
Investigating “Understanding by Design” in the National Music Education Standards: Perspectives and Practices of Music Teacher Educators

By

Daniel C. Johnson
University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Amber Dahlén Peterson
Southwestern College

Amy Spears
Nebraska Wesleyan University

Johnathan Vest
Centennial High School

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine familiarity with and usage of “Understanding by Design” (UbD) among music teacher educators. UbD (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) provides a curricular approach for the revised National Standards for Music Education as part of the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards. Accordingly, the co-authors collected quantitative and qualitative data to examine how music teacher educators conceptualized and implemented UbD. Initially, 300 members of the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) served as participants and responded to an online survey. Responses indicated a low level of understanding UbD, some frustration with communication about the revised standards, and an interest in creating a UbD resource network for music educators. As a follow-up, 13 participants who had experience using aspects of UbD in their teaching volunteered for semi-structured interviews. From those data, four themes emerged: curricular modeling, awareness and advocacy, teacher mindset, and pedagogical disadvantages of UbD. Implications include responsive professional development to explain and promote UbD in terms of its role in the revised standards. Additionally, music teacher educators may find a repository of sample UbD-formatted lesson plans useful in understanding and using the revised national standards.

Keywords: national standards, music teacher education, curriculum development, understanding by design

Introduction

In 2014, the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) revealed updated national music education standards based on “Understanding by Design” (UbD), a curricular framework developed by Wiggins and McTighe (2005). In this revision, NAfME leaders targeted essential questions and enduring understandings – two key concepts of the UbD curricular framework. At the national level, this set of standards functioned to provide ideals with broad applications and few practical specifics. As an extension of these ideas, NAfME provided Model Cornerstone Assessments to guide teachers with more practical means to address and assess these standards. Therefore, these educational standards offered both a measure of quality and a model for their achievement.

Research on the national standards has been a priority in the field of music education for some time (Yarbrough, 1996). The 2014 revised standards provide an opportunity for music teacher educators to examine their own understanding of UbD as an underlying approach to the standards revision. By reconsidering key, underlying assumptions of teaching and learning, music education scholars can re-examine the value of artistic processes in music education as a vehicle for promoting student understanding and achievement.

Literature Review

In 1994, the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), now known as the National Association for Music Education (NAfME), introduced the National Standards for Music Education. In doing so, MENC officials responded to the “Goals 2000: Educate America Act” passed by Congress in 1994. This legislation included the arts among the disciplines in which students should demonstrate competency. MENC leaders aspired to have music and the arts included as part of the core curriculum in every school (Consortium of National Arts Education

Associations, 1994). These nine national standards provided a way to unite American music teachers' curricular efforts (Fallis, 1994). Although some thought music teaching might become less personalized and responsive to students' needs (Schmidt, 1996), Lehman (1997) countered that "the standards are helpful because schools can be more effective if they have a clear vision of what they seek to achieve than if they don't" (p. 57). As listed below, these nine content areas, which teachers commonly referred to as the standards, served as the basis for most state-level voluntary music standards across the nation.

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.

(Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994)

Fonder and Eckrich (1999) reported the National Standards for Music Education improved music teacher preparation at the university level in several areas (e.g., improvisation, composition, and world music). They also found that practical K-12 application of the standards was inconsistent. Louk (2002) reported similar findings among general music teachers with regard to their imbalanced attention to content standards. Implementation of the standards,

therefore, was and remains a concern for music educators. By 2004, Reimer believed the profession had given adequate time to standards one and two, but that progress in the other seven standards was lacking. Likewise, Abrahams (2000) recommended that courses of study in music education “be refocused or rebalanced so that they emphasize process and thinking skills,” instead of simply citing which national standard matches with learning outcomes in course syllabi (p. 30).

After the introduction of the 1994 national music education standards, several researchers investigated how well music teacher educators, as well as pre-service and in-service music educators, understood and implemented these standards. For example, Byo (1999) found that general music specialists felt responsible for, and quite comfortable, teaching all nine national standards. They also reported that a lack of instructional time limited their ability to address the standards. In another study indicating a lack of standards awareness, Bell (2003) found that over one-fifth of teachers surveyed had no previous knowledge of national music education standards, despite having undergraduate degrees in music education, as well as several years of teaching experience. In addition, 90% of music teachers indicated they learned about the standards as part of their curriculum in methods courses, and the same number expected that pre-service music educators should be prepared to teach the standards. In contrast, McCaskill (1998) reported that 98% of general music professors were aware of the national standards.

To adopt a process-oriented approach to the standards, including enduring understandings and essential questions (NAfME, 2016), NAfME cooperated with the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards to introduce the National Core Arts Standards (NCAS) in 2014. While the nine National Standards of 1994 are descriptive statements, indicating what types of musical and cognitive activities should be taking place in the music classroom, the NCAS are much more

dense, detailed, and specific. They outline artistic processes common across all art forms, as listed below:

- Creating
- Performing / Presenting / Producing
- Responding
- Connecting

(State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education, 2016)

The value of using curriculum models when creating national standards, such as UbD for the NCAS, is that they assist curriculum developers in identifying questions that should be addressed from multiple perspectives (Cho & Allen, 2005). The concepts of “essential questions,” “enduring understandings,” and “backward design” are central to the curricular model of UbD. Essential questions are core ideas and inquiries within the discipline that are perpetually arguable, and help students make sense of important ideas (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). Enduring understandings focus on big ideas that are abstract and transferable, but need to be “uncovered” because they are not immediately obvious.

The backward design approach to curriculum consists of three stages: identifying the desired results, determining acceptable evidence, and finally, planning learning experiences and instruction. As a result of many of the accountability measures included in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, backward design curriculum theory has gained a foothold in schools across the country (McTighe & Thomas, 2003). Many educators know the term “backward design,” but how well it is understood (and subsequently implemented) is another matter. Herczog (2005) tracked social studies teachers as they were guided through a nine-month experience using UbD to develop instructional units, implement these units in the classroom, and reflect upon the

process throughout the school year. She discovered, among other things, that the participants' self-reported understandings about backward design were not always reflected in their application of UbD as an instructional approach or their use of assessments. In other studies, however, UbD has been effective in the classroom. In a study comparing curricular practices, teachers who developed lesson plans using the UbD model outperformed teachers who used a traditional model of curriculum design (Kelting-Gibson, 2005).

After the initial focus on content and behavioral music-specific competencies, the National Standards for Music Education have developed into more overarching and inclusive artistic processes. Aligned with twenty-first century skills and the other art forms, the current National Standards for Music Education are based on UbD principles and thereby offer teachers and teacher educators a curricular framework for instructional design. At this point, however, music teachers' familiarity and use of this underlying curricular approach is unknown. Therefore, the co-authors investigated music teacher educators' understanding and use of UbD. Although UbD may not be the only curricular approach to implementing the new national standards into music teacher education curricula, it seems most appropriate, as it is the framework on which the 2014 standards are based.

The two-fold purpose of this study was to determine: (1) how familiar music teacher educators were with UbD, and (2) how and to what extent they incorporated UbD into their teaching. Accordingly, the co-authors asked two overarching research questions for this study: to what extent do music teacher educators (1) understand UbD, and (2) incorporate UbD in their teaching?

Methodology

The co-authors used complementary, mixed measures which provided qualitative and quantitative data from respondents in order to consider more diverse information and generate more inclusive findings (Johnson & Christensen, 2014; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). Prior to collecting data, the co-authors received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for this study and received informed consent forms from all participants. Using a quantitative model, co-authors first devised and delivered an online survey to NAFME members identified as music teacher educators. The co-authors developed the survey as part of an Area for Strategic Planning and Action (ASPA) at the 2013 Symposium on Music Teacher Education (SMTE). They established face and content validity for the survey in consultation with published experts in the field as external reviewers. (See Appendix A for survey questions.) At the request of the co-authors and the members of the Society for Music Teacher Education, NAFME sent an electronic invitation to 6,640 self-identified music teacher educators to participate in this research study. After the initial invitation and one follow-up reminder, the co-authors collected 300 responses, yielding a response rate of 4.5%.

Upon reviewing the preliminary findings of the survey data, the co-authors developed follow-up interview questions to collect qualitative data from respondents who self-identified in a survey question as having experience using aspects of UbD in their teaching. With these respondents, the co-authors conducted, recorded and transcribed semi-structured interviews. The co-authors also established content validity for the interview protocol by basing their questions on the initial survey data they collected. (See Appendix B for interview questions.)

Participants

Demographically, 193 participants (64%) represented public institutions, while 107 participants (36%) represented private institutions. Of the 300 respondents, 233 of the corresponding institutions offered bachelor's degrees in music education, while 67 institutions provided Master's degrees, 71 institutions offered Doctoral degrees, and 64 institutions had licensure-only programs. Larger institutions (having 10,000 or more students) corresponded to 40% of the respondents ($n = 121$), while 24% of respondents ($n = 71$) represented slightly smaller schools (with 3,000 to 9,999 students). An approximately equal number of respondents ($n = 73$) represented smaller schools (with 1,000 to 2,999 students), and 12% of respondents ($n = 35$) represented schools (with fewer than 1,000 students).

As a follow-up, 13 respondents who self-identified as having background knowledge and interest in UbD, volunteered to provide additional information. The co-authors collected this information through telephone or Internet conference interviews. In the semi-structured interviews, respondents expanded on their written responses discussing why, how, and to what extent they used UbD in their classrooms. The volunteer respondents also reflected on aspects of the model itself and contextualized their answers in terms of their music teaching setting.

Data Analysis

Survey respondents provided quantitative and demographic data along with descriptions of current teaching practices and related comments, indicating their familiarity with UbD. The co-authors used a simple frequency analysis of these Likert-scale data. Follow-up, semi-structured interviews yielded qualitative data. For these, the co-authors independently analyzed transcriptions of each interview using open coding and compared the resulting in-vivo codes (Charmaz, 2006). Subsequently, they compared their analyses, which involved discussing

different views of the data, adjusting coding as necessary, and agreeing on emergent themes (Creswell, 2008). They also used member checks for internal validity and memoing to further develop the themes that had emerged. To further investigate participant responses, the co-authors continued to review the data repeatedly, using related literature to support their findings (Maxwell, 2013).

Results

Quantitative Data

In addition to the demographic data collected, participants provided responses about their understanding and use of UbD. Seventy-five respondents (25%) agreed that their music education faculty worked to address the UbD model in their undergraduate teacher education program, while 177 respondents (59%) disagreed and 48 (16%) gave no response. Additional information provided by respondents who answered affirmatively illustrated how they used UbD in their curriculum. Most responses cited methods and other undergraduate courses, while other indicated lesson planning and curriculum development. For a more detailed display of these results, see Table 1. In addition, three respondents commented that they were unsure about planning to use UbD in their classes because it has a “steep learning curve.” Nineteen respondents (6%) knew at least one in-service music teacher who was already using the UbD model in their classes and would be willing to ask them to share UbD lesson plans. Thirty-four respondents (11%) answered negatively to this question, and 247 participants (82%) did not respond.

Table 1. Current Use of UbD.

“Please expound on how you now use UbD How do you now use UbD?”	
Response	<i>n</i>
In methods courses	24
In other undergraduate courses	32

Incorporated in lesson planning	13
In curriculum development, mapping, or design	5
As unit planning	5
For edTPA experience	2
In course design	1

When asked to rate their own understanding of UbD, the most frequent responses were “Not at all” (27%) followed by “Somewhat” (21%). For a complete listing of these results, see Table 2. The co-authors asked if the music teacher educators who largely understood UbD also used it in their curricula. Thirty-three respondents (11%) indicated they did and would be willing to lend their expertise and help in disseminating information about UbD to other music educators. Twenty-two respondents (7%) answered negatively to this question, and 245 participants (82%) did not respond.

Table 2. Personal Understanding of UbD.

“How well do you understand UbD?”						
	<u>No</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>A Little bit</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Quite a bit</u>	<u>Fully</u>
	<u>Response</u>					
<i>n</i>	48	80	42	62	49	19
Percentage	16%	27%	14%	21%	16%	6%

When asked to identify and describe the framework used in their undergraduate teacher education program, responses varied. The largest percentage, 19% ($n = 16$) answered that they did not know or did not understand the question. Others answered spanned a range of responses, including: music education methods courses ($n = 7$); Charlotte Danielson ($n = 6$); accrediting body, including NASM and NCATE ($n = 5$); edTPA ($n = 4$); National Standards ($n = 4$); state guidelines ($n = 4$); Kodály ($n = 3$); constructivism ($n = 2$); UbD ($n = 2$); or other ($n = 18$). Forty-two participants (14%) who did not currently use UbD in their undergraduate curriculum indicated that they planned to adopt it in the future. Eighty-nine participants (30%), however, indicated they were not planning to adopt UbD and 169 participants (56%) did not respond to

this question.

The final, open-ended survey question solicited ideas about a network of teachers using UbD or additional comments about the UbD model. Fifty-seven respondents provided answers that included three recurring ideas: confusion about the term “framework,” frustration with official NAFME communication about the revised standards, and an interest in creating a support network for using UbD in music education. Other ideas clustered into three categories: teachers’ familiarity with UbD or lack thereof, concerns about UbD as a framework for the new national music standards, and current use of UbD within their classrooms. Fifteen respondents indicated they were unfamiliar with UbD. Others suggested creating a repository for sample lesson plans, having NAFME offer UbD-based professional development, and consulting with a curriculum specialist outside music to, “give feedback on assessment and student experience.” Twenty respondents indicated they already used UbD to some degree, for example incorporating backward design. One respondent explained that, “The fact that this [UbD] is published and being adopted by NAFME is validation for my teaching. Most of my former students realize that this is a very effective way of getting ensemble members to function as independent musicians.” Of note were seven respondents in this category who indicated they had been using backward design, but did not think of it as a UbD model. One respondent wrote, “It seems to me we are now defining or adding terminology to different approaches we, as music educators, have been already doing for years.” Finally, eleven respondents expressed concerns about the UbD model, suggesting that the, “traditional, tested, and successful methods of teaching music in the schools” should not be ignored. Other concerns were the restrictive time allotment of 30 minutes per music class in some schools and maintaining the “integrity of the music learning sequence.”

Qualitative Data

Four themes emerged from the qualitative data collected during follow-up interviews: curricular modeling and repackaging, awareness and advocacy, teacher mindset, and pedagogical disadvantages. Explanations about each, as well as example quotations from the data, follow.

Curricular modeling and repackaging.

The first theme addressed participants' responses about UbD as a curricular model for music education. They largely focused on essential questions and/or backwards design with regard to the lesson planning process while relating the UbD model to active music making. Participants reported using these specific UbD principles regularly, although without the specific vocabulary of Wiggins and McTighe (2005). In addition, they noted that they did not initially begin to use certain aspects of UbD in their pedagogical practice. As they learned more about UbD, they realized that they were already incorporating many of those strategies into their teaching. In that sense, their use of UbD was repackaged; though they may have used many of the aspects of UbD, they did not use the term "Understanding by Design" nor did they necessarily conceptualize it in that way. Participants also discussed how the UbD model worked well as a framework when paired with other systems such as the Danielson (Danielson, 2013), the Tomlinson (Tomlinson, 2014), or the Comprehensive Musicianship (Mark & Madura, 2013) models. They reported that UbD enhanced their use of these other models when planning lessons or designing curricula.

Awareness and advocacy.

Generally, participants indicated an overall lack of UbD awareness. They reported that most of the K-12 teachers in their areas had little to no knowledge of what the UbD framework was. They also noted that the UbD model seemed more interesting to general music teachers than

to ensemble directors. The ways K-12 teachers learned about UbD, if at all, were through workshops, seminars, and other professional development within their districts. They also noted that K-12 music teachers were more familiar with other models that had similar characteristics such as the Danielson model, although her approach is a framework for teacher evaluation. On that same note, music teacher educators suggested that NAFME should provide multiple methods of professional development on how UbD works and how it can help teachers in planning their lessons and districts in reshaping their music curriculum.

Teacher mindset.

Teacher mindset emerged as another theme, making reference to shifts in responsibility and instructional sequence. For both practicing and pre-service music teachers, participants noted that adopting UbD “forces teachers to consider how and what they are teaching,” and it “helps [teachers] and their students see music as a subject instead of a pedagogy.” Additionally, music teacher educators found that pre-service teachers were taking ownership of their own learning when they followed the UbD model.

Participants perceived these shifts in mindset as advantages. Specifically, the most advantageous aspects related to UbD that participants cited were: essential questions, backward design, understanding through performance, spiral curriculum, and logical and relevant thought. More broadly, they reported that conceptual learning followed experiences that the students had, and that students were contextualizing their learning through those experiences. Furthermore, they indicated that students gathered a praxial understanding of musical knowledge when teachers utilized UbD as a model for designing lessons.

Pedagogical disadvantages.

In addition to the above opportunities and advantages, some participants reported certain pedagogical disadvantages. Some expressed concerns with a one-size-fits-all curricular model, without room for flexibility. Similarly, other participants indicated that UbD was too confusing or too restrictive for music teachers. Although some participants noted the compatibility of UbD with other models, one respondent expressed a concern that experienced teachers must “unlearn” the lesson planning process to use UbD.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was two-fold: to determine (1) how familiar music teacher educators were with UbD, and (2) how and to what extent they incorporated UbD into their teaching. The co-authors collected quantitative and qualitative data: initially, NAFME members identified as music teacher educators responded to an online survey; as a follow-up, self-selected participants provided qualitative data during semi-structured, follow-up interviews. The quantitative and qualitative data included demographic information, Likert-scale ratings, and open-ended comments. Using quantitative results as a basis, qualitative data yielded reflections from self-selected participants in the form of more in-depth insights and more comprehensive conclusions (Johnson & Christensen, 2014).

The NAFME members who chose to respond to the initial survey demonstrated a range of familiarity with UbD and shared a variety of views on this topic. One limitation of the resulting findings was the reliance on self-reported data and ratings. While participants did not necessarily have reasons to report inaccurate data, a more rigorous approach might include more objective observations and document analyses. In addition, some participants’ confusion about terminology used during data collection might have altered some findings. In future endeavors of

this type, researchers might begin by clearly defining terms. An additional limitation was the relatively low response rate. Furthermore, self-selected participants did not necessarily represent the larger music teacher educator profession.

The quantitative survey data indicated that: 1) participants had a low level of understanding of UbD; 2) there was little to no consensus on the definition of the term “framework”; and 3) participants indicated both frustration about official communication related to the revised standards framework, and an interest in creating a UbD resource network for music educators. Responses revealed that a majority of respondents (41%) had little or no knowledge of UbD, and even more (75%) were unaware of plans to incorporate the UbD model in their undergraduate music teacher-education curriculum. More specifically, 42 responded indicated they were not planning to use UbD and referenced concerns about how this curricular framework coordinated with the new national standards. Other participants showed concern about the model itself and were reluctant to use the revised standards. Comments from some participants indicated that they were already utilizing certain aspects of UbD to some degree, either knowingly or unknowingly. Because some respondents said that taking this survey had given them some insights about the revised standards, these and other teachers may benefit by being more informed about UbD itself. A greater understanding of UbD could allow them to use that terminology to re-conceptualize and, if necessary, justify their current pedagogical processes. This finding is inconsistent with results reported by Louk (2002) who found no significant difference in attitudes or practices of general music teachers by level of familiarity with their content standards. Perhaps a greater comprehension of the UbD approach could provide a sufficiently larger context for the participants, allowing them to realize insights beyond the scope of content standards in Louk’s study.

In the semi-structured interviews, although the participants mentioned some perceived disadvantages, they talked overwhelmingly about the advantages of using UbD. They discussed how their students seemed to be learning the content more deeply and were more engaged in their learning. The perceived disadvantages seemed to indicate that they thought that the UbD model was too rigid or did not allow for flexibility. These observations are consistent with Florian and Zimmerman's (2015) findings that the use of UbD "provided opportunities for students to develop the skills in knowledge intensity that they will need to compete globally" (p. 120).

Comparing these thoughts from the interviews to the comments of the survey participants provides an insight about increasing acceptance through familiarity. Although the participants who had been using UbD and understood it more deeply had concerns, they did not seem to as wholeheartedly dismiss it as the survey participants who did not understand it and did not see the need to adopt it as the framework for the revised national music education standards. This comparison suggests that as people learn more about UbD and its design, they may come to understand and perceive its benefits when employed as the curricular framework for the updated NAfME national standards. These benefits are consistent with Kelting-Gibson's (2005) findings that pre-service teachers who used UbD-modeled lesson plans outperformed teachers who used more traditional curricular design models. Conversely, considering the perspective of participants who did not see the need to learn about UbD or incorporate it into their curricula, the value of UbD and perhaps the revised national standards could come into question. Although the co-authors did not investigate this view in the current study, it represents another avenue for critically examining curriculum.

Making other comparisons of the quantitative and qualitative data collected during this study, the co-authors observed that there were varied mindsets about UbD, participants' attitudes toward it, and how professional development should be approached to further familiarize more music teachers and music teacher educators with it. There was also a common thread in the two types of data: many of the characteristics utilized in the UbD framework were also used in other more familiar curricular models. Perhaps UbD professional development should begin by comparing UbD with more established models and then illustrating how it differs. This method may also effectively show how the revised national standards could be even more compatible with models teachers already use in their classrooms. As the quantitative data indicated, teachers who knew little about the UbD model were the most hesitant to change, and not all of them noted models they were already using. Highlighting similarities between UbD and curricular frameworks currently used may address teachers' concerns about UbD and ease their transition to the revised standards (Kelting-Gibson, 2005).

Implications

To guide pre-service teachers in using the new standards effectively, music teacher educators need to be familiar with UbD and how to implement it into the music classroom. Similarly, practicing teachers need to understand and implement these principles in their curriculum design to apply the new national music standards effectively. Therefore, implications for suggested praxis include multiple and varied methods of professional development regarding UbD and its role using in the revised standards. In addition, a repository for sample UbD-formatted lesson plans collected in an online database for in-service and pre-service music teachers could promote the revised national standards. In such a resource, teachers may benefit from clearly articulated definitions for terms such as "framework" and "standards" to clarify

confusion that many participants reported. Another recommendation is to promote professional development for UbD in terms of extending these areas where teachers are already using aspects of UbD.

Prior to responding to the quantitative survey, some participants were already using aspects of UbD in their teaching because they simply considered them to be good teaching practices. This observation applied to both participants who already understood UbD and those who learned to connect “Understanding by Design” with its instructional tenets while taking the survey. Following the announcement of the revised National Standards for Music Education in 2014, there were multiple opportunities for further research of this kind. Subsequent studies could chronicle the adoption of the revised national standards via feedback from both music teachers and music teacher educators.

Because instruction about the 1994 National Standards for Music Education improved music education majors’ attitudes about those standards (Froseth, 1996), the co-authors expect that music teacher educators would show a similar improvement in attitude following increased familiarity with and use of the revised national music education standards. It may take some time, however, for music teacher educators as well as in-service music educators, to fully invest in the National Core Arts Standards. As Abrahams (2000) wrote, “The process of changing the standards may appear easy when compared with the task of changing a teacher’s practices and a community’s perceptions” (p. 28).

References

- Abrahams, F. (2000). National standards for music education and college preservice music teacher education: A new balance. *Arts Education Policy Review, 102*(1) 27-31.
- Bell, C. L. (2003). Beginning the dialogue: Teachers respond to the national standards in music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 156*, 31-42.
- Byo, S. (1999). Classroom teachers' and music specialists' perceived ability to implement the national standards for music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*(2), 111-123.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cho, J. & Allen, T. (2005). Backward curriculum design and assessment: What goes around comes around, or haven't we seen this before? *Taboo, 9*(2), 105-121.
- Consortium of National Arts Education Associations (1994). *National standards for arts education: What every young American should know and be able to do in the arts*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (3rd Edition)*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Danielson, C. (2013). The framework for teaching: Evaluation instrument. Retrieved from <http://www.loccsd.ca/~div15/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/2013-framework-for-teaching-evaluation-instrument.pdf>
- Fallis, T. (1994). National standards: What's next? *Music Educators Journal, 81*(3), 26-47.
- Florian, T., & Zimmerman, J. (2015). Understanding by design, moodle and blended learning: A secondary school case study. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 11*(1), 120-128.
- Fonder, M., & Eckrich, D.W. (1999). A survey on the impact of the voluntary national standards on American college and university music teacher education curricula. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 140*, 28-40.
- Froseth, J. O. (1996). The standards: Surveys of undergraduate and graduate values. *Aiming for excellence: The impact of the standards movement on music education, 45-60*.
- Herczog, M. (2005). Standards-based practices: Challenges and triumphs for professional development. *Social Studies Review, 44*(2), 33-40.

- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches* (4th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kelting-Gibson, L. (2005). Comparison of curriculum development practices. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(1), 26-36.
- Lehman, P. R. (1997). Who benefits from the national standards? A response to Catherine Schmidt's "Who benefits? Music education and the national standards". *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 5(1), 55-57.
- Louk, D. P. (2002). National standards for music education: General music teachers' attitudes and practices [Abstract]. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64(2), 485.
- Mark, M. L., & Madura, P. (2013). *Contemporary Music Education*. Boston, MA: Schirmer.
- Maxwell, J. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McCaskill, L. L. (1998). *The national standards for music education: A survey of general music methods professors' knowledge, attitudes and professional practices*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- McTighe, J., & Thomas, R. (2003). Backward design for forward action. *Educational Leadership*, 60(5), 52-55.
- NAfME. (2016). *Core music standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.nafme.org/core-music-standards/>
- Ravitch, D. (1995). *National standards in American education: A citizen's guide*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Reimer, B. (2004). Reconceiving the standards and the school music program. *Music Educators Journal*, 91(1), 33-37.
- Schmidt, C. (1996). Who benefits? Music education and the national standards. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 4(2), 71-82.
- State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education. (2016). *National Core Arts Standards*. Retrieved from <http://nationalartsstandards.org/>
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches* (Vol. 46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *Differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Wiggins, G. P., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Yarbrough, C. (1996). The future of scholarly inquiry in music education; 1996 senior researcher award acceptance address. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 44(3), 190-203.

Appendix A

Understanding by Design in Music Education Curricula

Dear Music Education Colleague, The new national music standards will incorporate aspects of Understanding by Design (UbD) by Wiggins and McTighe, particularly in terms of articulating enduring understandings and essential questions. This survey is an effort to determine whom in our profession has the most knowledge about the UbD framework and who already uses it in their planning and teaching.

A sub-group of our Area for Strategic Planning and Action (ASPA) on a Critical Examination of Curriculum discussed this issue at the 2013 SMTE Symposium. In response, we hope to develop a network of collegiate and K-12 music educators who already use it. From that list, we would like to begin a database for lesson plans at all levels so that other music teachers who are less familiar with the framework can learn about it and feel more comfortable implementing them into their classes more quickly and easily.

Please take a moment to fill out this quick and easy survey so we can help music teachers implement the new national standards into their planning and teaching! Your responses remain anonymous unless you choose to collaborate with us in on-going data collection efforts.

You may stop at any time or refuse to answer any question and will not be treated any differently by the researcher. Data will be kept secure once it is in the principal investigator's (PI's) possession, however the PI cannot guarantee security during transmission of data due to key logging and other spyware technology that may exist on any computer used by the subject.

1. Which degrees / programs does your institution offer in music education? (Check all that apply.)
 - Bachelor's Degree
 - Master's Degree
 - Doctorate
 - Licensure

2. Which best describes your school?
 - public institution,
 - private institution

3. Which best describes your school's total enrollment size?
 - very small - less than 1,000 students
 - small - between 1,000 and 2,999 students
 - medium - between 3,000 and 9,999 students
 - large - at least 10,000 students

4. Our music education faculty work to address the UbD model in our undergraduate teacher education program.
 - yes
 - no

5. Please expound on how you now use UbD - e.g. in which classes, which levels, and what resources you have used to promote it.
6. I know at least one in-service music teacher who is already using the UbD model in their classes and would be willing to ask the him / her to share UbD lesson plans.
- Yes
 - No
7. On the following Likert-type scale, please rate your response to the following statement: I understand the “Understanding by Design” (UbD) model.
- not at all
 - a little bit
 - somewhat
 - quite a bit
 - fully
8. I would be willing to lend my expertise and help disseminate information about UbD to other music educators.
- yes
 - no

This information is optional, but will assist the survey organizers in following up with respondents.

9. Please provide your name, contact information, and school affiliation. Name
Phone/s
Email/s
School Affiliation
10. Please identify and describe the framework you use in your undergraduate teacher education program:
11. Although I do not use UbD now, I plan to adopt it.
- yes
 - no
12. Please write any other thoughts you have that might be helpful for us in creating a network of UbD teachers, such as planning materials or general comments about the UbD model.

Appendix B

UbD Interview Questions for Music Teacher Educators

1. What key points in the UbD do you see as most applicable in a music education setting?

Those include:

- Six facets of understanding: explain, interpret, apply, perspective, empathy, self-knowledge
- Backward design
- Essential Questions

Please explain how those are / are not important.

2. Do you address those key points in lesson plans with pre-service teachers? With K-12 learners? If so, how?

3. How would you describe your familiarity with the way/s local K-12 music teachers do or do not use UbD in their teaching?

Potential follow-up questions (TBD):

- a) How do you know this information?
- b) To what extent are you involved with local music teachers?
- c) Do you or others offer guidance or training in UbD (possibly as relates to the new national standards)?

4. Does your corresponding college of education require a certain lesson plan format? If so, how does this work with UbD?

5. Please share or describe an example lesson plan illustrating UbD. If I have further questions, would you be available to explain your lesson plan/s further?

6. What else might you like to explain or share about using UbD in your lesson planning (possibly as relates to the new National Standards for Music Education)?

Daniel Johnson (johnsond@uncw.edu) is a Professor of Music and Music Education at the University of North Carolina Wilmington, and a Lecturer at Boston University. A graduate of the University of Arizona and the New England Conservatory, he is a distinguished teacher-educator, scholar, researcher, and author. With over twenty-five years of teaching experience, Dr. Johnson is an international authority on music education pedagogy, having presented research and pedagogy workshops for the International Society for Music Education, The Society for Music Teacher Education, and the National Association for Music Education, among others. His work is published in numerous eminent journals and in the forthcoming *Oxford Handbook of Assessment Policy and Practice in Music Education* and in *Model Cornerstone Assessments for the National Music Education Standards*.

Amber Dahlén Peterson (Amber.Peterson@sckans.edu) is an Assistant Professor of Music and the Mazie Barnett Kilmer Chair for Strings Education at Southwestern College in

Winfield, Kansas. Previously, she taught at the University of Florida, and Kent State University. She is a graduate of Case Western Reserve University, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire. Her research has appeared in: *American String Teacher*, *Contributions to Music Education*, and *Arts Education Policy Review*. She has presented state music education conference sessions in Ohio, Iowa, Illinois and Kansas, as well as national conferences sessions for the American String Teachers Association, the American Educational Research Association, the Symposium on Music Teacher Education, and the National Association for Music Education.

Amy Spears (aspears@NebrWesleyan.edu) is an Assistant Professor of Music at Nebraska Wesleyan University where she teaches undergraduate music education courses, student teaching internships, and an online graduate course. Dr. Spears is a graduate of Arizona State University, the University of Alabama, and Auburn University. Previously, she taught at Florida Atlantic University and has five years of public school teaching experience. Her research interests include curriculum development, secondary instrumental programs, informal music learning methods, and female roles in music education. Dr. Spears has published articles for the Alabama Music Educators Association and Women Band Directors International. She is a regular presenter for the National Association for Music Education, the Society for Music Teacher Education, Instrumental Music Teacher Educators' Colloquium, and the Midwest Band and Orchestra Clinic.

Johnathan Vest (Jonathan.vest@wcs.edu) is Director of Choral Ensembles at Centennial High School in Franklin, Tennessee, and previously taught in the Nashville area schools for twelve years. He also taught music education methods courses and supervised student teachers as Associate Professor of Music and Music Education Coordinator at the University of Tennessee at Martin. Dr. Vest earned the BM Ed. from Harding University, the MA in Music from Middle Tennessee State University, and an Ed.D. from the University of Alabama. He has presented research for the National Association for Music Education, the Society for Music Teacher Education, and the Society for Research in Music. In addition, Dr. Vest has been a clinician for Middle Tennessee Vocal Association, and is currently President of the Tennessee Music Education Association.