favorably. However, cliques did form and human nature got in the way in terms of temperaments and strong personalities. What is surprising is that the teachers never listened to Channon when she recommended they bring in the adopted text, use the standards, etc. However, the news that MAAM was disbanded by Mitchell Goodman when he took over as Interim Arts Supervisor for MPS, made it less surprising that the music teachers did not listen to Channon. Perhaps they were never really interested in MAAM and the ones that were did not have enough leadership skills to lead the group to follow Channon’s advice, which would have made creating the rough draft of the music portion for MAAM much easier. This adversely affected communication.

Communication was the key to accomplishing this monumental task of creating the music portion of the district-wide arts assessment. What emerged from the observation was something that was not expected, because it was the communication between Channon and her music teachers that was the obvious breakdown in communication and leadership. For example, Channon could not understand why the middle school students could not be held to a higher expectation. Perhaps, she was correct. One could only know if they had observed Soffer teaching. Channon oversees a staff of well over one hundred fifty arts teachers, all of whom are managed and evaluated
by site principals. It is virtually impossible to know intimately what is going on in all of her teachers’ classrooms. But, this did shine a light on some of Channon’s relationships with her teachers.

Last, Channon achieved what she wanted: a dialogue among her arts teachers. It was a fruitful dialogue that revealed many of the skeletons the music classroom closet holds captive. The teachers were well served by the district-wide arts assessment and will hopefully use the skills they have learned from the project in their music classrooms even with the absence of Michelle Channon and MAAM.

**Criticisms on How the Music Portion of MAAM Was Created**

Overall, the beginning steps to starting a district-wide arts assessment were excellent. Channon excelled at the preliminary research and efforts for funding the endeavor. As was mentioned earlier in the thesis, there is no literature on the creation of a district-wide arts assessments or a solid how-to guide at the district level. All of the literature is written for state and national large-scale arts exams and none is specific to music. (The Pistone text is the only source that comes close to a solid how-to guide to create a large-scale arts assessment at the district level.) However, there is much to be learned from the trends that emerged from the creation of the music portion of MAAM. What Channon miscalculated was her music teachers’ assessment and writing competency. Their weakness and her overconfidence in them contributed to the confusion and frustration. Ironically, the final product, the actual MAAM assessment tool, is a solid district-wide arts assessment that is professionally executed in terms of content, and delivery format (including the accompanying DVD for the multiple-choice
No expense was spared.

In the final analysis, the success of large-scale arts assessment ventures come down to how well-funded the assessment is from the beginning. People are extrinsically motivated to work for money. When funded, the arts supervisor should provide rudimentary assessment workshops for the arts teachers. Once the supervisor sees that the teachers are confident in assessment and physically sees them in action in the classroom, then there should be a call for all interested parties to participate in a district-wide arts assessment. Deadlines and meeting dates must be set and adhered to from the very beginning. Like Channon, the supervisor should have little influence in the assessment creation. But, the arts administrator should steer them into the straight and narrow path if they stray. These trends provide the final bit of information to how to create a district-wide arts assessment. Communication is the key to success!

**Final Conclusions for MAAM**

The final entry in this account is the fact that the Metropolitan Arts Assessment Model no longer exists due to a change in management. It seemed to me that there were signs from Mitchell Goodman while he worked on MAAM that he did not truly believe in the project. However, it is not known why MAAM was abolished, and I cannot make any assumptions as to this.

However, the fact that the management changed is a very important detail. Many people take it for granted that the projects in which they believed passionately in will go on when they leave. When Channon’s upper level management supervisors departed, this marked the end for MAAM, especially when Superintendent Stevenson left the
school district. It was possible that, in a matter of time, after the new superintendent arrived, that Channon may have had a large struggle, even if she stayed with MPS, to keep MAAM alive. It is even possible that MAAM may be resurrected.

Not everything was done in vain with concerns to MAAM. Perhaps the arts teachers in MPS are using the MAAM materials and the techniques and skills learned during the creation of the assessment and/or the workshops they attended to administer the device. At the very least, they will have the technological equipment that was bought for MAAM, something they never had before. This was the very legacy Channon wanted to leave behind, a resource and experience her arts teachers could rely on even when upper level management, changes, and budget have virtually disappeared.\textsuperscript{xiv}

Finally, had I been able to further the study I would have liked to interview the principals and music teachers who administered MAAM to find out what they thought about the actual assessment tool, and whether it strengthened arts education in their particular schools, and whether they still support and implement MAAM in their music classrooms even with Michelle Channon’s permanent absence.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR MUSIC EDUCATION**

In conclusion, there are three basic overall themes to this thesis: policy (national, state, and local); standards in the arts; and most important, large-scale assessments. It is a trilogy that is inextricably connected as long as there are polices written at any level of government level geared to finding out what America’s students should know be able to do.

Creating a district-wide arts assessment is a complex and challenging endeavor.
Music is intrinsically a complex discipline. When one adds policy, standards, and assessment the endeavor becomes unwieldy if not comprehended in small chunks and then assimilated to obtain a product that will undergo numerous changes in each step of the long process.

First, policy is something that will always affect education at some level. Music education is not immune to educational policy set on Capitol Hill and must be quick to comprehend it and take action as needed. Not all policy negatively affects music education, as former Secretary of Education Paige stated in his letter in chapter one. However, most people in music education do misinterpret it and view it as a threat\(^1\). It is the author’s opinion that this attitude weakens the profession and needs to be eradicated.

What can be said about the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* is that it is a national law that through various people’s interpretation affects education of American children from kindergarten through twelfth grade (with some exceptions)\(^3\). Many educators, lobbyists, and advocacy persons in the music education world clamor for the abolition of NCLB\(^2\), citing that it is the ruination of music education.

However, a closer look at this piece of legislation suggests otherwise. The arts, music in particular, are still considered a “core academic subject” by the authors of

---

\(^1\) Please refer to the following organizations and their websites: Music for All (http://music-for-all.org/nclbinfo.html); The National Music Center and Museum Foundation (http://www.nationalmusiccenter.org/music.education.html). These are two of many examples one can find if they type “music education and no child left behind” in the search engine.

\(^2\) Please refer to the following organizations and their websites: Music for All (http://music-for-all.org/nclbinfo.html); The National Music Center and Museum Foundation (http://www.nationalmusiccenter.org/music.education.html). These are two of many examples one can find if they type “music education and no child left behind” in the search engine.
NCLB and thus are subject to assessment by education officials and law makers at every level of government. So the question remains, why are music programs being cut across the nation if the authors of NCLB encouraged the arts to be tested?

First, one must also understand how education in America works. Massachusetts education officials favor local control which is rare in the United States. Local control is a double-edged sword. Music teachers in music programs can have great potential with community support, or can disintegrate with the swipe of the members of a local finance committee’s pen. What does not make sense is the fact that music is a “core academic subject” in NCLB and that officials in states and districts still eliminate the arts due to budget cuts. Granted, the arts are not first priority in establishing a school’s or district’s Adequate Yearly Progress, but the arts should be protected with funding (to an extent) as one of the “core academic subjects.” Is it not against the law to cut the arts? Why do music educators have to fight to keep the arts in schools?

The answer is fairly simple. It comes down to this question: do the school district officials truly value the arts? Even before NCLB came into effect in a stronger economy, the arts were struggling in school districts across America. Back in 1992, the arts were cut in Pinellas County, Florida with hundreds of music teachers losing their jobs. This was due to budget cuts at the state level, which trickled down to the district level. The national economy was not a factor in this and again, NCLB did not exist at that time. What can be said about this is that budget cuts can occur at the local levels and will not have an affect on the national level. Sometimes within the same state, some districts are not affected by the state budget cuts because certain school districts have surpluses to
support programs the constituents value. However, even in this current struggling economy in the United States of America in the year of 2008, there are still many strong and outstanding arts programs across the United States. The members of MENC feature three schools at each level (elementary, middle, and high school) every March during Music in Our Schools Month. There are thousands more that are not given national recognition but thrive in precarious times.

The people who interpret NCLB affect every state in the United States and so does the down slope of the economy to some effect. It is wrong to conclude that since the arts can be assessed they will have a better chance to remain in the schools. Many of the school districts with strong arts programs do not have large-scale district-wide arts assessments. Simply put, people in those school districts regard the arts as important to the community’s children’s education and thus they remain as strong as they were back in a better economy.

In a Title I school district such as Metro Public Schools, assessment in core academic is considered extremely important to superintendent and principals. If it can be assessed, it is worth keeping. School officials believe that statistics are important to the success of these particular struggling school districts. That is why Channon had the support of her supervisors and the superintendent to commence with the creation of the district-wide arts assessment. However, in this particular case, Channon’s ole purpose for MAAM was not to justify the arts in MPS. Channon worked hard justifying the arts in the school district long before MAAM came into existence. But, she could have justified the arts in a site based management school district to certain principals in the
district who were not happy with their current arts programs in their schools or who did not have arts programs in their school to begin with as required by law and MPS.\textsuperscript{xxiii}

Second, the National Standards for the Arts must be included because they were a response from the authors to policy being created by law makers. The authors wrote highly ambitious standards (including the opportunity-to-learn and performance standards). The authors wrote that the standards are to be voluntary\textsuperscript{xxiv} and the author of this thesis believes that a child will have an adequate music education in all thirteen years of education (K-12) given that the music program resembles that of the opportunity-to-learn standards and that the music teachers are competent enough to teach music. In essence, it would resemble a thirteen-year comprehensive spiral curriculum.

True that members of MENC (as some may think) sold out the music education profession to policy in favor of stability versus freedom to teach in terms of leading the way in creating the standards for music on a national level, but in the end, local control prevails and music educators are still relatively free to teach units within the standards.\textsuperscript{xxv} One wonders how many members of the profession truly agree with the national standards as they stand now. The author believes that it is long past due for a debate about the national standards. Whether or not it leads to music educators changing them in any way will be up to the outcomes of the debate.

Third, no curriculum is complete without assessment. As was mentioned before, assessment is intrinsic to music. Music teachers assess their students to see if they are able to learn more difficult music. Whether or not it is done on the conscious or subconscious level is beyond the scope of this discussion. But, it does exist each time the
music teacher interacts with the students at the very least on the informal level. The question is how to assess students in music. There are thousands of possibilities.

The largest dangers to administering a standardized test are the misuse of scores and data, and not testing what was meant to be tested. This jeopardizes not only the test but the music program. However the positive aspects to standardized tests outweigh the dangers, in that people can use them to justify the arts’ position in the curriculum in the public and government’s eyes.

NAEP and SCASS are not going away any time soon, especially NAEP in that for the arts portion will be administered again in 2008. Even if teachers balk at the idea of a standardized test for the arts at the local level, they may be mandated to administer one at the federal level. They will never be able to hide from this predicament.

The large-scale arts assessment should be a positive experience for everyone involved. If done correctly, anyone can use to start a conversation among music educators in the district and that it should be used as a tool that is beneficial for everyone from the student to the superintendent. The music teachers SHOULD be invited to participate in the creation of the arts assessment. This will solve a lot of problems. The best justification for having them participate is that they are the ones who know the students best who will have then taken the exam. Therefore, the district-wide arts exam will be tailored to the students in the district.

Last, on the local level in the pre-Channon MPS world, there were no festivals, assessments, and textbooks for the arts in over sixty years. There were no instruments since 1973-75, no scripts, no scores library, no climate controlled instrument repair
facility, no professional development workshops, no newsletter, and no website. The three main partnerships for the arts that were happening were the local symphony’s children’s concerts, fine arts museum’s 5th grade program, and a local music college’s Saturday school. There were federal desegregation funds “636” that were given to principals to contract arts residencies.xxvii

The Channon arts administration at MPS (up until she left in August of 2008) came to include everything from the above list including adding over one hundred arts teachers since August 1995. Although the Metro Public Schools Arts Education Policy was created in 1994, it was not implemented until Channon took over the position. Overall, most of the arts teachers were happy about the support coming from the district office.xxvii However, with these lavish additions, accountability in this form of mandatory requirements and assessments often are not far behind.

The most controversial addition in the then current-Channon period was of course, the district-wide arts assessment. The landscape was changing in Metro Public Schools in response to policy and district requirements not imposed by Channon.xxxix Those who reminisce about MPS pre-Channon, with or without the addition of the district-wide arts assessment were forced to re-evaluate their philosophies and personal belief systems. They could have either accepted the changes or looked for another job in a school district that permits the teachers to teach in complete autonomy.

Based upon the literature review, observations, and interviews done for MAAM in this case study, it is not surprising that there are not many “how-to guides” for creating a district-wide arts assessment. The reason why the number of “how-to guides” for
creating a district-wide arts assessment is not extensive is because every school district is unique. The human element is the catalyst and the fact remains that every school district is unique in terms of structure, curriculum, philosophies, etc. The author recommends that school districts officials should research their state and national policy, assessment, and the standards. Then they should follow what Channon did to begin the task of creating a district-wide arts assessment. The Pistone reference is excellent and is highly recommended. One should also look at other large-scale arts assessment to obtain ideas.

Again, based upon the literature review done by the author for this thesis, there are not many district-wide arts assessments in existence. From that number not many district officials documented the process they underwent and no district official formally had the process they underwent documented as a case study. Therefore the research for large-scale arts assessments, especially at the district level is almost non-existent. I have provided a case study of only one story of how a district-wide arts assessment was created. Overall, Channon’s work and outcomes with MAAM were relatively successful. The end product, the 2007 MAAM assessment tool, was professional and relatively strong. This was due to the strength of Channon and all of the work she accomplished prior to the music teachers creating its first draft.

It is my hope that I may use this case study may add to the literature a qualitative critique about the creation of a district-wide arts assessment, so that other school district officials can learn from the mistakes and triumphs the participants in this district underwent while creating their own arts assessment. I will end with three absolute words to keep in mind when creating large-scale arts assessments: trial, error, and patience.
Finally, with regards to implications for music education, there are three themes that the author of this thesis wants the readers to take with them:

- Music teachers should always be cognizant of what is going on in terms of policy and research.
- District officials who explore the idea of creating an arts assessment must be aware that they are unique, take note of what happened with MAAM, and modify what MAAM did to fit their needs.
- Most important, the students’ needs should ALWAYS be the first to keep in mind whenever creating something new, or revising old curriculum.

The authors of NCLB created a mission statement for NCLB: “To close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind.”

The mission statement of music educators should be: “To close the ignorance gap between policy and music education, so that no child will be left without music in their lives.”

---
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Appendix One

Description of the Nine Content Standards in the National Standards for Arts Education, Music

“The nine music Content Standards are:

(1) Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music;

(2) Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music;

(3) Improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments;

(4) Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines;

(5) Reading and notating music;

(6) Listening to, analyzing, and describing music;

(7) Evaluating music and music performances;

(8) Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts;

(9) Understanding music in relation to history and culture.”

---

Appendix Two

Summary of the Opportunity-to-Learn Standards

The authors of the opportunity-to-learn standards intended for them to be voluntary. “The opportunity-to-learn standards presented here include standards for (1) curriculum and scheduling, (2) staffing, (3) materials and equipment, and (4) facilities. They are based on the national content and achievement standards in music. They represent a comprehensive set of recommendations concerning the types and levels of support necessary to achieve the national standards.”

Across grade levels, the music teacher of an optimum music program should provide:

1. Curriculum and scheduling: teach a balanced amount of the national standards; elementary: music should be 90 minutes per week minus elective choral and instrumental and general music classes should not exceed the number of students that the other content classes have, middle and high school: “Every music course meets at lease every other day in periods of at least forty-five minutes. Except for bands, orchestras, and choruses, music class size does not exceed the average class size for the school by more than 10 percent;” provisions for students with disabilities, special learners, and the gifted should be made accordingly; every member of a performing group should be involved in at least 2-3 performances per year at the elementary level; the curriculum should be sequential; (the music should teach) general

---

1 Unless otherwise noted, the recommendations made by the authors apply for elementary (grades 1-5 or 1-6), middle (or junior high), and high school.
music through grade 8 and all students should have had experience with playing instruments and singing; at the middle school level, the music teacher(s) should provide at least one course with no perquisites and a course other than band, choir, or orchestra must be offered for the span of one school year (at least one semester at the high school level); middle and high school: choral and instrumental classes should be offered by the teachers of the music program during the school day in which the students can take it during the entire year (or as alternative scheduling permits); there should be a variety of ensembles available by genre and ability level; middle and high school: there should be a reasonable number of performances scheduled by the music teacher(s) throughout the school year and the music teacher(s) should make them be informative; middle school: the music teacher(s) should make beginning instruction for instruments available; middle school: the music teacher(s) should utilize the community; high school: “no fewer than eight instructional periods” and the music teacher(s) should make sure that music courses should not conflict with other required courses for graduation.”

2. Staffing: only specialists and classroom teachers should teach music and they should collaborate; all music educators should be proficient musicians and highly qualified teachers and be qualified to teach the particular course of music that they were hired to teach; elementary: 1 general music teacher = 400 students; teacher should have at least a 30 minute preparation period excluding lunch and travel (where sufficient time should be given); teachers
should have at least 2 paid in-service days inside and 2 days outside the
district and all of it should relate to music; a music coordinator should be in
every school or district and if there are more than 25 music specialists, hire
more coordinators as needed; middle and high school: sufficient number of
music teachers for the music courses offered; middle and high school: an
accompanist should be provided for choirs of more then fifty students; every
music teacher must have training in special education.\textsuperscript{xi}

3. Materials and Equipment: music teacher(s) must make sure that every music
room at all levels have high quality technology, sound equipment, textbooks,
music library, sound recordings, and supplemental materials; all teachers must
have access to additional materials; elementary: there should be at least 40
titles of music in the music library with funds to purchase 15 new titles each
year for band, chorus, and orchestra…in addition with regards to middle and
high school, there should be a 3-year cycle of instructional materials; middle
school: 75 titles for each program: band, chorus, and orchestra; music
teacher(s) at all levels should never photocopy music, and there should be
enough music and stands for only two students to share and one choral solder
for each students; high school: there should be a library of solo/ensemble
music with at least 75 titles; at all levels there should be one textbook for
each student to not be older then 6 years old; at all levels there must be a
sufficient number and variety of instruments and good acoustics; financial
assistance must be provided to students with a demonstrated financial
hardship; an annual budget; the music teacher(s) must make sure that all equipment be in working order and create and maintain a financial allowance for repair and maintenance “that is at least 5% of the current replacement value of the total inventory of instruments and equipment” (with another 5% allocated for replacement of instruments and equipment);\textsuperscript{vii} music teacher(s) must tune pianos at least 3 times per year; disabled students must have access to proper equipment; middle school and high school: there is a breakdown of specific band and orchestral instruments that need to be purchased by the music teacher(s); and the music teacher(s) must make sure that there are choral risers if there is a choir.\textsuperscript{viii}

4. Facilities: (“Note: These standards apply to all new construction and to all facilities being renovated or adapted by school officials.”\textsuperscript{ix}

At the elementary level: the music teacher(s) at each school must have a general music room at the elementary level that: is large enough to accommodate all students (for instrumental and movement purposes as well); has good acoustics, lighting, storage-space (instruments and instructional materials), is in a “quiet environment,” and has proper ventilation:\textsuperscript{x}

The band room in the elementary school must have all of the above in addition to: “running water for instrumental maintenance;” studio space for sound-proof practice rooms and private teachers; handicapped accessibility; and be adjacent to the other music rooms.\textsuperscript{xi}
At the middle and high school levels each school must have everything the elementary schools in addition to: curtains so that the music teacher(s) can adjust the acoustics for the band and choral rooms; 2,500 square feet and 20’ ceilings for the band room; a choral room with 1,800 square feet and 16’ ceilings; adequate space to teach courses like piano lab; sufficient chalkboard space including a board with a music staves in classroom and practice rooms (at least 55 square feet a piece at the high school level); 2 additional rooms for small ensembles at least 350 square feet each; private office for teacher with access to supervise the classroom and telephone; accessible to stage or auditorium; climate and humidity controlled rooms.xii

Overall, the authors of the Opportunity-to-Learn standards wrote extremely ambitious standards to follow. One wonders what the quality of a music program would be if they were to have incorporate all of these recommendations in their program.

“Music teachers are encouraged to support their requests for more time, more help, improved facilities, and so on.”xiii Michelle Channon in fact, has used these standards to advocate improving the structural, material and time conditions of music education in Metro Public Schools and has succeeded, improving working conditions though not to the extent that the authors of the opportunity-to-learn standards suggests.xiv These standards have yet to be revised at the national level by music educators.

---

2 Ibid., Preface: vi.
iii Ibid., 9.
iv Ibid., 18.
v Ibid., 3-19.
vi Ibid., 5-20.
vii Ibid., 7.
viii Ibid., 6-21.
ix Ibid., 7.
x Ibid.
xii Ibid., 7-8.
xii Ibid., 14-5, 21-3.
xiv Michelle Channon, Senior Program Director for the Arts for Metro Public Schools, interview by author, 2 March 2004, Metro, tape recording, Metro Public School Board Building, Metro.
Appendix Three

Performance Standards

One advantage not having an established regimen of assessments in music education is that music educators can see what has worked and failed concerning assessments in all fields, learn from it, and create assessments that work. If the content standards are not assessed by music educators, they are meaningless. Therefore, the members of MENC created the Performance Standards to accompany the National Standards for Arts Education.

The purpose of this publication (Performance Standards for Music Grades Prek-12: Strategies and Benchmarks Assessing Progress Toward the National Standards) is to assist teachers, schools, school districts, and states in assessing the extent to which the music standards they have established for students are being met. The specific guidance this publication provides will help state education agencies, or their contractors, working with state music educators’ associations, to develop state assessments in music that are consistent with the voluntary national content and achievement standards and state and local standards based on the national standard (The National Association for Music Education (b) 1996, Introduction, 1-2).

In this publication, “performance standards” comprise model assessment strategies and descriptions of student responses. They also help to interpret and illustrate the meaning of the content standards. One sample assessment strategy is provided for each of the achievement standards in music specified in National Standards for Arts Education. For each sample assessment strategy, descriptions of student responses at the basic, proficient, and advances levels are offered” (Ibid., Introduction: 2).

Although the authors of the national standards state that they are voluntary these assessments can be easily adapted to state standards.

The authors of this manual derived it around the following beliefs:

- every student can learn music; music instruction should begin in the preschool years; assessment in music is not only possible but necessary; the purpose of assessment is to improve learning (including advocacy and analyzing the assessment data to compare to other schools, districts, and states); assessment of student learning is not synonymous with evaluation of teaching or evaluation of instructional program (if learning is poor, it is then feasible to use assessment to pinpoint the problems in the instruction); assessment in music requires various techniques in various settings; reports to parents should be based on standards” (Ibid., Introduction, 6-7).

---

1The authors from MENC use the word “performance” to mean all aspects of music including composition, essays, etc. (The National Association for Music Education (b) 1996, Introduction, 2).
The authors from MENC believe that though it is time consuming, “standards based objectives provide the only justifiable basis for assigning grades” and that “caution is needed in interpreting assessment results.” The last belief is extremely important. The Performance Standards authors make many valid points including: assessments by music educators are not 100% accurate and information may be misinterpreted by the public and members of the press in which if misused could hurt music education.

Overall, the performance standards authored by members of MENC are comprehensive and easy to follow. However, the danger in using them is that a music teacher may sacrifice their own creativity for the safety of publications such as these that “guarantee” officially recognized “results” by teaching to the prescribed method of a governing organization.

---

2 Ibid., Introduction, 1.
3 Ibid., Introduction, 2.
4 Ibid., Introduction, 3-7.
5 Ibid., Introduction, 6–7.
After the members of the Consortium of the National Arts Associations published the National Standards and “Goals 2000” was passed into law by members of the United States Congress, music educators wondered about what lay ahead for music education in the twenty-first century. Fashioned after the Tanglewood Symposium of 1967, June Hinckley convened Vision 2020 feeling that it was about time to generate another conversation about the status of music education in America without pressures from political forces. (This refers to political policy passed by the United States Congress, in which arts educators responded by rushing to create the national arts standards in 1994). During the Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education held on September 23-26, 1999 (Tallahassee, FL), music educators from K-12 and higher education, and representatives from the music industry convened to present formal responses to the papers the members of the Housewright Commission presented.

The product (Vision 2020) (was) a collection of papers in response to questions and topics submitted by the presidents and executive directors of all major music-related organizations (known as the Housewright Commission) to guide music education into the next century. It was presented on March 8, 2000 at the MENC National Conference in Washington, DC (Madsen 2000, Hinckley Introduction).

---

1 “(The participants of the Tanglewood Symposium’s) purpose was to plan the members of MENC’s future directions by defining the role of music education in an evolving American society that was dealing with the new realities of rapid social, economic, and cultural change. The participants of the symposium brought together music educators and representatives of business, industry, and government…” (Mark 2000, 9)
At the end of the book, there is a “summation of the agreements made at the Houswright Symposium” by the authors that was also presented at the (year) 2000 MENC National Conference in Washington, DC entitled The Housewright Declaration.

It is written by the authors of The Housewright Declaration in the introduction that music has been a part of human civilization since the beginning of time and no matter how much society changes, music educators must change with it, building upon the positive successes of music education “to insure that the best of the Western art tradition and other musical traditions are transmitted to future generations.”

The authors created twelve points that follow the introduction that address the following issues music educators should follow and implement and that should become a reality by the year 2020: teach music from all cultures, for all, having all participate; maintain the integrity of music, provide sufficient time for instruction “such that a comprehensive, sequential and standards-based program of music instruction is made available;” be proficient in their field; study and apply technological advances; include all possible sources to help improve quality and quantity of music instruction; coordinate interdisciplinary activities (that include music) among other colleagues; promote retention in the profession and act as an advocate for alternative licensing; “continue research which addresses all aspects of music activity needs supporting intellectual, emotional, and physical responses to music; explore the ancillary social results of music and studies which increase meaningful music listening; implement music making (performing, composing, improvising, listening, and interpreting music notation); last,
identify the barriers that impede the full actualization of any of the above and work to overcome them.iv

Based on my extensive review of literature, the authors of Vision 2020 and The Housewright Declaration did not have a direct impact upon the literature in the music education profession concerning policy, assessments, and the national standards. This conclusion was made based upon the small amount of references that were made to Vision 2020 and The Housewright Declaration by the authors of the references that were found in my research and the policy upheaval made by the authors of NCLB in 2001 that changed the political climate of music education. However, The Housewright Declaration and the points made in the essays in Vision 2020 are not substantially obsolete by any means and pose relevant arguments concerning what music education is facing with the implementation of NCLB today by law makers and educators across the United States. What is most striking is that even in the year 2008, the “vision” of the year 2020 is already a reality for participants in some music programs and yet, a distant dream for others across the nation.

---


ii Ibid.

iii Ibid., 219.

iv Ibid., 219-220.
Appendix Five

Music Teachers’ Testimonials to Participating in Large-Scale Arts Assessments

Only candid quotes taken from reliable sources by the author of this thesis will be used to discuss how music teachers created arts assessments at the district, state, and national levels. These quotes were chosen by the author of this thesis if they were the direct quotes from the teachers who have written articles about their experience creating arts assessments at those levels, or quotes from researchers who followed teachers while they created those arts assessments.

In this Appendix, it is revealed by the author of this thesis practicing music teachers’ reactions to their participation in the creation of large-scale arts assessments beginning with state the level and ending with district large-scale arts assessments.

Maria Green was asked by her principal to submit her name for membership on the New Jersey Elementary School Proficiency Assessment (ESPA) on Visual and Performing Arts. She was accepted and was put through a thorough training of assessment and test design with a number of other arts educators. Her experience with ESPA changed her view of how she taught and assessed in the classroom and made her a more effective educator. One of the salient issues she addressed in her own teaching was what to teach and how to assess it when the students only receive twenty-five total instruction hours for the entire year. She used the KWL method (“What I Know, What I Want to Know, What I Learned”), that she learned in the ESPA training to zero in on what the kids knew, what to teach them, and find out what they learned by developing an assessment tailored to that specific class of students."
Christine Sezer also learned a lot from the New Jersey State Assessment Committee and is frustrated with teachers in workshops who won’t try to learn about assessment or whine that they have no time to administer assessments.iii

Martha Snell Miller gives her account about her experience of creating music curriculum and assessments at the district level. In 1994, the members of the elementary music teachers in the Hollidaysburg Area School District in Duncansville, PA began to write a district-wide music curriculum. They found that it was easier to concentrate on one grade level per year. Thus, they began with first grade (not all of the teachers taught kindergarten) and built the curriculum and assessments from the bottom up.

They decided that each first grader was to have a portfolio with their aptitude tests, other assessments, and work. Portfolios were not a new assessment tool to the students because their other teachers used them as well. The portfolios were time consuming for the teachers to administer and grade but if Miller needed to know why the child was not performing at the level he/she should be performing at, she could refer to the child’s portfolio for an objective view and pinpoint where the student started to fall behind in that particular skill or objective. The portfolios were useful for the teachers to use during open-house night or for the fifth grade band director when the child wanted to take band down the road

Miller’s advice for creating curriculum and assessment: “Remember to start with something you think you can handle, assess the objectives stated in your curriculum, and look at the examples of others.”viii

The teachers were empowered by participating in the large-scale arts assessments.
They were able to take their skills and apply them to the classroom. Most importantly, they published their thoughts and ideas adding to the music education assessment discussion. This is what Michelle Channon envisioned for MAAM.iv

---


iv Michelle Channon, Senior Program Director for the Arts for Metro Public Schools, interview by author, 28 June 2005, Performance, tape recording, home of interviewee, Performance, MA.
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