



**UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS PRESS**

Council for Research in Music Education

An Examination of Music Student Teaching Practices Across Institutions Accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music

Author(s): Jay Juchniewicz

Source: *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, No. 217 (Summer 2018), pp. 27-44

Published by: University of Illinois Press on behalf of the Council for Research in Music Education

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5406/bulcouresmusedu.217.0027>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



University of Illinois Press and Council for Research in Music Education are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*

JSTOR

An Examination of Music Student Teaching Practices Across Institutions Accredited by the *National Association of Schools of Music*

Jay Juchniewicz
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to examine music student teaching practices from music education institutions accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music across the United States. One-hundred sixty (N = 160) respondents completed an online questionnaire that addressed: (a) What prerequisites do institutions require prior to beginning student teaching? (b) What similarities or differences exist regarding student teacher placements? (c) Who do institutions use as university supervisors? (d) To what extent are orientation meetings and seminars utilized during the internship? (e) What are the requirements for the successful completion of the student teaching experience? and (f) Upon successful completion of student teaching, program completion, and license requirements, what initial teaching licensure will students receive? Findings indicate more similarities than differences across institutions with respect to student teaching policies and procedures. Additionally, results appear to be consistent with nearly 5 decades of previous research examination on music student teaching practices.

Music education programs have consistently sought to provide preservice teachers with teaching experiences that allow for the personal and professional development needed to successfully enter the music education profession. For many, student teaching¹ represents the most significant aspect of the undergraduate music education curriculum (Brand, 1982; Kelly, 2015; Legette, 1997; Panhorst, 1971); it is a capstone experience that affords music education students the opportunity to apply the knowledge and skills developed in their preservice training within classroom settings. Thus, it is not surprising that student teachers and the internship experience have received a great deal of attention from pedagogues and researchers alike over the past few decades. While empirical examination into this area of music teacher education has produced timely and important findings for the profession, ascertaining the most effective manner in which to structure the student teaching experience has yet to be agreed upon.

A recent content analysis of the top eminent music education journals illustrates a sustained interest for researchers across multiple facets of student teaching (Silveira & Diaz, 2014). More specifically, researchers have attempted to ascertain a greater understanding of the developmental process of the student teacher during the internship by examining topics such as fears entering the student teaching experience (Kelly, 2003; Killian, Dye, & Wayman, 2013; Madsen & Kaiser, 1999), classroom management (Brand, 1982; Kelly, 2008), teacher identity (Draves, 2010; Schmidt, 1998), and assessing growth and development of student teachers (Draves, 2009, 2013). Researchers have also sought to focus on the relationship between the student teacher and the clinical/cooperating teacher as well as where student teachers are placed. For example, studies by Bowles and Runnels (1998), Legette (1997), and Pellegrino (2015) all reveal that forging a positive relationship with the cooperating teacher is beneficial to the professional development of the student teacher. Consequently, due to the influence of the cooperating teacher on the internship experience, the selection of qualified clinical teachers with whom to place student teachers is a critical decision (Kelly, 2006; Zeichner, 1987; Zemek, 2008).

Researchers have posited that in addition to the selection of the cooperating teacher, institutions should carefully consider the location of the student teaching placement, as “the placement should ensure a variety of instructional opportunities with different age-groups and cooperating teachers, but not so many as to dilute the experience” (Fallin & Royse, 2000, p. 19). This appears to be particularly important when considering the certification that student teachers receive at the successful completion of the internship and music education program. In an analysis of certification practices for all 50 states, Henry (2005) found each state determines its own standards for teacher certification, with the type of certification varying widely across states with respect to grade level and content area. Because these certification standards are not uniform, an understanding of the various certification practices is important when structuring the teacher preparation program and experiences associated with it. Several researchers have suggested each student teacher should teach at all grade levels and content areas appropriate to the certification awarded at the successful completion of the student teaching experience (Major, 1994; Music Educators National Conference [MENC], 1987).

Because student teaching placements are structured and controlled by the institution at which student teachers complete their preservice training, it seems plausible that the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the governing body for the majority of music teacher training institutions, and/or the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), the largest accreditor of educator preparation institutions, may have specific structural guidelines for the student teaching experience within the curricular structure for the baccalaureate degree in music education. However, CAEP requirements for the structure of student teaching reflect more broad recommendations rather than specific guidelines, providing that clinical partnerships “establish mutually agreeable expectations for candidate entry, preparation and exit, ensure that

theory and practice are linked, [and] maintain coherence across clinical and academic components of preparation and share accountability for candidate outcomes” (CAEP, 2016, p. 25). With respect to NASM (2016) requirements, student teaching is not considered a required component of the music education curricula, provided the guidelines of “professional education” (p. 115) are fulfilled. Further, the nature of NASM is that it establishes standards as benchmarks that allow for variation within broad principles, and thus, it avoids specific guidelines for carrying out program components. Consequently, no specific guidelines are provided for internship policies, procedures, or the placement of student teachers, “although student teachers must be supervised by qualified music personnel from the institution and coordinating schools” (NASM, 2016, p. 116). The absence of specific guidelines provided by these two governing bodies may result in a lack of consensus across music teacher preparation programs regarding how each student teaching experience is structured.

Given the broad parameters that teacher programs are afforded when constructing the teaching experience for their student teachers, establishing a knowledge base of internship policies and procedures from teacher education institutions is important. It is somewhat surprising, however, that while extant educational research has focused on a variety of areas influencing student teacher success during the internship, such as the impact of university supervisors (e.g., Emans, 1983; Slick, 1998; Zeichner, 1986), less attention has been placed on examining common internship practices across institutions. In a direct attempt to examine music student teaching practices, Panhorst (1971) surveyed 504 institutions offering undergraduate degrees in music education. Findings indicated three quarters of institutions had at least one full-time collegiate music faculty member serve as a supervisor of student teachers. Additionally, each university supervisor was assigned approximately nine student teachers per year and averaged five observations over the course of the placement. Further, 80% of institutions held a student teaching seminar that met approximately seven times during the student teaching period. The majority of these universities and schools did not give additional credit for these seminars, though almost all required mandatory attendance. Continuing this line of investigation, Baumgartner (2014) surveyed NASM-accredited institutions across eight contiguous states to determine current practices on the structure and content of music student teaching seminars. Results revealed the majority of institutions conducted weekly or biweekly seminar meetings, with 90% of respondents indicating these meetings were held face-to-face. Over 82% of participants also reported that an orientation meeting was held immediately prior to the internship. Additional findings also showed that the student teaching internship ranged from 10 to 18 weeks across institutions, with 16 weeks as the most commonly listed response.

While the results of Baumgartner (2014) and Panhorst (1971) have yielded important findings on several aspects of student teaching practices, many questions remain. Are the internship policies and procedures found by Panhorst (1971) still applicable to music education programs nearly 5 decades later? Do the findings of Baumgartner

(2014) with respect to internship placements, orientation meetings, and student teaching seminars materialize in a similar manner when expanded to include music education institutions across the United States? Based on the findings of these two investigations and with the lack of specific guidelines provided by NASM and CAEP with respect to student teaching policies and procedures, it is plausible that many similarities and differences exist across institutions regarding internship structure and the requirements for the successful completion of the student teaching experience. Additionally, as each state determines its own standards for teacher certification, continued examination into the initial teaching licensure received upon completion of student teaching and program completion seems warranted. The current study was designed to extend the research methodologies of Baumgartner (2014) and Panhorst (1971) to examine music student teaching practices from music education institutions across the United States. Specific questions included:

1. What prerequisites do institutions require prior to beginning student teaching?
2. What similarities or differences exist regarding student teacher placements?
3. Who do institutions use as university supervisors?
4. To what extent are orientation meetings and seminars utilized during the internship?
5. What are the requirements for the successful completion of the student teaching experience?
6. Upon successful completion of student teaching, program completion, and license requirements, what initial teaching licensure will students receive?

METHOD

Selection of Potential Participants

To gather input from as many music education programs as possible while maintaining a level of consistency across institutions, I chose to utilize a previous research methodology that selected all NASM-accredited institutional members with undergraduate music education and teacher certification degree programs (Wagoner & Juchniewicz, 2017). As previously determined, the use of this list of accredited institutions provides an opportunity to survey a variety of private, public, conservatory, and comprehensive institutions across all geographic regions in the United States. Using the NASM website,² a total of 649 accredited institutional members were identified. From this total, 523 institutions indicated they offered undergraduate degrees in either music education or music degrees that culminate with teacher certification.

To ascertain the appropriate faculty member to contact, I visited each institution's website to determine the individual responsible for either (a) student teaching placements, (b) student teacher observations, (c) chairing or coordinating the music education department, or (d) serving as a faculty member with extensive knowledge of student teaching practices at the respective school. A name and email address for each

of the 523 institutions was obtained and combined together to serve as the potential participant list for the present study.

Procedure

To address the research questions established for the present study, a survey was designed based on the findings of Baumgartner (2014) and Panhorst (1971) as well as the conclusions and recommendations of previous researchers on (a) student teaching placements (Fallin & Royse, 2000; Major, 1994; MENC, 1987), (b) university supervisors (Emans, 1983; Slick, 1998), (c) internship practices (Bowles & Runnels, 1998; Draves, 2009; Major, 1994; MENC, 1987), and (d) state certifications (Henry, 2005). Forced-choice and open-ended questionnaire items were developed and sequenced to address the following areas: (a) institutional grade point average (GPA) and/or course completion prerequisites required prior to beginning student teaching; (b) number of, length of, and location of student teaching placements; (c) primary area and compensation of university supervisors; (d) number of student teacher observations; (e) orientation meetings; (f) student teaching seminars; (g) teaching portfolios and certification exams required for student teaching, program completion, and/or licensure; (h) additional internship policies; and (i) initial teaching licensure obtained upon completion of student teaching and program requirements.

An online survey provider, Qualtrics (Version 1.0), was used to administer the survey to all potential participants. The questionnaire was placed on the website,³ and a direct link to the survey was created. Next, an email was constructed that explained the purpose of the investigation, contained the direct hyperlink to the survey, and informed potential participants that by clicking on the link they were giving their voluntary consent to participate in the survey. Due to the number of topics encompassed and overall length of the survey, a pilot study was then conducted to determine (a) if the email and hyperlink functioned properly, (b) the validity and appropriateness of each survey item, (c) any problems or limitations with the instrument, and (d) the total amount of time needed to complete the questionnaire. The email containing the survey link was sent to five music education and music therapy faculty members who previously served as university supervisors and were responsible for student teaching placements at multiple different institutions. From this pilot, the wording for several questions was revised including extending question responses to allow for multiple answers. Additionally, it was determined that the email and hyperlink functioned correctly and the online survey could be successfully completed in less than 15 minutes.

RESULTS

From the 523 potential participants emailed, 178 responded to the survey. However, 18 respondents did not complete the survey, resulting in 160 completed surveys and yielding a response rate of 30.6%. Overall, 96.9% ($n = 155$) of institutions require an

internship for program completion and/or initial teaching licensure. Institutions that do not require an internship (3.1%, $n = 5$) were asked to state how they fulfill the professional educational requirement for a bachelor's degree in music education. One respondent indicated "we have a two-month-long practice during our J-term," while the other participants did not understand the question or provide a response. In answer to Question 1 regarding prerequisites, 92.9% of participants ($n = 144$) indicated their program requires a minimum cumulative GPA in order to begin student teaching. This requirement ranged from 2.25 to 3.4, with an average GPA of 2.77 ($SD = .21$). Additionally, nearly two thirds of institutions (65.2%, $n = 101$) have a minimum subject area (i.e., music) GPA requirement as well. This GPA ranged from 2.0 to 3.0 with an average of 2.76 ($SD = .29$). With respect to coursework, data indicate that nearly 75% of institutions ($n = 116$) require that all courses must be completed prior to the start of full-time student teaching, with the exception of a student teaching seminar. For those institutions that do not have this requirement ($n = 39$), only about one third (28.2%, $n = 11$) of students take courses concurrently with their full-time internship placement(s), with the courses offered as both face-to-face and online formats.

In response to Question 2 about similarities and differences in teacher placements, data were analyzed across (a) number of semesters for student teaching, (b) total length of full-time student teaching, (c) number of internship placements, (d) length of individual placement(s), and (e) location of placements. Overall, the majority of institutions (83.9%, $n = 130$) use only one semester for the full-time placement of their student teachers, with 14 programs utilizing two semesters (first semester—observation/part-time, second semester—full-time placement) and two programs employing two semesters of full-time placement. Additionally, nine respondents indicated their institutions operated in a different manner, including quarter systems and alternating part-time and full-time placements within semesters. The total length of the internship in which students are placed in full-time positions ranged from 10 to 30-plus weeks ($M = 15.2$, $SD = 2.10$), with 14, 15, and 16 weeks accounting for 79.4% ($n = 123$) of the total responses. The most common number of placements used for the full-time internship are two (65.2%, $n = 101$), followed by a single placement (23.9%, $n = 37$). While none of the institutions surveyed utilize three placements for the full-time internship, 17 respondents (11%) commented that the number of placements varies between one or two placements depending on the situation of the intern, grade level, or musical area.

Regarding institutions that utilize two placements, the length of the first placement ranges from 5 to 17 weeks ($M = 7.84$, $SD = 1.8$), with 7 and 8 weeks accounting for 67.3% ($n = 68$) of the total responses. Five respondents commented that the length of the first placement varies or is part of a dual placement that is completed concurrently. Similarly, the length of the second placement ranges from 4 to 15-plus weeks ($M = 7.67$, $SD = 1.68$), with 7 and 8 weeks also accounting for 67.3% ($n = 68$) of responses. Additionally, five respondents commented that the length of the second placement varies or is part of a dual placement that is completed concurrently. Finally, with respect to

where student teachers are placed, respondents indicated the majority of student teachers are placed locally, within a 100-mile radius (59.3%, $n = 104$), followed by regionally within the state (12.9%, $n = 27$), statewide (12.5%, $n = 26$), regionally among multiple states (10.5%, $n = 22$), and nationally (4.8%, $n = 10$).

In response to Question 3 about university supervisors, nearly half of the institutions surveyed use full-time faculty (46.8%, $n = 141$), followed by part-time faculty/adjunct faculty (24.6%, $n = 74$), outside university supervisors (20.3%, $n = 61$), and graduate students (8.3%, $n = 25$). A complete breakdown of university supervisors' primary area and average number of interns per semester can be found in Tables 1–3. Overall, full-time faculty who serve as university supervisors are comprised of music education faculty (94.3%, $n = 133$) and ensemble directors (5.7%, $n = 8$; see Table 1).

The average number of interns per semester that full-time faculty supervise ranges from zero to 15 ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 2.16$), with two or four student teachers accounting for nearly half ($n = 70$) of the total responses. Additionally, more than 80% of full-time faculty receive load credit for supervising student teachers, and approximately one third of full-time faculty did not receive load credit but are compensated in the form of a stipend or mileage. Regarding part-time/adjunct faculty, the primary area of instruction included music education faculty (81.1%, $n = 60$), ensemble directors (12.2%, $n = 9$), and applied faculty (6.7%, $n = 5$; see Table 1). Part-time/adjunct faculty average supervising approximately 3.2 interns per semester ($SD = 2.14$), with two student teachers as the most common response (27%) listed by participants. More than 75% of part-time/adjunct faculty receive load credit for supervising student teachers, and an additional 13 did not receive load credit but are compensated in the form of a stipend or mileage.

With respect to the use of outside university supervisors, respondents indicated the majority of these supervisors are former collegiate music faculty (27.4%, $n = 32$) and former music teachers (42.7%, $n = 50$; see Table 2).

The average number of interns per semester that outside university supervisors are responsible for range from one to eight ($M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.71$), with one or two student teachers accounting for over half of the total responses. Further, more than 72% of institutions that utilize outside university supervisors require training prior to receiving a student teacher. Regarding graduate students, participants indicated these university supervisors are primarily from music education (92%, $n = 23$), along with one ensemble director (4.0%) and one applied area (4.0%) (see Table 3).

Graduate students average approximately 2.6 ($SD = 1.41$), with one and three student teachers as the most frequently listed (60%) by respondents. Finally, participants were asked to list the minimum number of observations that university supervisors are required to complete per student teacher. Observations ranged from zero to 14, with four as the most common response (27.1%, $n = 42$) and an average of 4.18 ($SD = 1.85$).

Question 4 examined orientation meetings and seminars during the internship. Regarding orientation meetings, more than 90% of institutions ($n = 141$) hold an internship meeting prior to the start of the student teaching placement. Additionally,

Table 1

Summary of Full-Time and Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty University Supervisors

Full-time (<i>n</i> = 141)	<i>n</i>	Percentage	Part-time/adjunct (<i>n</i> = 74)	<i>n</i>	Percentage
<i>Primary area</i>					
Music education	133	94.3	Music education	60	81.1
Ensemble director	8	5.7	Ensemble director	9	12.2
			Applied	5	6.7
<i>Average number of interns per semester</i>					
0	1	0.7	0	1	1.3
1	9	6.3	1	12	16.2
2	34	23.9	2	20	27.0
2-5	1	0.7	3	11	14.9
3	36	25.6	4	6	8.1
4	16	11.5	5	11	14.9
5	20	14.3	6	4	5.4
6	4	2.8	10	3	4.1
7	3	2.1	Other	6	8.1
8	6	4.3	Varies per semester (4)		
9	2	1.4	Almost never (1)		
10	1	0.7	Only when necessary (1)		
10-15	1	0.7			
Other	7	5.0			
<i>Varies per semester</i>					
<i>Receive load credit</i>					
Yes	114	80.9	Yes	56	75.7
No	27	19.1	No	18	14.3
<i>Receive other form of compensation</i>					
Yes	8	29.6	Yes	13	72.2
No	19	70.4	No	5	27.8
<i>Indicate type of compensation</i>					
Stipend	5	62.5	Stipend	7	53.8
Mileage	3	37.5	Mileage	6	46.2

Table 2
Summary of Outside University Supervisors

Outside university supervisors (<i>n</i> = 61)	<i>n</i>	Percentage
<i>Primary area</i>		
Former collegiate music faculty	32	27.4
Former music teachers	50	42.7
Current music teachers	4	3.4
Former music supervisors	16	13.7
Current music supervisors	4	3.4
Former arts supervisors	6	5.1
Current arts supervisors	1	0.9
Other	4	3.4
Former principals (2)		
Current principals (1)		
Current collegiate music faculty at another institution (1)		
<i>Average number of interns per semester</i>		
1	16	26.2
2	15	24.6
3	9	14.8
4	6	9.9
5	8	13.1
6	1	1.6
7	1	1.6
8	1	1.6
Other	4	6.6
Varies per semester		
<i>Required training for outside university supervisors</i>		
Yes	44	72.1
No	17	27.9

Table 3
Summary of Graduate Student University Supervisors

University supervisors (<i>n</i> = 25)	<i>n</i>	Percentage
<i>Primary area</i>		
Music education	23	92.0
Ensemble director	1	4.0
Applied	1	4.0
<i>Average number of interns per semester</i>		
1	7	28.0
2	3	12.0
3	8	32.0
4	4	16.0
5	1	4.0
6	1	4.0
Other	1	4.0
Varies per semester		

85 respondents (54.8%) stated that an internship meeting is held immediately after the completion of the student teaching placement. A large majority, 136 institutions (87.7%), offer a student teaching seminar during the full-time internship. Participants also indicated that for 97% of these institutions, this seminar is a requirement of the internship. Respondents indicated the number of seminar meetings ranged from one to 30, with an average of 9.17 ($SD = 5.33$). Finally, institutions are more split when assigning the student teaching seminar a separate grade from the internship, with 52.9% of respondents indicating a separate grade is not assigned and 47.1% stating a separate grade is assigned.

In response to Question 5 about the requirements for the successful completion of the student teaching experience, the data were analyzed across (a) teaching portfolios, (b) certification exams, (c) grading of the internship, (d) concurrent employment, (e) potential early release, and (f) ability to complete the music education program and receive a degree without the successful passing of student teaching. Regarding teaching portfolios, more than 82% of institutions require these assessments for either the internship (program completion), the initial teaching licensure, or both the internship and initial teaching licensure (see Table 4).

The majority of these portfolios are institutionally developed (63.8%), though almost one third (31.2%) of institutions require a nationally normed portfolio, with the Teaching Performance Assessment (edTPA) cited as the most commonly utilized of these assessments. Additionally, 97% of participants indicated their institutions require a certification exam for either the internship (program completion), initial teaching licensure, or both internship and initial teaching licensure. From these responses, Praxis II was the most frequently listed (45.4%), followed closely by state music certification exams (43.4%).

Participants indicate that more than half of institutions (52.3%, $n = 81$) grade the internship by providing a pass/fail designation, while 47.7% ($n = 74$) assign a letter grade. With respect to whether student teachers are allowed to have employment (including full-time and part-time) during the full-time internship, results appear to indicate similar parallels with grading, as nearly half of institutions allow for employment (47.7%) while the remaining 52.3% of respondents listed that employment is not permitted. Additionally, only 24 participants (15.5%) noted their student teaching process allows for an early release from the internship. Finally, only 20% of respondents ($n = 31$) indicated that students can still complete the program and receive a music education degree if they fail student teaching.

In response to Question 6 about the licensure students will receive upon successful completion of student teaching, program completion, and license requirements, Table 5 provides a complete listing of licensures across grade level(s) and music areas.

Overall, 33 different combinations of certifications and endorsements were listed by respondents, with K–12 music ($n = 74$) and PK–12 music ($n = 19$) accounting for

Table 4
Summary of Teaching Portfolios and Certification Exams

	<i>N</i>	Percentage
<i>Teaching portfolio required</i>		
Internship requirements (program completion)	59	38.1
Initial teaching licensure	9	5.8
Both internship and initial teaching licensure	60	38.7
Not required for either internship or initial teaching licensure	27	17.4
<i>Teaching portfolios</i>		
Institutionally developed	90	63.8
Nationally normed	44	31.2
State normed	6	4.3
Other	1	0.7
Not sure		
<i>Name of nationally normed portfolio</i>		
Teaching Performance Assessment (edTPA)	40	90.9
Teacher Work Sample (TWS)	2	4.5
Performance Assessment of California Teachers (PACT)	1	2.3
LiveText	1	2.3
<i>Certification exam required</i>		
Internship requirements (program completion)	15	9.7
Initial teaching licensure	49	31.6
Both internship and initial teaching licensure	86	55.5
Not required for either internship or initial teaching licensure	5	3.2
<i>Certification exams</i>		
State music certification exams	82	43.4
Praxis II	85	45.0
Other	22	11.6
edTPA	7	
Basic skills	2	
National Evaluation Series (NES)	2	
Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT)	2	
Academic Literacy Skills Test (ALST)	1	
Communication and literacy test	1	
California Standards Test (CST)	1	
Educating All Students (EAS)	1	
General knowledge	1	
PACT	1	
Program for Licensing Assessments for Colorado Educators (PLACE)	1	
P-12 pedagogy exam	1	
Not sure	1	

Table 5
Summary of Initial Teaching Licensure Received

	Responses
K-12 music	74
PK-12 music	19
K-12 choral or K-12 instrumental	13
K-12 instrumental/general or K-12 vocal/general	7
P-12 music	6
P-12 choral/general or P-12 instrumental/general	3
Secondary certificate w/K-12 endorsement in music	3
EC-12 music	2
K-12 music, 6-12 choral, or 6-12 band	2
K-12 choral or K-12 band	2
P-12 vocal, P-12 general, or P-12 instrumental	2
6-12 or K-12 (w/2-3 extra classes)	1
6-12 choral or 6-12 instrumental	1
6-12 music	1
B-21 music	1
E-12 music	1
K-8 general music or 5-12 choral or 5-12 instrumental	1
K-12 choral	1
K-12 general music, K-12 music band, K-12 music orchestra, or K-12 music choral	1
K-12 instrumental/general, K-12 choral/general, or K-12 instrumental/choral/general	1
K-12 music or 6-12 music	1
K-12 vocal with classroom music or K-12 instrumental with classroom music	1
K-12, endorsements in middle school music, HS band, HS choir, or HS orchestra	1
P-12 choral/general, P-12 instrumental/general or all three areas	1
P-12 choral/general, P-12 instrumental/general or P-12 general only	1
P-12 choral or P-12 instrumental	1
PK-12 choral/vocal, P-12 instrumental/general or P-12 general	1
PK-12 general, PK-12 instrumental, or PK-12 vocal	1
PK-12 music or PK-12 vocal music	1
PK-12 vocal or PK-12 instrumental	1
PK-adult	1
Multiage music	1
Induction	1

Note: K-12 = kindergarten to 12th grade; PK-12 = prekindergarten to 12th grade; PK-12 = pre-school to 12th grade; HS = high school.

60% of the licenses granted to student teachers who successfully complete their student teaching, program, and licensure requirements.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine music student teaching practices from NASM-accredited music education institutions across the United States. Due to

the number of policies and procedures related to the structure of student teaching that were investigated, specific research questions were developed including (a) prerequisites required prior to beginning student teaching, (b) similarities or differences regarding student teaching placements, (c) who institutions use as university supervisors, (d) the extent orientation meetings and seminars are utilized during the internship, (e) requirements for the successful completion of the student teaching experience, and (f) initial teaching licensure received upon successful completion of the internship, program completion, and license requirements.

In response to the Question 1, it appears that almost all institutions require a minimum institutional GPA, with more than two thirds of institutions also mandating a minimum subject area (i.e., music) GPA as well. One interesting finding is that both minimum institutional and subject area GPAs are approximately the same. This is somewhat surprising given the plausibility that institutions requiring a separate minimum subject area (i.e., music) GPA have this prerequisite because they place a greater emphasis on these courses above the rest of the general education or other undergraduate coursework. Findings also indicate three quarters of institutions require all courses must be completed prior to the start of full-time student teaching, with the exception of a student teaching seminar. Further, for institutions that do not have this prerequisite for student teaching, only a small number permit students to take classes concurrently with their full-time internship placements. Previous researchers have maintained all coursework should be completed prior to starting the internship so that student teachers can devote their time to developing instructional competence and daily preparations for becoming a teacher (Major, 1994; MENC, 1987), a conclusion that appears to be mirrored by the findings of the present investigation.

In response to Question 2, results reveal the majority of institutions conduct their full-time internship for one semester. The total length of this internship averages approximately 15 weeks, concurring with recent findings that indicate 16 weeks is the most common length of full-time student teaching (Baumgartner, 2014). Additionally, two thirds of institutions utilize two placements with the length for both the first and second placements found to average between 7 and 8 weeks each. Previous researchers have suggested the full-time internship should provide student teachers the opportunity to work with different age groups and cooperating teachers (Fallin & Roysse, 2000), and more specifically, that student teachers should teach at multiple grade levels and content areas to “experience and understand the relatedness of the curriculum” (Major, 1994, p. 31). It appears the majority of institutions surveyed in the present study concur and have structured their internships to allow for these experiences through multiple school and cooperating teacher placements. Finally, in a similar fashion to Baumgartner (2014), who found the most common distance for student teacher placement was 60 miles or less, the results of the present investigation indicate the majority of student teachers are also placed locally (within a 100-mile radius), with fewer student teachers being placed regionally within the state, statewide, regionally among multiple states,

and nationally, respectively. While the results of the present study and Baumgartner (2014) indicate most student teachers are placed locally, it is plausible that many institutions are forced to place student teachers much farther away due to difficulties finding suitable student teaching placements in close proximity to their institution. Therefore, it would be interesting to examine student teacher placements by geographic location of institutions to determine if the results found in the national average of the present study would be different or materialize similarly.

Regarding Question 3, nearly half of institutions were found to use full-time faculty, with part-time/adjunct faculty, outside university supervisors, and graduate students also utilized as university supervisors. Full-time faculty, part-time/adjunct faculty, and graduate students were all found to be primarily from the area of music education and supervised approximately two to three student teachers per semester. This result compares favorably with Panhorst (1971), who found the majority of institutions had at least one full-time music faculty member serve as a supervisor of student teachers, as well as with Emans (1983) and Slick (1998), who concluded the use of graduate students as supervisors can be beneficial in fostering positive relationships with clinical/cooperating teachers and influence the development of the student teacher. Additional findings from the present study showed outside university supervisors were found to be mostly comprised of former collegiate music faculty and former music teachers, responsible for about two student teachers per semester. Finally, it appears that on average, all university supervisors are required to complete four minimum observations per student teacher, paralleling previous findings that indicate supervisors complete approximately five observations per student teacher (Emans, 1983; Panhorst, 1971).

In response to Question 4, the vast majority of institutions hold an internship meeting prior to the start of the student teaching placement, corroborating similar findings by Baumgartner (2014). Furthermore, more than half of institutions from the present investigation also reported an internship meeting is held immediately after the completion of the student teaching placement. Student teacher seminars were held by the majority of institutions during the full-time internship, with nearly all seminars requiring attendance as part of the internship. Additionally, there appears to be an average of nine seminar meetings per student placement with more than half of institutions not assigning a separate grade from the internship. These results appear to be similarly aligned with Panhorst (1971), who found most institutions (a) conduct student seminars during the full-time student teaching, (b) require mandatory attendance, (c) do not provide additional grade compensation, and (d) hold approximately seven seminar meetings per internship. Similarly, Baumgartner (2014) determined the majority of institutions conducted weekly or biweekly seminar meetings over the average course of 16 weeks, and the majority of these meetings were held face-to-face. While the present study did not specifically investigate the method of instructional delivery selected to conduct seminar meetings, this could certainly represent an area of future research.

Regarding Question 5, the vast majority of music programs require a teaching portfolio for either the internship (program completion), initial teaching licensure, or both internship and initial teaching licensure, and almost all institutions require a certification exam for either the internship (program completion), the initial teaching licensure, or both the internship and initial teaching licensure. These findings align with previous researchers who also concluded the large majority of states require standardized testing for certification (Henry, 2005). The type of teaching portfolios used to assess student teachers range from institutionally developed to nationally normed, such as the edTPA, while certification exams are centered more specifically on the Praxis II and state certification exams. Finally, more than half of institutions listed that concurrent employment is not permitted during the full-time internship, a policy previously recommended to allow student teachers to completely focus on teaching and the daily preparations required in order to become a successful teacher (Major, 1994; MENC, 1987).

In response to the final research question (Question 6), it appears the number of differing combinations of certification and endorsements that student teachers receive upon successful completion of the internship, program completion, and license requirements aligns with previous findings by Henry (2005). More specifically, Henry (2005) determined that the vast majority of states offer all-level music teacher certification, along with a number of different combinations of grade level and content area credentials. The results of the present study support these conclusions, as K–12 music and PK–12 music account for more than half of all certifications, along with a large number of additional credential combinations offered.

Overall, it appears that these results from the present investigation of a national survey of NASM-accredited schools reveal more similarities than differences with respect to student teaching practices. Additionally, when compared with previous research findings, (a) minimum GPA requirements; (b) number of, length of, and location of student teaching placements; (c) demographics of university supervisors; (d) number of student teacher observations; (e) use of orientation meetings and student teaching seminars; (f) requirement of teaching portfolios and certification exams; and (g) differing combinations of grade level and content area music teacher certifications appear to be consistent with policies and procedures enacted over the past several decades. However, caution should still be exercised when viewing the results of the present study. While the response rate for a nationally administered survey is acceptable, it is notable that many participants started but did not complete the survey. The reasons are unknown, but it is possible their participation could have influenced the overall findings of the investigation. Additionally, while the methodology employed for the present study provided an opportunity to gather input from a large number of accredited music education programs, a probability sampling procedure was not specifically utilized and therefore could reflect the potential for bias in responding institutions. It should also be acknowledged that this sample does not completely encompass the entire population of music education and teacher certification degree programs across the United States.

Future investigations should consider examining all music teacher education programs to not only gain an understanding of the student teaching practices at these institutions but also to determine any impact of forgoing specific accreditations (e.g., NASM, CAEP, etc.) on the structure of music education curricula, and more specifically, student teaching policies and procedures.

While the current study reveals a broad picture of student teaching practices from NASM-accredited institutions across the United States, it is interesting to note the consistency of these results over nearly 5 decades of examination. Salzillo and Van Fleet (1977) posited “the only function of student teaching which has been identified by research studies is one of socialization. . . . To our knowledge, no study has shown conclusively that student teaching has any unique educational component other than assimilation” (p. 28). Many have been critical that the role of student teaching mainly serves to develop teaching behaviors and form student teachers’ professional identity (Rideout & Feldman, 2002). While the present investigation did not specifically examine desired outcomes of the internship experience, the similarities of student teaching practices over the past 50 years may lend support to these critiques. Further investigation is needed to determine whether these policies and procedures of student teaching reinforce normative practices or are actually “tried and true” methods that positively impact the student teaching experience. Is there a difference in student teacher growth when compared across number of and length of student teaching placements? Does the primary area and background of university supervisors influence their overall effectiveness in mentoring student teachers? How effective are the use of orientation meetings and student teaching seminars in supporting the development of student teachers? Are specific teaching portfolios and certification exams more effective and/or more predictive of early music teaching success in the classroom? These questions represent only a small number of worthwhile investigations needed to continue a further understanding of student teaching. More empirical investigation into the effectiveness of student teaching practices and their influence on the development of student teachers is warranted.

NOTE

1. In a similar manner to Baumgartner (2014), the terms *student teacher* and *intern*, *student teaching* and *internship*, and *clinical teacher* and *cooperating teacher* are used interchangeably.
2. See www.nasm.arts-accredit.org/.
3. See <http://www.ecu.qualtrics.com>.

REFERENCES

- Baumgartner, C. M. (2014). An examination of music student teaching seminars at midwestern universities. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 24(1), 51–64. doi:10.1177/1057083713494013
- Bowles, C., & Runnels, B. D. (1998). The need for collaboration in the student teaching experience. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 8(1), 15.

- Brand, M. (1982). Effects of student teaching on the classroom management beliefs and skills of music student teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 30(4), 255–265.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (2016). *CAEP accreditation handbook* (Version 3). Retrieved from <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/caep-accreditation-handbook>
- Draves, T. J. (2009). Portfolio assessment in student teaching: A reliability study. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 19(1), 25–38. doi:10.1177/1057083709343906
- Draves, T. J. (2010). Fostering and sustaining music teacher identity in the student teaching experience. In L. K. Thompson & M. R. Campbell (Eds.), *Issues of identity in music education: Narratives and practices* (pp. 15–35). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Draves, T. J. (2013). Transition from student to teacher—Student teaching: The capstone experience. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 23(1), 50–62. doi:10.1177/1057083712474935
- Emans, R. (1983). Implementing the knowledge base: Redesigning the function of cooperating teachers and college supervisors. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(3), 14–18.
- Fallin, J., & Roysse, D. (2000). Student teaching: The keystone experience. *Music Educators Journal*, 87(3), 19–22.
- Henry, M. (2005). An analysis of certification practices for music educators in the fifty states. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 14(2), 47–61.
- Kelly, S. N. (2003). Preservice music education student fears of the internship and initial inservice teaching experience. *Contributions to Music Education*, 27, 41–50.
- Kelly, S. N. (2006). The accuracy of K–12 public school supervising music teachers' written assessments of student teaching performance practices. *Contributions to Music Education*, 33, 41–57.
- Kelly, S. N. (2008). High school instrumental students' perceptions of effective music student teacher traits. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 17(2), 83–91. doi:10.1177/1057083708317648
- Kelly, S. N. (2015). The influence of student teaching experiences on preservice music teachers' commitments to teaching. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 24(2), 10–22. doi:10.1177/1057083713506120
- Killian, J. N., Dye, K. G., & Wayman, J. B. (2013). Music student teachers: Pre-student teaching concerns and post-student teaching perceptions over a 5-year period. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 61(1), 63–79. doi:10.1177/0022429412474314
- Legette, R. M. (1997). Enhancing the music student-teaching experience: A research review. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 16(1), 25–28.
- Madsen, C. K., & Kaiser, K. A. (1999). Pre-internship fears of student teaching. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 17(2), 27–32.
- Major, J. E. (1994). Student teaching: Full-time, multilevel, and concurrent. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 3(2), 30–32.
- Music Educators National Conference. (1987). *Music teacher education: Partnership and process*. Reston, VA: MENC.
- National Association of Schools of Music. (2016). *NASM Handbook 2016–2017*. Retrieved from <https://nasm.arts-accredit.org/>
- Panhorst, D. L. (1971). Current practices in the evaluation of student teachers in music. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 19(2), 204–208.
- Pellegrino, K. (2015). Student, cooperating, and supervising teacher perceptions of educational and musical interactions during student teaching. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 24(2), 54–73. doi:10.1177/1057083713508653
- Rideout, R., & Feldman, A. (2002). Research in music student teaching. In R. Colwell and C. Richardson (Eds.), *New handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 874–886). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Salzillo, F., & Van Fleet, A. A. (1977). Student teaching and teacher education: A sociological model for change. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 2(1), 27–31. doi:10.1177/002248717702800108
- Schmidt, M. E. (1998). Defining “good” music teaching: Four student teachers’ beliefs and practices. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 138, 19–46.
- Silveira, J. M., & Diaz, F. M. (2014). Student teaching in music: A content analysis of research journals in music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 23(2), 92–104. doi:10.1177/1057083713487215
- Slick, S. K. (1998). The university supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(8), 831–834.
- Wagoner, C. W., & Juchniewicz, J. (2017). An examination of secondary wind instrument methods courses. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 26(3), 51–64. doi:10.1177/1057083716665883
- Zeichner, K. M. (1986). Individual and institutional influences on the development of teacher perspectives. In J. D. Rath and L. G. Katz (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (Vol. 2, pp. 135–163). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Zeichner, K. M. (1987). The ecology of field experience: Toward an understanding of the role of field experiences in teacher development. In M. Haberman & J. M. Backus (Eds.), *Advances in teacher education* (Vol. 3, pp. 94–117). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Zemek, M. D. (2008). The selection and preparation of cooperating teachers in music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 17(2), 7–18. doi:10.1177/1057083708317619