

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg State University Digital Commons

Electronic Theses & Dissertations

7-2014

An exploration of Missouri elementary music educators' perceptions of their school districts' elementary music curriculum.

Megan Dawn Lamb
Pittsburg State University

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



Part of the [Music Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lamb, Megan Dawn, "An exploration of Missouri elementary music educators' perceptions of their school districts' elementary music curriculum." (2014). *Electronic Theses & Dissertations*. 132.
<https://digitalcommons.pittstate.edu/etd/132>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Pittsburg State University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@pittstate.edu.

AN EXPLORATION OF MISSOURI ELEMENTARY MUSIC
EDUCATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS'
ELEMENTARY MUSIC CURRICULUM

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate School in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Music Education

Megan Lamb

Pittsburg State University

Pittsburg, Kansas

July 2014

AN EXPLORATION OF MISSOURI ELEMENTARY MUSIC EDUCATORS'
PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS' ELEMENTARY MUSIC
CURRICULUM

Megan Lamb

APPROVED:

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Matthew G. Montague, Department of Music

Committee Member

Dr. Russell Jones, Department of Music

Committee Member

Dr. Susan Marchant, Department of Music

Committee Member

Dr. Ray Willard, Department of Teaching and Leadership

AN EXPLORATION OF MISSOURI ELEMENTARY MUSIC EDUCATORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SCHOOL DISTRICTS' ELEMENTARY MUSIC CURRICULUM

An Abstract of the Thesis by
Megan Dawn Lamb

The purpose of this study was to explore Missouri elementary music educators' perceptions of their school districts' elementary music curriculum, and to explore the elementary music educators' involvement in the development and implementation of their districts' elementary music curriculum. Elementary music educators from across the state of Missouri participated in the survey. After a link to the survey was sent to all the school districts in the state of Missouri, 169 people responded. The survey was created in SurveyMonkey. A link was then emailed to the superintendents of each school district in Missouri. The superintendents were asked to forward the link to the elementary music educator(s) within their school districts. Of the 169 participants, 77% (119) were satisfied with their school districts' elementary music curriculum, and 62% (94) of the participants were involved in the revision and implementation of their current curriculum. The survey results also indicated a possible need for more teacher collaboration. They further revealed a lack of professional development concerning the Missouri Music Grade Level Expectations. It would appear, however, that the majority of respondents were satisfied with their elementary music curriculum, and over half of them were involved in the development and implementation of their current music curriculums.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Purpose	1
Rationale	1
Research Questions	1
Procedure	3
Limitations	4
Method	4
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
Beginnings of Music Education in the United States	6
Post-Sputnik Changes (Age of Accountability).....	8
Missouri Curriculum/Education Law	12
III. METHOD	18
Selection of Participants	18
Limitation of Respondents Surveyed.....	18
Survey Design and Structure	19
Procedures for Data Collection	20
Procedures for Data Analysis and Interpretation	20
IV. FINDINGS	21
Overview	21
Section One	21
Section Two	23
Section Three	33
V. DISCUSSION	37
Process	37
Summary of Results and Discussion.....	37
Recommendations for Future Study	42
REFERENCES	44
APPENDICES	47
Appendix A – Letter to Superintendents	48
Appendix B – Reminder Letter to the Superintendents	49

APPENDICES	PAGE
Appendix C – Survey Questions	50
Appendix D	54
Appendix E	57
Appendix F	59
Appendix G	60
Appendix H	64
Appendix I	72

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE.....	PAGE
I. Level of Teaching Experience	22
II. Level of Satisfaction with District Music Curriculum	24
III. Curriculum Revisions and Sources	27
IV. Teaching Concepts.....	28
V. Please indicate how much time you spend doing the following	30
VI. Frequency of the Following Activities	32
VII. Indicate Level of Feelings	33

Chapter I

Introduction

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to explore Missouri elementary music educators' perceptions of their school districts' elementary music curriculum. Additionally, the researcher investigated the elementary music educators' involvement in the development and implementation of their districts' elementary music curriculum.

Rationale

Missouri state law stipulates that each of its school districts provide an established music curriculum. Yet a review of the literature did not produce any study exploring Missouri elementary music teachers' perceptions about the effectiveness of and satisfaction with the existing curricula. As mandated changes continue to play an important role in the development and adoption of curricula across the field of music education, this study will contribute to the increased understanding of elementary music teachers' participation in and perceptions about their districts' music curriculum. The study's findings should also be of interest to school superintendents, school administrators, and other stakeholders in music curriculum development and implementation.

Research Questions

The survey explored a range of topics relating to the participants' demographics and their districts' music curriculum. The following is a brief overview of the questions in the survey:

- Question 1: This question asked respondents for basic demographic information including, but not limited to, how long they have taught, what grade levels they teach, and the academic degree earned.
- Question 2: This question asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with a variety of statements about their districts' music curriculum. The statements include topics such as the curriculum's age appropriateness, the participant's perceived effectiveness of the curriculum, and whether or not the curriculum is taught in its entirety.
- Question 3: Respondents were asked to indicate how often they engaged in activities related to discussing curriculum and planning with other music educators and professional development in this question.
- Question 4: Participants were asked to select the grade level(s) they currently teach.
- Question 5: This question asked survey participants to specify the area of specialty of their undergraduate degree.
- Question 6: Respondents were asked to indicate the highest academic degree they have earned.
- Question 7: This question asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with a series of 21 statements. The statements pertained to their overall perceived level of satisfaction with their current elementary school

music curriculum, the curriculum's creation and revisions, the participants' involvement with those processes, what their elementary music curriculum is based upon, and how much of their elementary music curriculum is taught and why.

- Question 8: In this question, respondents were asked to indicate how much time they spend doing nine activities relating to classroom management, planning, collaborating with other educators, and other basic elements of teaching.
- Question 9: Participants were asked to indicate how often they engage in four activities regarding collaboration and professional development.
- Question 10: Respondents were asked to indicate their level of feeling for four activities, including meeting with upper level administration in their school district and teaching their elementary music curriculum.
- Question 11: In this question, participants were asked to complete two statements. One statement was about how they would change their curriculum if given the chance, and the other was a piece of advice for beginning music teachers in regards to teaching their districts' elementary music curriculum.

Procedure

Missouri superintendents of schools were sent an email describing the purpose of the study along with an active link to SurveyMonkey. The superintendents were asked to forward the email to their elementary music teacher(s) along with their own invitations that the teachers open the link in SurveyMonkey and complete the Likert-type

questionnaire. Teachers who wished to opt out of the survey were able to do so at any time while responding to the questionnaire. The results were completely anonymous.

Limitations

There are possible limitations of this study. For example, because all of the data were self-reported by the respondents, the validity of the data depends on the participants' honesty and accuracy in reporting. The researcher has no reason to believe that the participants withheld information. The study was not intended to represent a standard or identify any characteristic feature specific to all schools. It is also understood that some superintendents may have chosen not to forward the survey link to their elementary music teachers. Some elementary music teachers might have chosen not to complete the survey once they received the link. It is also possible that the researcher may have had an inaccurate email address for the school districts in the state of Missouri. Finally, it was not the researcher's purpose to generalize the study's findings to a larger population.

Method

A link to a survey instrument was emailed to each superintendent throughout the state of Missouri. In the email, the researcher solicited the superintendents' assistance by requesting that he or she forward the survey link to the elementary music educators in their school districts. . The survey was created in SurveyMonkey by the researcher. The possible responses to the questions and statements in the survey were either based on a Likert-type scale or responses participants typed into a text box. For the purposes of this study, "elementary" will encompass kindergarten through sixth grade.

It is also important to have a common definition of curriculum. One of the most common, widely accepted definitions of curriculum is “a broad sequence of music courses providing comprehensive information about music and facilitating development of music skills in order to promote musical understanding” (Labuta & Smith, 1997, p. 57). While this is a valid definition of curriculum, it is not, perhaps, the best definition regarding the Missouri music Grade Level Expectations (GLEs). The GLEs are expressed as a series of skills and outcomes students should have achieved at the end of each grade level. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, curriculum will be regarded as “what students must know as a result of schooling” (Labuta & Smith, 1997, p. 57).

Chapter II

Literature Review

Beginnings of Music Education in the United States

Music education in the United States, with its long, colorful history, continues to develop and grow to fit the needs of the times. From early colonial music practices to singing schools, early public school music education to the modern day accountability movement, music education in the United States is ever-evolving and growing. In order to put current music education practices into their proper context, it is important to understand how they have progressed over time. The following is a brief overview of that developmental process.

During the early seventeenth century, little was happening in the American colonies regarding the development of music education. The time and energy required for survival left little time for anything else. Over time, the people began to establish the colonies more firmly. As a result, people had more time for other pursuits. According to Birge (1928), one of the Music Supervisors National Conference creators (now the National Association for Music Educators), one hundred years went by from the establishment of the first colony before formalized music education began to exist (Heller, 2011). At this point, dismay with the poor state of the tone quality of congregational singing in the churches was growing. Something had to be done.

During the seventeenth century and early parts of the eighteenth century, a leader would sing the hymns a phrase at a time, and the congregation would echo it back (Birge, 1928). This practice allowed singers to stay together generally, but did nothing to improve tone production or quality of sound. Echo singing (also called lining out) the hymns was eventually phased out. Concerned with the continued unharmonious congregational singing, colonists established the first American public music education in the form of the singing school. Beginning in the 1720's and extending through the last half of the 1800's, singing schools popped up throughout the colonies (Mark, 1978). Teachers for these schools were paid for their services, often traveling from location to location and teaching in whatever kind of building was available. The duration of the schools could be a few months, or a matter of weeks (Mark, 1978).

Because opportunities for formal training were sparse, teachers in these schools educated themselves in the art of teaching (Birge, 1928). Birge (1928) further states that, even though they may not have been as professionally trained as their counterparts in Europe, they were effective leaders and had a definite interest in their field. Due to this lack of formal training, teaching singing school was not always recognized as a true profession. However, by the time the 1800s arrived and Lowell Mason became a recognized public figure, this perception changed (Birge, 1928). Unhappy with the current state of affairs, Mason sought to improve the singing schools and raise the quality of choral singing and literature in Boston. Many people supported Mason and his ideals, and it was he who first introduced music education into the public school system.

Although the early music educators were not professionally trained individuals who were formally held accountable for the content they were teaching, it is likely the

teachers of the singing schools were held to a high level of expectations (Mark, 1978).

Mark (1978) grounds this premise in the fact that the schools were only operational because the people liked them, and the only teachers able to provide for themselves were the effective ones.

In addition to improving the quality of singing in the colonies, the singing schools had several other unexpected effects on American society. Attending a singing school was a chance to see one's neighbors, visit, and catch up on one another's lives. Young people could even use these schools as an opportunity to court. In fact, it was not uncommon for families to go to a singing school every time one was available (Mark, 1978).

Post-Sputnik Changes (Age of Accountability)

Though there was not much accountability as we tend to think of it in the beginning of American music education, this changed rapidly in the last half of the twentieth century. The 1957 launch of the Soviet Union's Sputnik satellite during the Cold War had far-reaching effects on the American education system. To the surprise of the American people, the Soviet Union had successfully put the first satellite into orbit around the earth, causing a nationwide concern over the current state of the American education system.

As a direct result of Sputnik and the Cold War, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was passed in 1958. According to the New York State Education Department (NYSED), this act dealt specifically with assistance in funding the cost of attending college for future teachers, and it also allowed the federal government to help

fund foreign language, science, guidance, and math education in the public schools (NYSED, 2006).

Following a series of acts in the 1960s, including the Civil Rights Act and a chain of Title laws, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) came into existence in 1969 (NYSED, 2006). The NAEP was “federally funded to carry out periodic sample surveys of student academic achievement” (NYSED, 2006, p. 3). The law prohibited individual students, districts or states from reporting the results by delegating that responsibility to regions and the nation (NYSED, 2006).

Shortly after the formation of the federal Department of Education in 1979, the Standards and Accountability Movement began in earnest (NYSED, 2006). Spanning from the 1980s until the present, this movement began as a cry from the American people for schools to be held responsible for the content they were teaching. Concerned with what they saw as a decaying system, the people desired a more rigorous scheme of accountability for the public schools (NYSED, 2006). As a result of this concern, standardized tests and standardized content have been in a constant state of development and implementation at both the state and federal levels ever since (NYSED, 2006). Students are not the only ones assessed anymore, either. Another outgrowth of the Standards and Accountability Movement is that of measuring teacher effectiveness and growth (NYSED, 2006).

One of the most influential reports to emerge during the Standards and Accountability Movement was *A Nation at Risk: The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education* published in 1983 (NYSED, 2006). The introduction of the report states “Secretary of Education T.H. Bell created the National Commission on

Excellence in Education on August, 26, 1981, directing it to examine the quality of education in the United States and to make a report to the Nation and to him within 18 months of its first meeting” (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Using easy-to-read language, the report lays out the commission’s findings, beginning with the sentence, “Our Nation is at risk” (National Commission, 1983), and continues:

We report to the American people that while we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and the well-being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur – others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments. (National Commission, 1983)

The authors of the report continue, “We have even squandered the gains in student achievement made in the wake of the Sputnik challenge” (National Commission, 1983). Criticizing the lack of standards and pleading for reform, *A Nation at Risk* not only found problems with the nation’s test scores, it also found problems with everything from graduation rates to the amount of focus placed on academics to what was expected of the students (NYSED, 2006).

Since the 1980s, much has changed in the world of education in general. The first National Education Summit met in 1989 and approved the first National Goals for Education (NYSED, 2006). In the 1990s, there was a further desire by lawmakers and the

public to pursue national standards, and this manifested in a variety of laws and acts that have been passed since that time. President George H. W. Bush pushed for national standards in 1991 in his America 2000 Act (NYSED, 2006). Though this did not pass during Bush's presidency, it did leave behind a lasting effect in authorizing funds for "voluntary national curriculum standards" (NYSED, 2006, p. 6). The subject areas addressed in America 2000 included geography, English, history, math, and science; however, music and other fine arts were not included (Abeles, 1995). This did not sit well with the national fine arts community, and after much campaigning and hard work, the National Association for Music Education (MENC) played a large role in the arts' eventual inclusion as a core content area (Abeles, 1995 & Mark, 2007). This was a major victory in the field of music advocacy, and advocacy for the fine arts as a whole. In 1994, President Clinton added two more goals and passed the Educate America Act: Goals 2000 into law (NYSED, 2006). In the years after the passing of the act, the National Consortium of Arts Education Associations, which includes MENC (now referred to as NAFME), among various other fine arts organizations, "has formulated standards for student achievement and learning in dance, music, theater, and visual arts" (Labuta & Smith, 1997, p. 141).

Another of the most influential of the 1990 education laws was the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 (NYSED, 2006). NCLB requires schools to boost student achievement and meet a pre-determined Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) or face sanctions or possible re-staffing if AYP is not met three years in a row (Education Week, 2011). NCLB has been modified a little since its passing, and it is now possible for states to opt out if their assessment and progress measurement processes are federally approved.

With the current emphasis on content standards and standardized assessments, the state and federal levels either have created or are currently creating content standards and curriculum frameworks in a variety of academic areas. Music is no exception to this. In 1994, MENC published nine national music standards. These standards were intended as a framework from which teachers could work to create their own music curriculum.

They are as follows:

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 (MENC, 2014).

Missouri Curriculum/Education Law

The state of Missouri is not immune to the changes that have ensued since Sputnik was first launched. It has used a system for accrediting its schools since 1950 (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Sept 2004). Though the system remained in a continuing state of revision to fit the needs of the times, in 1990, the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) was created to apply a new set of classification standards (DESE, Sept 2004). Defined by the Missouri Department of

Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) as “the program through which Missouri accredits its school districts and encourages school improvement” (DESE, January 2011, p. 4), MSIP has become a driving force in the educational standards schools use to create and implement a thorough, rigorous curriculum in all content areas.

In its fifth stage since it was originally implemented, MSIP is a comprehensive program that spans a diverse range of areas from curriculum to resources, and class size, staffing, and planning time. Looking solely at the subject of music, the fifth cycle contains a policy which requires elementary students to receive at least 50 minutes of music instruction each week from a certified music educator (DESE, August 2009). It also limits the number of students a full-time music teacher can have per week to 750 (DESE, August 2009). On the curricular side of the program, MSIP requires that “the board of education adopts and district staff implement, review and revise a rigorous, guaranteed and viable curriculum for all instructional programs” (DESE, August 2009, p. 5). MSIP also provides that:

Instructional staff use effective assessment practices to monitor student learning and adjust instruction Instructional staff routinely provide effective instruction designed to meet the needs of all learners Professional development drives and supports instructional practices in the district to improve student learning. (DESE, August 2009, p. 6)

It should be noted that although state law mandates all these things, it falls to the individual school districts and educators to ensure the mandates are being carried out. Nevertheless, simply because they exist does not mean curricula will actually be revised on a consistent basis. It is also important to note that curricula are intended to be fluid

documents that change over time to reflect advances in the field and changes in what students should be learning.

Shortly after the passing of MSIP, the Missouri state government passed Senate Bill 380 – Outstanding Schools Act (OSA) in 1993 (Previous Key Legislation, 2012, ¶ 10). Correlating directly with MSIP, there are numerous sections covering a wide range of topics within OSA. The act addresses length of the school year, revenue, funding, curriculum, transportation, state aid, attendance, and so forth. Once again, narrowing in specifically on curriculum, there are three sections directly affecting the development of curriculum: Section 160.514, Section 160.518 and Section 160.526 (Senate Bill 380, 2012, ¶ 16, 17, 19).

These sections mandate that the state board of education implement academic standards that they have created for the state of the Missouri. The standards should be academically appropriate, and should allow Missouri students to pass from grade level to grade level successfully (“Missouri Revised Statutes”...Section 160.514, 2012). The act further requires that the standards be written by groups consisting of a majority of active classroom teachers who are either chosen by the Missouri state board of education or by any of the teachers’ organizations in the state (“Missouri Revised Statutes”...Section 160.514, 2012).

Additionally, the Outstanding Schools Act stipulates that once the academic standards have been written, the state board of education should create curriculum frameworks based on them that can be used by local school districts as guides for their own frameworks (“Missouri Revised Statutes” ... Section 160.514, 2012). After the frameworks have been published for one year, each district throughout the state is

required to have its own board of education approved written curriculum in every subject area (“Missouri Revised Statutes”...Section 160.514, 2012). Though the law requires each school district to have its own curriculum approved by the local school board in place, it does not specify that the school districts use the state curriculum frameworks. This distinction will be important when the reader is looking at the results of the researcher’s survey.

Assessments are also addressed by OSA, which calls for the development of “a statewide assessment system that provides maximum flexibility for local school districts determine the degree to which students in the public schools the state are proficient in the knowledge, skills, and competencies adopted by such board” (“Missouri Revised Statutes” . . . Section 160.518, 2012, ¶ 2). This allows the state to look at what has already been created by other states or specialists in the profession and to adopt those instead of creating completely new assessments or academic standards (“Missouri Revised Statutes”...Section 160.526, 2012). This is important because it helps ensure that the assessment system is grounded in current research and findings. It could also save time and lead to a more rigorous, accurate assessment system as the state can see what has worked and what has not worked in other areas of the country.

As an outgrowth of the OSA, the Missouri State Board of Education approved the Show-Me Standards (academic performance standards) on January 18, 1996 (“Show-Me Standards/Overview of Performance Standards”, 2012). For the purpose of clarity, the researcher will refer to these as the Show-Me Standards.

According to the goals stated in the Missouri academic standards, students will acquire the knowledge and skills to:

1. gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas.
2. communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom.
3. recognize and solve problems.
4. make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

(Show-Me Standards/Overview of Performance Standards,
2012, ¶ 5)

Within the area of the fine arts, there are five Show-Me Standards:

In Fine Arts, students in Missouri public schools will acquire a solid foundation which includes knowledge of

1. process and techniques for the production, exhibition or performance of one or more of the visual or performed arts
2. the principles and elements of different art forms
3. the vocabulary to explain perceptions about and evaluations of works in dance, music, theater and visual arts
4. interrelationships of visual and performing arts and the relationship of the arts to other disciplines
5. visual and performing arts in historical and cultural contexts

(Show-Me Standards/Fine Arts, 2012, ¶ 2)

These standards are not intended to comprise a curriculum. Rather, they are a starting point that can be used as school districts create their own (Show-Me Standards/Overview of Performance Standards, 2012, ¶ 4). The Show-Me Standards were never meant to take the place of an actual curriculum in any

content area. They are merely intended to help guide school districts in the creation of their own curriculum.

Students in the state of Missouri are expected to meet certain outcomes and demonstrate specific content knowledge at the end of each grade level. These expectations are organized into GLEs (Grade Level Expectations). Intended to serve as measurable learner outcomes, the GLEs are not a curriculum, (DESE, May 2007). DESE further recommends that teachers group the GLEs together into cohesive, comprehensive lessons that can be assessed instead of teaching them one at a time. The researcher was unable to find when the GLEs were first introduced, but the most recent revision that has been posted on the DESE website is from May 2007. Each grade level expectation ties directly into the Missouri state Show-Me Standards and the National Standards for music.

Chapter III

Method

Selection of Participants

Survey participants were elementary music educators throughout the state of Missouri. Using the “District Enrollment 2011” database from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) website and a school district list for the 2011-2012 school year (also from the DESE website), the researcher compiled a list of school districts and their enrollments. At the time the researcher was gathering this information, the district enrollment for 2012 was not yet posted on the DESE website. Comparing the district enrollment database and the school district list, there were 552 school districts in the state of Missouri for which the researcher could find a 2011 district enrollment. In those 552 school districts are 1,335 elementary schools. An email was sent to each school district’s superintendent, with a request that he or she forward the survey link to the elementary music educators in his or her district.

Limitation of Respondents Surveyed

Even though the survey link was sent to all the superintendents in all 552 school districts in Missouri, there is no guarantee that each superintendent forwarded it to the music educator(s) in their district. Similarly, it is unlikely that each music educator who received the survey link chose to complete the survey. Additionally, a few of the

responses to questions on the survey indicate a few members of administrative staff completed it. There appear to be only two or three non-music educators who completed the survey. As such, these responses would not have had a large impact on the results of the survey.

Survey Design and Structure

The survey, devised by the researcher, consists of a total of eleven questions. The first 10 questions elicit Likert-type scale responses. Question 11 calls for an open, written response. Questions one through six are demographic questions addressing the number of the years the participants have been teaching, level of education, grade levels taught, etc. Question seven contains 21 statements about the educator's district's elementary music curriculum and development for participants to indicate their level of agreement with. Question eight asks participants to indicate how much time they spend doing nine different aspects of teaching. These aspects include thinking about and talking to other teachers about classroom management, creating lesson plans, talking to parents, engaging in professional development, scheduling, addressing student needs, and working with district curriculum. Question nine asks participants to indicate how often they engage in four different planning/professional development opportunities, and question ten asks the participating music teachers to indicate their intensity of feelings about four different activities. The activities they were asked to respond to are meeting with building administrators and superintendents/assistant superintendents, engaging in curriculum reviews, and teaching their districts' music curriculum. Question 11 asks participants to complete two open-ended statements and invites a written response. Statement one is, "If I could make one change to my current music curriculum, it would be . . ." The second

statement reads, “If I could give a beginning teacher one piece of advice about teaching my districts’ music curriculum, it would be...”

Procedures for Data Collection

SurveyMonkey was used to collect and analyze data. The program tracks and compiles the survey results. Each survey participant remained anonymous, and the researcher was unable to tie individual answers to a specific elementary music educator, school, or district. The results were then stored on a memory stick.

Procedures for Data Analysis and Interpretation

SurveyMonkey provided several options for displaying the data, including graphs, and a table breakdown of the number/percent of responses to each possible answer in the Likert-type scale based questions. Answers to the open-ended survey questions were presented in their entirety in the order they were received. The researcher then organized the written responses into categories after careful reading and analysis of the data. All responses to the survey appear in the appendices.

Chapter IV

Findings

Overview

The survey was organized into three basic sections: demographic information, Likert-type scale responses, and written responses. One hundred and sixty-nine people participated in the survey. However, some participants did not answer every survey question. For example, the smallest number of responses to any of the questions that did not require a written response was 145. In the written response area, 124 of the 169 respondents typed an answer, making this the area with the fewest number of responses. The tables that follow display participant responses to each individual statement. Despite considerable effort in searching the DESE website and making multiple inquiries to the Missouri State Department of Education, the researcher was unable to determine the total number of elementary music educators in Missouri.

Section One

In Section One, participants responded to six basic statements about demography. Statements One through Three addressed number of years teaching, how long they have been teaching elementary music, and how long they have been working in their current district of employment. All 169 participants responded to Statements One and Three,

while 167 participants responded to Statement Two. Table 1 displays the responses for these three statements.

Table 1

Level of Teaching Experience

Statements	1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	More than 20 years	Total Responses
1. I have been teaching for:	25.44%	15.38%	18.34%	15.98%	24.85%	169
2. I have been an elementary music teacher for:	34.13%	20.36%	17.96%	11.98%	15.57%	167
3. I have worked in my current district for:	42.01%	26.04%	14.79%	10.06%	7.10%	169

Under Statement Four (“I teach the following grade levels”), respondents indicated individual grade levels, ranging from kindergarten through sixth grade. Of the 158 responses, 124 (79%) taught kindergarten, 126 (80%) taught first grade, 126 (80%) taught second grade, 123 (78%) taught third grade, 128 (81%) taught fourth grade, 109 (69%) taught fifth grade, and 68 (43%) taught sixth grade. For any participants who taught additional grade levels, another option response entitled “Other” permitted them to enter other grade levels into a text box. Fifty-four of the 158 respondents, or 34%, marked “Other”. Their responses included 7-12 grades, choirs, pre-school, band, private lessons, administration, and fine arts coordinator. A complete list of those responses is shown in Appendix D.

Under Statement Five, participants were asked to indicate their undergraduate degree area of specialty by selecting from the following prompts: Elementary Music Education, Vocal Music Education, Instrumental Music Education, and Other. Of the 145 respondents, 88 (61%) selected vocal music education, 78 (54%) selected instrumental education, and 40 (28%) selected elementary music education. Thirty-five participants, or 24%, indicated “Other” and entered their answer into a text box. It is unknown whether the 35 responses under “other” were participants who had not indicated any other responses in this statement, or if it was a mix of those who had previously marked an answer in this section and people who had not. Appendix E contains a full listing of the additional degree areas.

All respondents completed Statement Six: “My highest earned academic degree is.” Bachelor’s degrees were the highest earned degree for 75 (44%) of participants, while 89 (53%) marked Master’s degree, two (1%) marked Specialist’s degree, and three (2%) indicated Doctorate degree. Fourteen (8%) of the participants then listed additional degrees, including additional graduate hours, Kodály certification, National Board Certification, and various others. Appendix F contains a full listing of the additional degree areas.

Section Two

All responses in Section Two were based on a Likert-type scale. Question Seven asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with twenty-one statements. Their choices for level of agreement were “Strongly Disagree,” “Disagree,” “Undecided,” “Agree,” and “Strongly Agree.” Question Eight asked them to indicate how much time they devoted to nine different activities, while Question Nine asked them to respond to

how much time they spent engaging in an additional four activities. Question Ten, the last question of Section Two asked participants to indicate their level of feelings about four different activities (see Table 7).

There were varying numbers of responses to each of the questions in Section Two. Of the 169 participants, 155 responded to the statements in question seven pertaining to the teachers' level of satisfaction with their districts' current music curriculum. The lowest number of responses to these statements was 148. Tables 2, 3, and 4 list all the statements, the number of responses to each option on the scale, and the total number of responses to each statement.

Table 2

Q7 Level of Satisfaction with District Music Curriculum

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
I am satisfied with my district's music curriculum.	1.97%	13.55%	7.74%	52.26%	24.52%	155
My district's music curriculum is grade-level appropriate.	1.31%	6.54%	6.54%	55.56%	30.07%	153
My district's music curriculum covers an adequate range of concepts for each grade level.	1.94%	6.45%	4.52%	57.42%	29.68%	155
By using and following my district's music curriculum, my students' musical knowledge increases.	1.94%	5.16%	6.45%	56.77%	29.68%	155

Table 2

Q7 Level of Satisfaction with District Music Curriculum

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
My district's music curriculum includes a sufficiently wide range of musical styles.	1.30%	9.09%	11.69%	55.19%	22.73%	154
My district's music curriculum provides opportunities for students to increase their level of musical performance skills.	0.65%	4.58%	11.76%	55.56%	27.45%	153
My district's music curriculum contains opportunities to improvise/compose music and movement.	1.96%	9.80%	13.07%	58.82%	16.34%	153
I would eliminate part(s) of the current curriculum.	4.58%	32.03%	23.53%	32.03%	7.84%	153
I would add concept(s) to the current curriculum.	3.29%	13.82%	15.13%	49.34%	18.42%	152

Table 2 contains the statements pertaining to the survey participants' level of overall satisfaction with their districts' music curriculum. It would appear most of the survey completers are satisfied with their music curriculum. Between 77% and 86% of participants agreed or strongly agreed they are satisfied their current music curriculum, and believed that it was appropriate and that it covered a wide range of musical

opportunities. The two exceptions to this are the last two statements in the section: “I would eliminate part(s) of the current curriculum,” and “I would add concept(s) to the current curriculum.” Thirty-nine percent of contributors agreed or strongly agreed they would eliminate part(s) of their curriculum, while 36% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Nearly 24% of the respondents were undecided. When looking at adding concept(s) to the curriculum, the numbers were not quite so divided. Sixty-seven percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed with that statement, approximately 15% were undecided, and 16% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The next group of statements in Question Seven addressed how recently each respondent’s curriculum had been revised, level of participant involvement in that process, how personally rewarding their experience was with that process, the basis of the curriculum, and whether the participants have had any training in teaching the Missouri music GLEs. Approximately half of the contributors agreed or strongly agreed their music curriculum had been revised within the last three years, and nearly 15% of the participants were undecided. Sixty percent of the 152 people agreed or strongly agreed they were involved in the process of revising their districts’ music curriculum. Approximately 32% of respondents were undecided if their experience in the revision/implementation process of their curriculum was personally rewarding, 49% agreed or strongly agreed, and around 18% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

The other result of note in this group was the response to the statement: “I attended planning meetings or training in teaching and incorporating the Missouri music GLEs in the instruction in my classroom.” Ten percent of participants were undecided,

but 47% disagreed or strongly disagreed and 43% agreed or strongly agreed. Table 3 contains a list of all the statements and responses in this group.

Table 3

Q7 Curriculum Revisions and Sources

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
My district's music curriculum has recently undergone revisions (within the last three years).	11.04%	23.38%	14.94%	31.17%	19.48%	154
I was involved in the revision and implementation of my district's music curriculum.	13.82%	15.79%	8.55%	30.92%	30.92%	152
My experience with the revision and implementation of my district's music curriculum was personally rewarding.	5.30%	12.58%	31.79%	31.79%	18.54%	151
My district's music curriculum is based upon the Missouri music GLEs (Grade Level Expectations).	0%	4.61%	5.92%	41.45%	48.03%	152
My district's music curriculum is based upon a source other than the Missouri GLEs.	15.23%	33.77%	20.53%	21.19%	9.27%	151
I attended planning meetings or training in teaching and	16.45%	30.92%	9.87%	29.61%	13.16%	152

Table 3

Q7 Curriculum Revisions and Sources

 incorporating the
 Missouri music
 GLEs in the
 instruction in my
 classroom.

The last section of Question Seven explored whether the participants taught all parts of their music curriculum, added concepts to it, and/or omitted concepts from it. Of the responses collected, 66% agreed or strongly agreed they taught all parts of their music curriculum. Ninety-four percent of participants said they added concepts to their curriculum, while 57% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that they omitted some concepts. One of the statements in Question Seven asked respondents if they omitted concepts due to a lack of grade-level appropriateness or if they omitted them because they were not comfortable teaching them. Twenty four percent agreed or strongly agreed that they omitted concepts due to a lack of grade-level appropriateness. Only 10% agreed or strongly agreed that they omitted concepts because they were uncomfortable teaching certain concepts. These findings seem to indicate that time constraints pose the largest obstacle in omitting parts of the curriculum. Table 4 lists all of the statements and responses to Question Seven.

Table 4

Q7 Teaching Concepts

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
I teach all parts of the district's music curriculum.	1.99%	25.17%	6.62%	45.03%	21.19%	151

Table 4

Q7 Teaching Concepts

I teach the district's music curriculum and add some concepts.	0.68%	4.73%	1.35%	56.08%	37.16%	148
I teach the district's music curriculum, but I omit some concepts.	11.26%	19.87%	10.60%	50.33%	7.95%	151
I omit some concepts due to time restraints.	11.41%	17.45%	6.71%	42.95%	21.48%	149
I omit some concepts because I do not believe they are grade level appropriate.	22.67%	35.33%	17.33%	21.33%	3.33%	150
I omit some concepts because I am not comfortable with the ability I have to teach them.	33.55%	44.08%	11.84%	9.87%	0.66%	152

This section also had an option of “Other” for participants to add any additional thoughts. Of the 20 (13%) who provided a written response in this text box, three said they were currently revising their curriculum, two used the GLEs but added other elements, two specified to used curriculum different from the GLEs, two notated that their curriculum was outdated, and two said their district did not have an elementary music curriculum at all. To see a full list of all the written responses to Question Seven, refer to Appendix G.

As shown in Table 5, 151 participants indicated the amount of time they devoted to nine activities listed in Question Eight: Thinking about and talking with other teachers about classroom management, creating lesson plans, contacting parents, engaging in professional development, scheduling, addressing student needs, and working with district curriculum. All 151 gave a response for five of the activities, and 150 of the 151 people who responded to Question Eight gave a response for the remaining four. Fifty percent of participants said they spent much or a great deal of time thinking about classroom management. Fifty percent of participants also said they spent at least some time talking to other teachers about classroom management, while an additional 34% of respondents said they spent much or a great deal of time talking to other teachers. Participants also indicated how much time they spent working with their districts' curriculum. At least 38% of respondents indicated they spent some time working with their district curriculum. An additional 46% of participants said they spent much or a great deal of time working with their district curriculum. The full list of activities and the participants' responses to Question Eight can be found in Table 5.

Table 5

Q8: Please indicate how much time you spend doing the following

	A Great Deal	Much	Some	Hardly Any at All	None	Total
Thinking about your classroom management.	33.11%	27.81%	27.15%	11.26%	0.66%	151
Talking to other teachers about classroom	8.67%	24.67%	50.67%	14.67%	1.33%	150

Table 5

Q8: Please indicate how much time you spend doing the following

	A Great Deal	Much	Some	Hardly Any at All	None	Total
management.						
Creating lesson plans.	30%	42.67%	23.33%	4%	0%	150
Contacting parents.	1.99%	12.58%	54.97%	29.14%	1.32%	151
Engaging in professional development.	18%	30%	41.33%	10%	0.67%	150
Scheduling.	11.92%	15.89%	37.09%	26.49%	8.61%	151
Addressing student needs.	32.45%	43.05%	21.19%	2.65%	0.66%	151
Working with district curriculum.	13.91%	31.79%	38.41%	13.91%	1.99%	151
Making sure the elementary music curriculum aligns with the junior high/high school music programs.	15.33%	26.67%	34%	17.33%	6.67%	150

One hundred fifty participants responded to question 9, which asked respondents to indicate how often they engaged in the following activities: lesson planning, discussions about music curriculum with various individuals, and professional

development. Out of 150 participants, 148 responded to the statement about professional development. The responses can be found in Table 6.

Table 6

Q9: Frequency of the Following Activities

	Never	Hardly at All	Sometimes	Often	Very Often	Total
I meet with other music educators in my district to discuss the music curriculum.	13.33%	21.33%	36.67%	18.67%	10%	150
I meet with other music educators in my district to discuss lesson plans.	22.67%	27.33%	28%	18.67%	3.33%	150
Sometimes I meet with music educators outside my district to discuss music curriculum.	30.67%	30%	32%	7.33%	0%	150
I attend professional development activities specific to music curriculum.	8.78%	22.30%	40.54%	22.30%	6.08%	148

The last question in Section 2 asked participants to rank the intensity level of their feelings about four different activities. The first two activities listed were meeting with their building administrator and meeting the superintendent/assistant superintendent. The second two activities listed were engaging in curriculum reviews and teaching their district's music curriculum. The choices on the Likert-type scale were: Weak feelings, no feelings, and powerful feelings. One hundred forty-nine people gave a response for the first two activities, and 147 people gave a response for activities three and four. The detailed results can be found in Table 7.

Table 7

Q10: Indicate Level of Feelings

	Weak Feelings	No Feelings	Powerful Feelings	Total
Meeting with my building administrator.	13.42%	34.23%	52.35%	149
Meeting with the superintendent/assistant superintendent.	12.75%	48.99%	38.26%	149
Engaging in curriculum reviews.	16.33%	47.62%	36.05%	147
Teaching my district's music curriculum.	6.80%	26.53%	66.67%	147

Section Three

Section Three contained two open-ended statements for participants to complete. The first open statement is, "If I could make one change to my current music curriculum, it would be..." The second statement was, "If I could give a beginning teacher one piece of advice about teaching my districts' music curriculum, it would be..." One hundred

twenty people (71%) finished the first statement, and 123 people (73%) finished the second statement. According to Survey Monkey, 124 different people (73%) answered this section, and 45 people (27%) skipped it.

One hundred twenty respondents (72%) completed the first open-ended statement, “If I could make one change to my current music curriculum, it would be...” A detailed analysis of all responses began to reveal several themes. For example, 25% of the participants indicated that they needed more time. A few even listed specific musical concepts they wanted more time to teach, such as composition and improvisation. Others also expressed a desire to have more time to meet with other music educators, and to engage in professional development.

Another theme that emerged was the elementary music educator’s desire to update their school district’s curriculum. Approximately 27% of the answers fall into this broad category. It took shape in an expressed desire for new materials or books, coupled with an interest in adding other methods of teaching music to what the educators already have. These other methods include Orff and Kodály, as well as teaching instrument units, such as guitar, keyboard, and instruments in general. Respondents also expressed a desire to teach more music theory, do more with composers, and to use and incorporate more technology.

The answers also revealed a wish to simply change rather than update the curriculum. This manifested itself in several different ways. For example, some wanted to align their curriculum more with the GLEs, while others favored re-aligning their music curriculum with the National Standards. Others wanted to gear their curriculum more specifically to the grade levels they taught. One participant expressed a desire to make it

simpler for more “enjoyment of singing and song games.” Only 4% of participants stated they would not change anything about their curriculum. For a full list of responses to the first statement in Question Eleven, refer to Appendix H.

The second statement participants were asked to complete in the last section of the survey was, “If I could give a beginning teacher one piece of advice about teaching my districts’ music curriculum, it would be...” One hundred twenty-three respondents gave a piece of advice. There was a variety of answers that ranged across a broad range of topics. Several people suggested that beginning teachers remain flexible while teaching the music curriculum. Others thought beginning teachers should be creative and make the curriculum fun while, at the same time, making it their own. Several participants encouraged the teachers to follow the existing curriculum, but supplement it with other things throughout the year.

Several answers addressed planning. A common response in regards to planning was for beginning music educators to be organized, plan ahead, and always refer back to the curriculum while planning lessons. Along this line, one participant encouraged beginning teachers to always “plan with the objective in mind.” Another participant suggested that the beginning teacher should always know how he or she would assess the “concept before you start teaching the unit.” Other pieces of advice included looking for new ideas and lessons, and planning out the school year by concepts so beginning teachers would know what they were teaching at what point in the school year. Lessons could then be created with the conceptual map in mind.

Additional pieces of advice encouraged beginning teachers not to neglect classroom management while teaching their districts’ music curriculum. One participant

stated, “The most organized lesson plan won’t be much without great classroom management!” There were also numerous responses that advised beginning teachers not to be afraid to ask questions or ask for help, and to talk with other teachers – both music and regular classroom teachers. One person said, “Getting help is the answer; not asking for help is ‘shame’.” Only two respondents expressed dissatisfaction with their districts’ music curriculum and advised beginning teachers to get rid of it. One wrote, “Throw it away and get a new one.” For a full listing of all responses to the second statement in Question Eleven, refer to Appendix I.

Chapter V

Discussion

Process

The purpose of this study was to explore Missouri elementary music educators' perceptions of their school districts' elementary music curriculum. Additionally, it sought to explore the elementary music educators' involvement in the development and implementation of their districts' elementary music curriculum. A survey was created in SurveyMonkey, and then a link to it was emailed to the superintendents in the 522 Missouri school districts the researcher found on the DESE website. In turn, the superintendents were asked to forward the survey link on to their elementary music teachers.

Summary of Results and Discussion

As the researcher did not have a preconceived idea of what the survey results would show, it was thought-provoking to see the participants' perceptions of their districts' elementary music curriculum. It was also interesting to see their level of involvement in the development and implementation of their curriculum. In general, most participants seemed to be satisfied with their districts' music curriculum, though they do look for or have ideas about ways to improve it.

An analysis of the results for the first six demographic questions reveals a fairly equal representation of teachers who have taught for 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and more than 20 years. There were slightly more teachers who had only taught elementary music for 1-5 years than in the other categories, but the other categories had a mostly equal representation. Most of the music teachers had majored in vocal music education or instrumental music education rather than elementary music. The findings indicated that the distribution across the categories of years of experience teaching is as equally balanced as is possible given the way the survey was distributed. As a result, the findings are not as likely to be representative of the perceptions of only newer teachers, or of the perceptions of only teachers who have been teaching for a long time.

Fifty-two percent of respondents indicated that they were satisfied with their district's music curriculum, with almost 25% stating that they strongly agreed. Eighty-seven percent of participants thought their curriculum covered an adequate range of concepts for each grade level. Yet while most participants were satisfied with their district's music curriculum, opinion was rather evenly divided when looking at eliminating parts of their current curriculum. Approximately 36% of the participants disagreed or strongly disagreed that they would eliminate parts of their curriculum. Only about 40% said they agreed or strongly agreed, while almost 24% of the respondents were undecided about this issue. When asked why participants eliminated parts of their curriculum, most indicated it was because of time constraints, not because they felt the parts were not grade level appropriate or because they were not comfortable with their ability to teach them. Though respondents were so divided when asked about eliminating

components, 68% of them said they would add concepts to their existing curriculum.

Later in the survey, 93% of the people said that they teach their districts' curriculum, but that they add concepts. It would appear that even though they would not officially add concepts to their curriculum, most teachers do supplement it in some way throughout the school year.

About half of the participants indicated that their school district's music curriculum had not been revised in the last three years. Of that half, 15% were unsure if their curriculum had been revised within the last three years. Despite the number of responses that said their curriculum had not been revised recently or were unsure, most participants were still satisfied with their districts' music curriculum. Perhaps this is because 62% of them were involved in the revision and implementation of their districts' music curriculum. Most of those people also reported that their involvement in the curriculum revision process was personally rewarding, or were undecided. Another reason possible for the high level of satisfaction could be that although their curriculum might not have been revised during the last three years, it could have been revised during the teachers' tenure at their schools. Most participants indicated that their current music curriculum is based solely upon the Missouri GLEs. It is interesting to note that only 42% of respondents said they agreed or strongly agreed that they had attended planning meetings or training in teaching and incorporating the Missouri music GLEs in the instruction in their classrooms. This also seems to have had little impact on the overall satisfaction level.

Most participants spent much or a great deal of time looking at how much time the participants spent thinking about classroom management, creating lesson plans,

engaging in professional development, addressing student needs, and working with the district curriculum and the way it aligns from elementary through secondary school. The fact that only about half the respondents spent much time on scheduling could be because the teachers' schedule are pre-determined and they were never involved in that process. Most respondents spent some to no time contacting parents. This could be due to a variety of reasons, including lack of need on a regular basis. Often, the only necessary communication during the year between elementary music teachers and parents is at parent/teacher conferences and when sending notes and other pertinent information home during program or performance situations.

Also of interest is the finding that only around 29% of participants were able to meet often or very often with other music educators in their district to discuss their music curriculum, and only 22% met often or very often with other music educators to discuss lesson planning. In fact, only 7% are able to meet with music educators outside of their district to discuss music curriculum. Only 28% of the participants reported engaging in professional development activities specific to music curriculum often or very often. These responses seem to indicate that when it comes to providing professional development opportunities specific to music curriculum, the professional needs of some music teachers are not being met.

Most participants reported that they either had no feelings or powerful feelings when meeting with building administrators and superintendents or assistant superintendents, engaging in curriculum reviews, and teaching their districts' music curriculum. It is not conclusive whether the powerful feelings are positive or negative, as this was not addressed by the survey.

Careful analysis of the replies to the open-ended questions revealed that, although the majority of the participants are satisfied with the music curriculum in their school districts, many of them would make some changes. When asked if they could make one change to their current curriculum, 25% of the teachers answered that they needed more time to teach their students. This could indicate an area of need. However, adding more time to the music schedule would not be an easy undertaking in any school district.

The idea of supplementing the existing curriculum with other methods and classes was also frequently seen in the open-ended response section. These include incorporating Orff and Kodály methods and adding instrument instruction of some kind (guitar, keyboard, and others). This seems to indicate that the people who responded to this survey think about what they are teaching and how they can improve it. It could also be indicative of teachers who desire that their students have the best music education they can.

Most of the respondents were positive and encouraging when offering advice to beginning teachers about teaching their districts' music curriculum. There were a few who stated, "Don't follow it, it's outdated", but they only accounted for about 1.5% of the 124 people who gave an answer in this section. Many of the participants encouraged beginning teachers to be flexible, to always refer to the curriculum when planning, and not to be afraid to make it their own. This further supports the overall level of satisfaction with their music curriculum. It also lends credence to the participants' looking for ways to grow and improve their curriculum even though they are positive about it. The assumption can also be made that the respondents desire for beginning teachers to be successful in teaching their districts' music curriculum.

Recommendations for Further Study

As this was not an inclusive study, further study could be done to obtain more responses from the elementary music teachers in the state of Missouri. Having a larger number of responses could be beneficial in looking at long-term professional development and the need to revise existing music curricula. A study could also be conducted that looked at urban schools and schools in a more rural setting to see if there are any differences in the results between the two settings. Again, this could be beneficial when planning professional development and curriculum revisions. Another area for further study would be to look at how many school districts provided training for their music teachers in implementing and using the Missouri music GLEs in their classrooms, and how many music teachers had to search out those opportunities on their own. This could indicate either the need for further training, or highlight a need to publicize existing training opportunities. As so many participants did not engage in professional development or collaboration with other music teachers, a survey of their level of desire to engage in these activities could be enlightening.

Since so many of the participants indicated that they were satisfied with their music curriculum and not as many said that their curriculum had not been revised in the last three years, it would be worth investigating to determine when the curriculum had been last revised and if the teachers were involved in it then. There could be a significant number of music teachers who were involved in a curriculum revision within in the past five to ten years, or a significant number who have not been involved in a curriculum revision in a long time. Another major point of further research would be to look at what it would take to allow music teachers more time to teach music to their students and the

effect it would have on schools. Though many music teachers would like to have more face-to-face time teaching their students, there is no simple solution to facilitate this.

References

- Abeles, H. F., Hoffer, C. R., & Klotman, R. H. (1994). *Foundations of Music Education*, 2nd edition. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Birge, E. B. (1928). *History of Public School Music in the United States*. Washington D.C.: Music Educators National Conference.
- Chase, G. (1966). *America's Music: From the Pilgrims to the Present*, Revised Second Edition. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Education Week (2011). Adequate Yearly Progress. Retrieved January 3, 2014 from: <http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/adequate-yearly-progress/>.
- Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, G. N. (February 23, 2011). "Birge, Edward Bailey." *Grove Music Online*. Oxford *Music Online*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved July 3, 2014 from: <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/A2092859>.
- Labuta, J. A., & Smith, D. A. (1997). *Music Education: Historical Contexts and Perspectives*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Mark, M. (1978). *Contemporary Music Education*. New York, NY: Schirmer Books.
- Mark, M. L., & Gary, C. L. (2007). *A History of American Music Education: Third Edition*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (August 2009). *Fifth Cycle: Standards and Indicators Working Document*. Jefferson City, MO: Author.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (January 2011). *Glossary of Educational Terms*. Jefferson City, MO: Author.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (May, 2007). *Music Grade-Level Expectations*. Jefferson City, MO: Author.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (September 2004).
Missouri School Improvement Program: Standards and Indicators Manual.
Jefferson City, MO: Author.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2012). District Enrollment 2011. Retrieved October 11, 2012, from:
<http://mcds.dese.mo.gov/quickfacts/Pages/District-and-School-Information.aspx>.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2012). Previous Key Legislation. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from:
<http://dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/LegFolder/PreviousLeg.htm>.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2012). Senate Bill 380 – Outstanding Schools Act. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from:
<http://dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/LegFolder/SB380.htm>.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2012). Show-Me Standards/Overview of Performance Standards. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from: <http://dese.mo.gov/standards/process.html>.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2012). Show-Me Standards/Fine Arts. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from:
<http://dese.mo.gov/standards/finearts.html>.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2013).

<http://dese.mo.gov>.

Missouri General Assembly (August 28, 2011). Missouri Revised Statutes: Chapter 160 – Schools—General Provisions Section 160.514. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from: <http://www.moga.mo.gov/statutes/C100-199/1600000514.HTM>.

Missouri General Assembly (August 28, 2011). Missouri Revised Statutes: Chapter 160 – Schools—General Provisions Section 160.518. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from: <http://www.moga.mo.gov/statutes/C100-199/1600000518.HTM>.

Missouri General Assembly (August 28, 2011). Missouri Revised Statutes: Chapter 160 – Schools—General Provisions Section 160.526. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from: <http://www.moga.mo.gov/statutes/C100-199/1600000526.HTM>.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration (October 10, 2007). Sputnik and the Dawn of the Space Age. Retrieved September 27, 2013 from: <http://history.nasa.gov/sputnik/>.

National Association for Music Education (2014). National Standards for Music Education. Retrieved February 15, 2014 from: <http://musiced.nafme.org/resources/national-standards-for-music-education/>.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (April 1983). A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: Author.

New York State Education Department (January 24, 2006). Federal-State Education Policy Chronology 1944-2002. Retrieved February 12, 2013, from: http://www.sifepp.nysed.gov/edpolicy/altformats/ed_research_chronology.pdf.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Letter to the Superintendents

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting a study of Missouri elementary (K-6) music educators' perceptions of and experiences with their school districts' elementary music curriculum. As a result, I respectfully request your help in (1) forwarding this email message to your K-6 music teachers, and (2) encouraging them to complete the brief online research survey. The survey can easily be completed in 15 minutes, or less. It is not an evaluation of your school district. The questions address perceived effectiveness, development, and implementation of the current elementary music curriculum in each school district.

The Pittsburg State University (Pittsburg, Kansas) Office of Continuing and Graduate Studies has approved this study. Participation in the study is voluntary, and participants will be able to opt out of the survey at any time. Participants' information will remain confidential and anonymous. Refusal to participate or failure to complete the survey will have no adverse consequences.

Each volunteer participant will complete the online survey at this link: _____. The link will be active from Monday, March 25, 2013 through Friday, April 5, 2013.

I sincerely hope you will feel inclined to forward this message to the elementary music educators throughout your district. Your cooperation in this matter will also assist me in completing one of the requirements for the Master's Degree in Vocal Music Education I am pursuing at Pittsburg State University.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the researcher, Megan Hizey, at mhizey@gus.pittstate.edu, or my thesis advisor, Dr. Matthew G. Montague at montague@pittstate.edu.

Sincerely,

Megan Hizey
Graduate Student
Pittsburg State University

Appendix B

Reminder Letter to the Superintendents

Dear Colleague:

Please accept this reminder regarding my research study “An Exploration of Missouri Elementary Music Educators’ Perceptions of Their School Districts’ Elementary Music Curriculum”. I had contacted you previously and I am grateful for the response in soliciting K-6 teachers’ perceptions of and experiences with their school districts’ elementary music curriculum.

The survey will be posted on the website through survey monkey. I sincerely appreciate your help in encouraging the music teachers to complete the survey. Please accept my apologies if this is the first time you’ve seen this information, or if you’re not a superintendent of schools.

Pittsburg State University (Pittsburg, KS) has approved this study. Participation in the study is voluntary, and is strictly anonymous. Each volunteer participant will completely the online survey at this link: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/9PQLG5G>. It is currently active and will remain open through Thursday, April 11, 2013. If you feel inclined, please forward this message to the elementary music teachers in your district.

Thank you for your time and consideration. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the researcher, Megan Hizey, at mhizey@gus.pittstate.edu, or my thesis advisor, Dr. Matthew G. Montague at montague@pittstate.edu.

Sincerely,

Megan Hizey
Graduate Student
Pittsburg State University

Appendix C

Survey Questions

Background Information

1. I have been teaching for:
 - a. 1-5 years
 - b. 6-10 years
 - c. 11-15 years
 - d. 16-20 years
 - e. More than 20 years
2. I have been an elementary music teacher for:
 - a. 1-5 years
 - b. 6-10 years
 - c. 11-15 years
 - d. 16-20 years
 - e. More than 20 years
3. I have worked in my current school district for:
 - a. 1-5 years
 - b. 6-10 years
 - c. 11-15 years
 - d. 16-20 years
 - e. More than 20 years
4. I teach the following grade level(s):
 - a. Kindergarten
 - b. First grade
 - c. Second grade
 - d. Third grade
 - e. Fourth grade
 - f. Fifth grade
 - g. Sixth grade
 - h. Other _____
5. My undergraduate degree area of specialty is:
 - a. Elementary Music Education
 - b. Vocal Music Education
 - c. Instrumental Music Education
 - d. Other _____
6. My highest earned academic degree is:

- a. Bachelor's
- b. Master's
- c. Specialist
- d. Doctorate
- e. Other _____

7. As You Read the Following Statements, Please Indicate Your Level of Agreement:

Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided, Agree, Strongly Agree

1. I am satisfied with my district's music curriculum.
2. My district's music curriculum is grade-level appropriate.
3. My district's music curriculum covers an adequate range of concepts for each grade level.
4. By using and following my district's music curriculum, my students' musical knowledge increases.
5. My district's music curriculum includes a sufficiently wide range of musical styles.
6. My district's music curriculum provides ample opportunities for students to increase their level of performance and performance skills.
7. My district's music curriculum contains adequate opportunities to improvise/compose music and movement.
8. If I could, I would eliminate part(s) of the current curriculum.
9. If I could, I would add a concept(s) to the current curriculum.
10. My district's music curriculum has undergone recent (within the last three years) revisions.
11. I was involved in the revision and implementation of my district's music curriculum.
12. I found that my experience with the revision and implementation of my district's music curriculum was personally rewarding.
13. My district's music curriculum is based upon the Missouri music GLE's (Grade Level Expectations).
14. My district's music curriculum is based upon a source other than the Missouri music GLE's.
 - a. If it is not based upon the GLE's, what is your music curriculum based upon? _____
15. I attended planning meetings or training in teaching/incorporating the Missouri music GLE's in the instruction in my classroom.
16. I teach all parts of the district's music curriculum.
17. I teach the district's music curriculum and add some concepts.
18. I teach the district's music curriculum, but I omit some concepts.
19. I omit some concepts due to time constraints.

20. I omit some concepts because I do not believe they are grade level appropriate.
21. I omit some concepts because I am not comfortable with the ability I have to teach them.
22. I omit some concepts because: _____

8. As you read the following statements, please indicate how often you engage in the following activities:

Never, Hardly At All, Sometimes, Often, Very Often

1. I meet with other music educators in my district to discuss curriculum.
2. I meet with other music educators in my district to discuss planning.
3. I meet with music educators outside my district to discuss curriculum.
4. I attend professional development specifically about music curriculum.

9. As you read the following items, please indicate how much time you spend doing the following:

None, Hardly Any At All, Some, Much, A Great Deal

1. Thinking about your classroom management
2. Talking to other teachers about classroom management
3. Creating lesson plans
4. Contacting parents
5. Engaging in professional development
6. Scheduling
7. Addressing student needs
8. Working with district curriculum
9. Making sure the elementary music curriculum aligns with the junior high/high school music programs

10. Please select how strongly you feel about each of the following statements:

Weak feelings, no feelings, powerful feelings

1. Meeting with my building administrator.
2. Meeting with the superintendent/assistant superintendent.
3. Engaging in curriculum revision.
4. Teaching my district's elementary music curriculum.

11. Please respond to the following:

1. If I could make one change to my current music curriculum, it would be...

2. If I could give a beginning teacher one piece of advice about teaching my districts' music curriculum, it would be...

Appendix D

Appendix D

Q4: I teach the following grade levels: other (please specify)

1	7-8 choir
2	Grades 5-12
3	Pre-school, Adaptive
4	7-12
5	fine arts coordinator
6	7-12
7	Preschool
8	7 th & 8 th grades non-band
9	6-12
10	7-8 choir, 9-12 choir, in past and next year band
11	Volunteer Preschool, and also teach grades 7-12
12	Prek
13	pre-K
14	Sixth grade band, jr. high and h.s. bands, h.s. chorus
15	9-12 (HS choir)
16	plus 7-12 vocal/instrumental
17	7-12
18	administrator
19	MS Choir (grades 7-8_

20	Pre-school
21	7-12
22	7*12
23	7 th -12 th Grade
24	preK
25	Pre-K and 7through 12
26	Interventions in 1 st grade
27	k-8
28	7-12
29	1 st grade for 2 years
30	9-12
31	K-5 music
32	Pre-K
33	7-12 grades as well
34	private piano studio
35	K-8
36	K-5
37	Pre-School
38	Middle school, high school and college students.
39	6 th grade band and choir
40	elementary vocal music
41	7 th
42	Pre Kindergarten also

43	7 th and 8 th
44	Beginning Band
45	K-12
46	K-12
47	7-12 band 7-12 choir
48	Seventh Grade and Eighth Grade
49	K-12
50	Auditioned Choir and Beginning Band
51	pre-school –high school
52	k-12
53	Preschool
54	7-12 Choral, 5-12 Band

Appendix E

Appendix 5

Q5: My undergraduate degree area of specialty is: Other (please specify)

1	Bachelor of Music Education, K-12 vocal and instrumental
2	Elementary Education 1-8
3	certification K-12
4	Jazz Composition
5	Vocal Performance
6	vocal K-8, instrumental k-12
7	Music Performance
8	Vocal Music
9	teaching on temporary certificate this first year. Will be taking praxis test in music this summer.
10	Social Studies
11	early childhood education
12	I am dual certified
13	science
14	Christian Education
15	B.S in Elementary and Secondary Vocal and Instrumental Music
16	K-12 Vocal and instrumental music
17	Piano Emphasis
18	K-12 Vocal and Instrumental

19	B.A. Music, B.A. Spanish
20	Music Therapy
21	K-12 Certified
22	BS in Music Ed K-12, vocal and instrumental
23	K-12 Vocal Education
24	K-12 vocal/instrumental
25	Vocal Performance
26	7-9 Science and Elementary classroom
27	Composition/Music Theory and Piano Pedagogy
28	B.M. in performance-oboe
29	Bachelor of Music Education (vocal emphasis)
30	K-12 Vocal and Instrumental
31	bach of music – voice performance
32	Percussion performance
33	Elementary Education
34	Vocal and Instrumental degree
35	Bachelors in Social Work

Appendix F

Appendix 6

Q6: My highest earned academic degree is: Other (please specify)

1	Certification completed post Master's
2	additional hours in various topics
3	I have started my masters!
4	In Early Childhood Special Education
5	with certification in Gifted, 6-8 Lang. Arts
6	With a Kodaly Certification
7	ABD
8	80+ hours grad level in counseling and music
9	Kodaly Certification
10	w/ minor in library science
11	Plus 14 graduate hours
12	National Board Certification
13	plus 11 hours graduate
14	National Board Certification

Appendix G

Appendix 7

Q7: As you read the following statements, please indicate your level of agreement: Other (please specify)

1	We are in the process of revising the curriculum to match standards based grading requirements.
2	I am not in the classroom
3	Our music curriculum was written 10 years ago. Then the fine arts department chair took the curriculum and put into the GLE's So, many times it is unclear as to what we are to be teaching from. I try to teach from the GLE.
4	I am in the process of revising the curriculum again.
5	The GLEs are my guidelines for the school district. I follow those but use Lamar Robertson's American Methodology Planner that has the Kodaly concepts laid out in a nice scope and sequence format. I would also like to add that when I go to conferences, workshops, or read an article that presents a great concept to teach then I will add it in my curriculum.
6	Time constraints due cause not as much time to spend on some, but I do not omit.
7	We are using the complete Gagne curriculum with power points, doc camera, and projector. Love it.
8	My third year with my district they purchased a curriculum for another

district. I was to fill in resources, activities, etc. I was not given the time to do this. Since this time all other core content areas have been contract days to work on curriculums. Special classes have not been given this opportunity. I work on my curriculum when I can. It is not complete nor board accepted.

9 Time constraints are the music teacher's worst enemy! A 30 minute class is more like 20, because they are 5 minutes late coming in.....then there are stragglers. Then you have to stop often for distractions and disciplinary issues.

10 I feel that our K-5 music teachers do not teach the appropriate sequence for the students to learn adequately. I teach the 5th and 6th grade band students and see that there are gaps, based of my experience as a K-12 Music teacher. I have tried to suggest some things but it hasn't been implemented because of teacher's abilities.

11 I chose "Undecided" on many of the above because my school district does not seem to have a specific music curriculum mapped out for elementary music. Through the last 10 years, I have incorporated the MO Music GLEs into my lesson plans to give my students a well-rounded musical experience. However, I cannot say it is "my district's" curriculum. It is my own.

12 We have narrowed our focus to specific learning targets that are challenging but specific, and the individual teachers have freedom to choose literature and skill practice which supports the curriculum.

13 We have no updated basal series. Our district doesn't want to fund the
tools needed for the curriculum. Our new elementaries were provided no
instruments or basal series. Several teachers got together and lended the
school their instruments out of the goodness of their hearts. Sad but true.
14 I added K-4 recorder instruction 2 years ago to supplement vocal.
My school does not have a designated music curriculum. I have done my
best to create one, but as I am new to teaching in general I know that there
15 is a great deal of things I need to improve. Over the summer I am going to
revamp the whole curriculum and worked harder to align it with the
Missouri GLE's.

Certain portions of the district's curriculum may be more heavily
16 weighted. This should happen in some cases. If everything is touched
upon, but mostly the students are doing PP 1.A then revision needs to be
made.

This is my first year of teaching and the curriculum at my district is based
off Missouri GLEs; however, there was no curriculum previously set to
follow. I am currently mapping and planning units that match with the
17 GLEs, placing more emphasis on the ones I feel are most important. As I
go through the year, I try to at least touch on a few concepts that follow
the GLEs, but there might not be time to go as in depth into that concept
as I would like.

18 I am a retired music teacher that teaches at a K – 8 one day a week.
19 I wrote my district's music curriculum, but it is based in outdated

materials. (I'm using books from 1985.) I hope that I'm sufficiently caught up on what's going on that I am able to add to the book to cover the more current content.

The elementary curriculum is very outdated. It does align with current curriculum, but "added concepts" have to be used.

Appendix H

Appendix 8

Q11: Please complete the following: If I could make one change to my current music curriculum, it would be...

-
- | | |
|----|---|
| 1 | I want more time to meet with the music teachers in my district to share ideas, and I want to be allowed to attend the MMEA conference each year to gain music specific professional development and be able to share ideas with other music teachers in the state. |
| 2 | Acquire new books and then update the activities/songs. |
| 3 | combining 7 th & 8 th Grade Band into one ensemble |
| 4 | to add some more classroom instrument time in |
| 5 | pacing guide |
| 6 | Add more time, more instrument playing |
| 7 | adding Kodály methods |
| 8 | To adapt it to the limited amount of student contact time. |
| 9 | Schedule – allowing more time to teach the curriculum |
| 10 | add guitar instruction |
| 11 | to spend more time making music |
| 12 | update and Purchase new music classroom books and CDs |
| 13 | It needs to be much more appropriate, as well as aligned with both the GLEs & National Standards. The descriptions in “learning activity” need to be better worded, and grade level appropriate. |

14 More emphasis on movement and concrete ways to implement goals.
to change the k-1 curriculum. I am always trying to find new and fun kid
15 ways to learn things, but it is difficult.
More Orff based curriculum
16
No change.
17
Adaptable for the trasching style of each music teacher
18
add specific concepts and skills that are to be learned at each grade level
19
keyboard instruction
20
More added theory
21
more time with students
22
Finishing the realignment we started as a team of music educators four
23 years ago, but never had the chance to complete.
make it more interactive and updated using youtube
24
add a beginning keyboard class
25
to clean it up. Changes need to be made in order to address GLEs and
26 Common Core Expectations.
I would go more in-depth with the current curriculum, which is extremely
27 basic.
to add further concepts
28
more time for composing/creating
29
Make it more user friendly if someone after me does not have Kodály
30 training and still follow it.
have the materials to teach with!
31

32 Include more instrument-training.
33 I would add classroom guitar.
less GLEs and more time for just the enjoyment of singing and song
34 games.
35 Make it less vague.
36 More unit plans, rather than individual lessons.
37 more time
move to a more modern curriculum and to not have quite as much world
38 music topics.
39 I would not change it.
40 delete some of the GLE's
Not doing some many music programs which take away from instruction
41 time and having adequate materials to teach the concepts.
42 More opportunities for improvisation with a large group classroom setting.
43 making it grade level appropriate and realistic
Because we started using a new curriculum this year, I would make sure
that ALL of the music teachers using this curriculum have at least one
44 week of PD training from the vendor on how to use all of the material
before school starts. It is difficult to try to teach it to the students because
we are also learning it too.
45 Better alignment with the jr. high curriculum
46 more time for music
47 continuity through the grade levels

48 none
49 nothing, just more time with students
50 Just give me more time with my older students—we can do more!
51 Align it to core curriculum GLE's for each grade level so that I could help
52 teach and reinforce all concepts through music.
53 having a few less concepts and more time to really dig in deep with other
54 topics.
55 Less content in 4th grade
56 more current materials
57 To migrate it to the national standards, in conjunction with core standards.
58 better textbook lessons
59 To make it more user friendly.
60 updated and aligned with the GLEs.
61 More time with the kids.
62 to make it a bit more difficult – when we switched it over to following the
63 GLEs it seems like some concepts were taught later than I preferred
64 I would increase the recorder requirements
65 add an expectation of general knowledge about main composers
66 Omitting concepts that are unnecessary for the grade level and adding
67 concepts that would increase overall music awareness and connectivity.
68 adding time for improvising and composing
69 Add minutes to individual classtime/meetings.
70 add in more lessons on major/minor tonalities

67 More class time
68 the entire curriculum needs to be revised and updated
69 Adding a few more musical concepts.
Give us more than 30 minute classes, and have the classroom teachers
70 realize how IMPORTANT our music curriculum can be to what THEY
are teaching. All they usually need to do to get us to teach it, is to ASK us!
71 incorporating smart music into the curriculum
72 none
73 Not enough time to get everything in.
74 put improvisation at the middle school level instead of 5th Gr.
75 to eliminate the amount of concepts listed
76 more time
To have curriculum that was specifically geared to each grade level, to
77 help build knowledge for the next grade level.
to have my district adopt a comprehensive curriculum for elementary
78 music.
79 Start reading notes at a younger age.
80 Less individual data collection, more collaborative music experiences.
81 Need new text books in a basal series
82 add more world music in all grade levels.
83 update it
84 more music lessons for students
85 more time with the students/ there is not enough time to everything that I

believe needs to be done/also I would like to spend more time teaching
improvisation and creating
86 add electronic keyboard lab
87 Take out a few concepts due to time constraints.
88 Purchase Orff instruments
simplify; less theory in early primary grades, more movement/folk
89 dance/play part experiences
90 None
91 Shorten some because of time constraints
Diversify the types of activities/songs used for instruction to ensure
92 appropriate challenges.
93 Updated textbooks and cds
94 I would throw it away and start over. It is out dated & incomplete.
95 Align to Common Core as soon as those standards come out for music.
I see my students one time per week. It is very difficult to cover all of the
96 MO GLEs during that time frame..
More emphasis on activities and lessons that promote reading music,
97 playing instruments and singing and less that do not.
98 Less focus on programs
99 increase allotted time for music.
Less performance based curriculum and more interdiscipline curriculum. I
100 love teaching math, writing, reading, history and science along with music
concepts. It reinforces what the kids are learning in the classroom and it

makes music more accessible to more students.

101 more understandable and less redundant

102 to have a larger variety of Kindergarten & 1st grade materials.

103 Buy a newer version of our textbooks.

104 go back to two 25 minute periods per week

nothing yet. I have not yet completed one full year of teaching and have

not touched on a few of the GLEs for different grade levels. I feel that I'll

105 be able to pick and choose what I would omit after attempting to teach

everything.

106 Implementing more technology.

107 Update it to changes with society.

108 more solfage at an earlier age

I'm the only music teacher in the district so I make any change I think is

109 necessary.

110 I would like to have another music teacher to talk to in the district

To consider time restraints in a small school with one k-12 vocal music

111 teacher.

112 Make it more concise and readable

113 we are revising it now, so nothing

114 Better organized and thoughtful

115 to modernize it

Make it transparent. I have never been told exactly what our curriculum

116 outlines, only that I should follow the GLE's

117	N/A
118	Keep expectations reasonable due to amount of time actually spent in the music classroom.
119	Updated books and resources.
120	Increase funding

Appendix I

Appendix 9

Q11: Please complete the following: If I could give a beginning teacher one piece of advice about teaching my districts' music curriculum, it would be...

1	to seek out a mentor music teacher and meet regularly
2	Be flexible because the schedule may change; you may need to move a lesson that you are scheduled to teach in September back further in the school year.
3	be flexible with scheduling as music concerts are the first programs to be moved due to other conflicts.
4	follow the curriculum and pacing guides and it shouldn't be a problem!
5	show enthusiasm with whatever you are teaching. the kids will catch it and find the class fun and interesting.
6	Kodály Methodology, Lois Choksy
7	teach music reading –can begin with ta, ti-ti, rest in kindergarten
8	Make sure you're organized..with time constraints, have to get everything out of every single minute
9	check your curriculum often and be sure to follow it closely
10	great place to start
11	if something doesn't work, change it
12	Must be flexible
13	Use it as a source/resource, but also consider how the GLE's & National

Standards fit.

14 Know the scope and sequence for each grade by heart so you know what
to teach to which grade.

15 Be Patient!

16 Do the best you have with what you've got. It's better than nothing.

17 Be sure to use it.

18 Search out and attend professional development in the area of music.

19 think outside of the box when using curriculum for lesson planning

20 collaborate with the classroom teachers

21 start with the basic and build on them

22 find the method that works best for you

23 Plan with the objective firmly in mind and let your materials work for you,
not the other way around. (My advice to any beginning teacher about
curriculum.)

24 you may have to add some relevant videos and music from youtube that is
current and more interesting to students.

25 follow the GLE's

26 start with the basics (fundamentals) then build while always revisiting the
building blocks

27 to make sure that it aligns with GLEs and Common Core

28 Look at curriculum maps from other schools to get an idea of what to
teach when.

29 follow to the best of your ability, and supplement when necessary.

30 be consistent
Keep learning new techniques/games/songs to help keep it fresh for your
31 students and yourself.
do what you can and move on.
32 Make it your own.
33 It is very outdated. Do what you feel is necessary and correct, and don't
34 worry much about our curriculum.
don't get so lost in the curriculum that you can't enjoy the trip and letting
35 the kids enjoy the art!
What you want your high school performers to know and be able to do
36 begins in kindergarten music class.
37 Making music fun is priority number one.
38 It needs work
39 needs more time
40 Use what resources you can to make the subject enjoyable to our students.
41 Don't be afraid to try new things
Ask other music teachers to help you figure out how to use the curriculum
42 on a regular basis.
Use the curriculum as a beginning and then adapt the curriculum to their
43 teaching style.
Plan out the year in advance so you cover all the concepts. Ask other
44 music teachers for advice on how they teach them.
45 Map out the year with the main concepts you want the students to

accomplish and try to incorporate as many different skills and concepts as possible in each lesson...and don't worry about squeezing it all in!

most curriculums follow a published music education series. Follow the series and add or omit what fits with your curriculum and your particular group of students. Not everything in the book fits with what you want/need to do and your students' particular strengths.

Learn the curriculum as much as you can before school starts. Get support on classroom management from your building administrator and make sure that you have money (a budget) to supplement your curriculum. Visit other districts to see what the music teachers are doing.

Take it slow. There is a lot of material in the curriculum so don't try and do it all at once.

know when programs are and prepare your curriculum and programs to complement each other.

good luck.

fit it to your needs

learn to play a piano or guitar, be ready to have administrators ask you to teach other subjects besides music during the day

Don't get overwhelmed, take it as you go, worth it in the end to keep going through it.

Become familiar with the curriculum. If it needs changing, do it!

really work with the Gameplan curriculum and try not to get off date.

It's a solid guide, use it.

57 get comfortable with it..make it yours...you don't have to do it the same
way the person before you did.

58 Be mindful of your end of the year goals and what you want students to be
capable of when they move on to other buildings and schools.

59 don't be afraid to try things, get ideas from other teachers

60 Look at the state Music GLE's because it's the exact same.

61 throw it away and get a new one.

62 The most organized lesson plan won't be much without great classroom
management! Also, plan ahead. Map out what concepts you want to teach
with each grade level before the school year starts. Think about what
assessments you are going to do with each concept before you start
teaching the unit.

63 to keep up with it and realize that you have to move quickly to be able to
fit in any extras that you feel are important and allow time for
performance preparation

64 The curriculum is based on the GLE for music

65 Look first at our Standards for each grade, create a chart of in which
quarter you will teach each grade each Element, and then find ways to
teach it, whether from our textbook series or supplemental resources.

66 Do not try to do everything the curriculum says at once. Break it down to
basics and what they really need to know and then build on it.

67 observe observe observe other teachers as much as can!!!

68 Be prepared – keep the lesson moving.

69 follow it. It will help you greatly the first year!

70 Plan and stay organized.

71 use the curriculum as a guide, but do not be afraid to think outside the box
and try something new.

72 Classroom management will be more useful than any curriculum.

73 Always make your students feel he/she/they are the most IMPORTANT
thing in the world to you. Take time for them. Open your door to them.
LISTEN to their ideas, even if they see “weak”. Be student-oriented.
Don’t be afraid to talk with the other music teachers, we are all in this
74 together.

75 take advantage of teachable moments

76 organization, make music enjoyable for kids!

77 think outside the box – cross curriculum instruction is the wave of the
future – use music to help teach academics

78 to chose the GLE’s that are most important and teach those first. That
way, the GLE’s you don’t get to by the end of the year are of lesser
importance.

79 be flexible

80 To be sure to take piano lessons, ask for more elementary music ed.
classes to be offered to help prepare you. If teaching elementary music be
sure to go to workshops over the summer to learn new things to bring back
to the classroom.

81 to use the MO Music GLEs as a guide as you provide students with

multiple hands-on learning experiences through music.

Do not try to bite off more than you can chew. It may take two or three

82 lessons for them to really grasp the concepts of what you are trying to get
them to learn.

83 Ask for help in implementation of the Kodaly learning sequence.

Ask for text books if the school's are dated or in need of repair. Ask for

84 instruments needed to follow the curriculum. Get a copy of the curriculum
because the administrators have no clue what is in it.

85 plan ahead and stay focused.

86 Make a timeline

87 more creative

Complete all three levels of the Kodaly methodology and solfege. It was

88 the best training and preparation for teaching music and will help you
understand how to teach music from Kindergarten on up!

89 make it fun and you will be ok

Don't try to do it all. Ask for help in putting together a program. Seek out

90 classes that have great discipline and talk with that teacher.

91 Implement all the supplemental sources available.

engage students in singing, movement, and instrument playing, and leave

92 theory to mid-upper elementary

Concentrate on a few important concepts and keep coming to those, and

93 fit in the others as much as you have time to do.

94 talk with the other music teachers in the district.

95 Be ready to change things on the go in order to keep interest and challenge
appropriate elevated.

96 Don't be afraid to add omit depending on your strengths and knowledge as
well as your students learning styles

97 good luck!

98 Know the music you're teaching backwards and forwards and know/seek
how to manage classes.

99 I would advise the new teacher to not become overwhelmed with every
specific concept. Many concepts can be combined with others.

100 Use your time in class wisely so that you can emphasize the most
important things for future enjoyment of and skill in music.

101 Gear students to be literate for beginning band

102 Focus in on what you are most comfortable and work toward adding
things that are not in your comfort zone.

103 Do what you can to the best of your ability but never stress that you can't
teach it all. No one can!

104 get more training in ele. music education. There is not enough taught in
the undergraduate setting to give you a good set of skills to teach
elementary music ed.

105 to secure supplementary materials and have them ready.

106 Don't use the textbooks all of the time.

107 have fun, be inspiring, and make beautiful music as you instill good
musicianship in students

108 Focus on what you want your students to know by the time they are in the
next grade.

109 Use the available resources, but continue to add supplements

110 Be creative and make it fun.

111 implement as many policies and procedures as you can

112 Follow the National Standards for Music Education while reaching for the
higher level thinking in Bloom's Taxonomy

113 Follow it and make it your own.

114 Take accurate notes and document when concepts are introduced,
reinforced and mastered.

115 All elements of music are important, but, teaching children to read music
is most important.

116 it is only a guideline to what is to be taught, make it your own!

117 Don't follow it, it's outdated

118 remember that it keeps changing

119 Veni, vidi, abii

120 Make sure that all concepts for each grade level lead into the next grade
level.

121 Keep notes when you come up with additional ideas and activities.

122 It is o.k. to find other resources, to ask questions from other teachers and
other music educators. Getting help is the answer, not asking for help is
"shame".

123 Be flexible
