

Appendix G

Student Outcomes

(G1)	Studio Habits of Mind	Pages 1 – 4
(G2)	Concert Ratings	Pages 5 – 11
(G3)	Scholastics Participation and Performance	Page 12
(G4)	District Assessments	Pages 13 – 17
(G5)	AP and IB Exam Results	Pages 18 – 21

Habits of Mind

Studio Habits of Mind (SHoM) was developed by Harvard’s School of Education Project Zero¹. A set of eight dispositions to describe artist thinking skills, SHoM provide a language to discuss critical thinking skills in the arts.

During the 2016-17 school year, a group of visual arts teachers representing elementary, middle, and high school developed a student survey based on SHoM, and piloted the survey with a class. The assessment tool was then modified based on feedback from teachers and students. This assessment tool was developed for 5th grade (elementary), 8th grade (visual art 2 at all and visual art 3 at Kenmore), and Art 3/Studio Art, IB art, and Ceramics 3 (high school).

The purpose of the assessment tool was to capture the critical thinking skills and decisions that students face and solve when creating art. Elementary and high school students participated in the assessment during spring 2017. Middle school students participated during fall 2017.

Elementary

Table 1: Elementary Habits of Mind Responses

	Consistently	Sometimes	No	# of NA Responses
Craftsmanship: I selected tools for this project with careful thought and applied them with precision. (n=654)	56%	42%	2%	4
Persistence: I faced challenges throughout my artistic process which were met with problem-solving skills. (n=650)	54%	43%	3%	8
My Idea and Vision: I used research notes, sketches, and discussion with my peers and my teacher to develop my idea. (n=648)	52%	38%	10%	10
Express: I successfully used line, shape, color, texture, space, repetition, and movement, etc. to show an emotion. (n=622)	53%	42%	5%	36
Observe: I learned to see like an artist - carefully observing everything around me. (n=638)	50%	42%	8%	20
Stretch & Explore: I was willing to take risks and learn from my mistakes. (n=650)	64%	32%	5%	8
Understand the Art World: I discovered and learned about artists, genres, time periods, etc. (n=630)	59%	34%	7%	28
Reflect: My growth as an artist enables me to reflect on my artistic processes and my final product. (n=647)	65%	31%	4%	11

¹ www.pz.harvard.edu

Middle School

Middle school teachers updated their tool based on feedback from their pilot. The middle school tool assessed the same categories with modified language and response options.

Table 2: Middle School Habits of Mind Scores

	Mostly	A lot	A little	None
In developing your favorite work of art, how much did your skill improve? (n=115)	34%	47%	19%	0%

	Always	Mostly	Sometimes	Never
Develop Craft: Throughout the process of creating your favorite work of art, how often did you carefully select your tools and materials? (n=115)	49%	36%	16%	0%

	Yes, I kept going	Yes, I kept going, but in a different direction	No	# of NA Responses
Engage & Persist: Did you encounter any challenges with your favorite work of art, if so, did you keep going? (n=105)	61%	32%	7%	10

	Mostly	A lot	A little	None
Envision: Did you plan ahead before beginning your favorite work of art? (n=115)	40%	29%	23%	9%

	Yes	Mostly	A little	Not really
Express: Does your favorite work of art reflect on who you are? (n=115)	29%	30%	20%	21%

	Yes	Mostly	A little	Not really
Observe: When you were working on your favorite work of art, did you incorporate the elements of the world around you? (n=115)	32%	19%	22%	27%

	Yes	Mostly	A little	Not really
Stretch & Explore: Did your favorite work of art challenge you to take risks and learn new techniques? (n=115)	51%	22%	17%	10%

	Yes	Mostly	A little	Not really
Was your work of art unique and inspiring to others? (n=115)	31%	20%	28%	21%

	Yes	Mostly	A little	Not really
Understand the Art World: Was your favorite work of art inspired/influenced by another work of art/artist? (n=115)	28%	7%	23%	43%

	Yes	Mostly	A little	Not really
Reflect: After making your favorite work of art, did you reflect on its process? (n=115)	40%	22%	16%	23%

High School

Table 3: High School Habits of Mind Scores

	Consistently	Sometimes	No	# of NA Responses
Develop Craft: The mediums and tools were selected with careful thought and applied with precision. These selections were made to elevate the subject and overall idea of the piece. (n=107)	75%	25%	0%	0
Develop Craft: Using my existing art knowledge and skills, I furthered my abilities through experimentation and by utilizing new art techniques. (n=107)	72%	27%	1%	0
Engage and Persist: Any challenges that surfaced throughout my artistic process were met with persistence and mature problem-solving skills. Multiple solutions were investigated. Throughout this investigative process, a distinct focus developed within my artwork. (n=104)	59%	41%	0%	3
Envision: I dedicated time to conceptualize my various ideas/processes before and throughout my artmaking. Ideas were organized in the form of research notes, preliminary sketches, and discussion with peers/teacher, and critiques. (n=106)	66%	32%	2%	1
Express: The final product is a reflection/extension of my personal aesthetic, technique, voice, and vision. (n=107)	61%	37%	2%	2
Express: I was able to successfully utilize the Elements of Art and Principles of Design to convey a coherent emotion/idea. (n=106)	64%	33%	3%	1
Express: My work shows an awareness of my audience. (n=99)	39%	47%	14%	8
Observe: I invested considerable time into researching my subject, art making processes, and/or the environment around me that I may have otherwise overlooked. (n=107)	62%	31%	8%	0
Stretch & Explore: I was willing to take risks and learn from my mistakes. Throughout the process I was able to remain resilient and maintain an open-mind. I was willing to push myself into unknown, sometimes uncomfortable territory	69%	29%	2%	1

Appendix G1

	Consistently	Sometimes	No	# of NA Responses
and make meaningful connections with previous artwork I've made/past experiences. (n=106)				
Understand the Art World: I immersed myself in discovering all aspects of my subject (various artists, genres, time periods, etc.). (n=100)	49%	33%	18%	7
Reflect: I understand that my growth as an evolving artist is nourished by my ability to reflect on my artistic processes and final product. I am receptive to peer/teacher constructive feedback. (n=107)	86%	12%	2%	0

Concert Observations

Throughout the 2016-17 school year, trained observers attended instrumental and choral school concerts to assess them using a rubric (Concert Rating Form). The Concert Rating Form was developed by the Arts Education Office and was based on several concert observation tools used by other jurisdictions in Virginia and Maryland. Feedback was provided by a committee of elementary, middle school, and high school music teachers, and was then pre-tested by teachers at all levels. Once the tool was finalized, a training was held for observers to ensure inter-rater reliability. Observers were former APS employees with experience teaching music.

Rating Forms

Table 1: Instrumental Rating Form

1 –A SUPERIOR Consistently Evident	2–B EXCELLENT Frequently Evident	3 – C GOOD Occasionally Evident	4– D FAIR Rarely Evident
TONE QUALITY			
Overall tone quality is characteristic of the instruments and students age; Focused, controlled sound in all ranges			
1 -Overall tone quality is consistently evident and characteristic of the instruments and students age; consistently focused, controlled sound in all ranges	2 -Overall tone quality is evident and characteristic of the instruments and students age; frequently focused, controlled sound in all ranges (with a few notable exceptions)	3 -Overall tone quality is not consistently maintained and characteristic of the instruments and students age; needed adjustments are not made consistently.	4 -Overall tone quality is rarely characteristic of the instruments and students age; needed adjustments are not made.
INTONATION/TECHNIQUE			
Produce uniform tonal focus, attention to tuning and pitch processes, adjustments made as needed. Notes are generally in tune and supported by air, fingering, or bow techniques.			
1 -Uniform tonal focus is maintained; needed adjustments are made quickly.	2 -Uniform tonal focus is frequently evident with only a few notable exceptions; needed adjustments are usually made quickly.	3 -Uniform tonal focus is inconsistent. Notes are sometimes in tune, air, fingering, or bow techniques are inconsistent.	4 -Uniform tonal focus is rarely evident. Notes are not in tune and not supported by air, fingering, or bow techniques.
RHYTHM			
Age Appropriate Rhythmic precision, Pulse, Articulation, Tempo, produce a natural feel to rhythmic passages			
1 -Consistent rhythmic precision and accuracy; appropriate tempi are clearly evident.	2 -Consistent rhythmic precision and accuracy; appropriate tempi are evident with a few notable exceptions.	3 -Consistent rhythmic precision and accuracy; appropriate tempi are inconsistent.	4 -Consistent rhythmic precision and accuracy; appropriate tempi are rarely evident.

1 –A SUPERIOR Consistently Evident	2–B EXCELLENT Frequently Evident	3 – C GOOD Occasionally Evident	4– D FAIR Rarely Evident	
MUSICIANSHIP/DYNAMICS/ EXPRESSION/BALANCE				
Age Appropriate phrasing Dynamics, Style, Balance - Within instrumental sections, Across the ensemble				
1-Musical phrasing, expressive dynamics, and artistic style and interpretation are consistently evident.	2-Musical phrasing, expressive dynamics, and artistic style and interpretation are evident at most times.	3-Musical phrasing, expressive dynamics, and artistic style and interpretation are evident at times, but not consistent throughout.	4-Musical phrasing, expressive dynamics, and artistic style and interpretation are rarely evident.	Not Observed 4 th grade

CONDUCTING				
Accurate conducting skills for students age (beat, gesture/style, cues/cut offs, posture), communicates emotional content, confidence/command, presentation				
1-Accurate conducting skills (gesture/style, cues/cut offs, posture), communication of emotional content, confidence/command, presentation are consistently evident.	2-Accurate conducting skills (gesture/style, cues/cut offs, posture), communication of emotional content, confidence/command, presentation are evident with a few notable exceptions.	3-Accurate conducting skills (gesture/style, cues/cut offs, posture), communication of emotional content, confidence/command, presentation are occasionally evident but inconsistent.	4-Accurate conducting skills (gesture/style, cues/cut offs, posture), communication of emotional content, confidence/command, presentation are rarely evident.	

GENERAL FACTORS				
Age appropriate Repertoire Posture, Focus, Stage etiquette/presentation, Preparedness				
1-Posture, focus, stage etiquette/presence, and facial expression are clearly and consistently evident. Teacher and ensemble were consistently prepared.	2-Posture, focus, stage etiquette/presence, and facial expression are evident at most times with a few notable exceptions. Teacher and ensemble were prepared.	3-Posture, focus, stage etiquette/presence, and facial expression are inconsistent. Teacher and ensemble were inconsistently prepared.	4-Posture, focus, stage etiquette/presence, and facial expression are rarely evident Teacher and ensemble did not seem prepared.	

Table 2: Choral Rating Form

1 – A SUPERIOR Consistently Evident	2 – B EXCELLENT Frequently Evident	3 – C GOOD Occasionally Evident	4 – D FAIR Rarely Evident
TONE QUALITY/DICTION			
Healthy tone, Focus, Breath management, timbre & diction, Vowels, Consonants, Syllabic stress, Languages, Age appropriate			
1 -Age appropriate tone (vibrant, free, open), focus, and breath management are consistently evident. Vowels, consonants, language, pronunciation, and syllabic stress are unified throughout the ensemble.	2 -Age appropriate tone (vibrant, free, open), focus, and breath management are Vowels, consonants, language, pronunciation, and syllabic stress are unified throughout the ensemble. (Evident with a few notable exceptions.)	3 -Age appropriate tone (vibrant, free, open), focus, and breath management are Vowels, consonants, language, pronunciation, and syllabic stress are unified throughout the ensemble. (Evident but not consistent)	4 -Age appropriate tone (vibrant, free, open), focus, and breath management are Vowels, consonants, language, pronunciation, and syllabic stress are unified throughout the ensemble. (Rarely or not evident)
INTONATION			
Age Appropriate Pitch accuracy, Unisons, Intervals, Chords, Tonality			
1 - Melodic and harmonic pitches are correct; tonality is maintained; needed adjustments are made quickly.	2 -Melodic and harmonic pitches and tonality are correct with only a few notable exceptions; needed adjustments are usually made quickly	3 -Some melodic and/or harmonic errors; tonality is not consistently maintained; needed adjustments are not made consistently	4 -Frequent melodic and harmonic pitch inaccuracies, tonality rarely maintained; needed adjustments are rarely made
RHYTHM			
Age Appropriate Rhythmic precision, Pulse, Tempo			
1 -Consistent rhythmic precision and accuracy; appropriate tempi are clearly evident.	2 -Consistent rhythmic precision and accuracy; appropriate tempi are evident with a few notable exceptions.	3 -Consistent rhythmic precision and accuracy; appropriate tempi are inconsistent.	4 -Consistent rhythmic precision and accuracy; appropriate tempi are rarely evident.
MUSICIANSHIP/DYNAMICS/ EXPRESSION/BALANCE			
Age Appropriate phrasing Dynamics, Style within the vocal section across the ensemble			
1 -Musical phrasing, expressive dynamics, and artistic style and interpretation are consistently evident.	2 -Musical phrasing, expressive dynamics, and artistic style and interpretation are evident at most times.	3 -Musical phrasing, expressive dynamics, and artistic style and interpretation are evident at times, but not consistent throughout.	4 -Musical phrasing, expressive dynamics, and artistic style and interpretation are rarely evident.
CONDUCTING			
Accurate conducting skills for students age (beat, gesture/style, cues/cut offs, posture), communicates emotional content, confidence/command, presentation			
1 -Accurate conducting skills (gesture/style, cues/cut offs,	2 -Accurate conducting skills (gesture/style, cues/cut offs,	3 -Accurate conducting skills (gesture/style, cues/cut offs, posture),	4 -Accurate conducting skills (gesture/style, cues/cutoffs, posture), communication of

1 –A SUPERIOR Consistently Evident	2–B EXCELLENT Frequently Evident	3 – C GOOD Occasionally Evident	4 – D FAIR Rarely Evident
posture), communication of emotional content, confidence/command, presentation are consistently evident.	posture), communication of emotional content, confidence/command, presentation are evident with a few notable exceptions.	communication of emotional content, confidence/command, presentation are occasionally evident but inconsistent.	emotional content, confidence/command, presentation are rarely evident.
GENERAL FACTORS			
Age appropriate Repertoire Posture, Focus, Stage etiquette/presentation, Facial expression, Preparedness			
1 -Posture, focus, stage etiquette/presence, and facial expression are clearly and consistently evident. Teacher and ensemble were consistently prepared.	2 -Posture, focus, stage etiquette/presence, and facial expression are evident at most times with a few notable exceptions. Teacher and ensemble were prepared.	3 -Posture, focus, stage etiquette/presence, and facial expression are inconsistent. Teacher and ensemble were inconsistently prepared.	4 -Posture, focus, stage etiquette/presence, and facial expression are rarely evident. Teacher and ensemble did not seem prepared.

Instrumental Ratings

Table 3: Elementary Instrumental Concert Ratings

	% Superior	% Excellent	% Good	% Fair	Number Not observed
Tone Quality (n=71)	39%	52%	9%	0%	0
Intonation/Technique (n=71)	31%	56%	13%	0%	0
Rhythm (n=71)	48%	42%	10%	0%	0
Musicianship/Dynamics/Expression/Balance (n=66)	32%	56%	12%	0%	5
Conducting (n=66)	82%	17%	1%	0%	5
General Factors (n=71)	63%	35%	1%	0%	0

Table 4: Middle School Instrumental Concert Ratings

	% Superior	% Excellent	% Good	% Fair	Number Not observed
Tone Quality (n=19)	63%	37%	0%	0%	0
Intonation/Technique (n=19)	53%	47%	0%	0%	0
Rhythm (n=19)	68%	32%	0%	0%	0
Musicianship/Dynamics/Expression/Balance (n=19)	63%	32%	5%	0%	0
Conducting (n=19)	84%	16%	0%	0%	0
General Factors (n=19)	84%	16%	0%	0%	0

Table 5: High School Instrumental Concert Ratings

	% Superior	% Excellent	% Good	% Fair	Number Not observed
Tone Quality (n=15)	73%	27%	0%	0%	0
Intonation/Technique (n=15)	53%	47%	0%	0%	0
Rhythm (n=15)	87%	13%	0%	0%	0
Musicianship/Dynamics/Expression/Balance (n=15)	53%	40%	7%	0%	0
Conducting (n=15)	87%	13%	0%	0%	0
General Factors (n=15)	80%	20%	0%	0%	0

Table 6: Instrumental Transition Rating

	Efficient and Clear	Inefficient and/or too long
Elementary (N=71)	97%	3%
Middle School (n=19)	95%	5%
High School (n=15)	100%	0%

Choral Ratings

Table 7: Elementary Choral Concert Ratings

	% Superior	% Excellent	% Good	% Fair	Number Not observed
Tone Quality (n=30)	57%	43%	0%	0%	0
Intonation/Technique (n=30)	70%	30%	0%	0%	0
Rhythm (n=30)	90%	10%	0%	0%	0
Musicianship/Dynamics/Expression/Balance (n=30)	70%	30%	0%	0%	0
Conducting (n=29)	93%	7%	0%	0%	1
General Factors (n=30)	83%	17%	0%	0%	0

Table 8: Middle School Choral Concert Ratings

	% Superior	% Excellent	% Good	% Fair	Number Not observed
Tone Quality (n=17)	59%	41%	0%	0%	0
Intonation/Technique (n=17)	47%	53%	0%	0%	0
Rhythm (n=17)	82%	18%	0%	0%	0
Musicianship/Dynamics/Expression/Balance (n=17)	65%	35%	0%	0%	0
Conducting (n=17)	94%	6%	0%	0%	0
General Factors (n=17)	82%	18%	0%	0%	0

Table 9: High School Choral Concert Ratings

	% Superior	% Excellent	% Good	% Fair	Number Not observed
Tone Quality (n=9)	89%	11%	0%	0%	0
Intonation/Technique (n=9)	67%	33%	0%	0%	0
Rhythm (n=9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0
Musicianship/Dynamics/Expression/Balance (n=9)	78%	22%	0%	0%	0
Conducting (n=9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0
General Factors (n=9)	100%	0%	0%	0%	0

Table 10: Choral Transition Rating

	Efficient and Clear	Inefficient and/or too long
Elementary (n=30)	90%	10%
Middle School (n=17)	100%	0%
High School (n=9)	100%	0%

Instrumental Concert Ratings for Advanced and Beginner Performances

Table 11: Elementary Instrumental Concert rating by Advanced/Beginner Levels

	Level	% Superior	% Excellent	% Good	% Fair
Tone Quality	Beginner (n=22)	36%	46%	18%	0%
	Advanced (n=29)	48%	48%	3%	0%
Intonation/Technique	Beginner (n=22)	18%	64%	18%	0%
	Advanced (n=29)	31%	62%	7%	0%
Rhythm	Beginner (n=22)	36%	50%	14%	0%
	Advanced (n=29)	52%	38%	10%	0%
Musicianship/Dynamics/Expression/Balance	Beginner (n=17)	35%	47%	18%	0%
	Advanced (n=29)	31%	55%	14%	0%
Conducting	Beginner (n=20)	85%	15%	0%	0%
	Advanced (n=28)	79%	21%	0%	0%
General Factors	Beginner (n=22)	59%	41%	0%	0%
	Advanced (n=29)	66%	31%	3%	0%

Table 12: Secondary Instrumental Concert rating by Advanced/Beginner Levels

	Level	% Superior	% Excellent	% Good	% Fair
Tone Quality	Beginner (n=7)	86%	14%	0%	0%
	Advanced (n=18)	72%	28%	0%	0%
Intonation/Technique	Beginner (n=7)	43%	57%	0%	0%
	Advanced (n=18)	67%	33%	0%	0%
Rhythm	Beginner (n=7)	86%	14%	0%	0%
	Advanced (n=18)	78%	22%	0%	0%
Musicianship/Dynamics/Expression/Balance	Beginner (n=7)	57%	43%	0%	0%
	Advanced (n=18)	61%	33%	6%	0%
Conducting	Beginner (n=7)	86%	14%	0%	0%
	Advanced (n=18)	89%	11%	0%	0%
General Factors	Beginner (n=7)	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Advanced (n=18)	72%	28%	0%	0%

Scholastic Ratings

The Scholastics program, currently in its 95th year, is a national program recognizing outstanding creativity in teens which offers scholarship opportunities for graduating high school seniors. The national nonprofit organization that presents the Scholastic Art & Writing Awards honors students who receive national recognition at a gala celebration at Carnegie Hall in New York City. Selected award recipients and high school seniors recognized with top honors have their artwork exhibited at Parsons School of Design in New York.

Students in grades 7-12 submit their artwork electronically. A panel of judges reviews each submission and awards them at the regional level. An exhibit of regional gold and silver awarded work is held at Arlington Central Library every March. Any work awarded a Gold award at the regional level is sent to New York for national adjudication. Students who win at the national level are eligible to win college scholarships.

Table 1 shows the number of APS students who have participated in the national competition over the past five years, as well as the number who received awards at the national level. Comparison data is also provided for the other Virginia regions that participate at the national level: Fairfax Public Schools and Southwest Virginia (multiple school districts). In all years but 2015-16, APS has sent over 200 submissions to the national competition and each year receives several awards, with the highest number (30) in 2016-17.

Table 1: National Scholastic Awards for APS, Fairfax, and Southwest Virginia

School Year	Total National Submissions/ Total awarded	APS National Submissions	APS National Awarded	Fairfax National Awarded	SW VA National Awarded
2012-13	273,000/2,100	358	14	14	0
2013-14	263,000/1,900	401	15	14	0
2014-15	273,000/2,200	244	15	19	0
2015-16	301,000/2,400	185	9	15	4
2016-17	333,000/ 2,500	313	30	30	5

District Assessment Data

All APS middle schools and high schools participate in Virginia District XII band, choral, and orchestra assessments every March. These assessments are implemented by the Virginia Music Educators Association (VMEA)¹, and the adjudications for these ensembles is guided by state and national standards.

There are 16 districts across the state. Within District XII, there are 26 participating public and private middle schools, and 17 participating public and private high schools. At district assessment, ensembles are juried by three judges grading the tone, intonation, technique, balance, interpretation, musical effect, sight reading, and other factors. The judges' scores are averaged to give a single rating of 1 to 4 in both performance and sight reading, in addition to a single overall rating of 1 to 4, with a 1 indicating Superior, a 2 indicating Excellent, a 3 indicating Good, and a 4 indicating Fair. APS gathered district assessment scores and data from 2015 through 2017.

Table 1: 2015 Orchestra Middle School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music		# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1		1			
2		1	1	1	
3		2	1		
4					
5					
6					

Table 2: 2016 Orchestra Middle School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2	1	1			
3	3	1	1	1	
4	1	1			
5					
6					

¹ www.vmea.com

Table 3: 2017 Orchestra Middle School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1	1	1			
2	2	1	1		
3	2	2			
4	1	1			
5					
6					

Table 4: 2015 Orchestra High School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2					
3					
4					
5	2	1	1		
6	1	1			

Table 5: 2016 Orchestra High School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2					
3	1	1			
4	2	2			
5	1	1			
6	2	2			

Table 6: 2017 Orchestra High School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2					
3					
4	1	1			
5	1	1			
6	2	2			

Table 7: 2017 Choral Middle School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2	5	1	4		
3	1		1		
4	1		1		
5					
6					

Table 8: 2015 Choral High School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
unknown		7	2		

Table 9: 2016 Choral High School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
unknown		2	7	2	

Table 10: 2017 Choral High School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2					
3					
4	6	1	4	1	
5					
6					

Table 11: 2015 Band Middle School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2					
3	3	1	1	1	
4	2	1	1		
5					
6					

Table 12: 2016 Band Middle School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2					
3	3	1	2		
4	1		1		
5					
6					

Table 13: 2017 Band Middle School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2	1		1		
3	3	1	2		
4					
5					
6					

Table 14: 2015 Band High School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2					
3					
4	2		2		
5	2	2			
6					

Table 15: 2016 Band High School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2					
3					
4	2		1	1	
5	2	2			
6					

Table 16: 2017 Band High School District Assessment Scores

Grade of Music	# in Grade of Music	# Rated Superior	# Rated Excellent	# Rated Good	# Rated Fair
1					
2	1		1		
3					
4					
5					
6					

AP and IB Arts Exam Results

Advanced Placement Exams

Table 1: Number of AP Tests

Test Name	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>Art History</i>	29	10	39	18	11
<i>Music Theory</i>	31	33	22	47	14
<i>Studio Art 2D</i>	37	41	32	47	55
<i>Studio Art 3D</i>	5	16	16	13	23
<i>Studio Art Draw</i>	15	11	14	16	12

Table 2: Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or Higher, All AP Art Exams

2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher
117	53%	111	52%	123	60%	141	65%	115	65%

Table 3: Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or Higher, Art History

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher
<i>APS</i>	29	31%	10	40%	39	41%	18	72%	11	73%
<i>Virginia</i>	579	63%	579	68%	494	65%	518	75%	540	68%
<i>National</i>	22,723	61%	23,213	60%	23,314	58%	25,523	61%	25,178	61%

Table 4: Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or Higher, Music Theory

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher
<i>APS</i>	31	58%	33	49%	22	59%	47	47%	14	64%
<i>Virginia</i>	688	52%	575	55%	488	56%	508	59%	511	61%
<i>National</i>	18,192	61%	17,856	62%	18,642	61%	18,971	58%	19,213	61%

Table 5: Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or Higher, Studio Art 2D

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher
<i>APS</i>	37	70%	41	51%	32	72%	47	79%	55	62%
<i>Virginia</i>	695	84%	746	80%	707	80%	849	86%	847	88%
<i>National</i>	24,928	79%	26,811	79%	27,999	78%	30,925	82%	32,732	85%

Table 6: Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or Higher, Studio Art 3D

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher
<i>APS</i>	5	80%	16	63%	16	69%	13	77%	23	87
<i>Virginia</i>	112	63%	115	74%	95	88%	89	84%	123	76%
<i>National</i>	4,167	68%	4,256	68%	4,590	72%	5,051	75%	5,571	72%

Table 7: Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or Higher, Studio Art Draw

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher
<i>APS</i>	15	67%	11	64%	14	79%	16	63%	12	33%
<i>Virginia</i>	438	74%	408	80%	478	77%	363	85%	433	85%
<i>National</i>	16,597	79%	16,928	78%	18,105	78%	18,407	83%	19,957	86%

Table 8: Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or Higher by Demographic Variables, All Art Exams

Group	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher
<i>Female</i>	80	61%	64	56%	81	59%	85	68%	79	63%
<i>Male</i>	37	35%	47	47%	42	62%	56	61%	36	69%
<i>Non-Disadvantaged</i>	109	54%	98	54%	113	62%	128	67%	106	63%
<i>Disadvantaged</i>	8	38%	13	39%	10	40%	13	46%	9	89%
<i>Non-LEP</i>	114	53%	105	54%	121	60%	138	66%	114	65%
<i>LEP</i>	*		6	17%	*		*		*	
<i>Non-SWD</i>	113	52%	107	52%	119	60%	132	67%	112	64%
<i>SWD</i>	*		*		*		9	33%	*	

*Sample sizes less than 5 are not reported

Table 9: Percentage of Students Scoring 3 or Higher by Race/Ethnicity, All Art Exams

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher	# Tested	% with 3 or higher
Asian	8	25%	13	39%	15	40%	9	44%	10	60%
Black	*		6	50%	*		14	64%	*	
Hispanic	19	53%	14	50%	10	30%	16	56%	14	71%
White	80	56%	73	56%	84	68%	93	70%	83	64%
Other	7	57%	5	40%	11	64%	9	56%	8	75%

*Sample sizes less than 5 are not reported

International Baccalaureate Exams

Table 10: Number of IB Tests by Year

Test Name	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
<i>HL. Film</i>					5
<i>HL. Theatre</i>	2	1	8	9	6
<i>HL. Visual Arts</i>				7	9
<i>HL. Visual Arts Option A</i>	6	10	7		
<i>SL. Film</i>				37	4
<i>SL. Music Creating</i>					3
<i>SL. Music Gr. Performance</i>					6
<i>SL. Music So. Performance</i>					4
<i>SL. Theatre</i>	1	9	3	3	4
<i>SL. Visual Arts</i>				3	2
<i>SL. Visual Arts Option A</i>		3	2		

Table 11: Percentage of Students Scoring 4 or Higher, All IB Art Exams

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher
	9	78%	23	96	20	75%	59	53%	43	65%

Table 12: Percentage of Students Scoring 4 or Higher by Demographic Variables, All IB Art Exams

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher
Female	8	75%	19	100%	17	82%	31	68%	27	82%
Male	*		*		*		28	34%	16	38%
Non-Disadvantaged	8	75%	22	96%	20	75%	56	54%	39	64%
Disadvantaged	*		*		*		*		*	
Non-LEP	9	78%	22	96%	19	79%	57	53%	39	64%
LEP	*		*		*		*		*	
Non-SWD	9	78%	20	100%	19	79%	56	55%	39	69%
SWD	*		*		*		*		*	

*Sample sizes less than 5 are not reported

Table 13: Percentage of Students Scoring 4 or Higher by Race/Ethnicity, All IB Art Exams

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher	# Tested	% with 4 or higher
Asian	*		*		*		*		*	
Black	*		*		*		*		*	
Hispanic	*		*		*		13	31%	5	60%
White	5	100%	16	94%	17	71%	36	58%	28	68%
Other	*		*		*		5	60%	*	

*Sample sizes less than 5 are not reported