

**ASSESSING MUSIC TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS: ONE STATE'S
APPROACH**

William I. Bauer
Department of Music
Case Western Reserve University
william.bauer@case.edu

Ed Duling
Department of Music
University of Toledo, MS #605
ed.duling@utoledo.edu

Ann Porter
College-Conservatory of Music
University of Cincinnati
porteram@ucmail.uc.edu

ASSESSING MUSIC TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS: ONE STATE'S APPROACH

This brief paper amplifies an accompanying Power Point presentation and details the efforts of a team of six Ohio SMTE members worked with the Ohio Department of Education in revising the guidelines for the assessment of the state's music teacher education programs in the state's non-NASM colleges and universities. The September, 2007, presentation dealt with constituencies in music teacher education, the history and changing of practices in teacher education assessment in Ohio, and the actual process undertaken in developing the new standards.

Historical Perspectives

Music teacher educators seem to serve several constituencies as they prepare preservice teachers. They must attend not only to the dynamics within their own departments, but must also develop a working relationship with their college or university's department or college of education. While the latter is frequently the body which must respond to and interpret the mandates of state departments of education, NCATE, and TEAC, the music department itself must meet the requirements of NASM. As well, both the music teacher educator and the education college must prepare students for standardized testing e.g. various Praxis tests.

In Ohio, the move from certification (Music K-12) to licensure in the late 1990s brought with it a review of all music education preparation programs in the state. The matrix for evaluating the programs called "Preparing to Teach the Arts," was created by Dr. Roberta Newcomer and a committee of OMEA members. The matrix was based on not only NASM requirements, but also upon the state's arts standards at the time, *Comprehensive Arts Education: Ohio's Model Competency-Based Program*.

Ten areas—many of them similar to current Praxis sub-domains, had to be met by course work or other experiences; evidence in terms of course descriptions, syllabi, and other documentation was appended. In order to be sure each music teacher preparation program fully answered "where and how in his/ her preservice education does the music educator develop and demonstrate . . ." ten teams of 3-4 music teacher educator and others were asked to review the information (proof) submitted by each institution. The noted carefully—and with much discussion—where under each main standard "met," "not met," or there was "no evidence" Programs could submit rejoinders to their report they were able to "identify competencies and align curriculum as they worked toward final approval.

Current Influences

Appurtenant to the recent revision was that the 1990s program review was input-based, though to transition to assessment. Spellings Commission <http://insidehighered.com/news/focus/commission> specific programs, , and math education—among others, are Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs). music education does not have a SPA as , the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) standards are recognized as fulfilling this purpose. NASM's requirements are music and music education-specific standards deal with music department requirements and specific candidate proficiencies music and music

education students. NASM standards input based (<http://tinyurl.com/26vvh7>) NCATE that report NCATE Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions and Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources (<http://tinyurl.com/ysxjir>).

Our Charge

The charge to the music teacher educators, then, was to develop Music Teacher Licensure Standards for Ohio institutions without NASM accreditation. The advisory Committee Members represented a good mix of public and private institutions and large and small music education programs; in music-speak were represented by 3 band-oriented faculty, 1 string educator, 1 choir director, and a general music specialist. The group also included one member from a school without current Music Teacher Licensure approval who was guiding his department through the process at the time—an important component of our deliberations. The members were William Bauer, Case Western Reserve University; Michael Crist, Youngstown State University; Ed Duling, University of Toledo; Joanne Erwin, Oberlin Conservatory of Music; Daniel Monek, Marietta College; Ann Porter, University of Cincinnati, College-Conservatory of Music.

We worked closely with an ODE advisor who had prepared well by identifying for us in advance the NASM or ODE Music Content Standards wouldn't be met by TEAC or NCATE Standards. These were largely music-specific. With the groundwork laid the committee worked together on language that we felt was understandable and would make the standard easy to meet. In many cases, we the NASM standard some of our work on the experiences of the non- The process involved scrutiny of the various NASM and ODE standards to that schools without NASM accreditation adequate musical opportunities and experiences for the teacher licensure candidates.

We all used laptop computers with the standards downloaded from a jump drive provided by our ODE advisor. Thus, we were all able to view the same thing at the same time and work collaboratively on the standard writing. We created a fairly concise document, finishing ahead of other subject-area groups in attendance. Because the document has not yet been approved, there exists only an edited draft at the Ohio Department of Education. Eventually, the document may be accessed via the ODE website.