Entry 3, Part 3
Analysis of Assessment Procedures
Presentation and Analysis of Assessment Data

Pre-Assessment/Diagnostic Assessment Data

The results from the pre-assessment tell me that the students have plenty of room for growth. The students do the best job of listening and understanding character of music – which is good to know since they have spent time working on this throughout general music classes. The most important thing for them to develop beyond this is more of a specific understanding of how to describe what is happening in the piece musically to cause such emotional response from the listener.

When looking at student A, I can tell that there are going to be issues connecting the ideas. It will be important to focus the student often and make sure that they are able to take facts and make them into a workable knowledge. I believe that student A struggles with individual written work such as tests, so group projects will be the best way to help this student learn and succeed. Keeping this student active will be important – lectures will not engage him as easily.

Student B is a bright young lady and scored well on the opening assessment in relation to her classmates. It is clear that she has a better understanding than most in regards to musical terms and musical character. It will be something I can use to my advantage in class – allowing her to take ownership and describe things so that her peers may understand will help develop a sense of respect and trust between her and I.

Going forward, I think it is important that I spend quite a bit of time on all of the objectives. The one I can focus on the least is the moods. It will be important to really emphasize the composers as well as the musical terminology since these were the weakest points. I believe that the composition of scores will come with an understanding and increased exposure to this music.

Formative Assessment Data

The formative assessments both came back with good results. Formative assessment 1 – which was an exit ticket, had 100% participation and every student had valid facts listed, and many even were thinking at a HOTS level in response to the silent film and film history lesson. The students were praised for their thoughtfulness and the next class period I pulled out some of the best exit tickets and put them on the board. I also answered all questions that were asked in regards to film music or else told them that the questions would be answered as we continued forward in this unit. This allowed for the students to feel that their work was worth something and that they were being held accountable for what they turned in to me. Also, by addressing these comments, it showed the class that I was reading the tickets and really considering what they said.

Formative assessment 2 was the homework assignment of watching a movie and writing a paragraph about how the music affects the viewer and the scene interpretation. For recording grades, most of what I gave the students was completion grades – did they watch the movie, figure out the film composer, and think about the music in a scene. Therefore, students were easily able to achieve a 70% simply by doing the assignment. Their true HOTS level thinking was only apparent if they received a 100% on the assignment. Three students chose not to do the assignment and one student received a zero for blatantly copying another students homework. Aside from those 4 scores, 5 students received a 100%. 6 students received a 90%. This means that about half the class was already at a HOTS level of thinking, while the other half was not. Using this data, I was able to move forward and get them to think more about actual musical terminology and compositional effect before moving on to assign their authentic summative assessment on this 5th objective from the unit.

Summative Assessment Data
The disaggregated data shows that many students did not learn to the potential level that I had hoped. With under half, that clearly states that there was a lack of adequate teaching or planning on my part. The ELL, IEP, and minority students were left in the dust during this unit, with none of them learning to that potential level. Though they did improve, it was not at quite the same rate as the other students in the class. This data also shows that some objectives were better taught than others, as some objectives show greater growth and a strong percentage of students who met that 75% success rate. Students did learn much in each of the objectives, though they did not learn it to the extent that I was hoping. All objectives show major improvement, and the objectives with high student percentages that made a 75% success rate were relatively well taught, but there are some objectives that had low success rates, which can only mean faulty teaching. Students A and B did learn, just like the rest of their classmates, but not to the extent that I was hoping they would. Student A was successful in only 1 objective of 5, which is not at all where I wanted him to be. Student B, who has the potential to be the top student in her class, even fell through the cracks on one of the objectives. I feel that both students could have used more support from me in order to improve at a greater level. In future instruction, I think it would be important to do more interactive, kinesthetic, performance-based lessons. This would give the chance to reach those IEP and ELL students who struggle with reading and comprehension. Overall the unit could use more time or more focused objectives so that students are achieving a broader base of knowledge.