# Choir- High School

# Completed Student Learning Objective (SLO) Template—ANNOTATED

This template should be completed while referring to the SLO Template Checklist Document.

Teacher Name:	Content Area and Course(s): Choir Grade Level(s): 9, 10, 11, 12	_Academic Year: 2012-13
Please use the guidance provided in addition to	this template to develop components of the student learning ob	jective and populate each
component in the space below.		

#### Baseline and Trend Data

What information is being used to inform the creation of the SLO and establish the amount of growth that should take place?

In prior years, student choir assessment included an individual student assessment of participation and effort, student self- assessment, and student skill during class and during performances.

I provided feedback to students on their progress half way through the semester as well as at the end of the semester (with their final grade). Based on conversations at the end of last year (2011-12), students often felt they lacked a clear understanding of the techniques and specific strategies needed to improve.

A pre-assessment was administered. Results showed that across the eight categories in the rubric, students had the biggest difficulty with pitch and note accuracy, verbal clarity, and combining timing with all elements to correctly deliver part singing within a piece.

- No on 1<sup>st</sup> box. She did give a pre-assessment, but she doesn't identify its structure, who created it, what content it covered.
- No on 2<sup>nd</sup>. Doesn't really go into trend data, i.e. typically students do poorly in reading music, performance, etc.
- No on 3<sup>rd</sup>. She identifies weaknesses, but not strengths. Also needs to summarize the data. Overall, how did the students score on the pretest?

# **Student Population**

Which students will be included in this SLO? Include course, grade level, and number of students.

31 students in 6<sup>th</sup> period choir

The course contains freshmen, sophomore, junior, and senior students.

- Yes to first box.
- No on 2<sup>nd</sup>. Are there any special needs, ELL, TAG, etc.? Teacher could also add that this is a typical class or it is not. Does she normally teach 9<sup>th</sup> grade, but this course is 9-12. Would give more detail on 2<sup>nd</sup> box.
- No on the 3rd because we are unsure. Teachers should state "No subgroups are excluded" to ensure a check.
- More information is better than not enough... more benefits the teacher and the approval committee.



#### Interval of Instruction

What is the duration of the course that the SLO will cover? Include beginning and end dates.

August 2013 – December 2013: the course duration is one semester.

Yes, BUT teacher could add whether or not class meets daily and for how long. More info is better than not enough...*more* benefits the teacher and the approval committee. So if there are factors here that could impact growth, the teacher should state them. For instance, does the class meet daily? Is it a class period each day?

#### Standards and Content

What content will the SLO target? To what related standards is the SLO aligned?

This SLO aligns to all of Ohio's 2012 Revised Music Standards, high school levels I – IV, beginning to mastery levels.

- Yes, on first box. She names Revised OH standards.
- No on 2<sup>nd</sup>. She is including ALL standards, not the overarching, important content.
- No on 3<sup>rd</sup>. She is identifying ALL standards, not the core knowledge/skills needed. If the SLO is NOT targeted, state this so the evaluator(s) will know this box is N/A.
- How will teacher focus on, teach, and assess ALL indicators??? Not enough time in the day for that.

### Assessment(s)

What assessment(s) will be used to measure student growth for this objective?

The pre and post assessments will be comprised of the following areas of performance or knowledge:

20%	Music theory and problem solving: students will be given ten short-answer questions assessing their theoretical and technical knowledge of selected sample compositions, and knowledge of vocal exercises and vocal health. Two of the ten questions incorporate a problem solving and interpretation component related to composition.
80%	Performance assessment rubric, consisting of the following main categories: presentation, accuracy, verbal clarity, effort, tone quality, part singing, interpretation, and behavior. Each main category consists of sub categories as well.

Students' vocal technique and knowledge of the music that will be prepared for concerts will be evaluated through three singing tests and contextual information throughout the semester.

The first singing test and the music theory and problem solving pre-test will constitute the baseline pre-test assessment score.

The score on the second and third performance assessment rubric will be averaged and combined with the second and final administration of the music theory and problem solving test to arrive at the post-test assessment score.

- No on 1<sup>st</sup>. She doesn't specify who created and/or reviewed the tests.
- No on 2<sup>nd</sup>. She doesn't state the test has prerequisite as well as advanced knowledge/skills to allow sufficient stretch for both low and high-achieving students.
- No on 3<sup>rd</sup>. Says she will combine scores on tests but doesn't explain how. Will one be weighted more than the other? When will the tests be administered? How will she arrive at the final scores? How is she scoring the performance assessments...rubric(s)? Include it if so and provide any pertinent information.



• No to last one because we can't check any of the boxes above. Not sure if it was reviewed by content experts, valid, reliable, has stretch? Doesn't state this information.

# Growth Target(s)

Considering all available data and content requirements, what growth target(s) can students be expected to reach?

On the posttest (average of the performance assessments conducted at 2 points in the year after the first pretest, plus the final music theory and problem solving test), students should demonstrate at least 33% growth.

- No to 1<sup>st</sup>. She doesn't state this. We do not see specific growth targets. Were there different skill levels based on pretest? We don't know from information provided.
- No on 2<sup>nd</sup>. She never specified her baseline or pretest data so she couldn't have referenced it.
- No on 3<sup>rd</sup>. We don't know if they are developmental because we don't know where kids started and if any have special needs/talents.
- No on 4<sup>th</sup>. She doesn't have specific targets for all kids, much less tiered targets.
- No on final. No specific targets, so can't tell if rigorous enough. She said they would grow by 33%, but percentages are easy to misinterpret. What if I scored an 80% on pretest?

Rationale for Targeted Student Growth within the Interval of Instruction

What is your rationale for setting the above target(s) for student growth within the interval of instruction?

All students have opportunity to demonstrate growth within the assessment. Growth targets are based on total growth across the 8 performance categories and the music theory and problem solving pretest. In setting growth targets, I felt it important to keep in mind that some students will never reach a perfect score on the rubric.

- No to 1<sup>st</sup>. She should identify their strengths/weaknesses in relation to course content. Why did she identify this content as the most important or relevant?
- No on 2<sup>nd</sup>. Her targets are not specific enough to apply to the class ability levels.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> is a maybe. She did state their weaknesses earlier, but not here.
- No on 5<sup>th</sup>. No mention of school/district goals. Could refer to OIP goals to help with this.
- No on last one. Again, we can't tell if they are rigorous enough because we don't know how they did on the pretest.

