

TEAM Scores: (Band, March 2026)

Instruction Indicator	Score	Evidence Notes
Standards and Objectives	3	The teacher verbally communicated 4-5 learning objectives at the beginning of the lesson related to rhythm (counting and playing dotted rhythms), articulation, pitch/intonation, accidentals, and distinguishing major versus minor keys. All instruction, modeling of skills and musical structure, and content clearly reflected alignment to these core objectives. Throughout the lesson, the teacher consistently pointed back to specific skills (articulation, timing, major v. minor) to ensure connection to standards, and the lesson closure reiterated the objectives covered. However, students were not given time to internalize the learning goals themselves. There was limited connection to previous learning goals, life experiences, and/or other disciplines, though the teacher did reference the song being used in films and commercials to provide context.
Motivating Students	4	The teacher organized content to be meaningful and relevant to students by sharing background on the musical score, including the story of Mars and its connection to war and tension, and referencing how the song is used in films and commercials. Students listened to sample music to provide context. The teacher consistently reinforced effort with positive feedback such as "come on," "I like that," and "good job" when students demonstrated improvement in performance goals. The teacher followed up with students during the lesson, affirmed their efforts, encouraged them when trying new and challenging musical patterns, and offered individual assistance. However, there was limited evidence that inquiry, curiosity, or exploration were valued as learning experiences in the presentation of the lesson.
Presenting Instructional Content	4	The lesson effectively used multiple presentation strategies including modeling (piano demonstrations, keyboard examples, clapping out rhythms), visual models and presentations (smart board/panel displays of music, introductory video of the score), and clear, logical, and concise communication. The teacher frequently modeled performance expectations and identified instruments as students listened to music. The lesson was appropriately sequenced with scaffolded skills building from basic to more complex understanding: the teacher began with a connection to Roman mythology, then moved into intonation and note structure, started with a visual of the music and how to count it, proceeded to clapping the rhythm, focused on lead-in measures to the main piece, and culminated by asking students to play the entire section. However, there was limited evidence of a visual organizer that

TEAM Scores: (Band, March 2026)

		establishes the purpose of the lesson or internal summaries of the lesson.
Lesson Structure and Pacing	4	The lesson began promptly and was paced well with a very clear and distinct beginning, middle, and end. The lesson was progressively sequenced, leading up to whole-group attempts at the score. The teacher transitioned between whole group instruction, several sessions of individual support and feedback, small group practice by instrument section, and culminating whole group performance with limited lost instructional time. The teacher quickly distributed materials when needed (e.g., delivered mutes for horn players, collected music originals). However, there was little time provided during lesson closure for student reflection on the lesson's goals and how individuals/the whole group made progress toward mastery.
Activities and Materials	4	Students were actively engaged in tasks that required performance on their instruments. Materials were readily accessible and aligned to achieving the learning goals, including instruments, technology (smart board/panel), music booklets (Section 29), sample music, YouTube video, and specialized equipment. The activities and materials provided opportunities for students to engage in group discussion and practice, modeling of critical skills, and incorporated technology with the smart panel and introductory video of the score. Activities were appropriately challenging and required students to interpret meaning from the musical score.
Questioning	3	A variety of questions were presented throughout the lesson, with the teacher consistently engaging students with questions about the musical score. Questions included: "What do you notice about rhythm here?", "What articulations do you hear?", "What is that called?", "Anything else?", and "What do the articulations have to do with the character of the piece?" However, most questions were recall questions rather than higher-order thinking prompts. Most of the instruction, thinking, and problem-solving was owned by the teacher rather than asking questions to prompt thinking among students. There were limited opportunities for individual students (volunteers or non-volunteers) to respond to questions, and students did not generate their own questions to further their learning.
Academic Feedback	4	The teacher consistently circulated throughout the lesson during group and individual practice time, providing timely feedback that was mostly academically focused and aligned to the learning objectives. The teacher was engaged with individual students from various sections to help them read and interpret the score sheet, play particularly challenging portions of the score, address equipment issues, and modeled how to form mouth patterns to change the intonation of notes.

TEAM Scores: (Band, March 2026)

		Students used feedback to improve their individual and whole group performance. There was limited evidence of students providing feedback to one another.
Grouping Students	4	The teacher strategically used multiple grouping arrangements (individual, small groups by instrument section, and whole class) to maximize student learning and understanding. Each section-based group was given specific activities and objectives for their group work and interaction time. The teacher consistently communicated learning goals as students transitioned to various grouping arrangements to ensure progress toward stated goals was at the forefront of learning regardless of instructional grouping format. Most students in groups understood their roles, responsibilities, and group work expectations. Students participating in groups were held accountable for both group work and individual work. The instructional grouping arrangements adequately enhanced student understanding and learning efficiency.
Teacher Content Knowledge	5	The teacher displayed accurate and strong knowledge of all musical concepts being taught. The teacher regularly implemented a variety of subject-specific strategies including, but not limited to, audio/visual models for performance expectations, playing the piano to demonstrate differences in major/minor keys, modeling proper technique, and explaining musical notation. The teacher demonstrated content knowledge through multiple modalities and anticipated student learning difficulties by modeling expectations prior to performance activities.
Teacher Knowledge of Students	4	There was evidence of differentiated instruction where students were able to progress at different rates based on ability. The teacher used group and individual practice time within the lesson for students to practice on their own instruments prior to bringing the whole group back together. The teacher called on students directly to answer questions and appeared to anticipate potential learning difficulties by modeling expectations prior to performance activities. The teacher provided individual assistance tailored to specific student needs across various sections during circulation time.
Thinking	3	The teacher consistently promoted analytical and practical thinking throughout the lesson. Students had to evaluate information and apply musical concepts, interpreting notes from the score sheet into patterns and estimations for how they might sound. The four core objectives for the lesson were evident in the practical thinking students were required to do to put it all together to perform a portion of the score. Students analyzed problems from the musical score (rhythm patterns, articulations, key signatures) and applied their understanding practically through instrument performance. However, there was limited evidence

TEAM Scores: (Band, March 2026)

		that the teacher provided opportunities for students to generate a variety of ideas and alternatives or to monitor their own thinking processes.
Problem Solving	3	The opportunities for problem solving were focused primarily on observing, creating, predicting outcomes, and drawing conclusions. This was evident throughout the lesson as students worked to make musical sense of the notes, markings, and accidentals in the score sheet. However, there was limited evidence that the teacher implemented multiple problem-solving types. While the teacher identified problems with the musical performance, there were no opportunities provided for students to generate ideas for how to improve the performance. Additional problem-solving types such as abstraction, categorization, improving solutions, and identifying relevant/irrelevant information were not evident.