


2015

## MUED 397B/D: Practicum (Music Teaching Field Experience)—A Peer Review of Teaching Project Inquiry Portfolio

Dale Bazan

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, [dbazan2@unl.edu](mailto:dbazan2@unl.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/prtunl>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#), [Music Education Commons](#), and the [Music Pedagogy Commons](#)

---

Bazan, Dale, "MUED 397B/D: Practicum (Music Teaching Field Experience)—A Peer Review of Teaching Project Inquiry Portfolio" (2015). *UNL Faculty Course Portfolios*. 69.  
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/prtunl/69>

This Portfolio is brought to you for free and open access by the Peer Review of Teaching Project at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNL Faculty Course Portfolios by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

UNL PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING  
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITY ANALYSIS

UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA –LINCOLN  
GLENN KORFF SCHOOL OF MUSIC  
MUSIC EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

PRACTICUM MUED 397B/D

Spring Semester 2015

DALE E. BAZAN

402-472-2986

dbazan2@unl.edu

## **Table of Contents**

- 1. Abstract**
- 2. Description of the Course**
  - a. Introduction to the Course**
  - b. Assumptions about Students**
  - c. Teaching Environment**
  - d. Course Goals and Objectives**
- 3. Introduction to the Problem**
  - a. Background to the Peer Review of Teaching Project**
  - b. Rationale for Peer-Review Instructional Activity Analysis**
- 4. Method**
- 5. Results**
- 6. Reflection**
- 7. References**
- 8. Appendices**
  - a. Appendix A: UNL Junior Practicum Proposal**
  - b. Appendix B: Questionnaire**

## **Abstract**

The purpose of this course inquiry was to measure junior music education student school-based field experience models. All junior music education students at University of Nebraska – Lincoln during the spring semester of 2014-15 ( $N = 25$ ) were asked to complete a researcher-designed questionnaire for their self-reporting of experiences in schools during a 5-week period and resulting growth as secondary vocal or instrumental teachers. Differences and similarities between students in a field setting alone, with a partner, or in a small laboratory group supported at all times by a music education faculty member were examined.

## Description of the Course

### Introduction to the Course

This course is taken during the spring semester of the junior year in the Bachelor of Music Education degree. The field experience places students inside schools weekday mornings over 5 weeks following Spring Break, and following core music education methods courses in instrumental and choral teaching (i.e., Instrumental Methods MUED 345 and Choral Methods MUED 346). The UNL undergraduate bulletin describes this course as simply, “Supervised teaching experiences in school.” Students are placed in school settings in the discipline opposite their applied instrument. Specifically, vocal applied students are placed in instrumental settings, and instrumental applied students are placed in vocal setting. As BME students are licensed K-12 Music, they must be prepared to teach in any level or school music discipline.

The approximately 15-30 students who take this practicum in a given academic year are juniors in UNL’s Music Teacher Education Program (MTEP). By this point, students have completed most core music and music education courses. They have also completed two semesters of practicum (i.e., field experiences) designed to develop experience with students in schools. Finally, they will have participated in large music ensembles for a majority of their lives, including at least four semesters at UNL. All students were admitted to the School of Music after showing evidence of advanced musical performance skills and should have grown as musicians and teachers over the, at least, 1.5 years prior to taking this course.

### Assumptions about Students

Some general assumptions underpinning course design are that students *do* possess the following:

- advanced training, knowledge, and skills in conducting and music score analysis

- training in lesson planning, approximately 60 hours of teaching experience in schools at differing levels/disciplines, and several opportunities to peer-teach/microteaching during other music education classes
- experience playing almost all orchestral and band instruments (i.e., in their final skills class concurrently) beyond the beginner level and experience singing in choirs (one semester of choir ensembles is required of all BME students during their freshman year)
- have been provided in advance of this course with materials and resources for teaching at all levels and in all music disciplines, conducting ensembles, and planning lessons
- advanced musical performance skills both as soloists and within large ensembles
- are dedicated musicians and committed to the teaching of music in schools as, assuming a passing grade in this internship, students will continue progressing towards becoming licensed to teach K-12 Music in schools at the end of their next (i.e., Senior) year.

Further assumptions in course design are that students *do not* possess the following, or possess them at levels that could benefit from further scaffolding:

- awareness and perspective of current developments and trends in music education
- full confidence, competence, and experience in their current placement as it will be “outside their comfort zone” or instrument of expertise
- some degree of independence and competence in teaching
- some degree and much experience collaborating in groups and with peers
- strategies for implementing the National Standards for Music Education and principles of comprehensive music within the instrumental music program
- experience and training for semester long music curriculum

- knowledge, resources, and skills for administrating a choral or instrumental music program (i.e., budget, legal issues, fundraising, trips and travel, scheduling, business management, time management, stress management, etc.)
- knowledge and resources for assessing music students
- advanced awareness of rehearsal strategies for ensembles and music activities or lessons for elementary/general music classes
- knowledge, resources, and skills for inspiring creativity, self-expression, knowledge of music, and other skills or concepts

Aside from the above, this course is typically the final course-based opportunity in the MTEP to fill any noted gaps of knowledge and required skills for students outside of their intended student teaching discipline and applied instrument area.

### **Teaching Environment**

The course is offered in local schools, normally Lincoln Public Schools. In each case, students are placed with a licensed *cooperating teacher*, who supports and organizes the experience. Settings, curriculum, and experiences vary greatly amongst schools and cooperating teachers.

### **Course Goals and Objectives**

The goals of this course are to help BME students within the school environment:

1. demonstrate correct music responses through verbal explanation, vocal and instrumental modeling and/or physical gesture
2. prescribe developmentally appropriate solutions for problems in music performance
3. understand the implications of a comprehensive musicianship framework
4. demonstrate knowledge and application of appropriate discipline techniques
5. demonstrate knowledge and application of appropriate instructional pacing techniques

6. demonstrate the ability to manage the physical environment of the classroom
7. develop lesson plans that reflect applications of learning, developmental, and motivational theories
8. develop lesson plans that reflect applications of cognitive processing theories
9. develop appropriate instructional plans and objectives, appropriately sequenced and based on specific curricula models which reflect knowledge of appropriate theories of learning and development
10. select and demonstrate instructional techniques in an authentic setting in a manner appropriate to the setting and learners

At the end of the course, students will have:

- Demonstrated professionalism through punctual, regular attendance throughout the assigned practicum
- Demonstrated timely and scholarly completion of the Practicum Portfolio including all required elements as listed in the course assignments section of the syllabus
- Demonstrated satisfactory teaching and planning in a secondary ensemble setting on multiple as measured/observed by a university supervisor (i.e., professor or PhD. in Music Education student)
- Demonstrated consistent, weekly reflective practice and professional development

### **Introduction to the Problem**

#### **Background to the Peer Review of Teaching Project**

At the researcher's institution a program entitled Peer Review of Teaching Project is offered annually. Instructors are invited to voluntarily participate. The program is designed to promote instructors actively assessing their teaching and making learning visible. Several methods of inquiry underpin the process (Walvoord & Anderson, 1998; Bernstein, Burnett, Goodburn, & Savory, 2006; Savory, Burnett, & Goodburn, 2007). I volunteered to participate in the program and objectively analyze a component of the above undergraduate field experience during 2014-15.



I have been a supervisor for this course at UNL for seven prior semesters (Spring 2008 through Spring 2014). I have also been the faculty member responsible for placing all BME in schools during those 7 years. I adopted the placement and evaluative processes provided upon my arrival. Over the years, I supplemented those models with resources and ideas from my own ten years of teaching band, research studies I have conducted, observations of instrumental music programs as I evaluate practicum and student teachers in local schools, ideas from my own undergraduate program, and ideas based on conversations with instructors of similar courses from other institutions. Further collaboration with colleagues and school administrators arrived at further developments over the 7 years.

### **Rationale for Peer-Review Instructional Activity Analysis**

Providing time for teacher education students to observe and practice teaching in K-12 classrooms is a traditional aspect of most degrees. In particular, the whole semester, full-time student teaching experience is required by all states for traditional licensure as a capstone experience. This is frequently a carefully selected field placement where student-cooperating teacher are matched, students are placed in strong music programs, and a significant outcome on teaching is gained. Often, other practicum occur at some point during a traditional degree but can be more haphazardly matched, and of variable effectiveness and quality. Cooperating teacher-undergraduate student pairings can be poor, and classroom experiences negative.

For music teacher education programs in small urban areas, as is the case in many Midwest institutions, field experiences can be challenging to provide optimal experiences for all students given the broad array of potential settings. As coordinator of music field experiences at my institution, I've spoken to several placement officers across the country expressing concern with the effectiveness of placements. We saturate local school districts, overly rely on particular strong cooperating teachers who host field experience on a regular basis, but otherwise place undergraduates "wherever we can fit them." The purpose of this course inquiry was to measure junior music education student school-based field experience

models. Specifically, while any experience, even the most challenging and stressful could be positive, are there certain models of field experience that can provide more certain and rewarding experiences for music undergraduates, teachers, supervisors, and K-12 students?

It is believed that the earlier a field experience in a degree program, the more beneficial it is to other upcoming methods courses. Students have a real-world experience to link pedagogically to. However, students early in their degree may not have the pedagogical knowledge to teach well, run on intuition, and may have a less rewarding experience, sometimes so much as to turn them off of teaching music. Therefore, providing proper scaffolding of the early field experiences should be in place, and yet, be more than simply observing from the back of a classroom. We've developed, over three years, a laboratory experience, where the entire sophomore class goes to one elementary classroom. Students peer evaluate, and the cooperating teacher and professor will stop undergraduates as they teach to provide immediate feedback. School music students are asked questions to help music education students, and activities are provided to help music education students understand the impact of music teaching on children.

With recent challenges in music teaching as a whole, including increased responsibilities of all teachers in schools, as well as growth in undergraduate music education students in the area, there has been an increasing challenge to make appropriate, positive field placement for all students. Therefore, after discussions with the choral music education specialist, a proposal was developed to share with the entire UNL music education faculty, Lincoln Public Schools administration, and school cooperating teachers (see [Appendix A](#)). The proposal was supported by all; willing cooperating teachers were sought in schools, but with the suggestion that data be collected on the effectiveness of changes from a single/partnered experience to a supervised laboratory experience. Therefore, collecting such data as part of the UNL Peer Review of Teaching Project seemed doubly useful and valuable. More details on the hypotheses, proposed changes, and project objectives are outlined in [Appendix A](#).

## Method

UNL junior music education students enrolled in the instructor's MUED 397B/D Instrumental/Choral Practicum participated in this inquiry ( $N = 25$ ). Participants were provided a consent form and could voluntarily participate or opt out, with all students consenting to participate. A researcher designed questionnaire employing 5-level Likert-type scales measured self-reported learning/growth as a teacher, measures of support, and demographics (see [Appendix B](#)). The questionnaire was administered by proxy at the end of semester, the day following the end of 5 weeks of practicum.

## Results

Of the 25 respondents, for a 100% return rate, the median age was 21. There were 14 males and 11 females responding. Applied instruments studied included strings ( $n = 2$ ), brass ( $n = 5$ ), voice ( $n = 4$ ), woodwinds ( $n = 7$ ), percussion ( $n = 3$ ), composition ( $n = 2$ ), and piano ( $n = 2$ ). During their sophomore (i.e., introductory) practicum, all participated in large groups of 11-16 students in an LPS classroom. For their MUED 397A general music practicum in the preceding fall semester, 4 were placed in solo/independent field experience settings, whereas 21 were placed in pairs. Therefore, all students had experiences a large group laboratory experience and solo/paired experiences providing some objectivity to their ability to compare/contrast the two experiences, despite their current setting.

For the current semester, Spring 2015, there were 2 laboratory groups (8 students in high school choir, 6 students in a middle school band setting with a supervisor present each day), 2 students paired in a high school band setting, 4 students paired in a middle school choir setting, 2 students paired in a high school choir setting, and 3 solo students in middle school vocal settings. All the latter, non-laboratory students were observed only twice by a university supervisor. In total, 17 students were in secondary choral placements, and 8 in secondary band placements; 14 students were in a laboratory setting, 3 in solo

settings, and 8 in paired settings. Therefore, there was a combination of large group, solo, and partnered settings in both band and choral settings enabling comparisons of different field experience formats.

Mean responses to 5-level Likert-type items were computed with standard deviations as shown in Table 1. As can be seen in Table 1, in general students rated overall experiences of their three field experiences to date as somewhat positive (4.00 = Likert item response number for descriptor) to very positive (5.00). For their current instrumental/vocal practicum, students reported that learning or cooperating teacher feedback were about the same (3.00) as prior practicum, but there was somewhat more feedback from university supervisors (4.00) and somewhat less teaching experience (2.00). When asked to compare laboratory group settings to solo/paired settings respondents reported that feedback and support were about the same (3.00), whereas teaching experience and enjoyment were somewhat less (2.00) in small groups.

Table 1.  
*Means for Field Experiences Ratings and Comparisons*

Item Description	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Sophomore lab practicum experience	4.00	0.71
Junior general music pair/solo practicum experience	4.72	0.74
Junior instrumental/vocal practicum experience	3.92	1.04
Junior instrumental/vocal practicum learning*	3.08	1.12
Junior instrumental/vocal practicum supervisor feedback*	3.92	0.86
Junior instrumental/vocal practicum cooperating teacher feedback*	2.64	1.04
Junior instrumental/vocal practicum amount of teaching experience*	2.20	1.04
Teaching experience during laboratory field experiences vs. solo/pair experiences	1.80	0.76
Feedback during laboratory field experiences vs. solo/pair experiences	2.88	1.09
Enjoyment during laboratory field experiences vs. solo/pair experiences	2.40	0.82
Support during laboratory field experiences vs. solo/pair experiences	3.24	1.01

\*as compared to prior practicum experiences

*Note.* Means as reported on a 5-level Likert-type scale with 1 being least and 5 being most.

Respondents were provided a text box to provide open ended comments about their field experiences. After qualitative data analysis grouping statements into like topics, some important themes that relate to their quantitative responses were identified including:

- Field experiences are dependent on the cooperating teacher (some allow for more teaching experience or provide more feedback than others)
- The availability of school settings and cooperating teachers is known as limited and does not always allow for perfect fit placements
- Both group and solo/pair settings have pros and cons
- Some students expressed feeling more insecure in large group settings
- Some students expressed believing they learned more in large group settings due to seeing more teaching styles, and being provided more immediate university supervisor feedback they could all learn from
- Some students believed that solo/paired settings provide more teaching experience or "podium time" whereas some placed in solo/pair settings were provided as little as 3 teaching opportunities in 5 weeks and/or limited cooperating teacher or university supervisor feedback

### **Reflection**

Student responses analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively in this inquiry provide one, important perspective on field experiences provided to Bachelor of Music Education students at University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It would seem that early laboratory/group experiences leading to more independent or individual practicum later in the degree is an appropriate pattern--as long as increasing responsibility and teaching experience can be assured. As stated elsewhere in this document, and pointed out in open-ended responses by respondents, the circumstances of practicum cannot be assured given the current availability of cooperating teachers in surrounding area, but that laboratory experiences where the university supervisor

do instill more control over the availability of teaching opportunities and immediate feedback useful to all BME students.

Results of this inquiry will be shared with the music education faculty before any changes to existing models are made. Also, as student responses are one perspective, cooperating teachers and university supervisors will need to follow up with a focus group discussion on their perspectives of the different formats explored in this inquiry. In general, it seems that weighing pros and cons, either laboratory or solo/partnered practicum are valuable, even equivalent in overall impact on teaching development. However, practical matters related to placing students in a saturated school district, and ensuring the nature of setting and cooperating teacher (e.g., providing teaching time and feedback) may support continued exploration of laboratory small group settings for field experiences.

## References

- Bernstein, D., Burnett, A. N., Goodburn, A., & Savory, P. (2006). *Making teaching and learning visible*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Mertler, C. A. (2012). *Action research: Improving schools and empowering educators* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Savory, P., Burnett, A. N., & Goodburn, A. (2007). *Inquiry into the college classroom: A journey toward scholarly teaching*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Walvoord, B. E., & Anderson, V. J. (1998). *Effective grading: A tool for learning and assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

## Appendix A

### UNL Junior Practicum Proposal

#### Proposed Change

We are considering a change to our spring 2015 junior vocal/instrumental practicum to match our positive sophomore practicum. Historical practice has been to send out 1-2 UNL students to schools every morning for 5 weeks from March 30-May 1 (approx.) between 9:30 and 11:20 AM. UNL students are visited and observed 2 times during the 5 weeks by a supervisor. Significant responsibility rests on the cooperating teacher, and 5 weeks during April can be difficult to host. With approximately 26 students in this practicum, as many as 15 teachers are typically needed.

We propose decreasing the time frame from 5 weeks to 3 weeks. We also propose decreasing the request from 13 (avg.) teachers/schools to 6. Further, instead of being visited 2 times by a UNL supervisor, UNL students would arrive with a supervisor at all times to assist the cooperating teacher and collaborate to maximize the practicum.

To accomplish this, instead of pairs of students, a small group of students (7-8) would arrive for 3 weeks. The first couple of days would consist of observation with the cooperating teacher annotating where necessary, explaining their strategies or approaches. Thereafter, for the remainder of the 3 weeks, UNL students would split up regular classroom routines and rehearsal with guidance and feedback by the university supervisor and cooperating teacher. The cooperating teacher, and university supervisor, share in opportunities to "take the podium" and demonstrate specific strategies, correct UNL student practices, rehearse ensembles, and other laboratory type possibilities.

We propose 3 groups. 2 would be going to vocal environments, 1 to instrumental. Moreover, each group would visit a middle school for 3 weeks, then 3 weeks with a high school setting. When during the calendar these occur is to be determined, but we propose one level before spring break, and the other level after spring break.

#### Reason for the Change

The UNL music education faculty continues to be proactive to maximize the experience of both students and school teachers, and to support as many teachers as possible in volunteering to mentor undergraduate students. We respect the increasing stressors on school teachers, and realize the responsibility of a practicum or student teacher can add demands. In addition, new/young teachers cannot be used until they have more experience, and teachers' schedules do not always align with the availability. This has created a situation where a decreasing number of teachers are available for placements. A quick calculation last week by LPS Human Resources reported that there were 118 music teachers in LPS with only 60 willing to accept practicum and/or student teachers. With UNL's institutional growth of university-wide enrollment growth, we anticipate an increasing need for placements in schools. Therefore, "something has to give."

Several years ago, Judy Bush approached us feeling that even senior music education students sometimes seemed to lack the awareness of instructional strategies or classroom practices that one could expect. We thereby collaborated on a large group laboratory model where a university supervisor was on hand at all times to provide support for the cooperating teacher, feedback to students, and meanwhile decrease the number of days a cooperating teacher needed to host students in their program. By rotating these small groups through a small, select number of cooperating teachers, we feel that students have benefitted by:



- Increased attention and feedback from the university supervisor and cooperating teacher
- Increased perspective on effective teaching strategies
- Increased capacity for reflective practice and peer-evaluation
- Increased time spent in schools practicing, observing, and evaluating teaching

Meanwhile, with this model just at the sophomore level, LPS cooperating teachers have reportedly benefitted by:

- Decreased responsibility for mentoring and determining how to best use/evaluate practicum students
- Decreased intrusion on their classes/rehearsal due to the decreased time frame of practicum using a "spread the wealth" strategy
- Decreased potential to be used repeatedly for various field experiences by "leaving more teachers on the board." (We have been using virtually 100% of willing LPS music teachers in recent semesters.)

In the sophomore laboratory experience students have found the experience positive. They feel supported, and less "thrown into the water." The field experiences have been less haphazard, and we believe cooperating teachers have felt less frustrated, more supported, and their programs less interrupted. The benefits of continuing this in an overly strained spring semester seem prudent to propose. The junior instrumental/vocal practicum seemed the appropriate next field experience to maximize.

Admittedly, there are caveats. UNL students would rotate through the regularly planned activities secondary music programs tend to follow including warmups, and rehearsal of pieces. While some observation occurs at the beginning of each rotation, the remainder of the 3 weeks would have UNL students rotating through guided teaching experiences in 10-15 minute chunks. Cooperating teachers would continue to start classes, and may rehearse to correct issues and demonstrate good teaching practices in between UNL students. However, UNL students will not get as many podium opportunities in a small group format as opposed to solo/paired placements as in the past. Cooperating teachers would also not have as much opportunity to simply have UNL students sit at the periphery for observation only as some practicum models. While the 3 week commitment is shorter than the past 5 weeks, UNL students and the university supervisor/cooperating teacher will be more interactive with LPS students. We believe this can be perceived as a pro, as much as it could be determined a con by some.

In the end, our students require experience in schools. The more experience, and the greater variety of experiences, the better it is for their growth as teachers. Increased feedback in laboratory-type experiences can provide a greater impact on their career. To prepare K-12 licensed music teachers, it behooves programs such as UNL's music education program to provide experiences at all levels and in all disciplines. Of final note, no teacher receives a teacher license in the State of Nebraska without hundreds of hours of required preparatory experiences in schools. We are dependent on Lincoln music teachers to host these experiences, and are consequently extremely indebted to our cooperating teachers and collaborators in schools.

Dale E. Bazan

### Music Education Practicum Proposal

#### In Place Prior to 2010:

Year	Fall Semester	Avg. # of Students/LPS Teachers Needed	Spring Semester	Avg. # of Students/LPS Teachers Needed	TOTAL HOURS
Sophomore	MUED 297 M/W/F 10 weeks (21 Days minus fall break/Thanksgiving/NMEA) 9:30-11:20 AM 42 hours in schedule  <i>Students out in pairs, observed by supervisor twice</i>	32/16	No Practicum	0/0	42 hours in schools
Junior	MUED 397A M-F 5 weeks (November) 9:30-11:20 AM 45.8 hours in schedule  <i>Students out in pairs, observed by supervisor twice</i>	26/13	MUED 397B/D M-F 5 weeks (April) 9:30-11:20 AM 45.8 hours in schedule <i>Students out in pairs, observed by supervisor twice</i>	10/5 (Instrumental) 16/8 (Vocal)	91.6 hours in schools
Senior	MUED 497D/T T/Th 16 weeks 8:30-11:20 AM 90.7 hours in schedule  <i>Students out alone, observed by supervisor twice</i>	22/22	Student Teaching 16 weeks one level  <i>Students out alone, observed by supervisor 5 times</i>	18/18	90.7 hours in schools
Student Teaching (Fall Electing Student Teachers)	Student Teaching 16 weeks one level	4/4		TOTALS	146.6 pre-497 in schools
	<i>Students out alone, observed by supervisor 5 times</i>				237.3 hours in schedule pre- Student Teaching Semester
	TOTALS	55 teachers needed		31 teachers needed	

## 2010-2014:

Year	Fall Semester	Avg. # of Students/LPS Teachers Needed	Spring Semester	Avg. # of Students/LPS Teachers Needed	TOTAL HOURS
Sophomore	MUED 297 M/W/F <u>9 weeks as small group(s) in 3 settings each</u> (27 Days) 9:30-11:20 AM 42 hours in schools <u>rotating through different settings/cooperating teachers</u>	32/9	No Practicum	0/0	49.5 hours in schools <b>*Increase in time</b>  <b>Change in Nature:</b> <u>Each LPS teacher only experiences 9 classes/3 weeks. University supervisor with students at all times.</u>
Junior	MUED 397A M-F 5 weeks 9:30-11:20 AM 45.8 hours in schools	26/13	MUED 397B/D M-F 5 weeks 9:30-11:20 AM 45.8 hours in schools	10/5 (Instrumental) 16/8 (Vocal)	91.6 hours in schools <b>No change to this practicum</b>
Senior	MUED 497D/T T/Th 16 weeks 8:30-11:20 AM 90.7 hours in schools  <i>Students out alone, observed by supervisor twice</i>	22/22	Student Teaching 16 weeks one level  <i>Students out alone, observed by supervisor 5 times</i>	18/18	90.7 hours in schedule <b>No change to this practicum</b>
Student Teaching (Fall Electing Student Teachers)	Student Teaching 16 weeks one level  <i>Students out alone, observed by supervisor 5 times</i>	4/4		TOTALS	124.6 pre-497 in schools  215.3 hours in schools pre-Student Teaching Semester
	TOTALS	<b>48 (-7) teachers needed</b>		31 teachers needed	

*Note.* Decreased number of cooperating teachers need from LPS, reducing strain and potential overuse of certain teachers. Increased flexibility. Increased experience in schools for students. Increased attention and feedback/supervision by UNL supervisors.

## Proposed:

Year	Fall Semester	Avg. # of Students/LPS Teachers Needed	Spring Semester	Avg. # of Students/LPS Teachers Needed	TOTAL HOURS
<i>Sophomore</i>	MUED 297 M/W/F 9 weeks as small group(s) in 3 settings each (27 Days) 9:30-11:20 AM 42 hours in schools rotating through different settings/cooperating teachers	32/9	No Practicum	0/0	54 hours in schools <b>No change to this practicum</b>
Junior	MUED 397A M-F 5 weeks 9:30-11:20 AM 45.8 hours in schools	26/13	MUED 397B/D M-F 6 weeks as small groups split between levels (each group 3 weeks in 2 different levels) 9:30-11:20 AM 55 hours in schools	10/2 (-3 Instrumental) 16/4 (-4 Vocal)	100.8 hours in schools <b>*Increase in time</b>  <b>Change in nature:</b> <u>Each LPS teacher only experiences 15 classes/3 weeks each. University supervisor with students at all times.</u>
Senior	MUED 497D/T T/Th 16 weeks 8:30-11:20 AM 90.7 hours in schools <i>Students out alone, observed by supervisor twice</i>	22/22	Student Teaching 16 weeks one level  <i>Students out alone, observed by supervisor 5 times</i>	18/18	90.7 hours in schedule <b>No change to this practicum</b>
Student Teaching (Fall Electing Student Teachers)	Student Teaching 16 weeks one level  <i>Students out alone, observed by supervisor 5 times</i>	4/4		TOTALS	154.8 pre-497 in schools  245.5 hours in schools pre-Student Teaching Semester
	TOTALS	48 Teachers needed		<b>24 (-7) teachers needed</b>	

*Notes.* Decreased dependency on teacher pool, increasing flexibility. Decreased time in each school/cooperating teacher. Increased experience for UNL students in school. Increased supervision/feedback by UNL supervisor and support for cooperating teacher.

## Appendix B

## Questionnaire

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. What is your gender? *[circle one]*      Male                      Female    Other

2. What is your primary instrument? *[circle one group and specify which instrument on the line]*

Strings \_\_\_\_\_                      Woodwind \_\_\_\_\_

Brass \_\_\_\_\_                      Percussion \_\_\_\_\_

Voice \_\_\_\_\_                      Composition \_\_\_\_\_

Other/Keyboard/Piano \_\_\_\_\_

3. I am currently \_\_\_\_\_ years old. *[print a number]*

4. My 297 Intro (sophomore) Practicum was? *[check one]*

\_\_\_\_ Laboratory/ Small Group (8-16)

\_\_\_\_ Independent (I was by myself)

\_\_\_\_ Pair (I had a partner at my site)

\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

5. My 397a Junior Elementary Practicum was? *[check one]*

\_\_\_\_ Laboratory/ Small Group (4-10)

\_\_\_\_ Independent (I was by myself)

\_\_\_\_ Pair (I had a partner at my site)

\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

6. My 397b/d Junior Spring Practicum was: *[check one]*

Vocal/General (397d)

Instrumental (397b)

7. My 397b/d Junior Practicum was? [*check one*]

Laboratory/ Small Group (4-10)

Independent (I was by myself)

Pair (I had a partner at my site)

Other \_\_\_\_\_

#### FIELD EXPERIENCE PREFERENCES

8. On the scale below please rate your experience during your sophomore intro (MUED 297) practicum: [*circle one*]

1. Very Negative

2. Somewhat Negative

3. Neutral

4. Somewhat Positive

5. Very Positive

9. On the scale below please rate your experience during your fall junior elementary (MUED 397a) practicum: [*circle one*]

1. Very Negative

2. Somewhat Negative

3. Neutral

4. Somewhat Positive

5. Very Positive

10. On the scale below please rate your experience during your spring junior instrumental/vocal (MUED 397b/d) practicum: [*circle one*]

1. Very Negative
2. Somewhat Negative
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat Positive
5. Very Positive

11. Regarding impact on your teaching, compared to prior practicum, my spring junior instrumental/vocal (MUED 397b/d) practicum experience was: [*circle one*]

1. Much Less Effective
2. Somewhat Less Effective
3. About The Same
4. Somewhat More Effective
5. Much More Effective

12. Considering university supervisor feedback about your teaching, compared to prior practicum, my spring junior instrumental/vocal (MUED 397b/d) practicum experience had: [*circle one*]

1. Much Less Feedback
2. Somewhat Less Feedback
3. About The Same
4. Somewhat More Feedback
5. Much More Feedback

13. Considering cooperating teacher feedback about your teaching, compared to prior practicum, my spring junior instrumental/vocal (MUED 397b/d) practicum experience had: [*circle one*]

1. Much Less Feedback
2. Somewhat Less Feedback
3. About The Same
4. Somewhat More Feedback
5. Much More Feedback

14. Considering the amount of teaching time I was provided, compared to prior practicum, my spring junior instrumental/vocal (MUED 397b/d) practicum experience had: [*circle one*]

1. Much Less Teaching Experience
2. Somewhat Less Teaching Experience
3. About The Same
4. Somewhat More Teaching Experience
5. Much More Teaching Experience

15. In your estimation laboratory (small group) field experiences as opposed to solo/independent or partnered field experiences provide: [*circle one*]

1. Much Less Teaching Experience
2. Somewhat Less Teaching Experience
3. About The Same
4. Somewhat More Teaching Experience
5. Much More Teaching Experience



16. In your estimation laboratory (small group) field experiences as opposed to solo/independent or partnered field experiences

allow for: [*circle one*]

1. Much Less Feedback
2. Somewhat Less Feedback
3. About The Same
4. Somewhat More Feedback
5. Much More Feedback

17. In your estimation laboratory (small group) field experiences as opposed to solo/independent or partnered field experiences are:

[*circle one*]

1. Much Less Enjoyable
2. Somewhat Less Enjoyable
3. About The Same
4. Somewhat More Enjoyable
5. Much More Enjoyable

18. I regards to support for students, laboratory (small group) field experiences as opposed to solo/independent or partnered field

experiences offer: [*circle one*]

1. Much Less Support
2. Somewhat Less Support
3. About The Same
4. Somewhat More Support
5. Much More Support

**COMMENTS:**

Please provide general evaluative comments about your field experiences to date in this box.

**THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS RESEARCH! YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS  
ARE INVALUABLE!**