ENSEMBLE EDUCATORS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND EVALUATION: SUPPORT, SURVIVAL, AND NAVIGATING CHANGE IN A HIGH-STAKES ENVIRONMENT

by

Cara Faith Bernard

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Harold Abeles, Sponsor
Professor Randall Everett Allsup

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date ______20 May, 2015______

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

2015

UMI Number: 3704455

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI 3704455
Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ABSTRACT

ENSEMBLE EDUCATORS, ADMINISTRATORS, AND EVALUATION:
SUPPORT, SURVIVAL, AND NAVIGATING CHANGE
IN A HIGH-STAKES ENVIRONMENT

Cara Faith Bernard

This study examined the ways in which mid-career ensemble directors and administrators (some with musical and some without musical background) described the effect of implementing standardized teacher evaluations on their practices and perspectives. Participants described the application and critique of the evaluation tools, particularly the Danielson Framework for Teaching, on their process and pedagogy. There is little information on how in-service teachers—specifically ensemble directors—locate themselves in their practice and how they articulate their process and pedagogy. There is also little literature on mid-career teachers, both in identity formation and self-reflection. Mid-career ensemble educators who have an established professional identity may find imbalance in light of the new policies, and have to negotiate and manage the contemporary evaluation systems predominantly designed for English and Math. Further,

if supervisors do not understand what learning and assessment processes look like in a middle or high school band, orchestra, or chorus setting, they might try to evaluate with criteria that apply to a social studies or chemistry class. Without critically reflecting on how these evaluations affect pedagogy and process, educators may fall into routines of trying to reach a particular benchmark, instead of imagining ways to engage with their students.

A phenomenological interview approach was used to solicit the participants' voices and to allow their narratives to describe their lived experiences with teacher evaluation in ensembles. The participants' personal and shared narratives help to better explain and navigate the changing waves of educational policy. Data collection involved interviews and document review of the contemporary evaluation systems, in particular, the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Data analysis uncovered themes of conflicting identities in the classroom, misaligned interpretations of student-centered learning, as well as discourses based on location and the privileges associated with place. Teachers negotiated their performer/conductor and educator selves; administrators negotiated their leader and educator selves.

This study found that the Danielson evaluative tool, when poorly implemented in an ensemble setting, is faulted and lacks content validity. Additionally, while ensembles function rather traditionally in public schools, embracing a more open rehearsal pedagogy with conductor as facilitator may help to assure more student-centered learning.

© Copyright Cara Faith Bernard 2015

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

To my grandparents: my companions growing up,

who always helped me think what I could be and become.

You consistently showed me that a dream, perseverance, and dedication

can get you where you want to be.

Your memory is eternal in my heart.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The process of writing this dissertation has been anything but a solitary endeavor. I send great thanks to those who have contributed to this document and to my transformative journey.

Dr. Hal Abeles, my advisor, teacher, and mentor. Thank you for giving me every opportunity to grow and be challenged in the past three years; for always having my best interest in mind; and for always believing in me, even when I wasn't sure of myself. From writing curriculum and assessments to developing surveys and organizing social events, you never said "no" to me, and that has made all the difference. I hope that as I enter my career in higher education, I can facilitate the kinds of experiences for my students that you have fostered for me. I look forward to many more years of collaboration and learning with and from you.

Dr. Randall Everett Allsup. From my undergraduate days chatting about democracy on Cathy's couch to our Wednesday night reading group, we have come a long way. Thank you for guiding my ideas and writing with kindness and a keen eye for detail. Simply put, I am truly grateful for your guidance and friendship.

Dr. Daniel Brown, for your careful reading and feedback. With one foot in the world of ensembles and teacher evaluation, and one in the world of research and philosophy, you've helped me bring these worlds together. Thank you for being part of this process.

Dr. Madhabi Chatterji, for your assessment expertise and enthusiasm for this study. I am grateful for your time and input. Thank you for serving on my committee.

Dr. Lori Custodero, for clearing my mind and providing insight into carefully constructing my interviews and frameworks. I will never forget the patience and generosity you have showed me in these three years.

Dr. Marie Volpe, who contacted me every week after her “dissertation boot camp” class to check in on my research and writing progress. Thank you for giving me the kick I needed (always with love) to keep going, and for your homemade meals and writing conclaves.

Dr. Cathy Benedict and Dr. Patrick Schmidt, my dearest teachers, supporters, and friends. Cathy, thank you for modeling what it means to be a moral and ethical teacher, and encouraging me to be a thoughtful and articulate thinker and writer. Patrick, you have always pushed me to consider what and who I am, and what I could become. I would not be here were it not for you both.

Dr. Joseph Abramo, my friend and colleague. Your critical mind and compassionate soul are sincerely appreciated. Thank you for the countless lunches, phone conversations, and text messages helping me think through my frameworks and ideas, and encouraging me to take an idea and run with it no matter how silly or inconsequential it seemed.

Team GSD—especially Mike, Judy, and Andrea—thanks for sticking together and pushing one another. We have been “gettin’ it done since doc studies day one!” and here we are. Cheers to our milestone, our futures, and us. I can’t think of a better group of friends and colleagues to enter the profession with than all of you.

Lindsay Weiss, my friend, colleague, and writing partner. Who knew I would find a best friend and kindred spirit in doctoral school. This journey was all the better because of you. Thanks for many laughs and tears, and keeping our momentum going.

My mother, my first and greatest teacher, who has taught me the importance of teaching with love and care. For trusting and supporting my decisions, always. Thank you for all those years of carting me to piano lessons and musical rehearsals; for countless home-cooked meals as I sat at the dining room table writing; and proofreading all of my papers—even this one. Gracias por compartir todas mis alegrías, y por ayudarme en todo. Quiero agradecerte que estés en mi vida. Your teaching words of wisdom have always been "Keep it with the kids." I hope this study will be a gentle reminder to those in education to do just so.

And to the participants of this study. Thank you for your vulnerability to speak with me about a topic so emotion-laden, controversial, and personal. Your words and experiences are real and powerful. I am truly and forever thankful for your time, your words, and your insights.

C.F.B.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I – INTRODUCTION 1
Overview 1
Narrative 6
Background/Rationale 10
Theoretical Framework 12
Discourse 13
Panopticism 15
Communicative Systems 17
Critical pedagogy 18
Meaning making 20
Transformative learning 21
Problem Statement 23
Purpose 25
Research Questions 25
Research Design Overview 26
Summary 27

Chapter II – REVIEW OF LITERATURE 29
Introduction 29
Education Reform 30
Teacher Quality 32
Teacher Evaluation 34
Value-added model 36
Strategies for Identifying Quality Teachers 41
Danielson Framework for Teaching 41
Teacher Quality and Evaluation in Music Education 45
Alabama 48
Connecticut 49
Indiana 50
Michigan 51
Pennsylvania 52
Virginia 53
New York 54
edTPA 56
Teacher Identity 59
Occupational Identity 59
Professional Identity 62
Mid-career Teaching 62
Disequilibrium 64
Accountability and Stress 65
Teacher Bullying 66
Summary 69

Chapter III – METHODOLOGY 70
Overview 70
Assumptions 71
Research Design 72
Phenomenological Research Lens 73
Role of the Researcher 75
Participants and Setting 75
Procedures 77
Pilot 78
Identity 79
Ensemble Uniqueness 79
Instrumentation 80
Data Collection 80
Informed Consent 80
Issues of Familiarity and Trust 81
Interviews 81
Plan of Analysis 83
Content: Participants' Lived Experiences 84
Profile Backgrounds: Administrators 85
Mauro 85
Bradley 87
Frank 88
Lucian 89
Joel 90
Caleb 92
José 92
Profile Backgrounds: Ensemble Directors 94
Wilson 94
Tim 94
Stew 95
Andy 96
Anna 97
Lou 97
Jacob 99
Gloria 100
Summary 101
Remaining Chapters 102

Chapter IV – ENSEMBLE DIRECTORS 103
Curriculum and Performance Goals 103
Alignment With Core Subjects 103
Repertoire 105
Curriculum Driver 105
Contradictions of Student-centered Learning 111
The Discrepancy of Literacy 114

Chapter IV (continued)
Purpose Within the School Community 115
That Doesn't Apply to Me (the Inapplicability of Ensembles) 117
The Faded Fabric of the Community 122

Chapter V – ADMINISTRATORS 125
Expectations 125
Trust and Building Relationships With Teachers 128
Risk Taking 129
Purpose of Ensemble and Evaluations 130
"Sculptors of Their Own Learning" 132
Recognizing One's Own Strengths and Weaknesses 135
Discomfort 137
Mutuality 140
Literacy 141
"But Heart, You Can't Teach Anyone That Stuff" 142
"Accountability Applies to Us": Resistance to Change 144
Equity 149
"What's the State Want?" 153

Chapter VI – ROLES: CONNECTIONS, CONFLICTS, AND CONTRADICTIONS 156
Ensemble Directors 156
The Duality of Conductor and Educator 156
Poloses 161
Norming: Enforcers, Compliance, and Appeasing of Policies 165
Music in Context: The Role of Supervisor 167
Administrators 172
Rapport and Bedside Manner Are Key 174
Overload 175
Speaking Together 178
(Relinquishing) Control 178
Shifts in Pedagogy and Persona: The Chameleon Effect 180
Location Matters 185

Chapter VII – DISCUSSION 191
Conflicting Identities 191
Emergence of Subgroups 196
Compliants 196
Subversives 197
Flounderers 197
Administrator Groups 201
Compliants 201
Subversives 202
Agency 203
New Pedagogies: Embracing the Role of Educator 205

Chapter VII (continued)
Discourse of Location and Privilege 210
Surveillance 215
The Male Dominance 216
Comfort Levels and Contradictions 218

Chapter VIII – SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 221
Conclusions 223
Research Question 1 224
Research Question 2 226
Research Question 3 229
Findings 231
Implications 233
Application to Practice 233
Teacher Education Programs 235
Areas of Future Research 236
Epilogue 239

REFERENCES 241

Appendix A – Danielson Framework Domains and Components 257
Appendix B – Invitation Letter to Ensemble Directors/Administrators 258
Appendix C – Informed Consent/Participant's Rights 259
Appendix D – Ensemble Director Interview Protocol/Administrator Interview Protocol 261

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1 Administrators’ Background 93

2 Ensemble Directors’ Background.. 101

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Assessments of students and evaluations of teachers are no novelty to the field of education, and are used as a means to label quality and success in the classroom (Chambliss, Alexander, & Price, 2012; Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005; Kohn, 2011; Shuler, 2012a, 2012b). For some, measuring student achievement through written tests and project-based assessments is an indication of teacher effectiveness. In an era of accountability, Value-Added Measures (VAMs) connect student growth to teacher effectiveness. The claims are that student growth can be measured by gains in standardized test scores from one year to the next, and that such growth can be a criterion of teacher effectiveness. In principle, VAMs "capture how much students learn during the school year, thereby putting teachers on a more level playing field as they aim for tenure or additional pay" (Chroninger, Valli, & Chambliss, 2012, p. 15).

Although VAMs may seem objective and standardized, questions have been raised about the reliability and validity of VAM scores and the statistical procedures used for calculation; thus, there are questions about the extent to which VAMs should be used exclusively in high-stakes teacher evaluation (Darling-Hammond, 2013). Based on findings that teacher quality is a major determinant of student growth, policymakers have concluded that teacher evaluation should be a major facet of school improvement

(Sanders, Ashton, & Wright, 2005). The purpose of teacher evaluation is to provide feedback to improve instruction and hold schools and programs accountable. Yet, in current formats, the accountability tenet far surpasses the space for opportunity to improve (Robinson, 2015). Without accountability, there are consequences for schools and teachers. These consequences may serve as extrinsic rewards, such as job retention, tenure, and school funding; as such, they may dull motivation and yield few improvements (Hout & Elliot, 2011; Pink, 2009; Rothstein, Jacobsen, & Wilder, 2008; Springer, 2009).

Teacher evaluation in the arts—in particular, music—has caused much dissention and frustration (Robinson, 2015; Shaw, 2013; Shuler, 2012a, 2012b). Typically, the evaluation systems developed and targeted for public schools are implemented with English language arts (ELA), math, and science teachers in mind, and have been imposed upon music educators without contextualizing the material at hand or adapting the benchmarks for teacher and student success (Barrett, 2011; Brophy & Colwell, 2012). As of September 2013, 35 states and the District of Columbia require that student achievement data be a significant or the most significant factor in teacher evaluations (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2013).

While these evaluation systems, in their examples and descriptions of effectiveness, omit the content related to the musical process or skill development, music educators are expected to conform to the general procedures and criteria set forth by administrators and districts. As a result, and in order to conform, music educators—from general music to chorus/band/orchestra—may have to explain their pedagogical choices or perhaps even change their practices to look more mainstreamed, such as the teaching

strategies teachers in other disciplines use. For mid-career teachers who have already established a sense of their teaching identity (Coulter & Lester, 2011), it may be difficult to mainstream and change. As such, they may become defensive of their teaching practice or even experience feelings of imbalance, similar to a new teacher learning to find her identity (Gallagher & Stahlnecker, 2002). Additionally, if supervisors do not understand what processes of learning and assessment look like in certain subjects—a middle or high school band, orchestra, or chorus setting—they might try to evaluate with criteria that apply to a middle school or high school social studies or chemistry class (Barrett, 2011; Prince et al., 2009).

There is a predominance of music ensembles in American secondary schools—band, chorus, orchestra and other performance groups (Hoffer, 2008). This tradition has been a constant in public schools for more than 60 years. The role of conductor in a music ensemble is often multifaceted and includes being a leader, a community builder, and a musical expert on the repertoire and technique in her field. Often, ensemble directors have extensive training in music performance, literature, rehearsal pedagogy, and conducting. There is typically much emphasis on acquiring music-related skills in performance, conducting, history, theory, music literature and repertoire, and composition (Nierman, Zeichner, & Hobbel, 2002). Such skills are learned in undergraduate studies and are refined in the field or in graduate work.

Ensemble educators are unique when compared with other teachers in a school. These music educators may have more than 50 students in a class and in a large room—often separated from other classrooms—that is full of music stands instead of desks. Ensembles work together to produce a unified product—the performance. Each member

is an integral part of the group, often playing a unique musical part for his or her instrument. Also, each player is responsible for adding a musical component, texture, and nuance to the larger piece. The position of the conductor is to listen; assess problem spots in live time; teach and refine musical skills, techniques, and concepts (which may be different even within a band, for example, between the brass and woodwind sections); and foster musical independence for individual students within a large group. Such tasks are traditional and normal for an ensemble, but may seem atypical when viewed by other teachers and administrators. Traditionally, a principal may be inclined to measure the success of an ensemble based on how well the year-end concert sounds (Brophy & Colwell, 2012) or how many gold medals a group wins at festivals (Hash, 2012). However, the current state of high-stakes evaluations and standardization calls for more than just a final performance as a means to measure. Additionally, musical performance, such as festival ratings, may widely vary depending on ensemble and adjudicator (Hash, 2012); an adjudicator may bring her own biases and experiences to an ensemble which has a different set of backgrounds, values, and locations.

The teacher evaluation systems currently being adopted in many states often include at least two dimensions: measures of student achievement through testing and observation of teachers by school administrators. In an effort to balance the ways in which teacher observation and feedback are given and received and to better document student achievement and success, teacher evaluation has shifted to a quality-quantity hybrid; this hybrid relies on student success on standardized tests and other such data almost as much as on observable pedagogical tools within a lesson (Coggshall, Ott, & Lasagna, 2010; Prince et al., 2009). Music is included as a subject to be evaluated and to

measure student growth and teacher quality. This recognition is a positive development because it acknowledges music as a core subject (Barrett, 2011). However, a state standardized measure of achievement in music is seldom available. General assessments of students and evaluations of teachers are to be situated and contextualized within each subject. While state education policymakers may require administrators to observe teachers across all subject areas, administrators are not likely to be experts in each subject (nor are they expected to be) and they particularly are not likely to understand what the musical process of learning and assessment looks like in an ensemble. Because of this, there is a disconnect among the goals of the music program, the pedagogical strategies ensemble teachers use to reach those goals; and a standardized teacher evaluation system imposed on the schools by state education policymakers (Bernard, 2015; Brophy & Colwell, 2012; NAfME, 2012; Prince et al., 2009). As such, the validity of the evaluation instrument—when situated in a musical setting—is in question.

While the complexities of evaluation systems exist between theory and practice, it is up to those who are charged with implementing the systems—the administration—to make them accessible, palatable, and effective for teachers. The most prominent evaluation system used, the Danielson Framework for Teaching (2007, 2013) argues for this. Most administrators are non-arts-focused and are likely not sure how to approach assessing music instruction and student progress, particularly for an ensemble. A joint responsibility between teacher and administrator should occur, especially in discussing the implementation of curriculum in each specific class/ensemble (Danielson, 2007). As Freire (1998a, 1998b) stated, there is no way of importing and exporting curricula. Each class looks different from the next, depending on size, teacher, and student make-up;

therefore, teaching material cannot be replicated from class to class. Discussion between music teachers and administrators involving differences between each class—including learning styles, repertoire, and scaffolding of musical concepts—is imperative for a more common understanding.

Narrative

Each teacher's experience with teacher evaluation is unique and situational. As I talk with music colleagues about teacher evaluation, they often describe a level of frustration, futility, and misplaced pedagogical ideals. It seems as if our teaching skills and the criteria of our observations are often mismatched, with a focus on either product or process and success or failure, depending on who may be watching the lesson. My experience with teacher evaluations as the choral and piano teacher in my large, urban high school illustrates this problem and is the inspiration for this study. As a music educator who has taught for eight years in a large, urban setting, I experienced many situations where I needed to position myself post-observation as a choral rehearsal expert to my non-music supervisors, explaining the pedagogical choices I made within a rehearsal setting or lesson (e.g., how certain entrances and cut-off gestures in conducting affected the sound, or how to teach a round to beginning singers). While my chorus has enjoyed many performance opportunities and received many positive praises from the community at concerts, these did not constitute enough criteria for an evaluation. Acquiring and using pedagogical language that effectively communicates with non-arts supervisors was imperative for me to explain what we musicians do in the classroom.

In my school, the school-wide expectation was that we would strengthen our common understanding and language to describe what quality teaching looks like by deepening the school community's comprehension of Charlotte Danielson's (2007) Framework for Teaching. When my administration introduced the Danielson Framework to me in professional development in Fall 2011, it was presented in such a way that it seemed subjective and aggressive toward a finished product: "boring" lessons were unsatisfactory, and lessons with lists and lists of choices (differentiation to its utmost degree) were commended. I am a teacher who encourages choice in the classroom: promoting students to choose the word that stands out the most to them in a poem or musical phrase, choosing a part of a musical text and interpreting it, selecting a physical movement to represent a voice part's musical line. I have come to believe that students care more about their musical work when they are allowed to make choices. Yet, I found the video samples of Danielson-inspired lessons on a Martin Luther King, Jr. speech tedious—full of *too* many choices—tedious enough for most of my colleagues and me to consider it ineffective. The technical material students would have to work through to reach the meaning of the speech virtually killed the beautiful message Dr. King presented. I considered that if this model could negate the beauty of Dr. King's historical speech, what would a music lesson look like under its microscope?

We as teachers and ensemble directors have a responsibility to explain our decisions and process to our administrators—regardless of their content specialty—and in a way that can be clearly understood by all parties involved. Additionally, the reality of being observed without previous notice, with "pop-ins" by the administrators, left much to be desired and kept everyone alert, frustrated, and nervous. In my situation, the

evaluative process—rather than the teaching substance—was the issue with which I needed to grapple. Foucault (1995) described these feelings well when he stated that the evaluated "must never know whether he is being looked at at any one moment: but he must be sure that he may always be so" (p. 201). While I was always ready for a visitor, the pomp and circumstance that came with the "pop-in" was distracting to my students as well as to me, and we often lost focus. Hearing the observer's pen frantically writing and her heels clicking as she walked around the room interrupted moments of piano dynamic singing or held, ringing, resonant notes. In my chorus classes full of performers (including me), we felt comfortable in front of a crowd; yet, at times I felt uneasy, as if something ominous was about to occur. For a teacher who had recently entered her mid-career, I felt like a new teacher again, always being watched to make sure I was doing my job and observed for something negative, for that "gotcha" moment to uncover what is wrong in my lesson.

Over the course of the school year, I became unsatisfied with the implementation of the Danielson Framework in our school community. The imposition of Danielson's ideas was not improving my teaching, but rather forcing me to standardize my teaching when a supervisor walked in or asked for curriculum and lessons. I felt I needed to give her what she could recognize from general education and her own background/frame of reference. A tension arose between what I did and my principal's expectations from her translation of Danielson's rubrics—or perhaps a tension with the rubrics themselves because they did not fit my choral and piano programs. Some elements simply did not fit into my choral rehearsal, such as students constantly eliciting the learning objectives or levels of higher-order thinking and questioning in each lesson. My students, though high

school age, were older beginners, many of whom had no "formal" music education until my class. Adopting a new language takes time and students may not be ready to answer top-level, high-order questions in their first year of chorus. Additionally, I was asked to align and standardize my curriculum and assessments with the band teacher's because we taught the same subject. While both classes shared common musical concepts and goals, they were not the same in terms of repertoire; also, our teaching processes were different due to instrumentation, space, and style.

I began journaling to make better sense of my situation, and spent countless hours with colleagues and the music faculty discussing their evaluation experiences. I reflected upon my journals from the 2011 school year, in which I wrote much about my experiences associated with the evaluation process. For me, journaling was a way to pull myself out of my experiences and look at them from a more objective analytical way, trying to make sense of what really occurred instead of complaining and not taking action. These reflections helped to provide a comparison of the Danielson Framework with my personal experience of applications of the Framework in teaching; they afforded new and critical thought about the implications and importance of a solid system of evaluating both general and music educators. This was an auto-ethnographic approach (Ellis, Adams, & Bochner, 2011); I tried to bracket my biases of my experiences to reach the meaning of what I was feeling/saying, and use them to inform my teaching and the ways in which I engaged with the Danielson Framework and my administrators.

My unsatisfactory experiences with the Danielson Framework led me to a critical reading of the entire book, yielding a very surprising outcome. Upon reading the book, I found that Danielson's ideas were not problematic as I had originally thought. The

comparison of my experiences and the background of the Danielson Framework displayed vast differences. My experiences negated much of the Framework's intents and purposes. Yet, Danielson's overarching ideas are that no two classrooms can look alike, and we must consider what is best for the students in front of us. In my discussions with other teachers in the field undergoing similar teacher evaluations, the process is one of imposition—that is, imposition of ideas that do not fit into the music process. However. we must make changes to appease the evaluator for a good rating/grade. In chorus, this meant more writing to incorporate literacy because music literacy through dialogue, music making, and writing was not enough for my principal, according to the rubrics used. Also, this may play out differently depending on environment, especially suburban to urban, where a certified music evaluator may be in a suburban district.

If we can examine this issue from a music education standpoint, it would be important for those who are responsible for designing evaluation systems to be mindful that each classroom is different, one approach will not work for all subjects, and ensemble education in particular may look different from more traditional subjects. Through these experiences and conversations, I moved forward in this study, eliciting the voices from the field and the ways in which musical and pedagogical practice and programs may be affected by teacher evaluation.

Background/Rationale

The current teacher evaluation systems—devised through policy by stakeholders and policymakers—aim to disrupt what was thought of as an ossified educational system. In a business model, competition fosters excellence and yields extrinsic rewards (Hout &

Elliot, 2011). According to the stakeholders, the age-old education system was not a good business model. As such, adding high-stakes teacher evaluations, accompanied by student testing, became a means for competition to yield high accountability, improvement, and productivity. As a whole, teacher evaluation policies and tenets tend to bend toward the side of behaviorist (Kohn, 2011). Systems are conceived by benchmarks for particular duties, skills, and techniques, with numbers or descriptive words to label such levels of achievement. Without critically or consciously thinking about how these labels affect us, we educators may fall into the trap and routine of trying to reach a particular benchmark, instead of imagining ways of pedagogically improving our practices for our students. Myers (2013) referred to this as “standards that reduce us to the mean.” According to Kohn (2011), these systems may affect the ways in which we overlook how social environment affects our behavior and focus instead on the behaviors themselves (p. 71), or teaching in ways that conform to the evaluations. Kohn described how there is more focus on how well we do rather than on engaging with what we do; the first leads us to superficial thinking (p. 104) and a fear of failure.

How well we do versus what we do boils down to the idea of standardization against meaning making (Allsup, in press; Hubard, 2011). Mezirow (2000) described the process of meaning making or fabricating meaning in a non-fostered environment: “If we are unable to understand, we often turn to tradition, thoughtlessly seize explanations by authority figures, or resort to various psychological mechanisms, such as projection and rationalization, to create imaginary meanings” (p. 1). Can standards-based teaching and an open pedagogy of meaning making work together in teacher evaluation? If so, what kind of feedback would be most meaningful and helpful for teachers? What about for

administrators? Within policies and standards, teachers often experience belittlement or fear in post-observations and may feel like new teachers, resorting to rote and routine teaching and looking for balance and affirmation from colleagues and supervisors.

While teacher evaluation is a popular topic of late with daily blogs and articles in newspapers and education journals, the stance of these articles is usually one of defense or advocacy, specifically blaming administrators and higher authority figures for demoralizing the work of teachers. However, teachers' voices have been left out in a critical way and kept from describing their individual situations and the ways in which they may be approaching pedagogy under the many changes in regulations. Additionally, administrators' voices are crucial for understanding the phenomenon because they are often portrayed in a negative light for merely enacting the policies put forth from state policymakers. This process of eliciting both teachers' voices and administrators' voices may help illuminate how these educators and supervisors make and redefine meaning for themselves during an ever-changing age of accountability.

Theoretical Framework

Theoretical frameworks help to provide form for a study. The theoretical framework "is the lens . . . framing and shaping what the researcher looks at and includes, how the researcher thinks about the study and its conduct, and in the end, how the researcher conducts the study" (Mertz & Anfara, 2006, p. 189). A variety of viewpoints are represented in the participant sample; not all of the participants may adequately describe their experiences through these frameworks, but the frameworks may help to better situate and contextualize the general landscape for this study.

For theoretical guidance and grounding, I looked to discourse and discursive fields accompanied by Foucault's Panopticon to describe power struggles and the sense of surveillance surrounding a dystopian and behaviorist evaluative educational world. The notion of discourse is a tenet of poststructuralism, a philosophical concept which emerged in the latter part of the 20th century. Poststructuralism as a theory or concept is not fixed, but is comprised of a series of theoretical positions developed from the work of Althusser (1971), Derrida (1973, 1976), Lacan (1977), and Foucault (1972, 1980, 1984, 1990). In this study, poststructuralist theory was informed by Foucault's work and his ideas of discourse, social organization, and power. To understand the tenets of poststructuralist theory, the concept of discourse must be described in greater detail. Additionally, I looked toward critical theory, specifically critical pedagogy, and facets of critical and transformative learning. In Chapter VII, I illuminate the ways in which current evaluation systems and policies speak for, with, and against these theories.

Discourse

Discourses propose insight into "'the fundamental codes of a culture,' which predetermine, for a given discursive field, how we perceive, what can be known, how it can be known, and therefore what counts as 'truth'" (Surber, 1998, p. 211). The truth is hidden within the use of language and is what Foucault (1972) referred to as "discourse." A branch of poststructuralism, discourse in this sense refers to "how things are said and why" (p. 217). In other words, discourse offers a view into the construction of a social system. The language of a discourse can help us to critically understand better the intention and meaning behind the words, values, and power relations at play within a social system. Discourse may not be limited to the words one speaks, but rather to the

descriptions that frame one's communication. Foucault (1980) said that discursive practices are "embodied in technical processes, in institutions, in patterns for general behavior, in forms for transmission and diffusion, and in pedagogical forms which, at once, impose and maintain them." (p. 200). In this sense, it is not just the words that matter, but what they are connected to—the thoughts, ideas, histories, and power relations they manifest. Not all discourses are equal, which yields a power struggle. Foucault (1984, 1990, in Rabinow, 1984) considered the space for possibility among discourses as "the possibility of no longer being, doing, or thinking what we are, do, or think" (p. 46). Those in positions of authority have more power. The discourses that challenge the authorities' discourses are given less power. Working within and/or against these discourses and in acts of subversion may help to provide a sense of agency for some, giving them power to make sense on their own and take action. As we make conscious the discourses that shape us, we have the ability to resist and question their role. As Weedon (1997) described:

> The collective discussion of personal problems and conflicts, often previously understood as the result of personal inadequacies and neuroses, leads to a recognition that what have been experienced as personal failings are socially produced conflicts and contradictions. . . . This process of discovery can lead to a rewriting of personal experience in terms which give it social, changeable causes. (p. 33)

While the intention of this research was not to undergo a "discourse analysis" of the participants' words and experiences, I believe that attention to the ways in which words are used will help to understand better how ensemble directors and administrators negotiate the contemporary systems of evaluation. This is particularly appropriate for this study as the data stemmed from interviews.

Hierarchies of power are ever-present in educational institutions as building leaders and administrators oversee the productivity of the school. Teacher evaluation, including music teacher evaluation, is in an early stage of development and a constant state of flux. Mezirow (2000) stated, “In the absence of fixed truths and confronted with often rapid change in circumstances, we cannot fully trust what we know or believe” (p. 1). These words may perhaps encapsulate the many feelings educators possess about teacher evaluation in present times: the notion of an idea taking control of oneself and one’s actions, behaviors, and teaching. The idea of overseeing through the lens of teacher evaluation may feel akin to being watched or surveyed. It is this watchfulness from an authority that may keep teachers and administrators “in check.” To expand upon this idea, I turn to the Panopticon, as situated by Foucault.

Panopticism

The Panopticon was an institutional building designed by social theorist Jeremy Bentham in the 18th century as a disciplinary mechanism within a prison. The concept of the design was to allow a single watchman to observe (*-opticon*) all (*pan-*) inmates of an institution without them being able to tell whether they were being watched or not:

> In this central tower, the director may spy on all the employees that he has under his orders: nurses, doctors, foremen, teachers, warders; he will be able to judge them continuously, alter their behaviour, impose upon them the methods he thinks best; and it will even be possible to observe the director himself. (Foucault, 1995, p. 204)

The name is a reference to Panoptes from Greek mythology, a giant with a hundred eyes, known to be a very effective watchman.

Foucault (1995) conceived of the Panopticon as a means to create a docile people through surveillance and discipline. It is a power tactic. The Panopticon, simply stated,

may be described as: “He is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication” (p. 200). The effect of such watching, or surveillance, is to “induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic functioning of power” (p. 201). When applied to present-day education and teacher evaluation, the concept of the Panopticon holds strong, producing homogeneous effects of power from those who are enforcing the systems. Most onerous is the evaluation observation, or applying the same standards across all teaching circumstances regardless of context. The notion of “sameness,” imposing Danielson on all teachers and districts, leads to the negative outcome of only one valued model of teaching, and thus expects teachers to comply in a docile fashion. The consequences of the present evaluation system may limit opportunities for discourse that fosters the ideals for critical (music) pedagogy (Benedict, 2012; Freire, 1970)—a pedagogy that seeks to look beyond notes, rhythms, and precision, and embraces the student’s existing knowledge and world as well as critical thinking. The evaluation per se does not always lead to Panopticon disempowerment, but perhaps the format recommended by Danielson does, with respect to music curricula. Perhaps these systems of surveillance—data-driven binders of student work observations, rubrics for students and teachers—are unintended consequences that keep the teachers in line, always performing as if an authority were watching them. However, why would a teacher not perform to her highest ability at all times? In reality, some lessons do not always flow as they should; concepts are not communicated clearly; students cannot be assessed positively. Of course, without guidance and feedback through observation, a teacher’s growth and ability may not be further developed or expanded.

Bentham (in Foucault) described the effect and affect of the Panopticon:

> Among schoolchildren, it makes it possible to observe performances (without there being any imitation or copying), to map aptitudes, to assess characters, to draw up rigorous classifications and, in relation to normal development, to distinguish "laziness and stubbornness" from "incurable imbecility"; among workers, it makes it possible to note the aptitudes of each worker, compare the time he takes to perform a task, and if they are paid by the day, to calculate their wages. (pp. 60-64)

Bentham's words may resonate with educators and please policymakers: the ability to observe performance, to assess character, to distinguish the hard-working from the lazy. When we examine these evaluation systems through the lens of the Panopticon, we may draw on the reality of how teachers are evaluated. Foucault reminded us that "discipline brings into play its power, which is one of analysis" (p. 197). In this study, I planned to critically examine and analyze the ways in which these evaluation systems may affect teachers and administrators, both professionally and personally.

Communicative Systems

Learning is the acquisition of new knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviors, and values through experience, practice, or study or by instruction (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). The ways in which we experience our learning take shape through communication—by doing, listening, or dialoguing. Communicative systems in education look beyond a teacher as authority model, challenge a behaviorist approach to teaching, and embrace a more student-centered and student-driven model. Witherell and Noddings (1991) drew on the acts of communication and generosity, and reminded us that "to educate is to take seriously both the quest for life's meaning and the meaning of individual life" (p. 3). We as teachers must acknowledge that the qualities of citizenship and personal value have frayed and fragmented into skills, competition, and routine,

honoring neither a true critical approach nor the person (or people) at stake. This happens on a day-to-day basis in schools, where students bring their own histories and stories to the institution, each shaping the students' experiences, and so on.

It is important to note such communicative systems in pedagogy in light of contemporary high-stakes evaluation instruments and reforms. Danielson (2007, 2013) urged this in the observation and evaluation processes. Such reforms may not favor communicative systems, due to the openness and uncertainty of pedagogy on a day-to-day basis. However, striving for an open and critical pedagogy, where students take responsibility in the planning and learning process, may be beneficial to counter the constant student assessments and tests being taken. Using a framework of communicative systems, including critical pedagogy, meaning making, and transformative learning, may better illuminate the ways in which educators adopt or negate the assessment-driven world and tactics, and the ways in which they learn from their own experiences.

Critical pedagogy. Critical pedagogy finds its roots in critical theory, which begins with the premise that "men and women are essentially unfree and inhabit a world rife with contradictions and asymmetries of power and privilege" (McLaren, 1989, p. 69). From this, one can recognize the problems of society in relation to the individual and the larger society. In education, students and teachers partake in a dialogue in which they pose problems and question the problems of power and social injustice, while simultaneously transforming themselves into agents of change. Writings and reflections from theorists, scholars, and educators who adopt a critical pedagogy will help to frame a music education major's philosophy and praxis of education more effectively. In a music classroom, this may stem from the material in the repertoire. In chorus, it may begin with

the text. In band or orchestra, it may perhaps be the knowledge of a composer's musical intent or background.

Through the lens of critical pedagogy, teachers learn to read and write the world, examining choices, "deconstructing media images and representations, and asking the type of questions that their own future students should ask" (Gutstein, 2005, p. 208). The concepts discussed connect to the world of the student so that she begins to understand these concepts on a more personal and internal level, thus "knowing that she knows" she is processing something on a deeper level. It is student- or learner-centered (Palmer, 2007). Through the practices of critical pedagogy and drawing from their own experiences, students should begin to understand the lifeworld of others (Schmidt 2005). This understanding is the beginning of a paradigm shift from the "banking" concept of the teacher depositing knowledge to freedom in what Freire (1970) called "conscientization"; that is, becoming conscious of one's knowledge by engaging in learning that connects concepts to the learner's own realities. We leave behind the routines and rituals and look to the possibility of a changing world (Freire, 1998a).

Within observation and evaluation processes, it may be hypothesized that music teachers—specifically ensemble directors—may resort to their routines of rehearsal structure, choosing a more traditional approach to teaching the repertoire in order to yield a higher rating. This is contradictory to the essence of critical pedagogy because it is teacher-centered and directed. However, through dialogue with administrators and self-reflection, ensemble directors may be able to make meaning of their teaching practices and better locate themselves and their actions as they relate to a student-centered approach and rehearsal.

Meaning making. Pedagogy is informed by the engagements we have, the relationships we form, and the thoughts we challenge and embrace. Freire (1970) posited that the learning process is "thinking which perceives reality as a process, as transformation, rather than as a static entity" (p. 92). Always moving forward, we must rethink, recreate, reassess, and remake our ideas, conversations, and actions in order to develop true understanding of self and others. Danielson (2007) echoed this in her rationale for her framework.

Neumann (1998) reflected on this by asking, "How much of our 'selves' is inextricably bound into our work?" (p. 429). Our experiences, our "selves," may not be a separate entity from our teaching, especially in our responsibility to help students become more mindful members of society. Rather, they must be a model to our students of reflection, critical thinking, care, and self-expression, and the ways we engage with others. Our experiences have helped inform our knowledge, our understanding, and our actions, and have created and recreated meaning for us and for others. Straying from the scripted lesson plans or even rethinking the lesson plans to provide space to share, dialogue, reflect, and make meaning with students through our class materials—whether a piece of cardboard, a glue stick, and magazine clippings or a drawer full of percussion instruments—may help our students "become aware of more possible ways of being and of attending to the world" (Greene, 1994, p. 21). Our dedication as teachers is to help students make sense of their world, name it, and understand the responsibility they have to change it; to "penetrate cultural barriers, discover the power of the self and the integrity of the other, and deepen their understanding of their respective histories and possibilities" (Witherell & Noddings, 1991, p. 4). Additionally, we must acknowledge

that “restrictive social environments exist across places and cultures” and break these normative practices in our own pedagogical environments (Hubard, 2011, p. 5).

Yet, I question that perhaps systems of evaluation may solidify such restrictive environments in the ensemble classroom, perpetuating normative (rehearsal) practices. This might occur when a non-music administrator cannot provide music-specific feedback, or even when a teacher possesses great fear of receiving an ineffective rating. There may be no space for teacher—or student—to make meaning. In post-observations, teachers may not feel comfortable thinking and articulating—making meaning for themselves to reflect on their practices. This may limit and narrow the opportunity to transform as educators and learners.

Transformative learning. Transformative learning (Mezirow, 2000) is the process by which we transform our frames of reference to make them more open, to guide our action. It refers to the knowledge one gains through critical self-reflection and shares in dialogue that leads to a change in perspective, a change in how one views the world. Such learning involves a rational discourse, a critical reflection about increasingly outdated individual and collective ideologies and worldviews. Rational discourse involves reliance on those who are believed to be the most informed, objective, and rational to assess the arguments, examine evidence, and draw a rational conclusion (Habermas, 1984).

According to Habermas (1984), two of the domains of learning, instrumental and communicative help focus and illustrate transformative learning. Instrumental learning is learning to control and manipulate the/one’s environment and other people to improve performance. That is, learning is basic skill development essential for performing routine

yet needed tasks. Communicative learning is learning what others mean when they communicate with another person: the meaning and intention. The latter occurs through discourse and dialogue to better understand what people mean, what their values and ideals are, and upon which basis they make moral decisions. Communicative knowledge involves feelings and normative concepts not applicable to empirical tests.

Learning occurs beyond the formal learning in school as school-aged children and in higher education. It penetrates our lives in adulthood, both in formal, informal, and non-formal ways (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Mezirow, 2000). According to Mezirow (2000), Cranton (2007), and Bloomberg and Volpe (2012), adults may learn in the following ways: reflection, dialogue, drawing on past and reflecting on current experience, observation, role models, mentors, and experimentation/trial and error. The ways in which this learning occurs may revolve around social, organizational, incidental, action-based, or situated circumstances and environments. For adults, three levels of learning occur. The first two, based on Habermas (1984), are instrumental and communicative; the third is transformational. Transformational is most important with an adult learner because the learner identifies what he or she has learned and demonstrates that an observable change has taken place.

Often, when one speaks with a teacher about teacher evaluation and standardization, teachers will exemplify that a more instrumental learning occurs between administrator and teacher, and perhaps unconsciously between teacher and student. In other words, this may involve changing the environment and structure to yield higher student grades, or having a principal state exactly what the teacher did in the lesson and which sequential steps will improve her performance and her students' learning. Through

transformative learning, we are aware of this type of instrumental learning and, while it may not be desirable all the time, it may be necessary. Moreover, when balanced with communicative learning, it could prove to be very helpful when reflecting, both as a teacher and with students.

Problem Statement

High-stakes evaluations are mandatory for most public school teachers and are intended to drive teacher effectiveness. The Danielson Framework for Teaching is at the helm of the evaluation tools. Applied to all teachers, the evaluations impose a structure that (tends to) dictate a certain practice and may limit the acceptable pedagogies available for all subjects, including music ensembles. In theory, the objective of these evaluation systems are worthy (democratic and critical), yet their implementation may often go awry. Without thoughtful implementation and careful considerations of such systems that accommodate the unique circumstances of each school or classroom, their application has the potential to destroy educators' motivations and even their effectiveness and tenure in their district. A mindful critique of such systems is necessary to help teachers and administrators better navigate the rising tide of high-stakes evaluation.

These evaluation systems may be particularly problematic in a music setting when administrators with little or no music education background, knowledge, or experience are implementing and carrying out the evaluations because there may be a lack of musical knowledge and skill to make valid assessments of the music teaching/learning process. Conversely, these "non-music" supervisors may be able to comment on pedagogy more freely, from a less content-biased place. Lack of musical knowledge and content for an

administrator is a key norm in an urban setting, as there is often one administrator supervising multiple departments. However, this may be prevalent in a suburban environment as well. In music classes, and particularly in secondary performing ensembles, the general layout of the class environment looks and functions differently than it does with other subjects. Not desks, but music stands adorn the room, and students are grouped by voice part or instrument family. The repertoire serves as the text and, instead of taking notes as one might in a history class, students play/sing, discuss, and even possibly move. Due to these differences, it may be difficult for an administrator to see musical artistry and musical pedagogy occurring during a rehearsal. If a school or district has a music supervisor, administrators may struggle to manage the required number of visits per teacher along with the paperwork for evaluation. Additionally, a music administrator could find discrepancies and biases in the pedagogy; the administrator may insist that the teacher choose particular repertoire or even implement certain rehearsal techniques.

These evaluation systems may be problematic because music teachers may feel they have to compensate or change their pedagogy and practice to conform to the overarching standards of the educational system, which are not musically situated (Bernard, 2015). This may be particularly troubling in ensembles, where certain pedagogical strategies may be considerably different from effective pedagogies in general classrooms or other music classrooms. The content of the evaluation systems may not be quite appropriate for ensemble directors, particularly in the rehearsal context. An administrator's observation of a lesson—perhaps seeing only a portion of the rehearsal, where certain protocols are in place (such as the warm-up)—may not represent the entire

picture of the ensemble director. It is imperative to identify how the practice of music teachers is affected by the implementation, and how administrators navigate the choppy waters of enacting these policies. To better identify, an in depth look at the application of such systems and their content validity, specifically within the music classroom, is needed. While there has been much research on teacher evaluation, little research has been conducted in the field of music education (Aguilar & Richerme, 2014), and specifically in soliciting the voices of ensemble directors, whose traditional purpose is performance-based. Likewise, this research has omitted the other half of the evaluation process—the evaluators—regarding their experiences with these policies both generally and within a musical ensemble setting.

Purpose

The purpose of this phenomenological interview research was to share, both individually and collectively, how a group of secondary school ensemble directors and administrators with musical and non-musical backgrounds described the effect of implementing standardized teacher evaluations on their practices and perspectives. The participants' personal and shared narratives will help to better explain and navigate the changing waves of educational policy in light of their own experiences.

Research Questions

To carry out the purpose of this study, the following three research questions were addressed:

1. How do mid-career middle and high school music ensemble educators negotiate and manage the regulations of the contemporary teacher evaluation

systems? How do these negotiations affect the planning of curriculum, preparation of repertoire and rehearsal, and performance goals/ends?

2. How do administrators both with and without music education expertise negotiate and manage the regulations of the contemporary teacher evaluation systems, specifically in terms of the role and purpose of musical ensembles?
3. How do middle and high school ensemble directors and administrators understand and articulate their roles in this new context?

Research Design Overview

A qualitative research approach through a phenomenological lens was deemed most appropriate for this study, to provide space to solicit the voices of the participants. Freire (1998a) stated, “there is no such thing as teaching without research and research without teaching” (p. 35). Therefore, in education it is essential that the two go hand in hand, as a balance of theory and practice. Research, whether qualitative or quantitative, is a process. Through a qualitative process, the researcher may foster and gain a deeper understanding of music and pedagogy within a student’s, teacher’s, and even researcher’s world, and can help all participants learn about themselves and their musical experiences in a more valuable situation. The researcher may also attempt to present a relative framework to help describe a certain phenomenon. For this, I turned to notions of discourse and Foucault’s perception of the Panopticon. Within this attempt was “a desire to advance new theories and an interest in critically evaluating the tenets or assumptions of widely held explanations” (p. 11).

A qualitative approach best suited this research because the voices of the participants will greatly inform our understanding of the phenomenon of teacher evaluation and the participants' experiences with the present evaluation systems within their own schools and classrooms. Additionally, it may lead us to act more mindfully and less hastily in rethinking the importance of a musically centered evaluation system and pedagogies that favor space for dialogue and discourse. The methodologies used in this study included interview research (Kvale, 2007) and document review (Danielson, 2007, 2013).

Data collection and analysis were employed through an adaptation of Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) (Smith & Osborn, 2003). Semi-structured one-on-one interviews took place during the Fall of 2014, with secondary ensemble directors and music and non-music administrators (assistant principals, principals, and district supervisors) in the New York metropolitan area, in both urban and suburban settings. The ensemble directors were educators in their mid-career, who have had to make sense of these new evaluation systems after establishing a sense of grounding professionally. A more descriptive detail of the methodology is described in Chapter III.

Summary

In light of the ever-changing policies and standards this educative world has presented, music education researchers and practitioners have risen to pedagogical and curricular challenges. However, broadening the conversation about how music educators and administrators experience the changing landscape of teaching, particularly in ensembles, may help to understand better how to be proactive, both at the classroom level and from a policy stance. Music teacher evaluation, particularly using the Danielson

Framework for Teaching, specifically in ensembles, needs further examination. Speaking with ensemble educators and administrators will help to better situate and contextualize the current educational reforms occurring in each school.

This study was organized as follows. Chapter I introduced the problems and rationale for this study. Chapter II presents a review of literature on education reform, teacher quality, communicative systems in education, and teacher identity. Chapter III includes a methodology for the study, outlining the process of collecting and analyzing the data. Chapters IV, V, and VI present the findings, first reporting individual group's voices and then reporting them together as a collective. Chapter VII provides the space for discussion and interpretation of the data, and Chapter VIII presents conclusions, implications, and suggestions for future research.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Repertoire selection, classroom management, paperwork, and data production are a few of the many realities of the music teacher—and ensemble director—and can be overwhelming amid actual lesson planning and teaching. From the first days of school, music teachers are set to a high standard of performance, both in classroom rehearsal and on stage. (Music) teachers are regularly evaluated on lesson planning and execution, student assessment and progress, and creating and realizing professional goals. The tasks and skills associated with these assessments and evaluations are enormous, take many shapes based on the chosen evaluation system, and are accompanied by multiple rubrics with teaching and learning indicators. The systems may be different depending on the state education policy, but are applicable to all teachers, regardless of tenure.

The literature review presented in this chapter is organized into five sections. Section one describes the history of education reform in the United States and teacher quality over the past 30 years, leading to current teacher evaluation policies and practices. Section two provides a more in-depth look at teacher quality and evaluation, examining the value-added model and looking at a prominent evaluation system used nationwide. Section three narrows the umbrella of evaluation to music, describing music teacher quality, evaluation, and policy both nationwide and at the state level. Section four serves

as an overview of teacher identity and mid-career teaching, as the participants of this study were mid-career teachers; also, during this shift into high-stakes evaluation, these mid-career teachers may feel like new teachers, having to rethink and reflect on their current practices and pedagogies. A background of teacher identity, through new and mid-career levels, may help to better understand the participants' words in the data. Lastly, section five discusses the relationships between the age of education accountability and stress in the workplace.

Education Reform

U.S. educational policy has changed and evolved over the last 30 years. Having a background and history tracing why and how high-stakes teacher evaluations have developed may help us make better sense of why so much pressure revolves around education reforms for both teachers and administrators. In 1983, the Reagan administration presented *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. In the early 1980s, the United States was facing economic turmoil—high interest rates and unemployment, and lessening in-house industry. The administration believed the decline to be in direct correlation with education, and swiftly addressed how to raise academic performance and achievement. Our nation was endangered by a "rising tide of mediocrity" in schools, and our students did not reach the levels of international students on tests (U.S. National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). As a result, we as a nation were threatened by losing our powers in manufacturing (cars, tools, agricultural equipment and goods), as we would lose our place as a world leader (Abeles, 2010; Kohn, 2011; Ravitch, 2013). The document called for "better curriculum standards,

higher graduation requirements, better teacher training, higher teacher pay, and other customary improvements" (Ravitch, 2013, p. 10). *A Nation at Risk* paid small attention to the arts as they were not viewed as a way to increase our economic values. In direct response to this report, schools began increasing testing, and stating standards and benchmarks for learning (Abeles, 2010).

Years later, following George H. W. Bush's *AMERICA 2000* (U. S. Department of Education [USDOE], 1991), a governors' summit to discuss the state of education, the Clinton administration expanded the importance of education through *Goals 2000: Education America Act* (USDOE, 1995), which was more focused on standards-based education—that is, standards at the national and state level. The policy focused on "clear and rigorous standards for what every child should know and be able to do" (USDOE, 1995, Sec. 2). *Goals 2000* offered money to states as they set their own tests and standards to measure their students' performance through the core subjects. Initially, the arts were not included as a core subject, but became one after lobbying from many arts organizations (Abeles, 2010). In direct correlation, the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) developed the National Standards for Music, an effort funded by the USDOE (1994).

Following with the theme of student academic growth, in 2001 the George W. Bush administration created a federal legislation called *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB) (U.S. Congress, 2001), positing that testing and accountability can—and will—improve student performance. As a result of this legislation, children in Grades 3-8 were tested annually in core subjects to show student progress. The arts were now included, although only math, ELA, and science were mandated testing subjects (Abeles, 2010). By 2014, all

students were to achieve proficiency on their state tests. State education departments monitored their schools accordingly to track progress to reach this proficiency. Schools that did not improve or reach their target goal were labeled as in need of improvement, or a failing school. If a school continued to fail over the years, it was at risk for closing, firing staff, or being restructured with the help of the district school system. By 2012, 80% of Massachusetts's public schools were deemed "failing," according to NCLB standards (Ravitch, 2013).

In direct correlation with NCLB, the Obama administration developed the *Race to the Top* competition, in which $100 billion was set aside for education (Ravitch, 2013). To be eligible for competition, states had to agree upon common standards and tests (such as Common Core State Standards) and evaluate teachers through student test scores. Eleven states and the District of Columbia were awarded *Race to the Top* funding. It was thought that competition among these states would yield improvement in the schools. Additionally, standardized testing was the most efficient way to measure student growth and school/principal/teacher quality. Accompanied by test scores, many states adopted evaluation rubrics to observe teachers in the classrooms. These rubrics measured the quality of teacher planning and teaching, and provided another dimension of student learning outcomes.

Teacher Quality

Teacher quality, described broadly, may be the ways in which teachers perform in the classroom. The quality of performance is described, or evaluated, directly in conjunction with how well students succeed on tasks, including assessments and state

exams. In their six-year study, Chambliss et al. (2012) examined high-quality teaching, focusing on what teachers do to get their students to succeed in their subjects (particularly math and reading). The authors asked the following questions:

> What constitutes or counts as knowledge about high-quality teaching? Was it the beliefs of the observer, results from the observation protocol, the description in the *Standards*, or the teacher's explanation of her intention? How do we know that what we are seeing is true, that our beliefs about our perceptions are justified? (p. 3)

The authors also observed "how educational policies and organizational factors influence the ability of teachers to sustain effective pedagogy over time" (p. 20). In this sense, pedagogy may be something different, depending on who determines the performance grade (administrator, policymaker) and who establishes what quality teaching looks like. Quality teaching may possess different characteristics. In distinguishing two types of teaching—good teaching and successful teaching, Fenstermacher and Richardson (2005) stated that good teaching includes the teacher's task as well as the students' reactions to the task. This type of teaching is bound by logical, moral, and psychological standards, which foster a learner-centered pedagogy. The authors expounded, "We do not generally believe that the learner must learn what is taught for the teacher to be well and properly engaged in his or her craft" (p. 194). That is, teaching may be seen as *good* when it contests logical, moral, and psychological standards, and students demonstrate (through interacting with the teacher and their peers) that they are engaged with the content. *Successful* teaching is seen as learner-dependent and measurable. Such teaching may find its roots in behaviorism. Direct instruction, time on task, and extensive learning time (reading, writing, analyzing) lead to student learning pertinent to the information on standardized tests (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005). Chambliss et al. (2012) further

described successful teaching as full of "knowledge of what brings about successful outcomes for students regardless of learner-centered principles, moral standards, or domain logic" (p. 9).

Quality teaching is a combination of the characteristics of *good* teaching that will lead to *successful* student learning. However, to achieve quality, students must exert effort and the teacher must use a variety of resources. Regardless of this teacher-student duo, at the heart of quality teaching lies reflection from the teacher:

> The good teacher "adjusts" the elements of teaching on the basis of what is at hand in the way of students, surroundings, and resources. . . . The quality of teaching, how good and how successful it is, will depend—sometimes to a small and other times to a considerable extent—on how well the teacher adapts his or her instruction to the context at hand. (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005, p. 207)

The teacher's flexibility, based on the students' grasp of knowledge and skill, drives the lesson. In other words, each lesson should be experienced, taught or observed in context, which may mean the students, the environment of the school and community, or the resources at hand. This context may sometimes cloud the vision of an observer, while looking for certain characteristics of quality teachers.

Teacher Evaluation

Assessment of students and evaluations of teachers have long been of a qualifiable nature, documenting valuable successes and failures. Evaluations of teachers are attempts to hold them accountable for their planning and teaching (Hargreaves & Braun, 2013). Traditional observations led by administrators provide snapshots of individual teacher process and progress. Yet, the systems in which teachers are evaluated vary by district, school, and administrator, as some assessments are far more quality-

based than quantity-based. In an effort to balance the ways in which assessment is given and received in teacher evaluation and to better document student achievement and success, teacher evaluation has shifted to a quality-quantity hybrid, relying on standardized tests and other such data rather than observable pedagogical tools within a lesson. The creators of such systems are mainly policymakers and curriculum developers (Brophy & Colwell, 2012; Robinson, 2015). Among the discussions of evaluation systems and assessment tools, evaluation policymakers need to recognize the critical importance of including teachers in the debate not only to bring nuance and experience to the conversation, but also to build legitimacy for the reforms as they are implemented (Barrett, 2011; Brophy & Colwell, 2012).

In general educational research, a number of studies have focused on teacher evaluation policies (National Council on Teacher Quality, 2013). Brandt, Oliva, Brown-Sims, and Hess (2007) completed a descriptive study sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education of the teacher evaluation policies in 13 Midwest region school districts, and found that districts evaluate teachers primarily for personnel decisions rather than to improve practice. These evaluations often include observations most repeatedly performed by principals (Loup, Garland, Ellett, & Rugutt, 1996). Some recent programs do include veteran teachers as evaluators (Darling-Hammond, 2013), such as the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) and Peer Assistance and Review (PAR). Studies suggest that evaluators have complex and conflicting feelings about their role (Breedlove, 2011; Henry Barton, 2010; Himmelein, 2009; Myricks, 2009; Nowacek, 2008) and focus their efforts on beginning teachers (Loup et al., 1996), as they are the easiest demographic to solicit improvement and mentorship in schools.

In New York State, a *Race to the Top* (*RttT*) winner, students were faced with the idea of taking more exams, in addition to the mandated state Regents. The exams, which were targeted to roll out in 2012 but have not yet come to fruition, were part of a statewide overhaul of how teachers are evaluated. Each school district in the state is in the process of solidifying a way to evaluate teachers on a scale from “ineffective” to “highly effective,” with teachers facing potential dismissal if they are rated ineffective for two consecutive years (White House Press Office, n.d.). Under this *RttT* policy,

> 40 percent of a teacher’s grade will be based on standardized tests or other “rigorous, comparable” measures of student performance. Half of that should be based on state tests, and half on measures selected by local districts. The remaining 60 percent is to be based on more subjective measures, including principal observations. (Otterman, 2011, n.p.)

The tests projected for New York City are pre- and posttests, given at the beginning and end of year, to show how much students have learned from the teacher. Similar tests were given in Kentucky, and teachers had their students practice the particular skills they knew would be tested. Thus, the exam was measuring test preparation instead of a larger sense of learning. This is a contested issue in New York’s state standardized tests as well (Otterman, 2011). Additionally, there is no set way of evaluating the arts or physical education, although offices in the New York City Department of Education are developing assessments (personal communication, Office of Arts and Special Projects, New York City Department of Education, 2014).

Value-added model. Among the many measures to evaluate teacher effectiveness, including traditional observations and rubrics (for example, Danielson, 2007), there has been a rising interest in value-added models. Value-added measures (VAMs) “capture how much students learn during the school year, thereby putting

teachers on a more level playing field as they aim for tenure or additional pay" (David, 2010, p. 81). Evaluation specialists design detailed and complicated variables to best display how much student growth is actually sparked and fostered by the teacher and how much is caused by other outside factors. VAMs require formulas that take into account as many influences on student achievement as possible. Koretz (2008) argued that measuring the value added by the teacher requires knowledge of how much students have learned in a given year, and also the rates at which those particular students learn.

Student test scores and achievements vary greatly from class to class, and are inconsistent based on the students assigned to a particular teacher. For example, a value-added model would not favor a teacher of a remedial group of students. That is, comparing teachers whose classrooms are treated as "dumping grounds for troubled students with teachers whose classrooms contain the best-behaved students will favor the latter" (David, 2010, p. 81). Sass (2008) found that in five urban school districts nationwide who scored in the bottom fifth within one year, less than a third of the teachers had similar ratings the following year; at that point, nearly half of the teachers received the highest rating. Such was similar with "highly effective" teachers within the schools: a small percentage of teachers received the highest rating the following year, and the majority moved into other rating groups.

Numerous researchers have identified problems with the validity and reliability of the value-added model (Darling-Hammond, 2013; Hill, Kapitula, & Umland, 2011; Kupermintz, 2003; McCaffrey, Sass, Lockwood, & Mihaly, 2009; Yeh, 2012). Other researchers have countered that these models are fairer to teachers than raw test scores as data alone because they can control for prior achievement and a number of

family/background student observables (Aaronson, Barrow, & Sander, 2007; Shaw, 2013). Additionally, Polikoff and Porter (2014) examined the relationships between VAMs of teacher performance and instructional quality by analyzing data from over 300 math and English teachers in the following school districts: Charlotte (NC); Dallas (TX); Denver (CO); Memphis (TN); New York City (NY); and Hillsborough County (FL). The authors suggested that "the results are disappointing. Based on our obtained sample, we would conclude that there are very weak associations of content alignment with student achievement gains and no associations with the composite measure of effective teaching" (pp. 15-16).

While there are many gray areas in the value-added model of evaluation, traditional methods for evaluating teacher effectiveness have their own problems. For example, infrequent or poor classroom observations or administrator bias can make or break a teacher's evaluation assessment. Because of this, there is greater pressure to use student test score gains to evaluate teachers, in hopes of being less biased toward the individual teacher quality. David (2010) urged that an evaluation system should rely on a variety of student outcomes, including but not limited to standardized test score gains. According to a recent study (Coggshall et al., 2010), most teachers support such a multiple-measures approach to observe good pedagogical practices and outcomes.

When polling current teachers on the indicators of effectiveness, Coggshall et al. (2010) reported that educators had a difficult time pinpointing the degrees of importance of particular effectiveness. The four indicators for effectiveness included: a) whether students are engaged in their coursework; b) how much one's students are learning compared with students in other schools; c) the feedback from the principal and other

administrators; and d) how well the students perform on the district's standardized tests. The authors also deduced that less experienced teachers are more likely to say that student engagement is a fair or poor measure of their professional success, and almost one-third of teachers across all experience levels are suspicious of the principal or other administrator evaluations. This may perhaps be due to a lack of subject knowledge or the supervisor's acquired years of teaching.

In a further study by Coggshall et al. (2010) of what it means to be an effective teacher, self-reported effective teachers responded in four ways:

> They reported that the subject matter test scores of their students increased "a lot" from the beginning of the year (versus "increased somewhat," "did not increase," or "decreased somewhat").
>
> They chose the statement, "Good teachers can lead all students to learn, even those from poor families or [those who] have uninvolved parents" as being closer to their view than the statement, "It is too hard for even good teachers to overcome these barriers."
>
> They were either very or somewhat confident that most of their students will learn the skills and knowledge they were supposed to by the end of the year. (p. 3)

These teachers reported with great confidence that they could turn around their hardest-to-reach students by the end of the year. They were also more likely to believe that the effort students make is mainly determined by what teachers do to motivate them rather than by the level of motivation students bring to the classroom. This is also a very teacher-centric approach to teaching, although it may be viewed as effective, according to the self-reported successful teachers.

While it is unrealistic to determine if these self-reported effective teachers are more effective than their counterparts (such as new- to mid-career teachers), teachers who feel more efficacious, especially if they work with similarly successful colleagues,

achieve higher student learning results (Armor et al., 1976; Ashton & Webb, 1986; Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000). The cyclical movement of motivation helps teachers to feed off of each other and respond accordingly in a positive way. Additionally, self-reported effective teachers prefer to work in a school where there is a lot of collaboration and guidance from other instructional experts instead of one where teachers are freer to design their own lessons.

While these assessment models and studies inform the ways in which we evaluate teachers, they are often irrelevant to particular content areas, including music. However, as with all educators, music educators are expected to conform and adhere to the standards set forth by administrators and districts. Standards are often product-based, while pedagogy and music making and learning are process-based. While all pedagogies, regardless of content, are process-based, music is different, due to the combination of cognitive, psychomotor, and affective outcomes. Robinson (2015) furthered:

> while this sort of data [VAMs] may be useful at the school district level in predicting some differences among schools, it is inappropriate and invalid to use these data to determine effectiveness ratings of individual teachers because of significant technical and measurement problems. These problems are only magnified when VAM strategies are used in the evaluation of music teachers. (p. 13)

There is a clear disconnect among the societal and pedagogical needs of students, teachers, and school community; teacher evaluation systems and the drive for performance assessment; and the lack of *musical* assessment focus for students and evaluation of in-service music teachers. Additionally, the implementation of these VAMs and high-stakes evaluations within the musical context often does not fit.

Strategies for Identifying Quality Teachers

Teacher quality may be seen in many ways: classroom pedagogy, management, record keeping, and data (student test scores). To identify quality teachers within a building or district, a common basis for evaluation should be used. There are many evaluation systems devised for school use; the most prominent and widely-used evaluation instrument is Danielson's (2007, 2013) Framework for Teaching, which identifies benchmarks for planning and preparation of curriculum and instruction and breaks down teaching components to be appraised through a rubric. A supervisor within a school observes the teacher multiple times per year (the number of observations negotiated through school districts and union contracts), targeting specific parts of the rubric for dialogue and discussion.

Danielson Framework for Teaching. Danielson's (2007) *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* provides a common, general foundation for teacher observation, evaluation, and reflection. Based upon four domains of pedagogy and instruction—Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities—the Framework seeks to offer space for teachers and administrators as well as the educational and school community to think about the complexities of teacher pedagogy and practice, providing components of teacher assessment for measurements of "success." Within each domain lie components and descriptors of a particular pedagogical and professional skill, such as questioning or communicating with colleagues. The Framework is used as a means of evaluating teachers and staff as Distinguished, Proficient, Basic, and Unsatisfactory and providing action for improvement through reflection and refining. In some districts/states, the

ratings may be Highly Effective, Effective, Developing, and Ineffective. Depending on district unions, teachers may be observed up to six times per school year. Appendix A provides the domains and components of the Danielson Framework.

Prior to the rubrics, Danielson provided a framework and rationale for how the rubrics are constructed and should be used as a process in observation/evaluation. There are echoes of democracy and critical pedagogy in her explanations: "for all human beings—adults as well as children—it is the *learner* who does the learning" (p. 15). Danielson is clearly signifying the problematics of depositing information to students, and calling for a more critical approach to teaching and learning in order to facilitate deeper student understanding, engagement, and action (Freire, 1970). Danielson urged constant communication and dialogue among teachers and their supervisors in order to reflect on practice, and to rethink and reform over a lengthy period of time. In a critical pedagogy, emphasis is not on the product—fulfilling objectives and aims—but rather on the process of students engaging in thought and action. Students and teacher learn from each other through dialogue and doing, discussing social, political, and ethical implications, and through this dynamic, students learn to take responsibility for their own learning (akin to the kind of learning in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* by Paulo Freire).

Danielson (*Principal Journal*, 2012) spoke of "clear standards of practice, instruments and procedures to capture evidence of those standards of practice" (p. 1). In my school, evidence started with the environment. According to my supervisors, our classroom environment should show much student work and display rubrics accordingly. Goals for the year needed to be prominently posted on the wall, including the mission and vision statement of the school and our department. When someone enters the room, that

person should be able to observe immediately that students are engaged in the learning process and producing. I believe that most teachers want a high level of engagement in the classroom; however, there was no mention of how this engagement looks or the means of production that must occur within this evaluation system.

Danielson (2007) suggested that “teaching is a thinking person’s job; it is not simply a matter of following a script or carrying out other people’s instructional designs” (p. 2). Without the constant reassessment of teaching methods through self-critique, the teaching and learning environment, as well as the teacher’s engagements with students, will become static. It is individualized and reflective thinking—both independently and with others—that drives and informs pedagogy and instruction, and may aid in fostering an environment in which students and teacher learn from each other through making and creating, and discussing the reasons for their choices. Danielson (2007) gave considerable weight to the openness of pedagogy, that a teacher must know her students and their backgrounds, and must possess the ability to be flexible and empathetic within the environment (domain 2).

There is great importance in the openness and space for teachers to speak with one another and with their supervisors, to think through practices and align teaching expectations so there are no surprises in an observation report from a supervisor: “without a Framework, the structure is reduced to whatever the mentor, coach, or supervisor has in her head, and it thus reflects the personal beliefs that individual holds about the teaching, regardless of whether these have ever been made explicit” (Danielson, 2007, p. 12). During the observations, the evaluator looks for specific domains or components within the rubric, or may take a more holistic approach to the rubric,

applying what she sees to the rubric's content. Again, dependent on district and union policy, a certain number of components will be completed by the end of the school year. In post-observation, there is a discussion between supervisor/evaluator and teacher, which should be led mostly by the teacher. Danielson called for the administrator to facilitate the discussion but allow space for the teacher to speak to and think through the lesson. Once both parties have conversed, feedback or an action plan is made for future teaching experiences; feedback could be as small as making sure to write the lesson goals on the board or working on improving questioning techniques.

When examining the validity of the Framework as an evaluative tool, there are mixed responses, specifically when implemented in an arts or musical setting. Regarding music, specifically vocal/choral, a class that might have more than 25 students, Danielson (n.d.) responds that the evaluation tool is only valid if implemented in an open way:

> . . . it's important for common sense and reason to prevail. Therefore, a vocal music teacher might know that the alto section is coming in too early at a specific point in a piece of music. That same teacher might also know, however, that a particular student has a strong voice that might be suitable for a small solo role. But much of the teacher's knowledge of students will be, inevitably, group-based. (n.p., https://danielsongroup.org/questions-about-the-framework-for-teaching/)

Danielson continues to argue the validity of her Framework, explaining that it has been used and refined over 15 years, each year tightening the language and making the components more pedagogically universal. There have been several research studies on the Framework: one conducted by the Consortium on Chicago School Research, another by Measures of Effective Teaching [the MET study], funded by the Gates Foundation (Griffin, 2013).

In the MET study, over 23,000 lessons were captured on video and then analyzed according to five observation protocols, one being the Danielson. The research found that

Danielson's Framework had predictive validity, meaning that when teachers perform well on the framework—as judged by trained and certified assessors—their students perform better and learn more than the students in the classrooms of teachers who do not perform as well. Danielson further reasoned her Framework as valid, saying: "The research studies that have been done can offer to schools, districts, and states confidence that they are adopting a validated instrument that will be predictive of student learning" (The Danielson Group, n.d., n.p.). There are, however, no specific studies done on the implementation and validity of the Framework with regards to music, specifically ensembles.

Teacher Quality and Evaluation in Music Education

There is a process vs. product dichotomy at play within evaluation systems and procedures. While this struggle can be applied to any subject and content area, music education stands out because of the different purposes and outcomes. Most music course offerings are group-based such as ensemble, where students work together toward a common goal. Even in the case of general music, students work together and individually to hone musical and critical thinking skills through play and activity. Music courses, when compared to a social studies course, have more of a combination of cognitive, psychomotor, and affective outcomes. This may become difficult to observe and evaluate. Since teachers of kindergarten through second grade, high school teachers, special education teachers, English Language Learner specialists, and all arts teachers do not report standardized test scores, almost no measures exist to demonstrate student growth objectively for almost 70% of all educators (Marion & Buckley, 2011; Peterson, 1996;

Prince et al., 2009). A solution from the state level has been to use math and reading scores to evaluate all non-tested teachers (Winerip, 2011), although this has been met with protest (Shuler, 2012a, 2012b). Other states have attempted to design or choose alternative assessments and/or subject-specific "Student Learning Objectives," better known as SLOs (Gill, Bruch, & Booker, 2013; National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2010; New York State School Music Association [NYSSMA], 2012).

There is little recent research in the field of music education on music teacher evaluation. Aguilar and Richerme (2014) searched practitioner publications (such as *Music Educators Journal, Art Education Journal, Journal of Dance Education,* and others) for an article directly mentioning teacher evaluation changes under *Race to the Top*. They found only 12 articles, three of which specifically focused on the topic. However, music is not exempt from the current trends and tensions of teacher evaluation. As Barrett (2011) described, new initiatives are "churning ahead at breakneck pace" and "the very metaphor of 'Race to the Top' seems to preclude careful deliberation" (pp. 2-3). Evaluations and measurement may not be negative for the music education profession, but rather aspects to highlight and inspire musical growth. Scott Shuler (2012b), former National Association for Music Education (NAfME) president, believed that "measuring student achievement can empower individual teachers to assume responsibility for their own professional growth" (p. 7). While all teachers have a responsibility to reflect on their own growth as well as their students' growth, the ways of measuring may look different for music. Prince et al. (2009) posited that "identifying highly effective teachers of subjects that are not tested with standardized achievement tests—such as teachers of art, music, physical education, vocational education, and foreign languages—requires a

different approach" (p. 5). As researchers and policymakers continue to explore facets for employing a value-added measure of assessment and evaluation, external factors within the music education realm may prove useful for quality improvement. These may include student performances, compositions, arrangements, and certain skill-level appropriate tasks. Brophy and Colwell (2012) augmented this and reminded us that "student achievement data used for music teacher evaluation MUST be from music assessments, not an arbitrary attribution of the effect of the music teacher on scores for the 'usual tested subjects' of math, reading, science, and writing" (p. 14). The implications of the current state of music teacher evaluation and assessment point to this direction of possibility. Brophy (1993) agreed, further stating that:

> The evaluation of music teachers remains an area in need of relevant research, and the development of an appropriate evaluation and observation instrument must be urgently addressed. It is now the responsibility of the united music teaching profession, in tandem with active music education researchers, to address this challenge. (p. 17)

While this quote was written over 20 years ago, it still rings true in light of *RttT*, VAMs, and evaluation processes such as Danielson. Echoing Brophy and Colwell, NAfME positions itself in favor of music-centered evaluations and assessments. In its statement on teacher evaluation in music education, NafME (2012) urged for the inclusion of the following traits of an assessment:

> Must include measures of music student achievement along with the above indicators, as only one element of a teacher's evaluation. For evaluation of music teachers, measurements of student achievement should include evaluation in the three general areas of creating, performing, and responding. The relative weighting of measures in these three areas should be carefully designed to be commensurate with the nature of the class taught and the express educational goals for that class. (n.p.)

These general statements by NAfME are intended to provide support for music teachers to continue their daily teaching routines and stay firm in their pedagogical decisions, while being mindful that they are teaching musical skills, performance, and critical thinking and explicitly setting specific goals and objectives for each class. This support for growth is essential in a teacher's professional development, regardless of teaching tenure. Shuler (2012b) expanded on this, explaining that "Just as effective teachers empower their students to become self-guided musical learners, so also do effective music supervisors seek to empower members of their faculty to become self-guided professionals" (p. 8). The largest issue in this statement is that most music teachers do not have a supervisor whose expertise is in music, so there is a lack of expert leadership from administration. A music teacher should "understand quality, to self-assess their work in relation to quality, and to take action to achieve quality. Self-evaluation is just as important for the independent growth of teachers as it is for students" (p. 9).

While the National Association for Music Education (NAME) oversees and speaks on behalf of all music educators nationwide, each state, due to state policy and law, functions differently with regard to music teacher evaluation. The following subsections highlight recent research and policies of particular states, based on existing music teacher evaluation research and current reform trends.

Alabama

In a 1990 study, Taebel (1990a) investigated the fairness of music teacher evaluations, combining data from a statewide study of Alabama teachers to compare music teacher performance with other teachers on competencies and classroom behaviors. While music teachers' scores on 94 of the 117 classroom behaviors showed

virtually no difference from those of other non-music teachers, music teachers' competency scores were below the mean on 7 of the 10 teaching competencies. Taebel (1990a, 1990b) resolved that universal, standardized teacher observation instruments may not be fair and equitable to music teachers. Relatively little is known about the beliefs of music teachers regarding their evaluations. Taebel (1990a) found that while music teachers generally supported their evaluation program, they doubted the qualifications and expertise of their evaluators, yet they accepted the feedback of their supervisors. The teachers were not included in contextualizing the material or rubric content.

Connecticut

Years later, in a 2005 study, Robinson examined the beliefs of veteran teachers who were directly involved in designing evaluation procedures for beginning music educators in Connecticut. These evaluations, known as the BEST (Beginning Educator Support and Training) program, were portfolio-based and included lessons, examples of student work, reflections, and teaching videos. They stemmed from an initiative of the Connecticut State Department of Education to help improve the quality of the teaching in the state. The data used in the BEST portfolios were generated by the teachers' own students in the course of normal classroom activities, as opposed to non-subject-specific state tests. Additionally, the portfolios were reviewed by veteran teachers who were working professionals and peers to the new teachers.

Robinson (2015) found that new teachers became more competent as a result of working in music-specific domains and with content-related peers. The veteran teachers also felt that their teaching—as well as the novice teachers' teaching—was improved by focusing on classifying instructional "best practices." Robinson believed that the BEST

program "endorsed a vision of school music that was broad based, inclusive, and focused on providing students with the skills to become lifelong learners in music" (p. 18).

Indiana

The state of music teacher evaluation in Indiana may be described as divorced from the musical process (Gerrity, 2013). This was similar to Taebel's (1990a) study in Alabama, done almost 25 years prior. Nonetheless, evaluation is required, as is of all state educators. In addition to formal observations, data sources and professional development are required of all teachers in the state. According to public laws, a "significant portion (interpreted to mean no less than 25 percent) of a music teacher's effectiveness rating be determined by the performance of his or her students on both teacher-generated and standardized assessment tasks" (p. 17). Gerrity wrote that

> as much as 75 percent of a music teacher's effectiveness is likely still to be determined through observation by an administrator and/or a qualified evaluator. Most observation rubrics, however, are purposefully generic and reinforce the belief that good teaching essentially "looks the same" regardless of the content being taught. (p. 17)

To counteract this standardization of effectiveness, the Indiana Music Educators' Association (IMEA, 2012b) developed a Music Teacher Effectiveness Rubric, which targets specific music competencies: Teaches Comprehensively, Engages Students in a Variety of Music Experiences, Differentiates Instruction, Provides for the Application of Musical Skills and Knowledge, Utilizes Musically Appropriate Assessments, Demonstrates a Commitment to Cross-Curricular Instruction, Provides a Model for Professionalism. The rubric "goes beyond recording 'if' a competency is met and describes specifically 'how' a competency should be met" (p. 19). While the rubric ranges from the traditional Ineffective to Highly Effective in each box, the descriptions

are more music-specific. There are mentions to the Indiana State Standards for Music, to choosing and experiencing a wide range of musical repertoire and styles, differentiating music-making activities, and creating a cross-curricular connection. The language is very similar to that of popular current evaluation rubrics (i.e., Danielson), but they tie in more musically active words. Additionally, the state has created a self-assessment supplement to be completed by the music teacher (IMEA, 2012a). In this self-assessment, the teacher gives herself an evaluation mark (from Ineffective to Highly Effective) and provides a rationale. The observer/evaluator has space on the template below the teacher portion to add her rationale, based on the actual observation and any given artifacts to be used as evidence.

Michigan

Michigan's ensemble educators are not exempt from the state's teacher evaluation structure. Shaw (2013) surveyed band and orchestra teachers in Michigan who belonged to the state music education band and orchestra association. Most teachers were observed twice a year by an administrator, usually the principal. Observations included classroom visits and even concert productions. These observations were scheduled most often 1-4 weeks ahead (42.0%), followed by "A few days in advance" (20.5%). When asked what instructional model/framework was the basis for their evaluations, teachers indicated Danielson's "Framework for Teaching" (31.1%), Marzano's "Four Domains" (19.7%), and "Other model" (10.0%). A large percentage (39.1%) indicated they did not know what model/framework was in use. Respondents indicated how they had been rated in the past: 43.1% had been rated as "Highly Effective," 44.9% had been rated as "Effective," 2.0% as minimally effective, and 0.0% as ineffective. Evaluator comments were positive

overall on rapport, student engagement, pacing, and classroom management. Evaluator comments that were critical tended to recommend that the teacher move around the room more, minimize classroom noise, engage all students more, incorporate technology, write a more detailed agenda on the board, or be able to demonstrate growth and achievement. Discussion of the use of festival ratings in Michigan were surveyed, with directors responding with concern because of the level of the instrumental programs as well as the resources and socioeconomic status of the school. Teachers showed trust in their administrator's ability to evaluate them, yet many felt that these evaluations could not help them improve professionally because of the administrator's lack of content knowledge (p. 15). The respondents preferred

> that their musician evaluators have experience in the same area of specialization (band or orchestra) and that evaluations occur in person, instead of through videotape. For a number of logistical reasons, this may prove difficult or impossible to accommodate in many locales. (p. 19)

Shaw (2013) concluded by explaining "qualified peers must receive consistently high effectiveness ratings before they can take part as evaluators. In districts where there is a small corps of arts teachers, meeting all these stipulations would be difficult if not impossible" (p. 23).

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania has begun to experience evaluation systems for Non-Tested Grades and Subjects (NTGS), which includes music. This new system requires the rating of NTGS teachers on three components: Building-level data (15%), including student performance on assessments and a value-added assessment system; Elective data (35%), utilizing "Student Learning Objectives" to describe student achievement, which in turn

measures educator effectiveness; and Observation and evidence (50%), based on the four domains of the Danielson Framework for Teaching (Emert, Sheehan, & Deitz, 2013, p. 30). Of key importance for Pennsylvania music educators is the addition of the Student Learning Objectives, or SLOs. Such objectives measure student growth as well as achievement due to teacher effectiveness. The SLOs "provide a way for music teachers to demonstrate evidence of student achievement in music content" (p. 31). A team of music educators are developing music SLOs as a tool for guidance as the state undergoes the process of evaluation.

Virginia

In a 2002 study, Maranzano investigated music teacher practices and beliefs surrounding teacher evaluation. He surveyed Virginia music teachers (n = 138) on both their evaluation procedures and their beliefs about evaluation. Most respondents noted that principals were their primary evaluators and that direct observation and self-assessment were used. Respondents answered negatively to questions about the applicability and accuracy of their evaluations. Maranzano suggested that traditional evaluation practices had limited applicability for fine arts teachers.

While certain evaluation systems have been adopted by many states and school districts, an overarching assessment, regarded as the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR), has become prominent for its clear standards of practice and accountability, especially in New York State.

New York

In 2000, in collaboration with educators, administrators, and other educational partners, the New York State Board of Regents developed and approved the APPR of teachers. The regulation requires school districts/BOCES to conduct annual evaluations of probationary and tenured teachers providing instructional services or pupil personnel services. The new requirements will not take effect until the new APPR plan is collectively bargained in each local district. Under the law, school districts and BOCES are required to conduct an APPR on each teacher, resulting in a single composite effectiveness score and a rating of “Highly Effective,” “Effective,” “Developing,” or “Ineffective” (New York State Education Department [NYSED], 2013), which is based on the Danielson framework, the most prominent evaluation system in New York State.

According to NYSED (2013), the APPR must also include:

1. Teacher Improvement Plans (TIP) for developing and ineffective teachers,
2. Training for evaluators,
3. Appeals process for evaluations, and
4. Expedited discipline process when a teacher receives two consecutive annual ineffective ratings.

While these attributes may be common for evaluation systems, they are very general. APPR and evaluation system ratings are often added together for a teacher overall score of effectiveness. Sixty percent of a teacher’s overall score is based on observations using a rubric (such as Danielson); 20% is based on state measures—the students’ state test performance—regardless of the teacher’s subject area; 20% is based on local measures, such as district-wide tests or Measures of Student Learning (MOSL) exams. Additionally,

the local measures could also be a small population group from the state test, such as the lowest third in the school, African American males, or ESL students (NYSED, 2014). SLOs are reviewed or accounted for within the overall APPR score, which is often based on students' test scores.

Often the general guidelines may become lost in translation when applied to a musical setting. NYSSMA (2012) helps to aid in contextualizing the APPR as it relates to music education. The organization encourages evaluation systems, but advocates for

> the use of fair and valid assessments of music achievement and growth for several purposes, including the encouragement of high levels of music performance by students and the development of quality school music programs. (n.p.)

NYSSMA regards the importance of assessment for teachers and students, but urges that the focus be specific to musical skills and development, not an imposition of an existing system to the music world. Yet, the organization cannot affect policy, and 20% of the ratings are based on outside, non-musical test scores. In its position statement regarding the direct implementation of APPR in the music classroom, NYSSMA provided the following information to help teachers more effectively during this time of accountability:

1. Since music teachers are primarily responsible for music instruction, any system that includes measures of student achievement or growth should focus on music achievement or growth.

2. A range of assessment types, including performance-based and written, should be used in determining levels of music knowledge and skills.

3. When generating and providing data related to music teacher performance, focus should be on the most important music learning by the teacher's students for the academic year (or semester when applicable) related to the relevant state and/or national arts standards. Results should be determined by skilled educators with an appropriate level of musical training in a fair and objective manner.

4. Sufficient resources, including instructional time, space, materials, equipment, and certified educators, must be provided in order for useable data on music achievement and growth to be gathered. (NYSSMA, 201s)

APPR may be situated and contextualized differently, depending on district. For example, New York City does not subscribe strictly to APPR due to union policy. However, it is important to have a basis of knowledge of the performance review, as some of the research participants for this study engaged with the content. Further understanding of the ways in which music teachers are reviewed through APPR and Danielson will be discussed based on participant situation in Chapters III, IV, V, and VI. While this study focused on mid-career teachers, attention should be given to the evaluation tools for preservice educators as they enter the profession.

edTPA

When reviewing particular models of teacher evaluation and assessment, it is important to note and consider the ways in which preservice teachers are evaluated and prepared for their careers. edTPA is a national performance assessment designed by Pearson Education, Inc. (2013) and the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (2013) to assess teaching readiness for preservice, novice teachers. The assessment focuses on student learning, with support from research and theory. Four factors grounding edTPA include:

1. Development of subject matter, content standards and subject-specific pedagogy;
2. Develop and apply knowledge of varied students' needs;
3. Consider research and theory about how students learn;
4. Reflect on and analyze evidence of the effects of instruction on student learning. (p. 1)

As of January 2015, 33 states and the District of Columbia participated in edTPA (edTPA, 2015, www.edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy). edTPA prides itself on being a performance-based assessment and helps to engage preservice teachers in "demonstrating their understanding of teaching and student learning in authentic ways" (p. 1). This aims to make new teachers feel more secure and prepared in their planning and execution of teaching during their first year in a classroom, and to promote the highest quality of student and teacher engagements. There are subject-specific assessments in edTPA, including one for performing arts, which are consistent with the National Standards for Arts Education and the Common Core Learning Standards. The benchmarks for effective teaching are viewed as a cyclical process, and include planning, instruction, and assessment to help preservice teachers "document and demonstrate their readiness to teach through lesson plans, instructional materials, student assignments, and video clips of teaching, and analyses of teaching and student learning" (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity, 2013). One informs the other, and the process continues, improving each time. This assists both the evaluator to assess effectively as well as the preservice teacher. Rubrics aid in documenting these teaching snapshots and progress. Additionally, reflection and an analysis of one's teaching, coupled with the use of academic language, aids in the assessment as well. Preservice teachers are given a handbook of all information and guided through this process for best results.

edTPA guides the preservice teacher through constructing a lesson, leading her to think through the audience (class and subject), goals, and objectives, and to focus and execute the lesson to meet the goals through a lesson plan. Action verbs, such as identify, analyze, perform, and explain, are encouraged to better ensure student engagement and

student-centered learning. The guidelines in edTPA for performing arts present possibilities for multiple learning experiences in the classroom, including performing, listening, responding, and critiquing. Using key terms specific to the arts helps to support arts-based inquiry and process in the classroom, honoring the art form without stripping its value and imposing a non-arts-based assessment.

While state music education associations strive to navigate the new evaluation systems in a more content-specific way, a careful eye must be kept on the different locations and environments in which teachers are evaluated. Locations, specifically sites of urban living, may be overlooked when applying and implementing (music) teacher evaluations. The evaluation system, to be more equalized among schools, "holds schools and districts accountable for effective delivery of results, but without holding system leaders accountable for providing the resources and conditions that are necessary to secure those results" (Hargreaves & Braun, 2013, p. 24). Amrein-Beardsley (2014) posited "that student background and out-of-school factors are significantly more important" (p. 85) than the impact of in-school factors and resources on teaching and learning objectives and outcomes. Student background may mean resources, location, socioeconomic status, gender or race; they may directly impact the productivity and "success" of a student. In primarily White schools, issues of class and race often go unaddressed (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Leonardo, 2004) because students may have more similar backgrounds and needs; these schools tend to have higher "success" and productivity rates than those in urban schools. Hammerness (2003) suggested that as teachers and community members, we must identify and

acknowledge the "differences in school and classroom contexts . . . demands and issues that may vary considerably from setting to setting" (p. 44).

Yet, in an urban setting, the evaluative tools and policies that drive them do little to tackle the issues of poverty that impact educational achievement (Otterman, 2011). Secretary of Education Arnie Duncan (2011) conveyed

> School districts and their local partners in inner cities and rural communities are overcoming poverty and family breakdown to create high-performing schools, including charters and traditional public schools. They are taking bold steps to turn around low-performing schools by investing in teachers, rebuilding school staff, lengthening the school day and changing curricula. (n.p.)

For Duncan, evaluation systems—demanding of teachers and students—are the key answer to overcoming such hardships in the urban setting.

In a musical context, Benedict (2006a) wrote that urban music education programs are traditionally not as high quality as those in suburban areas. The urban school community often invests little money, care, or effort in growing or maintaining the music programs.

Teacher Identity

Regardless of location, number of teaching years or experience, all teachers navigate finding themselves and their footing in new roles and environments. Understanding the ways these identities are constructed, reconstructed or compromised may help teachers make meaning for themselves more effectively. Thinking about the types of learning that occur both as teacher and learner allows us to reflect on our practice as educators and make sense of who we are in the classroom. This may be particularly

important and useful in current educational reforms, as teachers are asked to reflect on and locate themselves in their practice.

Teacher identity is formed from the central beliefs one has about teaching and being a teacher. These beliefs are continuously formed and reformed through experience (Chong & Low, 2009), both positive and negative. Teacher identities begin to shape as early as secondary school and continue into college experiences, preceding preservice and student teaching, and are markedly influenced by applied studio teachers and ensemble conductors (Conkling, 2003). Danielewicz (2001) proposed that preservice students begin to construct a collective self or a professional self during the process of learning to teach. The psychological and social-emotional complexities of becoming a teacher are integral to a teacher's sense of self and, similarly, to her effectiveness in the classroom. Within the light of contemporary evaluation systems, even a seasoned teacher may feel like a new teacher, having to negotiate pedagogies and certain routines in favor of hitting new benchmarks in her lessons. As such, her teaching identities may be negotiated, muddied or compromised.

Occupational Identity

New teachers piece together their past and the present in the configuration of their teaching personae (Feiman-Nemser, 2003). Personal schooling experiences that impressionable, transformative teachers had in the past affect beginning teachers' teaching experiences and personae and infiltrate their vision of a good teacher. New teachers have to envision themselves as *someone* in their first years in the classroom, and their own teachers serve as significant criteria for what "Teacher" is and means. Identifying the multiple facets of a teacher personality, Intrator (2006) wrote that

"[novice teachers] 'try on,' much like an actor in a drama, the role of their mentor teacher, or strive to reproduce images of the teacher that they harbor from . . . their apprenticeship of observation" (p. 235). For preservice music educators, these mentors may be private studio teachers. Mills and Smith (2003) and Sogin and Wang (2002) studied that both performer and teacher identities encompass a music teacher's occupational identity. Additionally and similar to Conkling (2003), Chong and Low (2009) found that preservice and new teachers related learning to teach with learning to perform. Teaching experience, in which preservice and new music educators take responsibility for the planning and implementation of lessons, seems to have a great impact on one's teacher identity development.

Many different identities take shape and reform in the process of becoming a teacher. Stamou and Custodero (2007) suggested that the different identity-forming experiences of (new) teachers may be an issue of *poloses*; that is, "continua upon which teachers might be working to seek balance, based on their perceptions of self and self-other in their individual teaching contexts" (p. 5). They found the notion of *poloses* in working with inservice music teachers in Greece during professional development workshops. This balance may be based upon relationships, agency, and interaction, both solitary and communal, within the school setting. Role conflict is an individual's expectation of herself as a teacher, which conflicts with professional norms. A lack of teacher identity development may contribute to teacher attrition (Hellman, 2007), career dissatisfaction (Russell, 2007), and teacher stress, all of which that lead to burnout (Scheib, 2007) as well as an unbalanced professional character.

Professional Identity

The concept of professional character and identity is related to teachers' concepts or perceptions of the profession (Knowles, 1992). These concepts or perceptions may strongly determine the way teachers teach. Professional identity is not static; that is, it is not fixed or unitary (Coldron & Smith, 1999). Professional identity is a complex and dynamic equilibrium where professional self-image balances with a variety of roles teachers feel they have to play. The primary site of struggle for beginning teachers is the self (Featherstone, 1993). Zembylas (2005) acknowledged this struggle and further described "the need to find personal and professional boundaries emerged as a central part of teacher identity" (p. 9). These boundaries help to form a multifaceted professional identity (Cooper & Olson, 1996). Historical, sociological, psychological, and cultural factors may all influence the teacher's sense of self as a teacher. Environment and school climate may also impact the professional identity. When there are stark changes in these factors, an imbalance for the teacher may occur, regardless of teaching experience. Such may be seen through new evaluative systems, where teachers may have to reflect upon or explain their pedagogical decisions to their evaluator. The greatest imbalance may occur in more seasoned teachers or teachers who are over their first five years of teaching.

Mid-career Teaching

Mid-career teachers compare and describe themselves through early career teachers (Coulter & Lester, 2011)—that is, the experience and activity of getting over the hump of the first few years and finding the transition to their own groove. According to Feiman-Nemster (2001), "the first years of teaching are an intense and formative time in learning to teach, influencing not only whether people remain in teaching but what kind

of teacher they become" (p. 1026). During the beginning years and into the mid-career, reflection plays a key part in teacher growth so as to not fall into a routinized style of teaching, void of critical consideration (Blumer, 1969; Conway, 2006; Froelich, 2007). This may stunt the growth of the teacher self, as Conway described. Routinized teaching so early in one's career may be viewed as dangerous, as the teacher will continue to teach as a second-year teacher for the rest of her career without careful attention and thought to current students' needs or her own needs. These routinized educators rely on survival tactics taught in undergraduate programs as well as any gained professional development the first year. Looking past formulas for success and focusing on critical engagements and musical experiences should be of main concern during the first few years of teaching, according to Froelich (2007). She added that "undergraduate music education programs focus on the teaching of recipes while many graduate programs as well as music education scholars want the students to rethink those practices" (p. 9).

The most glaring characteristic between early- and mid-career teachers is the establishment of a professional identity. This identity is dynamic, according to Coulter and Lester (2011), and combines "theoretical understanding of teaching with the actual practice of teaching" (p. 19). This dynamic of understanding and doing may not be linear. Rather, each teacher may develop particular professional identities at different times, often unexpectedly. Mid-career teachers adopt and abandon their early professional identities (or those of their mentors), developing and integrating new and always evolving professional identities in tandem with their personal identity. The personal self—acknowledging the personal aspect of teaching—comes to the forefront of teaching as well.

Teacher growth is maximized when there is support from other professionals (Darling-Hammond & Baratz-Snowden, 2007). When teachers are or feel isolated in their schools or communities, it is often detrimental to their job satisfaction, effectiveness, and, ultimately, retention (Brown, 2005; Johnson, 2006). During the mid-career point which settles after the fifth year, Nieto (2003) advised mid-career teachers to continue to persevere, to better themselves professionally and personally. Professionally, one may participate in communities with others "as a way to live in the world" (p. 101). This may mean persevering through the bad days (Coulter & Lester, 2011) or reflecting on what is colored in a jaded light and what is real. Eros (2013) expanded on that by saying bad days may include feelings of "being taken for granted" by administrators. This may be being left alone, assuming everything is status quo, and feeling not encouraged to attend workshops, programs, and so on. While most mid-career teachers may seek their own professional development outside of the school system, they may find difficulty implementing their new ideas in their existing schools/classrooms. Additionally, they may find it difficult to implement their evaluator's pedagogical suggestions, as they may not agree with them, they may not fit, or they do not know how to implement them. As a result, teachers may feel stunted and imbalanced or feel a lack of professional growth and failure because they could not make changes to their programs, or they may feel stunted due to lack of administrative help.

Disequilibrium

Disequilibrium, as discussed by Gallagher and Stahlnecker (2002), is the state of imbalance that is inevitable when a teacher enters a school as workplace, as well as the complexities of human relationships within the school. A teacher's disequilibrium can

either be productive or counterproductive, depending on the amount of reflection and acknowledgment of this stark professional change. A state of disequilibrium can have a significant effect on one's identity and sense of self. As Kegan (1982) described:

> [During] those times in our lives when the specter of loss of balance is looming over the system. . . . These are the moments when I experience fleetingly or protractedly that disjunction between who I am and the self I have created . . . the moments that Erikson refers to hauntingly as "ego chill." The chill comes from the experience that I am not myself, or that I am beside myself, the experience of a distinction between who I am and the self I have created. (p. 169)

Teachers' beliefs regarding pedagogy and learning are challenged by the intricate realities of schools. The transitional spaces of a teacher's ideals and the realities of schools may often ignite the initial state of a teacher's disequilibrium (Cook, 2009).

Most beginning teachers experience this type of disequilibrium, and whether or not it is productive or unproductive makes the difference in their development as teachers. However, stark changes in educational reform and policy may impact an older teacher's disequilibrium and identity as well (Bernard, 2015). The disequilibrium may result from the impact of pressures and stresses put upon educators, which may ultimately affect teaching performance.

Accountability and Stress

The age of accountability in education intends to yield improvements and quality teaching for student learning. Yet, it has also yielded issues of stress and unsettling feelings for teachers. When compared to other professions, teaching is constantly viewed as a high-stress occupation (Kyriacou, 2001). Approximately 25% of teachers in the United Kingdom regard teaching as "very stressful" or "extremely stressful," a percentage that has stayed consistent for the past 40 years (Kyriacou, 2011). In the United

States, the annual MetLife survey has indicated that teacher stress appears to be worsening. In 1985, 36% of survey respondents felt high levels of stress at least several days a week; in the 2012 survey, 51% experienced this stress (MetLife, 2013).

In light of high-stakes evaluation and heightened student testing, there has been a stark change in teachers' roles within the school building (diFate, 2009; Valli & Buese, 2007). Causes for teacher stress vary depending on environment and situation, but factors may include extreme workload (Butt & Lance, 2005; Kyriacou, 2011), low social support at work (Griffith, Steptoe, & Cropley, 1999), and lack of autonomy (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). Stress may also stem from increased paperwork, data driving and documentation, and administering/grading student assessments (Murphy, 2008). Additionally, teachers may feel that as a result of evaluations and testing, they have to narrow their curriculum (Newberg-Long, 2011).

Music teachers in public schools are in difficult and stressful positions, possibly more so than other subjects. This is due to the unique nature of music teaching (Hodge, Jupp, & Taylor, 1994; Scheib, 2004), as classes are often large and music teachers may see hundreds of students each day, especially in high schools (Scheib, 2004). As such, music teachers may feel isolated from other teachers both in physical classroom location and work overload. In a survey of 120 public school band directors, respondents were asked to rank-order potential work stressors (Heston, Dedrick, Raschke, & Whitehead, 1996). Student behavior/attitude, and teaching load were the most noteworthy and significant causes of stress. Yet, as Scheib (2003) related, “The subjects report that they themselves are to blame for any tension or stress they endure, since they are the sole determiners of the expectations and roles of their position” (p. 135). According to Scheib,

the stress was unrelated to demands from administrators, the school community or current policies.

Regardless of content area, teachers experience stress throughout their work and responsibilities, both in paperwork, teaching load, and interpersonal and professional interactions and relationships. This may be felt as burnout. However, Santoro (2011, 2013) believed that this stress may be better known as "demoralization" instead of burnout. When "the conditions of teaching change so dramatically that the moral rewards, previously available in ever-challenging work, are now inaccessible," teachers experience demoralization (Santoro, 2011, p. 3). Demoralizing may come from extrinsic factors, or even intrinsic factors such as interactions with colleagues or supervisors. This may be construed as a form of bullying, particularly from supervisors/administrators.

Teacher Bullying

Within the whirlwind of education reform, teachers may find themselves pressured to teach and perform successfully. While many may regard the notion of teacher bullying to mean a teacher pushing upon a student, it may also mean a teacher feeling bullied in the workplace by others, perhaps a peer, boss or student. More than 90% of adults have experienced workplace bullying at some time during the span of their working careers (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2003, p. 472). The victims of workplace bullying struggle to translate their experiences into words (Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006, p. 177). While there are many connotations and descriptions of bullying, the main characteristics may include: the negative effect of the bullying on the victim, the persistency of the bullying behavior, and the power disparity between the victim and the bully/bullies (De Wet, 2011). Salin (2003) defined workplace bullying as "the repeated

and persistent negative acts towards one or more individual(s), which involve a perceived power imbalance and create a hostile work environment" (p. 1214).

Other forms of bullying, which are more focused in an educational setting, may include questioning professional competence, overruling decisions, moving goal posts, excessive criticisms, or monitoring of work (Hadikin & O'Driscoll, 2002, p. 17; Hall, 2005, p. 46; Hoel & Beale, 2006, p. 243; Pietersen, 2007, p. 60; Salin, 2003, p. 1215; Tracy et al., 2006, p. 152). Such bullied actions may be apparent in a teacher's formal observations or professional conferences between teacher and administrator, or perhaps within a professional development setting among colleagues.

De Wet (2011), in her research on teacher bullying in South African schools, observed the ways in which teachers make meaning of their professional lives in light of an authority figure (the principal) watching over them. Themes of professional and personal tension versus success surfaced as the common threads connecting each of the participants. The teachers' experiences of being bullied by their administrators caused them to rethink their careers and their identity, and move on from their teaching lives. There is little research on teacher bullying, with the teacher in the role of victim (Allsup, in press). During this age of accountability and high-stakes teacher evaluation, more literature is needed to describe the feelings of teachers when they are bullied in a professional setting, and the ways in which feeling bullied may stunt teacher growth and limit opportunities for a more open pedagogy to occur.

Summary

This chapter provided background on the history of educational reform and teacher quality over the last 30 years, highlighting teacher evaluation in general education as well as music education, both at a national and a state level. Value-Added Models (VAMs) as well as evaluative rubrics such as the Danielson Framework for Teaching and Learning are among the popular systems to observe and evaluate teachers and track student progress. In higher education, edTPA serves as a portfolio-based experience for preservice teachers to be evaluated on their planning and executing of lessons as well as their ability to reflect. Educational reforms may have an impact on teacher identity, specifically in mid-career; within the new evaluation reform, seasoned teachers may feel like new teachers again. With this age of accountability, teachers may have feelings of stress or may even feel bullied by their administrators.

Currently, the literature and policies of teacher evaluation change weekly, sometimes daily, depending on state or district policy/incentive. Given this nature, it is difficult to keep abreast of each and every change. The literature presented in this review provides a representation of the most current trends of teacher evaluation.

The following chapter situates the issues presented in this literature review to create a more concrete and detailed perspective of what it means for teachers and administrators to reflect on their current teacher positions, and how to potentially engage critically with the evaluation material.

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The purpose of this study was to portray how middle and high school music ensemble directors and administrators described the effect of implementing standardized teacher evaluations on their practices and perspectives. A qualitative research approach was deemed most appropriate for this study, to provide space to solicit the voices of the participants and highlight the essence of their words.

According to Creswell (2007), often the topics on which researchers focus "are emotion laden, close to people, and practical" (p. 43). This allows the researcher to see the world through the eyes of the participants of the study in a holistic, non-evasive sense, by asking open-ended questions that begin with "to what extent" or "in what ways." Through these questions, the researcher may begin to understand and articulate the participants' thoughts, feelings, and actions in their natural setting: "we cannot separate what people say from the context in which they say it—whether this context is their home, family, or work" (p. 40). As music teachers are no strangers to the ever-shifting age of accountability and standardization, each teacher has her own experiences, opinions, and reactions to the current state of accountability and evaluation, and these may be personal. Moreover, as a music ensemble looks and sounds different than a traditional classroom or even that of a general music classroom, listening to these

experiences, feelings, and opinions may help us make sense of the state of teacher evaluation in the ensemble paradigm. This study centered on honoring the importance of the participants' voices about and perceptions of music teacher evaluation.

Assumptions

As with all research, an assumption, or a hunch, is the preliminary driving force to pursue the investigation of a subject. Assumptions, perspectives, subjectivities, and biases cannot be separated from a research project (Lather, 1993). This study was based on three assumptions about music teacher evaluation related to ensemble directors. The current systems of *music* teacher evaluation impose a pre-existing set of values and benchmarks to be met, looking more towards general pedagogy rather than contextualizing music as an idiosyncratic learning activity. Additionally, current (music) teacher evaluation looks more towards universal pedagogies, not contextualizing music in its natural situation.

Specific music teacher evaluations, developed by organizations such as the National Association for Music Education (NAfME), retain the same structure as general education evaluations. While musically situated, they are designed as an advocacy tool to keep music in schools and underscore the importance of a well-rounded education, not to help teachers think through their own process and pedagogy (Benedict, 2006b). Lastly, music teachers, specifically ensemble directors, crave interaction with other music colleagues as they make sense of these new systems of change; yet, these directors are often singletons in their own departments. Ensemble directors in mid-career may feel very isolated and may often turn to routine as a tactic for survival amid a sweeping new standards movement. Such may be the same for administrators. To speak with individuals

about their experiences may help them make better sense of their current situations under these new standards and policies.

Research Design

A qualitative research approach was deemed most appropriate for this study to provide space to solicit the voices of the participants. Freire (1998a) reminded us that "there is no such thing as teaching without research and research without teaching" (p. 35). Therefore, in education it is essential that the two go hand in hand, as a balance of theory and practice. Research, regardless of paradigm, is a process. Through a qualitative process, the researcher may foster and gain a deeper understanding of music and pedagogy within a student's, teacher's, and even researcher's world, while also helping participants learn about themselves and their musical experiences in context. Kincheloe (2003) described that "our research allows us to reconcile what we see as social contradiction and to ponder the consequences of the actions of institutions" (p. 207). The researcher may also attempt to present a relative framework to describe or illuminate a certain phenomenon. Within this attempt is "a desire to advance new theories and an interest in critically evaluating the tenets or assumptions of widely held explanations" (p. 11).

In this study, I, as the researcher, took on the role of a learner, interviewing participants to gain information and better understand their perspectives and opinions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 707) of music teacher evaluation in the public schools and its effect on the ensemble model of music education.

Phenomenological Research Lens

A phenomenological approach was best suited as a lens for this study because it is philosophically rooted and seeks to "describe the meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or a phenomenon" (Creswell, 2007, p. 57). The purpose of a phenomenological lens is to help the researcher understand the point of view of the participants. That is, it examines "how members of the social world apprehend and act upon the objects of their experience as if they are things separate and distinct from themselves" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 48). According to Ferrara (1991), all knowledge is personal, and assumptions and personal decisions are engrained in and throughout any method of analysis. Namely, we understand the lifeworld of others through our own experiences. As Moustakas (1994) stated, we see the "ways that the life world—the world every individual takes for granted—is experienced by its members" (p. 48).

Due to the humanistic nature of a phenomenological study, it is important to see the environment and subjects of the study in a non-biased, open way. Bowman (1998) stated:

> The key to getting behind conceptual distortions to pure appearances is an act of suspending, setting aside, or "bracketing" all presuppositions. . . . By suspending beliefs about reality, utility, logical consistency, and so forth, one can examine the way experience presents itself before it is overlaid by the aftermath of the mind's categorizing and abstractive activities. (p. 257)

I chose a qualitative design through a phenomenological lens to best foster the participants' descriptions of their experiences regarding their teaching practices and engagements with teacher evaluation. According to Moustakas (1994), phenomenology is concerned with "wholeness, with examining entities from many sides, angles, perspectives until a unified vision of the essences of a phenomenon or experience is

achieved" (p. 58). While this research was not a full-fledged phenomenological study, I took the overarching ideas of the research paradigm and used them as a means to approach and look at the study. Through a phenomenological lens, I as teacher and researcher had the ability to bracket out all presumptions about the participants' teaching, as well as my own, to reflect objectivity on my teaching and learning, including my own experience with teacher evaluation. This is known as *Epoche* (Moustakas, 1994). In this process of bracketing, or in the *Epoche*, it is necessary "to see what is really there, and to stay away from everyday habits of knowing things, people and events" (p. 85).

While the unit of analysis for this study was the participant, data were best collected through interviews. Semi-structured interviews were selected as the primary method of data collection in this study. This method was most useful for this research because it allowed great potential for collecting rich, thick description from the participants. Additionally, it gave me space within the interviews to refine statements and probe for additional information, in order to capture the participants' perspectives of their current situations as related to their pedagogy and practice in light of teacher evaluation (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008a, 2008b; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). In semi-structured interviews, the respondent shares more closely in the direction the interview takes, and the respondent can introduce an issue the investigator had not thought of.

Through the individual and collective narratives, I hoped to understand the lived experiences of these professionals, having a better sense of the ways in which they perceived of these new evaluation systems as well as how they functioned and viewed their role and purpose.

Role of the Researcher

As a choral director who has had some first-hand experience with the contemporary systems of teacher evaluation teaching in a public school (Bernard, 2015), I had to be cautious not to let the participants' voices be overshadowed by my own ideas and experience. It was essential that I held a position as both an insider and an outsider—that is, an insider by the mere fact that I, too, am a music educator and an ensemble director. Because of this, I carry my own perceptions, values, and ideas about music education and opinions of music teacher evaluation. As an insider, I was able to connect with the participants on a common basis and allow for spaces of trust. Yet, I was, and am, an outsider—a guest—in the lifeworld of the participants. I needed to gain knowledge and listen to the stories to make sense of the participants' own personal and professional situations engaging with evaluation.

Participants and Setting

The participants for this study were mid-career secondary school ensemble directors as well as administrators with both a musical and a non-musical background. Mid-career may be seen as the point after the first five years of teaching (Coulter & Lester, 2011). The choice to focus on mid-career teachers stemmed from the teachers' experiences and number of inservice years. In mid-career, teachers have already adopted a professional identity, having developed and integrated new and evolving professional identities in tandem with their personal identity (Coulter & Lester, 2011). There is proportionately little information on the ways in which inservice teachers—specifically ensemble directors—locate themselves in their practice as well as articulate their process

and pedagogy (Dust, 2006; Pellegrino, 2009). Along with this, there is little literature on mid-career teachers, both in identity formation and self-reflection. With the implementation of the contemporary teachers' evaluation systems, mid-career teachers are likely to have to negotiate certain practices and pedagogies as well as their current professional and personal identities. Each teacher's response may be different because teaching is a personal, not a standardized, one-size-fits-all profession (Freire, 1998b).

Creswell (2007) stated that "a hallmark of good qualitative research is the report of multiple perspectives that range over the entire spectrum of perspectives" (p. 122). To elicit multiple perspectives related to the phenomenon of teacher evaluation in music, especially within ensembles, I interviewed eight ensemble directors (band, chorus, and orchestra) and seven administrators in the New York metro area, both with formal and non-formal musical background. This number of participants was determined using the criterion of whether sufficient information had been obtained to answer the research questions. Purposeful sampling was employed to choose the participants who closely aligned with the subject of study. I was specifically interested in participants who were not only in mid-career, but who also taught in either urban or suburban areas within a relatively close range of 100 miles of each other, and whose teaching responsibility included a middle or high school ensemble. Appendices A and B provide the invitation letter and consent form to participate.

Each participant interview took place in a different setting and lasted approximately one hour. Two interviews spanned almost an hour and a half. I believe the difference in interview length among the participants was due to their comfort level with me as the researcher. I had worked with the interviewees producing the longest

interviews in professional development settings, so we had a pre-existing rapport. I believe their desire to share their experiences and provide me with as much information as possible contributed to the length of our interviews. All of the participants use the Danielson framework for evaluation. While this was not planned nor a requirement for sampling, it was expected that a large number of the educators used Danielson because it is the most widely used evaluation instrument in New York State.

Procedures

A selected literature review preceded data collection. Yet, while the literature informed this study, it was not a method to collect new information. Interviews appeared to be the richest way to collect data for this study in order to gain a more complete picture of music teacher/ensemble director and administrator perceptions, negotiations, and practices during this age of accountability and teacher evaluation systems. Seidman (2012) wrote to this effect:

> Interviewing . . . provides access to the context of people's behavior and thereby provides a way for researchers to understand the meaning of that behavior. A basic assumption in in-depth interviewing research is that the meaning people make of their experience affects the way they carry out that experience. . . . Interviewing allows us to put behavior in context and provides access to understanding their action. (p. 4)

Thus, the inclusion of individual interviews was necessary to understand the benefits and challenges within each participant's setting. Interviews were semi-structured and employed a conversational strategy within an interview guide approach (Patton, 2002). Additionally, I conducted a document review of the evaluation systems used in the participants' school districts, including rubrics for observation and evaluation; handouts

from professional developments from administrators regarding APPR; and Danielson-based observations, goals, evaluations, and archival data.

Pilot

A pilot study interview took place in the Summer of 2014 in conjunction with an interview research course taken at Teachers College. I interviewed two mid-career ensemble directors and one administrator in the greater New York metropolitan area. The opportunity to practice questioning and probing techniques and to refine particular questions and topic headings prior to data collection proved invaluable in preparing for the larger data collection. The participants in this pilot study were not involved in the actual research study. Interviews took place at Teachers College, Columbia University or at the participants' homes, whatever was most convenient given the date and time of the meeting.

Following each interview, I wrote up a professional profile for each participant to provide background information including location of school, responsibilities, and any relevant anecdotes that seemed important for relating a comprehensive and personal narrative. Preliminary themes that emerged from the pilot study were the conflict of theory and practice; disposition of adaptability regarding change; and *poloses*, or the balance of self in teaching context (Stamou & Custodero, 2007). These themes allowed me to revisit my protocol and expand on my questioning, particularly regarding theory (Danielson) and practice, identity, and the uniqueness of ensembles.

The pilot study yielded some insights into the effectiveness of my data collection and analysis procedures, and how they related to the research questions. In some

instances, the pilot confirmed my assumptions about the effectiveness of some of the content within the procedures; in others, they provided information for revision. The following describes how the pilot study changed my methods for this dissertation and how I altered my interview process and protocol for the dissertation study.

Identity

Both ensemble directors discussed their experiences as new teachers, finding their footing in the first year and also while being observed, but we did not discuss how their identity in the classroom had changed in mid-career and how it has perhaps been negotiated through contemporary systems of evaluation. Additionally, asking questions on professional identity, a subtopic in my literature review, was important to include in the interviews. The ways in which the participants view themselves professionally, both under the lens of teacher evaluation and in terms of pedagogical strength, were important to better describe the teachers' experiences.

Ensemble Uniqueness

In thinking how the participants' words might help to answer or describe the research questions, I found I needed to create some questions directly pertaining to the unique qualities of ensembles: that is, the large group learning, the community-based goals (performance and pedagogical), the choosing of repertoire, and the ways in which administrators contextualize this. Additionally, I needed to create some questions directly pertaining to the unique qualities of ensembles: the large group learning, community-based goals (performance and pedagogical), and the ways in which administrators contextualize this.

Instrumentation

Topics of interview and discussion for this study included: musical and professional background, curricular planning and collaboration, repertoire selection, musical performance and pedagogical goals, rehearsal planning, mentoring and administrative support, personal experiences with observation and evaluation procedures, evaluation post-meetings, and vision for ensemble evaluations. Interview protocol and questions were inspired and adapted from Goddard (2004), and were related to teacher and administrator behavior, perceptions, and feelings about the evaluation process. Appendix D provides the interview protocols for both administrators and ensemble directors.

Data Collection

Informed Consent

The ensemble directors were contacted via email and invited to participate in this study. I provided, and also read with them, the consent form that was created in compliance with Internal Review Board (IRB) requirements. These forms informed participants of their right to leave the study at any time and that accepting or declining to participate had no bearing on their relationship with me or the institution. They were also informed of the time commitments, (lack of) payment requirements, securing of data, and intended use of the results. Finally, ensemble educators and administrators were informed of the benefit of better understanding the phenomenon of music teacher evaluation that accompanied the study. To assure confidentiality, names of all people and places were

replaced with pseudonyms. Appendix C includes the form for the participants' rights and informed consent.

Issues of Familiarity and Trust

Coming from many years of teaching in the public schools in the New York area, I too have my own set of experiences and ideas about music teacher evaluation. In interviewing the ensemble directors, it was like talking to someone with a similar language. They often found themselves saying, "You know what I mean, I know you've been there" and other bylines to suggest that I understood what they have been through. Conversely, I found this to be different with the administrators, who began speaking more tentatively to me—more administrative- and business-like—knowing that I had extensive and recent public school teaching experience. In both situations, I needed to position myself more as researcher, as inquirer, rather than as colleague or even teacher. Small comments to support the administrators' words, such as "I know it can't be easy to have over one hundred observations with your faculty," began to shift my position as teacher for the principals and assistant principals. This proved to be a critical moment in the establishment of my research identity, and allowed me to become more of an insider than an outsider. The participants—mainly the administrators—trusted my commitment to separate my teacher and researcher roles.

Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were selected as the primary method of data collection in this study. This method helped to capture the participants' perspectives of their current situations as related to their pedagogy and practice in light of teacher evaluation

(Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008a, 2008b; Marshall & Rossman, 2011). In semi-structured interviews, the respondent shares more closely in the direction the interview takes, and the respondent can introduce an issue the investigator had not thought of.

Kvale and Brinkman (2009) described qualitative interview research as an "attempt to understand the world from the subject's point of view, to unfold the meaning of the subject's experiences, to uncover their lived world" (p. 1). The lived world of an ensemble director and an administrator are greatly different, yet both may inherently share core values of student interest and growth. In describing interviewing in hermeneutical phenomenological human science, van Manen (1990) stated:

> The interview serves very specific purposes: a) it may be used as a means for exploring and gathering experiential narrative material that may serve as a resource for developing a richer and deeper understanding of a human phenomenon, and b) the interview may be used as a vehicle to develop a conversational relation with a partner (interviewee) about the meaning of an experience. (p. 66)

Thus, my inclusion of individual interviews was necessary to experience each teacher's and administrator's rich narratives, without being influenced by outside or other participants.

I contacted the prospective participants via an email which described the purpose of the study and invited their participation. Interviews took place between July 2014 and December 2014. Before each interview commenced, the interviewee reviewed and signed a consent form. All interviews were conducted in person and in a one-on-one setting to make the participants more comfortable to open up in an honest and candid way to describe teacher evaluation. Patton (1990) described "the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit" (p. 278). The choice to

employ interview research for this study was to interact with the participants to capture the meaning of their experiences in their own words. All interviews were semi-structured.

All interviews were audio recorded. On completion of the interview, each recording was transcribed and analyzed. Appendix D provides the interview protocol.

Plan of Analysis

Analysis of the data occurred immediately following data collection and transcription of interviews. Merriam (1998, 2009) reminded researchers to analyze and collect data simultaneously to avoid the possibility of repetitive, nonspecific, and overwhelming data. I conducted the steps in my methodology in an organized manner that aided in my ability to collect, interpret, analyze, and report the data and voices of the participants in a "reflexive" fashion (Luttrell, 2010).

Transcripts were approached with an open mind to best allow significant ideas to emerge and "to let the interview breathe and speak for itself" (Seidman, 2006, p. 100). It was assumed that much information would be gained from these interviews; however, as the researcher, I needed to decide which stories would be reported. Stake (2000) reminded us that "this is not to dismiss the aim of finding the story that best represents the case, but to remind that the criteria of representation ultimately are decided by the researcher" (p. 441). I proceeded with great care throughout the data collection and analysis phases of this study to ensure that the participants' ideas, beliefs, and opinions were not misrepresented based on my own subjectivities.

I adopted an Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) approach, adapting and modifying it for this study. IPA seeks to "explore in detail how participants are

making sense of their personal and social world" (Smith & Osborn, 2003, p. 51). This method of data collection and analysis is more concerned with the participants' personal awareness of an object or event, rather than attempting to fabricate an objective statement of the object or event itself. Accessing the participants' points of view—their narrative—is of utmost concern. Smith and Osborn (2003) suggested that IPA consist of: looking for themes, connecting the themes, and continuing the analysis with other cases (participants). Upon reading each transcript three times, I identified significant statements within the interview. These statements helped me develop categories as I kept in mind the research questions that guided the study. These categories served as a way to code the data, consider the big ideas and themes that emerged, and group them accordingly—or what Seidman (2012) and Creswell (2007) referred to as a "winnowing process" to create themes. A music teacher educator colleague served as interrater reliability, blindly analyzing the transcripts. While this interrater did not see my categories or themes in his analysis, he came up with the same meanings and themes as I did, with many of them verbatim.

Content: Participants' Lived Experiences

To describe the phenomenon of music teacher evaluation, specifically in ensemble settings, I conducted interviews with seven administrators (three with no music background and four with a music teaching background) and eight middle and high school ensemble directors. Each participant described distinctive events and similar experiences from their professional and personal lives regarding their teaching and

learning processes in the wake of the age of accountability and teacher evaluation. To maintain confidentiality, all participant names were changed and given pseudonyms.

Prior to examining the phenomenon of teacher evaluation as a shared experience with all participants, it was critical to describe individual lived experiences, honoring the personal stories and narratives that contribute to a larger understanding of the phenomenon. The following profiles serve as background for the individual participants' lived experiences, drawn from their own words and ideas. These narratives were then woven into the collective narrative of each group in the subsequent chapters, eliciting themes to form a more holistic view of the experiences.

Profile Backgrounds: Administrators

Mauro. Mauro is in his third year as principal of a large, public high school in a wealthy suburban town in close proximity to a large, urban metropolis. The school and school district are often featured in the *U.S. News and World Report* list of top high schools in the country, and are in the top 20 for best STEM schools. Prior to his current appointment, Mauro was principal at an urban public high school, ranked one of the best high schools in the state and the country; students complete an intensive examination for admittance. As a teacher, he taught Russian and Social Studies for nine years at a large, urban public technical high school, also ranked one of the best high schools in the state.

As a school building leader, Mauro believes his direct responsibility is to provide support for his staff with regard to content, pedagogy, and resources while also being personal. He tries to hire teachers who differ in terms of pedagogical strengths as well as personality to appeal to any type of learner. While teachers are filled with emotions and fear of failure to perform at a high level during the evaluation, hitting the highly effective

mark, Mauro aims to calm his faculty down logistically and approach the evaluation process as an ongoing experience, one rooted in teaching and focused more on the students and improving pedagogically across time. He reminds his teachers that they are the professionals and yet, they are all striving to improve themselves together.

Being a principal rarely receives compliments on a daily or even weekly basis, yet the demands increase from the district and state on a daily basis. While in his growth of responsibility, Mauro views his primary responsibility as helping his faculty to learn and grow professionally, to channel their passions and share them with their students. The current teacher evaluation strands have not deeply affected the overall function or teacher productivity or morale of Mauro's school. He acknowledged that his entire career has been at high-functioning schools, where discipline or test scores are of no grave concern. With this luxury, he said, come other problems of maintenance and finding other ways to improve, but it leaves much space for supporting programs outside of the tested subjects.

Mauro described that the school is renowned for its arts program, in particular the ensembles. The concert band has performed numerous times at Carnegie Hall and Lincoln Center, and has gained many accolades for their challenging, high-quality repertoire. Mauro played the trombone in his own schooling, in middle school through high school. From his perspective, a robust music and arts program provides a space for expression, enjoyment, and community and cultural opportunities for all students at different ability levels. While he does not have a content knowledge on a par with his ensemble faculty, Mauro spoke to the pedagogical markers during the rehearsals, especially the levels of questioning asked and the ways in which students respond to these questions, with both verbal answers as well as musical changes.

Bradley. Bradley is an assistant principal at a middle school in a small suburban district outside of a large urban metropolis, where he has worked for the past three years. He is one of two assistant principals in the school and manages the discipline of the 1,200 students as well as supervising and observing/evaluating teachers. Before his administrative position, Bradley worked in banking and joined a teaching fellows program for math education, earning his teaching license. He taught for years in a large public high school in an urban metropolis, a low-functioning school, and quickly became a dean.

Bradley feels that the goal of music in the schools is for students to have music in their lives forever. He wants their experience in school to be positive, and believes that he and the music teachers are charged with the responsibility to make this happen, without creating hierarchies or competition among students in the program. Additionally, Bradley thinks that participating in the music program—specifically the ensembles (which his middle school only offers as an incentive to make music more hands-on and engaging)—helps to reduce stress and provide a shift in students' mindset during the day, as almost a break from their more academic classes.

While each teacher gets observed and evaluated in Bradley's school, he believes there is no need for teachers to feel fearful or on edge about receiving a low rating or being less than "highly effective." He has had extensive training in leading teacher evaluation, spending much time sitting around with other principals to watch videos of lessons and "norming," or trying to find common pedagogical tools and tactics agreed upon by all watching. Bradley revealed that he often becomes very frustrated with the "norming" tactics that take place in his professional developments because they might

lead to inauthentic observation. Related to this, he reflected that he struggles with the role of administrator, and questions that perhaps he would serve the community more actively if he were a teacher.

Bradley played saxophone during his middle school years and diligently so, but regretfully stopped in high school because of the demands of his other courses and his involvement in sports, as he did not have enough time to dedicate to practicing and afterschool activities. While he can read music and has had hands-on experience as a member of an ensemble, Bradley does not feel as comfortable speaking to content or the actual happenings in a band rehearsal as he does in an English or science class. He will follow along with music and sit with the woodwinds in band and orchestra, which takes him back to his own middle school ensemble days, but he rarely follows the music in chorus because he enjoys watching the students and the teacher sing.

Frank. Frank is the principal of a large middle school in an urban metropolis, with a focus on the arts. He has been in his current role for six years, and has experience teaching and administrating in both private and public schools, with a background in special education literacy and math in the K-8 setting. Frank's school has received an A on the city report card for the past three years, and has been named a model school by the chancellor of the department of education. While Frank does not have a musical background, he shows a fervent passion for the arts, and shared that at an early age he was told he was not musically talented and should not take up an instrument. This experience has fueled his vision for having an active arts education for all students in his middle school, with band, chorus, and orchestra as a mandate for all students.

Though he does not possess a language or music background, Frank tries to rely on his teachers to translate their rehearsal processes to him, including particular words or conducting gestures. The end goal of a music education, particularly through ensembles, Frank said, is to develop a love of lifelong learning through music, and to learn behaviors that might transfer to every day, such as listening, self-regulating, revising, and improving oneself through practice and reflection. Frank believes that all students need these qualities to be successful in any career.

Frank relies heavily on school data to inform his decisions and actions as a school building leader. While he feels overwhelmed with the overload of paperwork and citywide incentives, he uses the data as markers to diagnose where he can provide content and pedagogical support for his teachers. Frank admitted that the teacher evaluation system used, the Danielson Framework, can be overwhelming for both administrator and teacher. Because of this, he tries to choose two components (such as questioning) to hone in on for an entire year and help the faculty build upon them into their curriculum development and planning, instead of using snapshot observations to capture one instance of a teacher's questioning technique. For Frank, thinking longitudinally is how he makes the evaluations more meaningful. Shortly after this study, Frank was promoted to a district-level position as a result of his keen leadership skills and attention to data as they inform pedagogy.

Lucian. Lucian holds a new position within his city's department of education as director of teacher effectiveness in the arts, which was created in light of the new teacher evaluation incentives and the implementation of the Danielson Framework in the city schools. Prior to this post, he was a band director and Italian teacher in a 6-12 public

school within the urban public school system. Lucian recalled that much of his non-teaching work in the schools was innately administrative—ordering instruments and supplies, repairing instruments, and organizing events for the music department—which led to him gaining his administrator's attention as an effective teacher and planner. He quickly became a right-hand man to assist with programming, which directly resulted in an increase of students participating in the music program.

Lucian described his responsibility to be the connective tissue between the administrators and the arts teachers, blurring the lines between artistic processes and "edu-speak" as he called it, helping to contextualize the artistic process within the Danielson Framework. While he feels his hands are tied in relation to changing policy, he also feels responsible to foster space for teacher growth and success in light of the compliance incentives. Lucian has helped to develop a Special Considerations Document for the city public schools, which is rooted in the Danielson Framework, highlighting each of the components. The purpose of the document was to shed light on what art instruction looks and sounds like, offering a set of indicators and possible examples of what an administrator might see in a music-, dance-, or art-specific class. Finding a common language for teacher and administrator to speak is at the heart of Lucian's work, as is helping teachers balance their artist-teacher roles.

Joel. Joel is the director of music for a suburban district about an hour outside of the city. Having spent his entire career in this district, he spent 21 years as the high school band director, receiving many accolades at festivals both state- and nationwide, and he has spent the past seven years in his current role. In addition to his full-time job, he is on the executive board for the state music educators association. While his routine

changes daily, Joel reflected that his primary responsibility is to support his teachers, both curricularly and musically, providing opportunities for student and teacher growth through resources, modeling, workshops, and performances. Above all, Joel wants all students to leave the music department—specifically the ensembles—with an understanding of being better persons for their experiences as well as of the importance of teamwork. While Joel comes from a music background, he feels most comfortable in the band and orchestra rehearsals because most of his teaching career has been spent in ensemble settings. He admitted he might not provide as fruitful feedback for elementary general music teachers as he would for band directors, but he recognizes the same musical concepts and the importance of solid pedagogy and scaffolding among all ages. He also added that he, of course, provides more musical feedback than a non-music administrator.

The district music teachers' overall ratings are influenced by student scores in ELA and math, but Joel is neither concerned nor bothered by this because the district performs very high overall in terms of student testing and growth; this has yielded high evaluation ratings for teachers in all subjects. Joel described how within his role in the state music educator association, he encounters many music teachers whose scores decrease due to ELA and math scores and often finds his hands tied because he cannot change policy. With regard to evaluation, Joel observes his teachers in addition to the building administrators, and has constant conversations with school leaders to contextualize what is happening in the music classrooms, or to "translate," as he referred to it. He feels it is a great responsibility to be the mediator between the teachers and the

administrators, so the teachers can focus on doing their jobs well and not fret about having to explain why they asked a particular level of question.

Caleb. Caleb is in his second year as the assistant principal of a small arts-focused high school in a large urban city. Students must audition to attend the school and receive an arts education with equal amounts of theater and music. The school has received an A on the city report card for the past three years, and students pass their state examinations with high marks. Caleb was the choral and theory teacher for six years and is in his second year as administrator; he is one of two assistant principals. Although his daily routine changes constantly, Caleb stated that visiting classrooms is his primary goal because he feels he is most useful working with teachers and students.

One of Caleb's biggest struggles, he shared, has been finding his footing as an administrator in the building where he was a teacher. Giving feedback to teachers who have been colleagues for years has been uncomfortable because he feels the teachers view him only as a music teacher and now as a person who could speak to the larger pedagogical canon. Caleb believes that good pedagogy transcends all content mastery as an educator, and strives to have conversations with his teachers about the importance of good questioning and thoughtfully planned assessments.

José. José is the district-level director of music, art, and technology in a wealthy suburban district outside a large metropolis. He was the choral and vocal teacher at a large, urban, arts-friendly high school for six years, where he also served as the community relations coordinator. Although he is now out of the classroom full-time, José runs a Saturday children's chorus within the city for middle school students. He believes

in order to be a good supervisor, one must be a good educator and must keep active in his pedagogy. He is in his second year of administration.

At the core of his thinking and teaching, José believes that good pedagogy is universal across the board and is not subject-specific. He argued that good questions should sound the same regardless of subject, and believes that often his music colleagues hide behind the "that doesn't apply to me" complex, as he described it. While José's district has performed very high on state exams and teachers have had effective ratings, he feels his purpose in his role is to help teachers to think long-term about curriculum and make small shifts in their pedagogy for student-centered learning. This, he shared, will allow the time and space for teachers to engage with one concept and think, plan, practice, and reflect on them in relation to student engagement and work.

The following table provides an overall composite of each administrator's background, to help the reader navigate the following chapters and locate the participants' narratives.

Table 1

Administrators' Background

Name	Music Background	Years as Administrator	Location
Mauro	No (played as student)	5	Suburban
Bradley	No (played as student)	3	Suburban
Frank	No	6	Urban
Lucian	Yes	1	Urban
Joel	Yes	7	Suburban
Caleb	Yes	2	Urban
José	Yes	2	Suburban

Profile Backgrounds: Ensemble Directors

Wilson. Wilson is a middle school choral and general music teacher in a large urban city, and the first music teacher in the history of the school in over 15 years. Prior to his current school, he was the choral/vocal director of a small performing arts high school. With a background as a professional vocalist and with training in an all-boys' choir school, Wilson seeks to find a musical experience in all that he does with his students, regardless of their formal musical knowledge or experience. He hopes to build his current program up in the coming years and secure relationships with nonprofit arts organizations around the city to provide more performance opportunities for the students outside of their school community.

Coming from a performance background, Wilson struggled in his previous school setting when more emphasis was put on lesson planning and providing evidence of student learning. Without a solid set of musical skills, Wilson shared, one cannot teach a musical subject, especially one that is action-based like chorus. Wilson does not have a music supervisor within his building.

Tim. Tim has been teaching for 14 years, with his area of specialty in instrumental education. Growing up as a "band person" in the Midwest, he went to a large university regarded as a "band school." As a result of his experiences, Tim feels most comfortable teaching and being in front of a band or large ensemble. He is a French horn player, now living and working in a large metropolitan area as a freelance musician and conducting a popular community summer wind band in the area. He also teaches full-time in a wealthy suburban district about 30 minutes from the urban hub. His teaching responsibilities include concert band and sixth grade strings in addition to small group

lessons. Tim has a music supervisor in his district who observes him and works with the principal in his building.

Stew. Stew is in his ninth year of teaching at a large, urban public high school of approximately 3,500 students, where he conducts the concert band, jazz band, and beginning bands. In his first few years of teaching, he was charged with having to rebuild the instrumental music program, growing his concert band from 9 students to 45 in three years. Students at this public high school do not take a test for admission; many students enter the music program without formal music education, as is the norm for city schools. As a result, those students who have played an instrument often attend specialized high schools for the arts.

Over the last five years the music department at Stew's school went from having a music-focused supervisor to being combined with other small departments within the school, including foreign language, art, and business with a non-music assistant principal. Stew recalled his non-music supervisor praising his work, as his performances within the community brought a positive light to the school, which was suffering from low test scores and in danger of closing. In order to have professional development that is musically rooted, Stew joined the Music Educators Workshop at a world-renowned, local music institution, receiving monthly workshops as well as school visits by an instrumental music educator.

This year, as part of the citywide teacher evaluation incentive, Stew was able to choose the means of evaluation, a result of his previous Effective ratings (using the Danielson Framework); he will receive four informal observations in total from his assistant principal and/or principal.

Andy. Andy is a middle school band director in a large, urban school district. His school is one of the only middle schools in its area to offer music and ensembles in band, chorus or guitar. Many of Andy's students come to him in sixth grade with no prior formal music education, but stay with the program and grow to playing Level 3 repertoire in the state music manual. He works hard to recruit from the incoming sixth graders, overprogramming his classes beyond capacity because he knows many of the students he wants for the ensemble will not be able to stay due to academic responsibilities such as double periods of English and math.

In the 12 years of teaching in his school, Andy has had three principals. In his first year, he was required to teach one class of science, for which he had no background. This year, his principal took one period of band away and replaced it with an art class to fulfill the state requirement for students to take courses in music and art. As a result, Andy sees his band four times per week and teaches them a period of visual art, a subject in which he has no prior background or expertise. He admitted being quite frustrated with the current situation because his students know he possesses little visual art knowledge; he feels it makes for a "lose-lose" situation in terms of providing a fruitful learning experience for the students.

Andy has had all satisfactory and effective ratings for his observations and evaluations over the years, noting that there has been little to no musical feedback regarding his ensembles. He shared that he is grateful for the music professional developments within the city because he is able to "talk shop" with colleagues and situate and contextualize how the new evaluation incentives may look within his band rehearsal.

Anna. Anna is a band and general music teacher in a small wealthy district outside of the city, where she teaches middle and high school. Now in her 15th year, she has changed her program and curriculum significantly to offer band, general music, lessons, guitar, and rock band, describing that the non-band classes are smaller and more intimate than the large band ensemble. Many of Anna's students have taken private lessons before or take advantage of the pull-out lessons during the school day to improve their playing.

Anna has a positive and close relationship with her administrators, sharing that she has had many conversations with them about curriculum and pedagogy and how they may look in a music class; she attributed the space for this to the administrators' openness to learn and treat the faculty as content and pedagogical experts. Anna considers herself an educator first and a musician second, and feels this is her greatest trait within her school and department. When the Danielson Framework and APPR were rolled out in Anna's district, she quickly joined the faculty team as the music and art representative to try to figure out how the critical attributes and student learning objectives (SLOs) fit into music because she did not want general ideas imposed on the department. She and her department tried to visualize what a more student-centered ensemble might look like, with teacher as conductor less prominent and project-based learning in all the ensembles. Following her work, the entire school had professional development in Danielson and in writing the SLOs in departments in order to prepare for the following school year and the implementation of the incentives.

Lou. Lou is a fifth year orchestra director in a wealthy suburban district near the city. Most of the community commutes into the city for work, and students have many

opportunities to visit the city with their families and classes for cultural excursions and learning experiences. Lou teaches at the high school and also at the elementary school, and is trying to build a cohesive and comprehensive strings curriculum that spans from 4th to 12th grades to align musical goals for each level. Additionally, he accompanies the high school choruses and assists with the marching band as sound technician. While some students join the orchestra without prior experience, Lou feels they can catch up quickly because other students have been playing for so long. There is also a tiered program at the high school level, so new students in the "lower" group do not perform in the community as much. All of the music programs in the high school are ensemble-based.

Lou's district has a music supervisor who is housed in the high school and works closely with all the school principals, completing some of the evaluations for the teachers. Lou added that he is grateful for a music supervisor because it frees up time and effort related to administrivia, such as ordering music, dealing with budgets, and speaking with parents. He feels he has more space to focus on teaching and curriculum.

In the past two years, Lou has incorporated more formative assessment into his orchestra classes, using technology to aid in this. As the ensemble rehearses, Lou moves a microphone around the room, recording each student and uploading it onto a website where the students may access their individual recordings and reflect on them. He described that this has been a wonderful tool for reflection and dialogue within the group as well as evidence for his administrators to show growth and student learning. As a result, Lou has been praised by both his music supervisor and principal, who has used his pedagogy as a model for other teachers in the building.

Jacob. Jacob is the orchestra teacher at a large public high school in the city, which serves around 4,500 students in the neighborhood. At a time where music programs are declining due to budgets or lack of programming in the public schools, Jacob feels lucky to be teaching five classes of orchestra, which are tiered; his top groups perform regularly for the community and for events within the department of education. Prior to teaching, Jacob was a full-time performer and director of orchestras for a prominent college of music within the city. Feeling unfulfilled with his career, he turned to teaching and obtained certification through a Fellows program in the city, where he took classes and taught simultaneously. His first job was at another large high school, which was on the city's failure list. He taught all orchestra and described his time there as wonderful because he learned how to connect to students who had no interest in school or making music, and helped them to find joy and self-expression. His administrators praised his work, although they never gave him any constructive feedback or interest in his teaching, leaving Jacob hungry for support and a better school. He is currently in his 11th year of teaching.

Jacob has a music supervisor who observes and evaluates the music department, and helps organize performances, festivals, and trips for the ensembles; the music course offerings are all ensemble-based at the school, and a year of music is a state requirement for graduation. There are seven music teachers at Jacob's school. Jacob values his supervisor's feedback greatly, and feels he is "spot-on" in his suggestions and practices what he preaches in his own teaching, which makes Jacob respect him even more.

This year, the evaluation process is based on eight components of the Danielson Framework, still on a continuum of ineffective to highly effective. Jacob feels that while

many of his colleagues are nervous about the evaluations, they still feel better having fewer components than the more than 20 from the previous year. However, regardless of the number of components, Jacob feels will be highly effective in his work because he shows a passion for teaching and musical excellence, which is evident in his rapport with students and the growth of the program.

Gloria. Gloria is a choral and general music teacher at a middle school outside the city. She is in her sixth year teaching, and prior to her current appointment, she taught the same course load in a different district. Gloria feels that all students should have a quality musical experience, which for her means activity participating in music making. As a result, she and her colleagues are working to omit general music from the curriculum and have all ensemble-based learning, with band, chorus, piano, and guitar/ukulele.

Gloria has been fortunate to have music supervisors in both of her districts, so she had a point person and mentor in her discipline during her first couple of years teaching; however, she has felt a disconnect between what her supervisor says and her principal's ideas, specifically in terms of what particular pedagogy looks like in the music classroom. While Gloria's supervisor felt that literacy was incorporated through reading music in her chorus class, her principal wanted students to be writing more. Feeling torn, Gloria included both styles in her teaching, as neither the supervisor nor the principal communicated with one another about their mixed messages to the faculty. Regardless, Gloria has received highly effective ratings using the Danielson Framework.

The following table provides a general background of each ensemble director in order for the reader to remember specific narratives more easily for these participants.

Table 2

Ensemble Directors' Background

Name	Ensemble	Years Teaching	Grade Level*	Location	Music Supervisor
Wilson	Choral	10	Elementary/Middle	Urban	No
Tim	Band	14	Middle/High	Suburban	Yes
Stew	Band	9	High	Urban	No
Andy	Band	12	Middle	Urban	No
Anna	Band/Rock Band Lessons	15	Middle/High	Suburban	No
Lou	Orchestral	5	Elementary/High	Suburban	Yes
Jacob	Orchestral	11	High	Urban	Yes
Gloria	Choral	6	Middle	Suburban	Yes

*Elementary = Grades 3-5; Middle = Grades 6-8; High School = Grades 9-12

Summary

This phenomenological interview study (Creswell, 2007; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009) examined the ways in which secondary music ensemble directors and administrators described the effect of implementing standardized teacher evaluations on ensemble teachers' practices and perspectives. Additionally, the intersection of the social, musical, and pedagogical dimensions of ensembles with teaching and learning were studied, as well as the impact of teacher evaluation on teacher identity. Interview data were collected from eight ensemble directors and seven administrators using a purposeful sample. Documents of evaluation protocol, rubrics, and district-made and district-enforced policies were reviewed. Data collection for this study took place from September through November 2014.

Remaining Chapters

The following four chapters include the presentation and analysis of data from each participant group separately. Chapter IV presents the findings from the ensemble directors, Chapter V presents the findings from the administrators, and Chapter VI presents the findings for both groups. Chapter VII is a discussion of all the data. Finally, Chapter VIII presents conclusions which answer the research questions, implications for the field of music education and music teacher education, and suggestions for future research.

Chapter IV

ENSEMBLE DIRECTORS

This chapter presents the findings for how the ensemble directors negotiate and manage the regulations of the contemporary teacher evaluation systems. These include the ways in which the educators experience teacher evaluation in terms of curriculum and performance goals, repertoire, and purpose. The stories are not chronological, nor do they have a beginning or end. They are part of a collection of shared experiences. The ensemble directors' experiences and narratives are woven together to tell a larger story of engaging with contemporary evaluation systems.

Curriculum and Performance Goals

Alignment With Core Subjects

While the demands to provide evidence of student learning and growth increase, the ways in which the evidence is presented are different, depending upon school and situation. In terms of ensembles, some principals feel that curriculum should align with academic subjects. Reflecting on feedback he received from his principal, Andy, a middle school urban band teacher, felt the suggestions given were lackluster and inapplicable to his building and maintaining his program or improving his curriculum and teaching. The feedback was not related to anything he taught or showed in terms of a lesson plan:

A: Uh . . . nothing that stuck with me in a meaningful way. Nothing constructive that stuck with me. I got, um, I got a suggestion . . . recommendation that, uh, he noticed that the brass instruments emptying their spit on the stage, I should come up with a new solution.

C: Okay.

A: Well, that's how they've been doing it for centuries. I don't know if I can do anything about that.

C: Sure. Mop the stage.

A: It's a bummer that that's the feedback that sticks out after all these years, is that one. I have an unsanitary classroom. Which is not untrue, I guess. It's a little bit gross. Yeah, it was always connected to major subjects. You see something and, I know, I'm being very vague about it, but you know, "The ELA teachers are doing this, we need to do something like that, I didn't see it today. Can you figure out how to do that?" But it's . . . it's as . . . it's still whatever rating they want to give you. Um, teaching the same way as everyone else. It was about making sure I hit every bullet that everyone else has to hit. I did get one musical feedback once, it was, uh, about some repertoire. He said, "Listen, not one of those slow ones, okay?" And that was the musical feedback I got.

At the same time, no one has looked at Andy's lessons, units or curriculum maps to see how they are aligned with other subjects. Conversely, the majority of the other ensemble directors felt they have autonomy over their curriculum; there are no ground rules (from state, district or school) for what is included in ensemble teaching, and there is much leeway to construct learning goals and plan curriculum separate from other subjects.

With the exception of Andy, the participants did not report that their principals mandated that curriculum needed to align with academic standards. Gloria shared her experiences with thinking through curriculum, where she was not asked to turn anything in except her student learning objectives (SLOs). There were no demands, she stated. An indication of good learning was a good-sounding concert: "But really, it was the concert,

the kids were having fun, and they sounded great. No one asked me what I'm doing to get them there." Gloria continued to describe that in her administrators' eyes, the performances seemed almost separate from the teaching that occurred on a daily basis, as if there was no correlation between teaching and learning and the performance product. Additionally, no one looked at Gloria's SLOs or discussed them in post-observations.

Tim reported that his band and orchestra always put on a solid concert with a high-level repertoire, and that he received positive feedback from parents, colleagues, and administrators. He felt comfortable with his teaching, but did not have detailed lesson plans for each unit or piece of music because no one ever asked for them. However, he is always ready with something in case he is observed or charged with the task of handing in a document:

> If an administrator comes in to observe me and they want to see a lesson plan or something, I have something to show them. But I don't . . . I'm not sitting home on Sunday nights anymore writing things out. But I'll listen and then I'll sit down and be like, "I like where these things are and I want to focus more on tone next week, so we're going to do some more tone stuff." So there is a plan and it's always in my head.

If someone asked Tim how his curriculum aligned with ELA, he said he could give examples off the top of his head because he has been teaching long enough and knows how to approach those types of questions. For Tim, the plan and learning objectives come out of the repertoire and are not rooted in standards from other subjects.

Repertoire

Curriculum Driver

The ensemble directors unanimously agreed that the repertoire they taught was the main foundation of curriculum in their classroom. While the participants felt much

autonomy in terms of devising curriculum, they shared that the choice of repertoire usually becomes the curriculum or drives the curriculum for them, and that has never been questioned by any administrator. Lou, who teaches in a wealthy suburban district, described that "it's just this unsaid culture that happens here," meaning there is an expectation that the ensembles will perform well and the teachers are doing their jobs well and have a curriculum of some sort. There is no set structure for what curriculum should look like or what it should entail. Stew, now in his ninth year of teaching band, has just begun to write down some curriculum goals for the year—general musical goals that could apply to any piece of repertoire. He remarked on how he thought through curriculum and constructed daily lessons, which were always adaptable and based on the previous rehearsal and how well the students acquired certain skills or get through the music. For him, his process begins with score study—first to learn the score musically and then to pull out musical terms and techniques for teaching:

> I . . . I know the score, I can anticipate issues that are going to arise during rehearsal, but I'm basically improvising my rehearsals. I know I'm going to work on maybe measures 1-16, I know some of the issues that the students are going to have. Let's see what happens and I, being the expert on the score, am going to respond to them.

Stew remarked that no one has ever asked for his curriculum in his years in his urban high school; he has been asked for yearly goals that he wants to achieve by the end of the year—what the city calls SMART (Specific-Measureable-Achievable-Relevant-Time Bound) goals—but they can be so vague that he can just "make them up and if anyone asks how I'm using it, I can always bring it back to something I do to cover my ass."

Jacob, a high school orchestra director in a large city, also admitted to having never been asked to show any curriculum to his administrators. While many method

books serve as curriculum and fulfill some non-musical standards as well within the Common Core, Jacob was trying to challenge himself, look past them as the authority, and think long-term and more openly about where to go with his performance goals with the students. Additionally, Jacob knows something needs to be written down so he will not be forced to use an imposed curriculum or have to write a curriculum based on ELA and math standards. He admitted:

> I just started writing a comprehensive curriculum. We don't have one. What I'm using is the Sound Innovations, uh, the method books. And the method books are, by definition, a curriculum. And it's a very good. . . . Sound Innovations is good because it allows the director to sort of pick and choose what they want, what kind of exercises do you want in there, what would you like this to be. Um, it's hard and it's . . . my supervisor says, "I don't understand someone who does what you do, doesn't have a curriculum." So, and he qualifies this by saying, he looks at me and he says, "It's my job to give you a curriculum, I know that. But wouldn't you much rather be teaching what you want to teach rather than what I want you to teach?" It's a very good point because God knows I don't want to teach what he wants me to teach. And he trusts me to teach what I want to teach, but it needs to be put on paper. Why? Because the principal is a micro-manager. And because when they come in for quality review, they want to see curriculum, they want to see pacing calendars. Because we have to justify our existence every minute of every day. And that gets aggravating after a while.

Although Jacob's curriculum is autonomous, his motives for writing curriculum stem from his principals' nature to collect data and evidence of teacher planning and preparation—Domain 1 in the Danielson Framework. Yet, the curriculum is made up of the musical constructs and techniques found in most mid- to upper-level repertoire, such as mixed meter and particular bowing. Jacob, who is beginning to write a curriculum, has been having a change of heart, and he attributed this perhaps to the professional developments over the past couple of years related to the Danielson Framework and showing evidence of planning. Learning how to plan has helped him to be more organized and see a trajectory in a more structured way, rather than going in and just

rehearsing as professionals do. While the repertoire changes, the overall musical goals do not change, but are static year to year, as Jacob said:

> I have to be honest with you, I used to think that lesson planning was a waste of time, um, mainly because I didn't have time. Um, but I have, you know, now that I've been doing this a while, I have my lessons from previous years that I generate again because I'm teaching the same things. The only things that really change are my orchestra lessons because it's different repertoire. So that's something that happens.

Tim echoed Jacob's sentiments about the dangers of methods books as curriculum. While Tim added that some principals might like the idea of having some sort of a method book that keeps the class on track and provides a similar structure of having a book like other (non-music) classes, his principal has never requested this. He continued, saying that his responsibilities are to teach different musical styles and constructs:

> I really think that I have a responsibility to expose students to music that they wouldn't get anywhere else, but at the same time balancing that with music that they're familiar with and they want to play, because they play an instrument and of course they're going to want to play stuff that makes them feel good and sounds good. You know, you relent and you might have to do "Let It Go" with your sixth grade orchestra because they just love that movie, and that's important too. So, I struggle with that because it's too much of, you know, the art music side and the kids might be like "Oh really? What's this one again?" but every so often they get into it and they might find a composer they really like and go, "Hey! Are we going to do another piece by Frank Ticheli?" or something like that. Or too much of the Broadway/pop stuff and, you know, it kind of goes too much the other direction.

Method books could be tempting to an administrator, both Tim and Jacob remarked, as they make the class look more like other classes. Selecting varied repertoire is the heart of the ensemble directors' teaching. Learning experiences and rehearsal processes stem from the choices of literature. Each participant described the importance of programming different difficulty levels of music and different styles and historical periods for a well-

rounded musical experience, and showed enjoyment when asked how they chose their repertoire. Stew reflected:

> In the performance settings, I, like, quickly realized that selecting the right repertoire is everything for the experience of the students and the quality of the program. And the most important thing that I try to concentrate on is having good, quality literature that challenges the students in such a way that they have to reach beyond their current capabilities but also in a way that it's an attainable challenge.

From the repertoire, Stew pulled out the salient aspects of music making and technique, literacy, ways to make connection to everyday life, other classes or larger non-musical ideas. He said this was often done in short discussions, keeping the music making at the core of daily rehearsal. He has incorporated worksheets for his students, which he called a "Tech Sheet," to track vocabulary and musical symbols for each piece. Not only does this help students realize their knowledge and build on it, but Stew shared that it becomes a wonderful example of student work to show any administrator who visits for observation. Stew is always sure to refer to it when a visitor enters the room, yet it is not for show but for a "real learning purpose." Additionally, no one has ever given Stew feedback on poor repertoire programming.

Tim returned to thinking about curriculum through the repertoire, sharing that it drives what he does in the classroom daily, from skill to making connections beyond music:

> But for me, a lot of everything comes from the repertoire. So I pick the music and then, you know, we have some, um, what do I want to say. We have, I wouldn't say a loose curriculum, but it's like there are things that my kids are expected to know when they leave my class. They know these scales, blah blah blah. If they were to go on to the Symphonic Band or whatever it is, there's certain stuff I want them to know when they leave, but I always . . . I choose to teach those things through the lens of the repertoire. You know, "These are the key signatures that you need to know. These are the rhythms. This is . . . " you know, talk about tone and blend and intonation and all of those things, but through the music, because, you know, you're just talking about a core set of

> concepts and techniques that you need to know in order to be able to play any sort of music. It doesn't matter whether it's band or classical or singing.

Both Stew and Tim shared separately that they felt choral teachers had a greater advantage to connect beyond music, due to the textual connection to poetry and writing. They are built in, they said.

Despite the changes in teacher evaluations, the choosing of repertoire and the building of curriculum are separate from the evaluation process for these ensemble directors. Tim added, "I think that's a big deal, is that you never, ever should compromise your musical standards. For anything." Within the repertoire selection, the ensemble directors choose different styles and levels of difficulty, what are most appropriate for the students whereby they can grow by the end of the semester/year. Anna mindfully chooses her repertoire to make time for projects with her middle and high school students and to delve into the music beyond playing the pieces:

> I want one to be more challenging, one kind of in the middle, and one easy so that they're not frustrated. So that sort of appropriateness of, um, level. I also want it to be something that kids will think is fun to play and, um, you know that's not always so easy, but I think I've arrived sort of at that balance.

Although he writes curriculum in the event someone asks to see it, Jacob as well was beginning to think differently about repertoire. This is not in relation to the evaluation system but more in the context of finding a balance of difficulty where students can take responsibility and feel enjoyment in playing a piece more easily and within their reach, and polish their piece more quickly. Jacob wants his students to find themselves in their musical learning process.

Contradictions of Student-centered Learning

By the very nature and function of ensembles which are performance-based, one may think that the action of playing an instrument is engaging or student-centered. Others may think that student-centered moves beyond one pressing a note or key and making a sound. Regardless, when administrators enter the room to observe an ensemble rehearsal, or any class, their main goal is looking for student engagement. Although each of the participants came from different locations, experiences, and backgrounds, each one shared with me that in every discussion with administration—whether in faculty meetings, pre- or post-observations, or written evaluations—student engagement was at the core of what should occur in a classroom and drove the observations. However, the ways in which engagement was contextualized was often a point of contention. For example, Wilson described the many ways of engagement, how it may be contextualized, and how often his administrators in chorus pre-observations requested to see as much student engagement as possible but without giving examples of what that looks like:

> A lot of teachers . . . a lot of administrators look for students to be quote-unquote engaged as if . . . and I don't want to go on a tangent, and you'll forgive me. . . . I mean, we've all been in a position of quote-unquote trying to engage someone. You could set yourself on fire . . . they still may not be engaged. I mean "Hello! Like, I'm on fire!" "Oh well." You know what I'm saying . . . I mean don't do the . . . and that's real. So you're like, "What are you looking for? I don't know!" You know, but, so, with that . . . I mean I think they were just looking for cohesion in lesson.

For Wilson, who teaches middle school chorus in the city, the nature of chorus is student-centered and engaging, and like anything, has moments of not being "on the edge of your seat." The students are singing, they are making sound, "they cannot *NOT* be engaged," according to Wilson. Anna, a middle and high school instrumental director, felt that watching the students and observing their levels of energy and activity may best

measure engagement. When students are doing and learning on their own and together—without a teacher telling them exactly what to do—they are engaged. She can tell instantly when the students are not engaged or feeling active in the learning process:

> I've found when I did less of it [student-centered teaching] . . . that you see that kids just, you know, check out. They're kind of just not as engaged. And when I change it up and I do these more student-centered activities . . . and I say activities, but it's also . . . it's more . . . it used to be more, like, activity . . . but now it's a constant in our class where students know their role and how to work together musically and to think together.

Anna's commitment to student-centered learning has become the constant in her classroom, often involving students in small group work and using (music) technology. When working on an excerpt from "Ode to Joy," Anna fostered an activity for the class. Students listened to a recording and drew the shape of what they heard. Each student's shape was different and, after a brief discussion, they agreed on one shape where it looked like a stretched line and then a drop. Anna asked the group why they needed to make this shape; one student responded that at one point (where the drop was), the sound surprises the audience as it gets quiet. Students were able to arrive at why those musical ideas were present in the piece, not just as symbols on the page. Rather than telling the students to crescendo/decrescendo at the appropriate time, Anna helped to contextualize the piece so students understood why, making their playing more purposeful and engaging them in their playing.

In addition to being active, many of the teachers felt it was important to connect to the students' worlds and interests, and bringing those into the musical material and skills. Wilson reflected:

> Um, a lot of it, believe it or not, is based on what I think they should know, but majority is based on what they want to know. So, of course, you have your gamut, "Let It Go," you know, Mr. Jackson can we sing "Hero," Mr. Jackson can we

> sing, you know, um, "Circle of Life," can we sing Whitney Houston? So I try to find, in the music, a way, to give them what they want . . . wink wink . . . but find the pedagogical stuff in that. Maybe rhythms, maybe notes, maybe intervals, maybe text, maybe voice leading . . . whatever it is. So you're still getting what you want, but it's something there.

Wilson tries to appeal to the students' musical tastes, bridging the gap between school music and home music, helping students to make sense of music they may already know.

The notion of ensemble as student-centered may be two-fold. There is always a conductor present, and typically the performance outcomes are a result of the conductor's vision and process working with the players. Anna felt the tension between the tradition of ensemble and the nature of student-centered teaching; it is not something that can be changed overnight. She continued, believing that most music teachers—specifically ensemble directors—feel that performance and product are the driving forces of a class or rehearsal. She hinted that perhaps it is a downfall for our classes in terms of functioning with the rest of the school and moving forward in pedagogy, beyond the traditional rehearsal setting: "And I think that's baggage that we bring—that we're supposed to be playing all the time. I don't think they [students, administrators] have that expectation."

Gloria, as a result of her conversations with her administrators about components of Domain 3, has looked inward to herself as a conductor-teacher and questioned the degree to which her choral rehearsals are student-centered, where students are truly engaged in the music-making process. She reflected on her work:

> Is it teacher-centered? That's a biggie in choir, something that's personal for me this year, I want to get out of being always teacher-centered, teacher-directed, um, and I really want to create the climate where the students are doing some of that.

While she was aware that she would always be the teacher and have some sort of "control" because the group needs a conductor, Gloria has begun to ask more questions in

rehearsal to have students make musical decisions. In singing a three-part folk song "How Can I Keep from Singing," Gloria asked her students if they liked the crescendos written in the music. The students gave their responses and suggestions, trying different ways of singing the phrase and ultimately changing the notated markings. Gloria said that each time the group sang this song, they "owned it" more because they were involved in the decision-making process.

The Discrepancy of Literacy

When asked to what extent they felt they needed to incorporate a traditional sense of literacy—reading and writing—the participants expressed mixed feelings. Some participants felt there was no time for it in the music rehearsal, as non-music teachers do not make time for singing or listening in their classrooms; also, other literacy was happening musically. Wilson found his purpose as choral director to help students find their voice and enjoy making music, not to fix grammar. Also, literacy was interpreting and singing the repertoire:

> You know, I mean, so if they don't use proper English, is that okay? It's fine for me because you know why? They're . . . they're engaged. Rome wasn't built in a day. Besides the fact that I'm not an ELA teacher. Hello! You see what I'm saying? I'm a music teacher. So if they can take the time to get their words out . . . fine. I'm not going to critique them on their English for them to then feel self-conscious for them to express themselves in this abstract subject.

Tim, on the other hand, felt a grave responsibility that all teachers, regardless of subject, should be teaching literacy in the form of reading, writing critically, and speaking, both traditionally and musically. To overlook students' mistakes or purposely omit experiences where students can express themselves articulately is not what a true educator should do, according to Tim:

> If you have your kids write, there's no reason that you shouldn't make sure that they use proper grammar and proper plot structure and engage them in, you know, like, critical discourse and thinking about stuff and making them, you know, like we do in other classes. Like, there's no reason that you shouldn't do that. You're a teacher and that's just good education.

Regardless of subject, Tim continued, all teachers should find their purpose to be helping students to better understand themselves and feel more comfortable with acquiring their knowledge.

Purpose Within the School Community

In light of contemporary teacher evaluation systems, very few of the ensemble directors felt their overall purpose in the school changed. Rather, they found their primary and most important purpose to be about the students, helping them to connect to their everyday lives, foster critical thinking, and give opportunities to create and express.

Anna's goal for her students when they leave her class is not about being a professional musician, but about using the tools and understandings they gathered in her class and having them for the rest of their lives to apply to the arts or elsewhere:

> I want them to have a deeper connection to music so that when they experience music in their lives in whatever capacity . . . there's this more meaningful and interesting connection. I don't necessarily want them to go play their flutes after graduation. That would be nice if that's what they want to do.

In an urban setting such as New York City, most schools do not have established music programs, or the programs are just beginning to germinate. Wilson has been tasked with the responsibility of building a music program with very limited funds. However, he felt his purpose was having the space for students to have music:

> And, um, so, you know, just dealing with, you know, the realities of bringing music to a community that didn't have one. You know, the school community. The children obviously had it, um, in their lives. And, so, you know, we're building from the ground up.

Tim brought both Wilson's and Anna's words to his own purpose. Although his band plays at a high level of musicianship and quality, and the ensemble is often run in the traditional way, he did not expect his students to go on to become musicians. Rather, he hoped they would make connections between the repertoire in band and the music they hear in their everyday lives and make critical opinions and arguments for their enjoyment.

> It doesn't even need to be like classical or art music, it can just be a Beatles tune or something on the radio, and just really understand those elements and, like, why did they like music? You know, take the time to really delve into those kinds of things and explore that a little bit, and then bring those things back to, you know, this more classical art form that we tend to live in in these types of ensembles.

For many years in the large urban metropolis, music and art were cut due to budget constraints. Now, with a new mayor, new grant money, and new director of education for the city, arts programs are slowly budding in the public schools, beginning at the elementary school level and building up to high school. Wilson attributed this to administrators realizing the importance of music for cross-cultural and cross-curricular purposes. As someone who lost his job due to budget constraints, Wilson admitted he held a bit of sourness towards the old mayoral regime and felt like a babysitter by the end of his time in his old school.

> When these schools, between the mayor and the administration, when they decide to break down these schools, it was a wonder why, after they . . . after they attempted to take the arts on and everything like that. . . . it's a wonder how each individual principal brought back the arts. It was pretty resounding to say, "Okay, you may have thought it wasn't necessary, but look at the numbers." Some type of afterschool band, and I think they recognized the power of it. I don't think it's that

> many of us that can actually show them that it could stand toe to toe to another curriculum, you know. They think kids like it and some of the kids do like it, but, you know, you're not going to tell kids about slavery, but you can teach them spirituals. As far as I'm concerned, it's all cross-cultural. And you're talking about . . . you're talking about lab lessons and things . . . well, what the hell, you know. Slavery . . . Civil War . . . Spirituals . . . America's Folk . . . all of that is through music. You know, music is the thing that, you know, so, you can't talk about them without music.

Within the urban setting and dependent on school environment and program offerings, many students may not opt to join ensembles, according to Stew. This may be due to a lack of experience or formal music education in their schooling from elementary school. By high school, when students are required to take music, they may be wary of joining band or chorus because of their lack of skill and experience. Stew, while wanting students to enjoy making music and have it be a part of their future lives, felt it was his responsibility—one of his purposes in the school—to make the students more interested in the subject and part of an ensemble while they were in school:

> The . . . the first issue is that students don't generally select their electives. They're not truly elected. They're placed in them to earn a credit for graduation in the art or music class. So fifty students in a beginning band class may be comprised of only, or I'm sorry, may include only five or six who really have a genuine interest in learning to play an instrument. So I take it as a challenge to myself to, over the course of the year, make this something that's interesting and enjoyable and something that they'll want to return and continue doing.

That Doesn't Apply to Me (The Inapplicability of Ensembles)

When speaking with music teachers about schoolwide policies, specifically regarding elements of Domains 1 and 3 of the Danielson Framework, I have often heard "that doesn't apply to me" or "we don't fit into that." I, too, have been guilty of saying such things in my time in classrooms experiencing changes in schoolwide policy. These are usually self-generated terms to describe that the points administrators ask of the

faculty in terms of lesson planning, documentation/assessment. or shifts in pedagogy are inapplicable to the music classroom or the musical process. Additionally, many music teacher education programs often or mainly focus on attaining musical skill (reading notation, conducting, and playing) and running ensembles. As a result, many ensemble directors may not have considered alternate forms of pedagogy or locating themselves outside of the role of "director." Jacob, who has two degrees in viola performance and sought alternative teacher licensure, said that some pedagogies, often using open-ended questions, do not always work in an ensemble classroom because of issues like technique (holding a bow or creating an embouchure, tuning, etc.). He stated that his principal often overlooked this uniqueness of musical skill building while observing:

> My weakness, I think my biggest weakness as a teacher is probably the way they want us to ask questions now, um, where no question can actually have an answer. They don't want questions with answers, they want open-ended questions, they want topics with multiple entry points. Blah blah blah blah blah blah blah blah. Well, the fact of the matter is, if I ask a student, "What did you think of that F sharp? Was it in tune?" The answer is yes or no and we're not allowed to ask questions like that.

Anna added that the lack of "fit" is a self-imposed barrier by our profession. She attributed it to the nature of traditional ensembles and teacher preparation:

> However, I don't think music teachers are equipped, unfortunately, to do that. This is new for people. Especially ensemble teachers—you've got all these kids in the room and the model is that you're the person who is leading the class. How are you going to have dialogue where kids can shape the class? You know, that's not what we do. So I don't think it well to the way music is typically taught in ensembles.

While she continued to say she was neither defending nor negating the inapplicability of the ensemble process and most teachers' beliefs, she explained that the ensemble set-up was one of conductor-musicians, where the conductor runs the rehearsal and the students have very little say over what happens. As a result, ensemble directors innately separate

themselves from their colleagues instead of learning how other disciplines incorporate different modalities of teaching. Anna has worked for years trying to understand what happens in her colleagues' classrooms—how they ask questions, how they incorporate technology—and considered how this may look in her band room. She felt that if she could lessen the divide between ensemble director and "everyone else" in the school, there was a greater chance of maintaining the music program in the building:

> Um, I think music teachers, though, too often think that nobody understands them, they're their own thing and they disconnect themselves from the culture from the school. And that's a problem. And we as a field, we keep re-inscribing that. And "nobody understand me." And you want your music administrator to observe you because they understand you, but that's insular. And I think as music educators we need to be aware of not only the culture of our school, but what's going on in education. We need to open our eyes a little bit more and be ready and willing to see what's happening around us and situated ourselves in that. So, I think in some ways only having music people observe music people . . . perpetuates this isolation. And I think that isolation is causing us a lot of problems. You know, I worry, honestly, long-term about . . . I feel like we're becoming so much less and less relevant to kids and that we're sort of writing ourselves out of public education.

Anna's administrator was always looking for student-centered learning and engagement, as described earlier. She felt the traditional ensemble set-up does not lend itself to a space where students are always making musical decisions. At the same time, Anna has experienced moments where administrators have perpetuated the stigma of inapplicability regarding pedagogy on the ensemble classroom, as the traditional set-up usually does not foster student input, but is more about the performance and the refining of skills:

> So that particular day they listened to a little excerpt of themselves and I said, "Okay, what did we do well? What can we improve?" We wrote them on the board and then we picked one of the things they said we should improve and then I rehearsed it. So to me it was just sort of not a big deal. And he said . . . well . . . he said . . . he's a former phys ed teacher . . . he said, "You know that I learned today? Band is a . . . can be about a lot more than tootin' that horn!" [laughs] And I was like . . . "thank you!" but it was this moment where . . . it was . . . he saw by

> what I was doing and thought "Oh wait! You know she . . . " I confused his expectations of what a band class really was.

While most administrators do not possess music backgrounds other than their own experiences of participating in music in school, they often leave the ensemble directors to filter new incentives and pedagogies for themselves. Half of the participants of this study did not have music-specific supervisors, but were charged in their post-observations with the task of "asking better questions" at deeper levels, beyond the "what" or "where" questions, as Jacob described. For example, Andy had a hard time considering what deeper-level questions were in his band class, as there was no model or any indication of what these questions could be in an arts classroom. It was almost an unspoken understanding that his administrators did not know how to help him, and realized music was its own breed of subject. As a result, the policies or pedagogies did not fit into Andy's teaching.

> I think there were a lot of ideas, a lot of, uh, curriculum, a lot of things were being sold and everything sounded like a good idea, so then everything was kind of put on my colleagues that was, uh, kind of subject-specific. So then everything, all of it was put on me with the tag, "figure it out for you." So it's like, "Yeah, yeah. I know none of this works for you, but figure it out." So I got, I think the mantra for years was and is, uh, "I know it's a round peg or a square peg in a round hole, but figure it out." So that was the most support really that I got.

Yet, despite the administrators acknowledging musical elements did not fit, they requested Andy's curriculum to align with ELA and math, as he shared previously. The greatest discrepancy where the ensemble directors felt the most difficulty was connecting with the components of the Danielson Framework in Domain 3, which pertains to instruction. The components relate to connecting with students, asking questions, engaging students in learning, using assessment in instruction, and demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness in the lesson (Danielson, 2007). While each domain is

intended to be personalized and modified for the teaching situation, on the whole the participants felt the feedback from administrators was general and not applicable—or music-specific. Jacob reflected through the Danielson Framework:

> Um, I personally feel that music needs, um, music needs performing arts specific components. Now, can these components be manipulated . . . well, okay. Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy, absolutely. So let me, before I say anything . . . designing coherent instructions, creating an environment of respect and rapport, managing student behavior, using questioning and discussion techniques . . . that's the one that . . . a) I'm not very good at, b) I don't think really fits into what we do. Engaging students in learning, well that fits into anything. Using assessment in instruction, the question is the definition of assessment in a music classroom. Uh, growing and developing the profession, I don't even know what the hell that means. So, yeah. I mean, I think that, um, based on these eight components, I would have to say yes. I guess it does. But I still think that we need performing arts-specific components. And when I say performing arts, I don't mean just music. I'm talking about them all. You know?

After being observed by his principal, it was suggested that Jacob consider asking different types of questions to have students generate discussions and find the answers in the music themselves. Jacob described to his principal that this was difficult given the high level of musical skill needed for the piece and that the students were not yet at the point of being able to make these connections on their own, but it was more "I tell them what to do because I am the one who knows." He further explained that the musical process is more product-driven and the evaluation tool should reflect that:

> It's gotta be more results-driven because that's what we do. We produce results. Um, how do you measure . . . how do you measure education in a music classroom? Um, the way you measure, you measure it differently in performance-based classrooms than you do in a core classroom. See, the problem is that I've never taught core nor will I ever teach core. I can't do it. It's just not my thing. Um, so you have to be able to measure performance classes differently that you do a core classroom. How can you measure them the same? Different goals. There's a different set of goals.

The Faded Fabric of the Community

One goal of public school music ensembles is often being ambassadors for the school within the larger community of the town or city. The school band or chorus performs for tree-lighting ceremonies, sporting events, local hospitals, or homes for the elderly. While the entire group of participants agreed that their purpose of teaching was to provide a sense of expression, creativity, and critical thinking for the students, they have also come to feel as if they were taken for granted or treated as a filler in the school and a way for the principal to say the school has music and arts. Andy, who teaches band at one of the only middle schools in his area with an ensemble-based program, has had to advocate for his band to play at community events, including the neighborhood Halloween parade, the state music festival, and even prospective student night for incoming sixth graders. When the ensembles perform within his large urban neighborhood, Andy pointed out, the community adores it and remarks that the band is an important part of the fabric of the school and neighborhood community. However, the importance placed on ELA, math, and test scores drive the activities and agendas of the school, causing the arts and music to take a backseat. The constant advocating has made Andy feel as if he is disposable and unappreciated, and serves very little purpose within his larger school community:

> I had discussions with my APs and our principal. Like, every one of the administrators has children who are doing these things. Every one of them. Most of them played music when they were a kid. A lot of the teachers here, students or children are doing some musical things. A lot of the teachers here when they were younger, did music. But when I say, “Please, there’s an open house next week. Could my kids and I play some stuff? The parents want the arts, so let the art teacher come and do a show and do her schpiel. Let me come and do a show with my kids. They’re going to eat it up. You did the same thing for your kids.” But there’s such a fear about the numbers on those other tests, it doesn’t matter. The only thing that matters is that we have higher ELA scores than the two other

> middle schools nearby. For the no effort it would take to have me to volunteer a couple of hours to come in and do that, there's no value in it. We're like the common thread of the community, the fabric, but we've faded, withered. So it makes me concerned for what else . . . what other room there is in the building for, uh, for me to slide down the totem pole further.

While Jacob's school has seven music teachers, all teaching in different areas of expertise, he felt that the emphasis on the music and art departments has waned in the last three years, becoming more of a requirement to fulfill that students may enjoy instead of being a passion and an outlet that all students should have. I found that Jacob's response to the following question about good teaching pointed to his feelings about the lessened importance of the music department, which are all ensembles:

C: What's the best indicator of a good teacher do you think?

J: How did you do on the English Regents? Oh, you mean musically?

C: No, I mean what do *you* think is the best indicator of a good teacher.

J: Oh, okay! Because, you know, that's how we're being judged, so.

C: It was a nice rehearsed response.

J: It wasn't even rehearsed, it just rolled right out.

Over time, Jacob has felt that although he has not changed his energy or pedagogy, the importance of student enjoyment and activity in orchestra has been replaced with the need for students to produce high scores on state tests, which in Jacob's school count as 20% of his evaluation rating. But, his purpose in the classroom and making music with students still drives his passion for teaching.

The ensemble directors spoke on elements of their curriculum and lesson planning, and the ways in which the repertoire fuels and shapes both. While choices in repertoire have not changed, the evaluation policies and tools have shaken some

directors' purposes within their schools. Chapter V next shares the narratives of the administrators—with both music and non-music backgrounds—at both the school and district level and their experiences with teacher evaluation in general and within an ensemble setting.

Chapter V

ADMINISTRATORS

This chapter presents the findings of the administrator interviews. Half of the administrators interviewed had a music background; the other half did not. The stories are collective, intertwining, to describe the larger group narrative surrounding the participants' experiences with teacher evaluation, and the ways in which they—as school leaders—negotiated and managed these contemporary systems, comprehensively as well as musically-centered. The themes and subthemes stemmed from the participants' words and stories. For all of the administrators, expectations situate and provide a solid foundation for the evaluative process to stand.

Expectations

An expectation is a belief or presumption that something will occur or someone will achieve and accomplish something in the future. On the whole, the administrators reflected that clear expectations were the most important connective tissue between and among themselves, the evaluation rubric/process, and the teachers—that is, expectations of what will specifically be observed and evaluated. The expectations, they collectively described, should arise naturally from one-on-one conversations with teachers, having teachers identify strong points and points of improvement within their teaching. Additionally, administrators may make comments that they are looking for a particular

technique, such as questioning or forms of student engagement. They acknowledged as a whole that teachers are people with lives outside the classroom, which makes them human and able to connect to students. Individually, each administrator stated that no one can be perfect all the time, nor would one expect a teacher to have five perfect lessons per day. Mauro, who over the past six years has been an evaluator as a department head, assistant principal, and principal, stated his frustration that education—and the policies put upon educators—has become too business-like, focusing on faultlessness of teacher performance rather than the whole person. The expectations—and consequences—are too serious and unattainable:

> People, by and large, try their best, they work their hardest. Not all of them do, some people need to be coached along, some people go through different phases in life. The young woman who has three young children at home is going to be able to give of herself in a different way than the late career empty-nester. That's a fact of life and I think most businesses have found a way to accommodate people with different obligations outside school. We certainly haven't found a way . . . this is a human enterprise.

Each interaction, observation, and evaluation write-up were individualized, personal, and situational for Mauro; the other administrators agreed. With this said, the expectations of administrators and teachers should not be for faculty to achieve Distinguished or highly Effective evaluations. Mauro argued that teachers should not live in Danielson's Distinguished zone. Instead, they live in Proficient—or Effective—and visit Distinguished because teaching is a process where many elements are uncontrollable:

> If a teacher is distinguished in every indicator in every lesson, that's not human. There's probably an amazing strength, and it recognizes that people have different areas of strength and different areas of growth and I think it recognizes that.

Instead of looking at critical attributes and expecting his teachers to achieve each one or the majority in a lesson, Mauro wants to see how the teacher is reflecting on her own pedagogy and working with him to think together of improvements.

Additionally, each assistant principal and principal individually stated that their expectations for achieving the multitude of observations/evaluations are realistic, from what they see in the classroom. There is no "gotcha" to catch the teachers off guard. They do not play to the components on the rubric. On the whole, the administrators found that they liked the Danielson Framework because it provided a set of clear expectations for administrators and teachers and a basis for conversation, compared with the old evaluation process of writing a narrative and giving a "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" rating. The expectations were consistent. The Danielson Framework has pedagogical markers to springboard discussion of thinking and shifting one's practice. All of the principals reflected on their own time as teachers being observed and the feedback they received, and how often there was a disconnect among observers or between teacher and supervisor which could not be negotiated. As Mauro commented:

> What I found as a teacher previously was that . . . the expectations of the supervisor, whether it was the principal, the assistant principal or even the same assistant principal throughout the year, or if your assistant principals changed, they would vary and things that you would get praised for in one observation either wouldn't appear as praise on the second, or you did something wrong but you didn't know it was wrong because it wasn't mentioned. It was kind of, like, it felt more arbitrary. Whereas using a rubric, I felt it was consistent and felt more objective or that it at least reminded me, as the observer, what I needed to be looking for and helped me actually refer, and I still do it today when I observe a class, I keep a running list of the elements used, and we use Danielson's Framework now, but it helps me to remember. And it actually helped to have, like, almost a template of language to use in writing, um, observations.

However, some administrators felt that although the components of the rubric are clear, there are ways to infiltrate biases into it instead of being objective, which could make or break one's success in the school. Bradley reflected that:

> It's very opinion-based and people's opinions sort of vary pretty widely. So, I think that it can be problematic when you think about teacher evaluation and teacher tenure, et cetera. Because I do think, depending on who is supervising you, the supervisor could have some, um, impact on the rating, not simply your teaching, you know.

José echoed this. He felt that going into a classroom looking for general components of the Danielson Framework blinded him from seeing other things: "And I never felt comfortable like, trying to put, you know, something in a category because I think it just clouds your experience of seeing something." Though José had a choral background, he aimed to approach all ensembles with an open mind and allowed his live-time experience to drive his evaluations.

Trust and Building Relationships With Teachers

As all teachers need to be observed a minimum of three times per year, depending on their tenure appointment and district union negotiations, the administrators try to make the implementation of the policies as fair as possible. Aligned with clear expectations in their observing, all of the administrators felt they needed to provide more space to know their teachers, to establish trust between them for the teachers to think openly and share ideas and reflect. Frank said that regardless of years of teaching experience, he afforded space for his middle school teachers to, as he called it, "glow and grow":

> I'm not out to get the faculty in any way, because in order for them to develop, they can't have that fear. So, if I go into a classroom and I observe, and I'll say this and I'll tell . . . I'm not afraid, I mean I'll say it to other people . . . I won't necessarily evaluate that teacher and write it up as an ineffective. I have a conversation with the teacher, we talk about it, and we talk about the areas that,

> together, what they could have done differently and what they could have changed. And then I will go back in and I'll observe. That's how the rubric was intended and that's what I'm doing.

Bradley observed classrooms a few times before writing anything down formally and did not let the rubric dictate his relationship with them or what he saw in the classroom:

> I'm trying to help them to improve, I'm not really using the rubric when I'm having my conversations with them. And maybe I should be more, or maybe I shouldn't be. I think when people see the rubric come out, the hair goes up on their back a little bit. And what I'm trying to do is to get teachers to sort of hear what I'm saying and agree that there's room for improvement.

Bradley said he often questioned if he was taking too many liberties with the evaluation tool, and if it mattered or not, since its purpose was for improvement. The last thing he wanted was for his teachers to teach inside a box in the rubric, whether he was watching or not.

Risk Taking

Teaching outside of the box is a task that involves taking risks. Caleb, a music teacher who is now in his second year of being an administrator, cautioned his faculty that he did not want them doing what they "think they need to do," but more what they believe is right in their own teaching, to take risks and be as authentic to themselves as possible:

> I want you to have big ideas. I want you to put your vision down on paper, um, so that you can make it happen for you, as opposed to you just absorbing what you think you should be doing, or what we want you to do.

Sometimes teachers need a model to remind themselves that what they do is (or is not) working. In ensembles, José, who was a choral teacher for years and is now a district-level administrator, is not afraid to jump in and help his arts teachers contextualize new ideas, either by modeling it with students or speaking through how to set up:

> Well, when I was dealing with one particular band teacher, I just did it for, for them. I said uh "I'll show you how to do it." You know, I mean he basically was like didn't think it was possible to do. So I said "Mind if I just show you how I would do it?" He's like "Yeah. Show me." So I did it. And then he saw how it worked and I, I think that was good. But um I think when, when it comes to like right now I'm supervising many areas that are not my specialty. Um . . . so it may it could be a bit of a challenge that way. But I think part of good teaching is taking risks. And if we want to get better at anything we have to take a risk. We can't do the same thing we've always done and expect to get better at it. So I think because we're arts people, I think we should understand and appreciate that, you know, a painter doesn't paint the same painting over and over.

Purpose of Ensemble and Evaluations

Regardless of subject, keeping an open mind when observing is at the core of what the administrators reported as a key value in their evaluations. The participants attested to knowing colleagues who observed and evaluated based on the rubric boxes or by listening for key phrases in the lesson. But listening and watching to get the larger picture are most important to providing support to the teachers. Frank remarked:

> So, you just don't go by the pure words, because that can be, for some administrators, they get caught up with the words and the depth of knowledge wheel, and they're really just saying, "It's 'what.' it's low level." Well, if you're asking the students, "What are the similarities and differences between . . . " that's more of a higher . . . it's not the highest level, but they have to recognize and compare and contrast, right, in order to be able to do that.

The evaluation systems should not drive teaching and instruction, according to the administrators. Rather, the purpose of education, to provide quality learning experiences for the students, should. While all of the administrators are overloaded with responsibility to observe and evaluate their faculty, they do not feel that policies have changed their views of their responsibility or the purpose of education and student growth. As Bradley said on this point:

> I don't think that the evaluation system has changed or made me think any more or less critically about teaching and learning. I think that if I were an administrator who did not have to, um, participate in this year-end evaluation process, I think I would be . . . my practice day to day would be almost exactly the same. Um, it's about are kids learning, are they learning to the best of their ability and are teachers making the right moves so that the students are enjoying and processing and getting a lot out of it.

When asked what purpose the ensembles served in their schools and districts, each administrator responded with a desire for students to have a love of music beyond school. There was no mention of fulfilling requirements for graduation, being a top-performing group in the area, or aligning with standards, although many of them said the three happen regardless. Additionally, the administrators did not feel that their school ensembles had suffered as a result of policy changes. Recently in Bradley's school, the music department switched from general music to all ensembles. He felt that the goal of this was for the students to leave eighth grade with "music in their life. Whether it's something that they're going to pursue as a career or not, I think it's a wonderful thing to have. So I think that's a goal." For him, enjoyment was the basis.

Having a non-music background, Mauro, whose school ensembles were some of the top in the state and have been nationally recognized, felt that band and chorus were wonderful breaks in the day from the academics:

> Well, I think that the time that they spend in those classes should be enjoyed, it's such a great break from the academic piece. Um, I hope that they see it as an opportunity to take, that they can take further if they want to develop their skills and become, you know, or view it either as something they can pursue further or something they can keep with them for the rest of their lives and maybe give it to their own children or play recreationally.

Mauro felt that greater learning skills, communicating, reading, decoding, and analyzing are all facilitated in ensemble classrooms, and he has often told his faculty to visit the band classroom to watch differentiation and student engagement. Joel, who spent 21

years as a high school band director and is a district-level music supervisor, said that ensembles are more than enjoyment: they are about dedication, commitment, and social learning through music. He constantly reminds his colleagues (school principals and other district coordinators) that the ensembles are not purely for enjoyment. When his staff began to fret about evaluations and rating, he recapped his goals and values:

> Um, so . . . in this position it's more of a reminding of the staff what our global goals are for children. Again, we just get to do it through the music and we get to work with it in a way that, um, that they respond to in ways that other people don't, you know, in other subjects . . . it's all about ensemble, it's all about, you know, working together, it's all about collaboration, it's all about . . . and then what you realize is that they're reaching a different student population than we are. So, it's the things that make them human, not just the math and the scores.

"Sculptors of Their Own Learning"

One of the biggest challenges for the administrators has been situating student-centered learning—specifically student-centered questioning—in the rehearsal setting. The administrators—both music and non—know that the nature of ensembles is one of playing, diagnosing, and following a leader. However, small shifts in pedagogy involving questioning are the most important, not just to fulfill the Danielson Framework, but to allow students to be more actively involved in thinking and learning. Caleb illuminated the concept of highly effective questioning—Domain 3B—in the ensemble classroom, and its importance of not being "drive-by" moments, but more a constant in the classroom. An example may look as follows:

> But if it is something that has become part of your culture of the classroom, um, you know, the, the sort of highly effective column is that sort of magical place where the kids start saying things like, uh, "Ms. Bernard, can we do it again? I don't think we got that." Um, but a teacher can facilitate that, a teacher can call down section leaders. He can say, "Okay, guys. We're going to do this warm up that we know very well and Tiffany's going to listen to you. And she is going to give you some feedback on, um, all these skills we've been working on

> for the last week in these warm ups." And that is a tremendous and recognizable teaching strategy that goes directly into what Danielson was talking about in terms of high quality teaching. It's putting owning on some students and it's bringing the, uh, ownership of the material on students, and it is encouraging them to be the sculptors of their learning.

Caleb also believed that any administrator, regardless of music expertise, could be able to suggest this to an ensemble director, as it would only improve teacher, student, and musical performance because student-involved pedagogy transcends subject.

Joel expounded on the use of questioning in the ensemble classroom, pointing to the large use of low-level questions. Joel worked hard with his teachers to use low-level questions as springboards for more questions. He sometimes encountered some resistance when his teachers felt it would take up too much time or was not part of the rehearsal process:

> We're so comfortable in that rehearsal structure, where what you're really dealing with is diagnosing and fixing as efficiently as possible, we sometimes don't ask the questions the way we could or should to get kids to really think about it. We get kids to go, you know, "What's the fingering for that" and they tell you. In Bloom's [taxonomy] that's a very low level question, either you know it or you don't. It's not a big deal. Um, but instead to play a passage and then stop them and go, "Okay, how did that sound? What do you think? What do you think? What can we do better? What do you think we can do differently? Let's try that." But to let them start to elicit those issues and I think that we don't like to take the time to do that. We like to go, "Okay, do this so we can move on." I think we lose something in there and I think that's probably the one area where, um, I see in all of my teachers, but particularly the performance teachers. And periodically they'll slip a really great question in and you watch the whole thing grind to a halt because, oh my god, they just make everybody think, um, about something.

Joel quickly followed up his anecdote by saying that, regardless of questioning tactics, student-centered learning is innate in the ensemble process. Yet, the ensemble profession should consider more mindfully the ways in which we can have our students actively engaged, and how at times the conductor might take a back seat:

> I think that the student-centered pedagogy is, again, a lot of that is built in to what we do. I don't want to lose sight of that. It's the nature of what we do. Our students are actively engaged in every part of what we're doing. I think the interesting thing is that we need to change how we look at our world. If you're playing and you have a solo, my conducting should become less important because it's your solo. So I think that there are things that we can do as conductors and as instructional leaders that really start to reframe what the role is that you are fulfilling as a conductor.

Joel recalled a district supervisor meeting with his superintendent where the discussion topic was differentiation. As the superintendent gave examples of differentiation, he acknowledged Joel and the chorus, band, and orchestra teachers, citing that differentiation was built into their classes. He followed that up with, "It's the nature of what you do. Just make sure you know the lingo."

Mauro did not touch upon the student-centered aspect of the Danielson Framework in his observations because he accepts that ensembles run differently than other school subjects. He knows that the conductor is needed to achieve the musical goals and direct the group where it needs to go: "Yeah, I just think it's one of those areas where it is what it is. You know, the Philharmonic is done that way and, you know, we have opportunities for students to conduct and compose. Um, but it's . . . I don't see how you could really get away from that model." Mauro further said that his ensemble faculty members ask wonderful questions of the students and are models for other teachers. Mauro recalled the questions asked in a recent observation of his band teacher:

> "Okay, what did you hear in that little, you know, performance or recitation that we just did? What was wrong with it? What might we need to work on?" And the students are self-assessing. I want to see that development of self-assessment, which is crucial because they're not always going to be with the teacher when they're practicing and so forth. So that ability to differentiate in an enormous class, a good feeling and tone in the room, those are the primary indicated to me, anyway.

Bradley thought there were certain markers of student-centered learning that should be present in every classroom, regardless of subject, such as the teacher away from the front of the room. He realized that small group learning cannot happen all the time in an ensemble classroom, but felt the conductor cannot—and should not—be at the helm of the classroom daily diagnosing and fixing errors.

Recognizing One's Own Strengths and Weaknesses

The non-music administrators shared that their music backgrounds were not strong enough to provide musical feedback, yet they did feel there are pedagogical markers that should be seen in any classroom, regardless of subject. Frank, who is the principal of a performing arts middle school, has no musical background; he never participated in school, community, or home music growing up. However, he does not use this as an excuse. Frank felt that the relationship of teacher/administrator is key for him to understand the musical material, even if they have to translate a little bit: "I don't feel one hundred percent as comfortable with the music and the arts in general. However, I do know good pedagogy . . . but I'll be honest, in having my conversation with teachers in music, I'm relying on them for their content expertise." Frank focused most of his observations—formal and informal—around questioning, which is 3B on the Danielson Framework, not for the purpose of the rubric but because he noticed that schoolwide it is an issue. For formative assessment, which is also a schoolwide issue, he never worried about the ensemble teachers:

> But we have a conversation about what the noticings were because I will capture the questions that they asked. So are these questions getting at kids' thinking? In performing, you know, in the art classes in general and in music

> classes, I generally don't have a problem with that assessment and instruction. Because they're doing it immediately.

Frank was keen to realize that much of the formative assessment happens through the ensemble teachers' listening for error detection or how students respond to conducting, although he admitted he did not know what conducting means as much as the students did.

Mauro agreed that the teacher's background and willingness to have a conversation about content is more important to provide a well-rounded picture of the learning experience "because I know the limits of my own, I hope, expertise." Mauro, who has a Russian and social studies background, said he looks for instructional technique in the band and chorus classes, just as he would do in a language class where he did not know the language. Caleb, who has a choral background, has had experiences observing foreign language and social studies classes, which are not his expertise. As a result, he knows his limits in content, but also looks for instructional technique. In post-observations, he described himself as "a person who is not afraid to say I don't know. Be the person who is not afraid to set their limitations." Caleb also gave advice to teachers who may feel their supervisors do not know as much content as they:

> Um, don't decide that you know better than the person above you, uh even, even if you have spent your life as a teacher thinking that your principal doesn't know means about education. Um, allow yourself to recognize that there's reason that person is in that position and, and recognize what you can take from them and what you were right about.

Despite their own musical content background (or lack thereof), the administrators all felt comfortable providing feedback pedagogically and asking questions if there was a discrepancy or confusion. Joel, who is a district music supervisor, admitted that although he has a music background, his strength is with high school

ensembles. When he does not feel he has the best "answer" for his faculty, he points them elsewhere:

> Um, we all have different strengths and weaknesses. . . . You know, give me ninety kids in a room and I can rehearse them, give me twenty third graders and I'm not really in my comfort zone. I'll sometimes suggest that they go see another particular teacher within the district, um, or be in touch with somebody.

Discomfort

When asked if he thought administrators had a hard time observing outside of the music classroom, Joel said that many principals do not see themselves as the experts in content, even in their respective fields. For Joel, this meant that they rely on their pedagogical mastery. Joel uses the Danielson rubric with his ensemble directors loosely in terms of pedagogy, looking for musical context, such as how the teacher communicates as an effective conductor; how her repertoire selection determines the elements that will be taught; and if the group is on track to being performance-ready. He said that a non-ensemble person, despite strong pedagogical skill and knowledge, would not be able to do this because each ensemble is unique:

> I think it's a lot easier if you . . . if you're in a classroom setting and you see the same kinds of things happening, you know. There are multiple math sections so you go to one room, you go to the next room and you go to the next one and you say, "Oh okay, they're all about the same place, I guess they're all on track for when the exams happen." I think that's a little harder to do when you're looking at an individual ensemble within a building and you don't understand completely that whole, um, that whole sequence of events that happens in preparing a performance. So I think that's a little different and those are thing that I look for. And certainly I don't expect non-music people to be talking to my people about conducting.

Joel takes much pride in being able to translate and rationalize the ensemble faculty members' decisions to his administrator colleagues, and to point out how he would advise them to grow.

Bradley felt a bit guilty at not being able to provide concrete musical feedback to the ensemble teachers because the musical piece becomes the lesson. He ventured to guess that most administrators feel this way, especially when having to evaluate:

> It's hard for me to, I think, see, um, areas for teachers to grow. I think this is something that probably all administrators struggle with. What I find myself doing is noticing, um, some of the basics. So in a music classroom, I'll notice that in a band classroom, the teacher is talking but the kids are not paying attention, kids are still playing or the kids are distracted or whatever. I think I avoid . . . I'm not even sure I would recognize if a music teacher . . . if the band or the orchestra was struggling with a couple of, um, bars, measures . . . I'm not sure I would realize that they were struggling with that.

Bradley can listen for pedagogical context clues within the rehearsal, such as the conductor stopping and reviewing a measure, isolating instrument or voice parts, or calling attention to a musical symbol. He recognized the teacher's expertise in terms of content and his lack of it, even though he played saxophone in band throughout middle school and into high school. I asked Bradley what he looked and listened for specifically in terms of the pedagogy. He touched on musical aspects, despite his lack of lengthy formal music training:

> Are the students engaged? Are the students following? What's the quality of the music I'm hearing? Am I hearing the students starting and stopping together? Can I hear the parts moving together? Do I hear kids doing different things? But I don't. . . . I think there are a lot of people who can probably heard what I hear in a music classroom, whereas I think the music teachers hear a whole lot more than I hear.

One of the issues that the non-music administrators had in dealing with the ensemble teachers was that the teachers did much playing, stopping, fixing, and playing again, with little discussion, questioning, or student response other than playing. Although Frank previously said much of this could be formative assessment, to him this was not student-centered pedagogy, nor was it engaging for students (not to mention a

lower rating in Danielson's Domain 3 for Instruction). The teacher is the one telling students how to fix their errors. Frank used these moments to address the issue of student involvement not only to the ensemble faculty, but to the entire school:

> But what was their image of doing a good job? A lot of them thought, "I'm a teacher, I'm supposed to be teaching them. So I'm supposed to be up in front of the room talking to them and telling them and showing them and doing for them." But the table has shifted. How do we know the kids are learning? It's not you teaching. You can teach all you want, but do the kids learn anything from it? So the shift now has been placed on the learning.

Bradley felt that although sometimes the musical language confuses him, it does not cloud his full understanding of what is happening in the rehearsal classroom. For example, Bradley noticed in a band observation that the percussion section was being rowdy—banging on instruments, moving around a lot. Some students did not play in certain sections of the music because their instrument (such as triangle) was not used. Finding the behavior distracting, Bradley brought it up to the teacher, who responded with, "Well, you know, that's why they're in the percussion section." Bradley felt that the teacher tried to take advantage of his lack of musicianship. Yet, Bradley argued that the percussion section actually needs to be the most disciplined section in a band because if they are not precise, then everybody else will follow—or not follow. While there was a "difference of opinion, to me, the behavior was distracting and the necessary precision wasn't there," he said. Additionally, putting the fidgety students in percussion was not a solid reason to excuse their rowdiness. Bradley had to take a more directive approach with his suggestions, asking that the discipline be improved right away. To him, this story was an example of when good pedagogy overrides musicianship. As a leader, Bradley created a space to work toward a common understanding and action plan with the teacher.

Mutuality

At a citywide level, Lucian's position is to provide support to teachers and administrators for teacher effectiveness in the arts. In speaking with urban principals who have ensembles in their schools, he has found that the biggest issue for them is static questioning—that is, low-level questions and more of a rote sense of learning. Lucian is creating a document—called the Special Considerations Document—and a set of online, web-based pages with video, audio, sample lesson plans and examples of the Danielson rubric in ensembles to help both teacher and administrator gain a common understanding:

> A lot of what we do in the music classroom is demonstrative, specifically in a rehearsal setting. There are certain things that we as music educators have an eye, or an ear for that maybe a school building leader that doesn't share that same background doesn't have.

While Lucian is trying to equip teacher and administrator with tangible models to align them in terms of language and expectation, Caleb has felt that ensemble teachers need to be more attuned to the pedagogical tools available to them; conversely, administrators need to be aware of the ways artists build skill levels. The mutuality of understanding and the understanding of mutuality is key, as Caleb stated:

> So what are we doing as arts educators to mimic our colleagues in academic subjects in a way, um, which I think is really important learning for me as a, you know, it, it's, it's like I said before, it's about malleability, right? Principals need to be understanding of arts specific techniques and arts teachers need to be understanding of pedagogical preparedness.

Thus, the most prominent point of misunderstanding between music teachers and administrators is often literacy-based, regarding a difference of viewpoint, application and understanding of the term.

Literacy

When discussing literacy, or the ways in which administrators contextualize literacy in the ensembles, the administrators gave divided responses based on content area. The non-music administrators did not have much to report. They explained that literacy happens in the music and through assignments such as reflections and discussion in class. The music administrators, however, had strong opinions regarding literacy and evaluation. Lucian did not feel that traditional literacy should become policy to be used in every classroom every day, especially the ensembles. Music literacy is in the notation, the reading and writing of the music, and the ways in which the music is played or interpreted:

> Where students are reading text, um, there is a sense of literacy obviously . . . through the music notation, and this is why it's very important that, uh, music teachers are able to articulate that, and present that to their school building leaders. That it is in fact its own written language, using music . . . notation as the basis . . . tap into that reading and writing component maybe as an assignment that can be done outside of the classroom.

Lucian continued to discuss that the chorus teacher teaches chorus, not another subject, as the primary focus. While she should weave in strands of literacy and other subjects, she must keep the integrity of her own musical subject. As a result, she should not receive low ratings in instruction or pedagogy if a principal says the literacy component is missing because it is contextualized in a musical sense.

Joel was also strong in explaining to other administrators that music incorporates literacy, but with a broader technical definition:

> Um, we're not a writing subject unless you're into composition. We don't write, it's not what we do, so why would you take a class that's not designed for that and have them do it? So it's trying to find that balance of understanding what the intent is and then how do you fulfill the intent.

However, Joel did believe that any reading is literacy. A student cannot play a musical phrase well if he cannot read the English language, as it is the same as stringing a sentence together; the noticeable different, he said, is that in music, the outcome is a musically played phrase and becomes something human and aesthetic.

"But Heart, You Can't Teach Anyone That Stuff"

Each administrator was asked what the best indicator of a good (ensemble) teacher was. Responses were similar across the board, pointing toward personal character, passion, and caring. Frank said he looked for someone with self-reflective practices because he cannot teach someone that, but it is innate. José felt it was a love of children. Caleb described that he can assist with pedagogy, with analytical questioning, "but I can't teach you affect. . . . I can't teach you to love children, I can't teach you to put aside your . . . wants and needs and interest in being in charge for the good of some kids." Bradley concurred, echoing the other participants and adding:

> I think that another essential component for great teaching is a person, a teacher, who is able to sort of get inside the mind of the student. So, a teacher who can recognize when a student's feeling uncomfortable or when a student is afraid to ask for help, but the teacher can see that the student needs some help or needs further explanation.

Following the administrators' responses, I asked them if these qualities could be assessed and measured in the rubrics. Each of them responded with smiles. Bradley, however, was one whose smile quickly faded, and said that it could not be measured and often cannot be linked to good pedagogy. One of Bradley's ensemble teachers was stressed about his evaluation, constantly asking Bradley what was going to happen and what components will he be rated on for fear he will perform poorly; another ensemble teacher was not

bothered by it at all and welcomed Bradley's feedback. Bradley questioned, "Is this time of scrutiny in education taking a toll on teachers? I'm not sure, you know . . . " While every teacher cannot be perfect, he said, he would rather see constant positive interactions and student engagement in the classroom than a robot that plows through content material. Perhaps, he speculated, one of those teachers yields a more positive and long-term measurable outcome.

Each of the participants agreed that ensembles do function differently than other classrooms because the goals and materials are different and students are working toward a common goal together. I mentioned to the administrators that some of the ensemble directors I spoke with talked about how new pedagogies within the evaluation system did not apply to them. Lucian, in his new role as director of teacher effectiveness in the arts, visits numerous music classrooms during the course of a month. He thought that the ensemble directors were right, orchestra does look different than social studies, but the cause was not being helped by showing our differences as an exemption to the rule. Rather, we should find a place where the focus is—on the board as it is for other subjects—or:

> tweaking teaching practice to make it more friendly to the non-artistic lens . . . not that we need to have notes on the board and consistently address the board. Logistically in the rehearsal setting it's impossible, but in a way just have that objective be present to . . . to someone who enters the classroom.

José expanded upon Lucian's words, saying that ensemble directors often take advantage of having non-music supervisors:

> When it's a non-music person, they always think it doesn't apply to them. Even when I [as a music supervisor] say things they think "We're music. That doesn't apply to us." That's like always my thing. "Yes it applies to you. It always applies to you."

In a way, he said, the only way for supervisors to be legitimate according to his ensemble faculty is if they have the music background. José used the term “bullied” to describe the ways in which ensemble directors positioned themselves toward administrators. For administrators, knowing Danielson backwards and forwards to discuss pedagogy was their saving grace. The generic aspect of the teacher evaluation models was so that they applied to anyone. While music teachers think the models do not apply to them, José said he spends a lot of his time trying to convince music teachers: “Actually it does apply to you because that’s what good teaching is. This is good teaching. It doesn’t matter what the subject area is.”

“Accountability Applies to Us”: Resistance to Change

I asked the music supervisors why they thought the ensemble teachers felt the evaluation system was inapplicable to them. José believed it was a resistance to change because there has never been a way for a non-music person to have a measurable tool for them:

> And so it’s like, in music so many times we’ve been ignored in evaluation systems and now finally people are kind of telling us, oh data applies to us. You know? Accountability applies to us. . . . It’s not just like the kids look cute and they play the instrument. . . . And . . . and they’re a little lazy about it. You know?

Within a resistance to change, José has found that ensemble directors think they have a different pedagogy than everyone else in the school. Caleb drove the point across to the ensemble directors that music teachers were lucky in the sense that they can create their visions from scratch and follow them because they /were not answering to prewritten curriculum and arbitrary exams. As such, they should embrace possibilities for new teaching tools and work harder to combine creativity and pedagogy in their rehearsals

because there are no tests for students to pass. Additionally, he felt that music educators should honor the pedagogical strengths of more common branch teachers because there is much to learn. Caleb recalled his first few years of teaching, where he was creative and inspiring with his lessons and got the students excited and engaged, but his planning and pedagogy were terrible:

> What I really needed is to make a new pedagogy, to have someone come in and say, "I don't care what you're doing, whether it's music, social studies, or economics, the way you're asking questions is not poignant . . . the way you are setting up rapport is not there." Administrators were not interested in the fact that I was . . . I was interesting and creative. They were interested in the fact there were four kids in my room who didn't seem to be doing anything.

If Caleb had an arts administrator who felt the arts were an untouchable and separate and continued to let him do what he was doing, he would never have improved his pedagogical and assessment tools.

The traditional description of a good ensemble teacher, Lucian said, is usually having a high-quality performing group. The music administrators posited that under the new evaluation system, the pedagogies that might yield this higher quality of performance are being more carefully examined. Additionally, many ensemble directors are quick to retort to feedback saying their classes are innately student-centered and yield high results (or performances). Joel supported this by saying:

> They [the students] are the ones who are actively engaged in the activity with me, not for me. And I think that's where the conversation should go. You know, I don't know how a non-music person could walk into a classroom, could walk into a rehearsal and say, "Okay, the students were not engaged." If they were singing, they were engaged. It's almost by default that it happens.

Lucian agreed with Joel's idea that ensembles are more student-centered than other classrooms could be because students are creating their own sounds. But, the larger issue is not about protecting the ensembles or resisting or changing for the sake of a rubric. It is

about assessing what is already done in the classes and seeing how it aligns with Danielson. Lucian felt that “once we’re able to approach Danielson from that lens or that angle and are able to articulate the practice that we do, to have a Danielson align to our practice I think it, it . . . it doesn’t muddy the waters as much.”

As Lucian stated, rubrics can have a tendency to muddy the waters depending on the evaluator and teacher. Mauro recognized that ensembles do not always apply to the components of the rubric verbatim. Yet, he stressed the importance of having some sort of measureable tool for the ensembles, although he felt it would be difficult to quantify an art form: “Sometimes it can seem kind of amorphous or talent-based, like either you got it or you don’t. . . . I think it’s even harder quantifying student achievement and progress over time in the arts.” Bradley said that sometimes teachers make excuses for themselves regarding Domain 4, which is professional and community responsibilities. His ensemble teachers complain that they often do not fit into the Domain 4 rubric components. Yet Bradley found much of Domain 4 to be innate in the responsibilities of a music teacher, such as putting on a concert for the school. Bradley questioned the teachers’ complaints and wondered:

> they [ensemble teachers] put in a lot of time for the concerts. Is that considered above and beyond? Or is that just part of the job? I’m not exactly sure. Um, if I were playing professional baseball, I’d be lifting weights in the off-season. If I’m a music teacher, I’m here at night for concerts. I sort of see that that’s just part of the job.

When his ensemble directors tried to position themselves as working extra for the school concerts, Bradley shared his beliefs with them, but has been met with resistance and disagreement. Bradley felt that the ensemble directors sometimes will not budge in their beliefs or in trying to view ideas and perspectives from different angles.

Because of ego and fear of failure, many ensemble teachers defend their ensembles as inapplicable to the system, as José explained:

> J: You know, they know they get a good sound out of the kids. So it, it's scary to them that the good sound may not correlate with a good teacher.
>
> C: Mmmm.
>
> J: 'Cause you can get a great sound out of a chorus and still not be. . . .
>
> C: A good teacher.
>
> J: Right . . . teaching them great stuff in the room.

Fear and ego are the main reasons many ensemble directors are not able to embrace the evaluation and try new pedagogies, Lucian said. He has gotten some pushback from teachers in the field when doing school visits. Ensemble directors specifically have complained to him that they should not be asked to do what everyone else does since they are different in terms of goals. Lucian has reminded them that language is the most effective way to communicate with those who do not live in the musical world:

> I think we could advocate for ourselves and our art, simply by being able to articulate what that interaction in a music setting—in an ensemble setting looks like, and how it does align with the Danielson Framework for Teaching, and how we as . . . orchestral directors, band directors . . . choral directors have made a purposeful decision in the seating of our students, in the setup of our ensemble, in general, of our students, and the rationale. . . . The rationale for the selection of the music literature for that specific semester or concert series. And being able to speak to that and show that in an overarching lens and not through a myopic rehearsal setting on one specific date.

Four of the administrators linked teacher personalities to being adaptable. The tougher, more egocentric personalities, or "big personalities," as two administrators put it, need to learn to be a bit more adaptable. Frank knew that he needed to approach conversations about pedagogy and process a bit differently with his ensemble teachers:

> I do see a difference in the patterns of some of the art and music teachers', um, personalities in the sense of . . . I think some of them might be a little more sensitive or temperamental. Um, and I think I try to approach teachers individually according to those needs, and so for there might be an area for them to develop and grow, it has to be a conversation that we have together.

José has taken much time to visit his ensemble teachers' classrooms and have many conversations with them about what happens in rehearsals. Considering the larger personalities of ensemble teachers, he speaks with his ensemble directors on how they might consider small shifts in their role of conductor, engaging the students more in an active way:

> So, what gets in the way is this like ego thing. And if you can just strip them of that ego and say, "I'm not saying you're a bad person. I'm not saying you're a bad teacher. I'm just saying like, things are changing with our kids. Things are changing with, with education. And we, we need to adapt. We need to be adap-adaptable."

Joel agreed with the "big personalities" in the ensemble faculty and laughingly said he considered himself to have one as well. However, since Joel has a similar personality to his faculty, he views adaptability as being more creative with pedagogical language and the evaluation tool, tailoring it to the ensemble class. At this point, the content of the rubrics become more the basis for discussion through a musical lens.

> Are there certain things in there that I sort of look at and go, "Why is this even here?" Sure. There are some, um, elements within some components that I sort of scratch my head at going. . . . It's not relevant sometimes. There's one in there about working with, um paraprofessionals and, um, volunteers. Well, we don't, with some rare exceptions, we don't have paraprofessionals in our classrooms. We don't have, you know, we just don't have volunteers in our classroom. So what do you want me to write for this teacher for that, you know? But that's . . . that's where you become very creative and we use Danielson, we use it as a driver of conversation.

As a school building leader, Mauro felt all teachers need to be adaptable, regardless of personality. Yet, the personality is what keeps the community diverse, as a

means to connect to more students. When evaluating teachers, Mauro tries to be adaptable himself, seeing the teachers for who they are and what they do, and not molding them into his image of good ensemble directors:

> I think good teachers come in a lot of different flavors. . . . I try to remind myself . . . people have a tendency to look for people like them or for this model and I try not to. I try to get some dissonance among the different staff members because I want them to be complementary rather than some, uh, you know, cookie cutter. That's not going to work. I think kids connect to different people. I connected with a lot of kids but there were always a few that thought I was not. . . . they wish they would have had another teacher.

Equity

Within each conversation with the administrators, I asked them if they felt the evaluation policies were fair and equitable, both within a school building and in the district/community. Frank believed that regardless of education policies, a school building is a community that works together for the good of the children. Teachers should be united in their quest for excellence and improving, making connections wherever possible. Yet, Frank has a great issue with his music, art, physical education, and foreign language teachers being rated based on outside test scores over which they have no control. Twenty percent of a teacher's rating in New York City, for example, is tied to how well the students perform on the state ELA and \math exams. Frank felt this should have no bearing on whether or not those specific teachers are rated effective or not:

> When you're tied to the greater school community, it's showing we're a community. We're together and that what you do, I could help support in some way, even in music, right? So the relationship between math and music, between literacy and music, there's a connection between both of those. But, the other twenty percent, why are they being tied to something that they don't have a direct relationship to? Why don't they or why isn't something created to measure them too?

I asked Frank if he skewed his evaluation ratings as a result of the 20% uncontrolled factor, to guarantee that teachers receive what they truly deserve. He did not skew, but he did not need to worry about low test scores because the students have performed well over the last five years. He attributed this to schoolwide improvement plans on pedagogical tools like Domain 3B—questioning—and the time he spent rolling out the incentives, including Common Core, with his faculty. Frank was concerned with the ways the music teachers were evaluated citywide. He believed that if there are no equal conditions across the city, as there are with ELA and math state exams, then the evaluation tool should not be in place. Frank was torn on how he would handle the ratings situation if students did not perform as well on tests. To evaluate the students in music, art, physical education, and foreign language, he thought a measurement tool should be created. For ensembles, he thought using the state music festival ratings and feedback would be a good idea.

Bradley felt it is unfair to visit classrooms for the sole purpose of evaluation. Rather, he looks to provide support and help his faculty as best he can, even if he is observing them formally:

> I'm not using the rubric on a day-to-day basis. Like, when I go in and see a teacher who is sort of turning the work over to the kids, but then they're sort of on their own and some are floundering, um, I'm not pointing to a cell on the rubric and saying, 'This is the problem area.'

Additionally, Bradley would not wait until the concert to evaluate his ensemble director's teaching, as the bigger steps of the process are missing, which is what matters most. Bradley thought festival participation could be useful, but then wondered if this was a smart idea because students might not play as well as they do in their classroom or "home field" due to nerves.

Within their own schools, the non-music administrators discussed the importance of equity among teacher ratings. In Frank's urban middle school, he ensures no teacher receives an ineffective rating to remove any fear or distrust. If a teacher is ineffective in certain areas, he says, there is a verbal conversation and ongoing monitoring:

> We're talking about an area and being open and honest with one another about any area of growth and next step. So giving a teacher an ineffective or developing isn't necessarily a bad thing; but the natural instinct for teachers is, "you used the word ineffective." So that's not the most . . . that's not the best terminology that should be used.

The connotation with ineffective on paper causes more hysteria than it is worth, said Frank. In Joel's district, there is a policy that all teachers must be rated effective to eliminate competition or ill feelings among the faculty. His district also omitted the highly effective rating, although some teachers would attain that at the end of the year. Joel felt sometimes he nudges his teachers into the effective category as a means of job protection and preventing administrative intervention. On the other hand, some of his orchestra teachers who should receive highly effective cannot attain this rating because of the weigh-in of the state ELA and math scores, which count as 20% toward the teacher's year-end overall rating. In Mauro's suburban district, there is similar equity in ratings as in Frank's and Joel's schools/districts. He felt it was to lessen the teachers' fears and frustration and ease administrators' stress in having to deal with the issues. Mauro described:

> M: We're not allowed . . . on the tenured teacher form there is no distinguished rating. It's . . . effective is the ceiling. We can use flowery language in the narrative, but the highest you're getting is effective.
>
> C: Don't you think if a lot of teachers knew that, that would be a game changer?
>
> M: What do you mean?

C: I mean, in my talking with other teachers from other districts, I don't think that they might be aware that. . . .

M: That's what we're doing? No, we haven't made it public. This is probably illegal.

C: Yeah, so, um, so when you say, like, people are crying between an effective and a highly effective. . . .

M: I don't want to have those conversations. It's a waste of everybody's time. It's ludicrous.

The time spent with teachers to discuss the difference between effective and highly effective would be tremendous and would cease the administrators' other daily duties. To bypass this, Mauro's district took preventative measures of assigning ratings.

When asked if ensemble directors should have their own tool for evaluation, the administrators had mixed feelings. There was no divide between music and non-music background. Joel felt that the basic goals of music teacher evaluation should be measured on how they teach music, whether through writing SLOs and pretesting/posttesting kids. He strongly felt that music teachers should have a musician observing them, but more importantly a music educator who understands how a classroom works, how a rehearsal works, and "why they look so different."

Bradley, who supervises every subject within the building, knew that a content specialist would be best to provide feedback and observe. Yet, in reality, that is not possible for each subject, especially for music, given the financial set-up in schools. Additionally, sometimes individuals outside of the content area may be able to pick up on behaviors or student responses that are important for the overall understanding of the class. Caleb, who also supervises all disciplines, echoed this and stressed the importance of arts supervisors observing math, and vice versa, for a more objective view of the

teaching. Mauro thought music evaluations might look similar to how students take state subject exams, yet he does not find it practical because the nature of ensembles is playing and performance-based:

> I don't know. I don't even know how you would assign a performance grade. I mean, I guess you have a performance grade that you would assign a student on a piece of work and make them play the same piece in June and see if it's better. Sounds idiotic to me."

"What's the State Want?"

As much as the administrators try to be equitable in their schools, five out of seven of them felt they were acting under compliance, appeasing the policies because they needed to. Yet, within their appeasement, they remain uneasy of the purpose of the evaluation tool: "I think it should be used for all teachers. . . . I just question whether it should really, um, be counted for evaluation purposes" (Frank). In the city, Lucian described that "the new teacher evaluation changes—what one would say daily, it seems." It is hard for the administrators to keep up with the new incentives and communicate them effectively to their faculty.

In José's district, which has music from Grades K-12, the ensemble directors—and the larger faculty—were not frightened of the new evaluation changes because they were confident of being effective in their jobs. Yet, once the teachers realized there was more equity than they expected, they had a bit of a change of heart:

> J: You know, there were tea- the confident teachers who are really working hard were happy to have evaluations I think.
>
> C: Of course.
>
> J: Because they were like "Sweet! Now they're gonna see." But then once these scores came out they see everyone scoring so high, they're like, "Okay. So I just spent all this time organizing my data, making these great

> tests, and the guy next to me did nothing and got the same score." So it basically brings us back to like those evaluations where you got satisfactory or unsatisfactory. It's the same thing.

Additionally, even if some teachers did not hit every mark on the rubric, José has some colleagues who would rate them as effective, to boost overall scores and dodge any uncomfortable moments with teachers.

> J: And then I know other administrators that would just if, if they didn't hit a domain would just be like "Well, but they're a good teacher so I gave them a high rating."
>
> C: Fudge it.
>
> J: And it's like ohhh man, like I, I never want to give an evaluation that's not authentic. So I if I didn't see it, I would leave it blank and I would wait for them to yell at me. [laughs]

José said he knew he needed to comply with the system by enforcing the evaluation rubrics, yet he could not in good conscience "fudge" his teachers' ratings. In meetings, José has been told to comply with the system as best he can to save face for the district: "'What's the state want? Um, okay, what forms do we have to fill out to, to like cover our ass? What do I have to really fill out?' Um . . . 'cause when, when I go in, I never when I use Danielson, I didn't go in looking to see a particular domain."

While Mauro must comply and roll out incentives with the new teacher evaluation systems among other policies in his district, he did not think it fair that the teachers must endure the political premise of the system, to dismiss "poor teachers." As José mentioned earlier, many administrators "fudge" the evaluations; Mauro agreed, believing this new policy is not working to achieve its goal. If administrators do not acknowledge this discrepancy, they are leading with blinders on:

> There's a premise that every student can learn at the same rate to the same level of complexity in every subject. I'm not sure that's true. And once we base policy on that assumption, we're in Never-Neverland. So, once you tell parents that the reason that children are under-performing is the teacher, politically that's a wonderful, I mean, who wouldn't elect someone who says, "It's not my kid, it's them." So yeah, I think we could do a better job of exiting people who are unsatisfactory. I don't think this has done anything to get us there. (Mauro)

Chapter VI

ROLES: CONNECTIONS, CONFLICTS, AND CONTRADICTIONS

This chapter presents the findings regarding roles—and role conflicts—within the two groups of participants. The first part of this chapter describes the roles of ensemble directors; the second part shares findings from the administrators about their roles; and the final section reports shared themes regarding both groups' roles.

Ensemble Directors

The Duality of Conductor and Educator

The ensemble directors all shared their desires to be ensemble directors post-graduation. Jacob, who came from a performance background, would not even consider teaching elementary school and general music. When he was assigned general music in his first high school job, he turned the class into strings, playing to his comfort zone and preferences. As a new teacher, Gloria wanted to be a high school choral conductor. Her first job was teaching middle school chorus and general music. Gloria struggled to balance her new role as music educator, planning learning experiences and lesson plans around the repertoire. In her undergraduate studies, she had not been taught how to think or plan developmentally through scaffolding and differentiating, but she could demonstrate a solid warm-up while conducting, singing, and accompanying the chorus. Gloria reflected that she did not know how to consider more than being a strong

musician-conductor and running efficient rehearsals. As such, she struggled with planning and teaching: “I didn’t even think to ask anyone [for help] ‘cause I felt like I should know it.” As she grew to be more comfortable in her teaching, she relied on her musical foundation to build her program and fuel creativity. As well, Lou as a new teacher “didn’t know what I didn’t know” and struggled to find his teaching balance and sense of self.

Over time, both Gloria and Lou became comfortable writing lesson plans, straying from them, reading students’ energy levels, and adjusting their musical activities accordingly. As they grew into their role of music teacher, they were lauded for the fine performances of their groups and the awards they won at festivals. Their rehearsal plans passed as lesson plans for their first few years. In her fifth year teaching, Gloria felt great demands from her administrator to incorporate more literacy, differentiation, and student evidence of meeting long-term goals. Her lesson plans did not reflect her administrator’s requests. At the same time, she was feeling unfulfilled artistically; the educative demands held her back, she explained, and she sought outside growth through professional and community organizations. She felt even greater frustration when, after seeking her own professional development through guest conducting festival choruses and presenting at state music conferences, her principal did not acknowledge her work nor count it as evidence for Domain 4 in her evaluation, which is Professional Responsibilities, including professional growth. Currently, Gloria expounded, educators are being held to different levels of accountability. Teachers are asked to produce lesson plans which include different learning goals and modalities, differentiating instruction, involving students’ input, and assessing throughout class.

Wilson, coming from a vocal/choral performance background, struggled with this idea of having to think through daily lesson plans, and build upon musical ideas and concepts as well as extra-musical concepts in his rehearsals. His lesson plans were rehearsal agendas. Wilson humbly admitted he has grown greatly, but has a long way to go in terms of thinking more long-term in building ideas:

> C: Great. What do your lesson plans look like?
>
> W: [Laughs] As that has been a deficiency of mine, because, again, as I shared, my experience has been very performance-driven.

In Wilson's previous school, his chorus received many accolades and had high-profile performance opportunities. He was lauded as a fine and master teacher due to the level of performance. Now, in his new school as he builds his program from the ground up, Wilson received a proficient rating in an observation. His administrator wanted to see how objectives beyond "rehearse measures 23-31" or "float the high C's" were obtained, and what specifically was happening in rehearsal that was not said on paper. Frustrated, Wilson tried to defend his plans to his administrator, explaining that it was a "rehearsal" and he fixed things as they came up. For his assistant principal, this was not enough to show that everyone was learning or aware that learning was happening:

> In my head I know what I need to do, you know, typical, you know, professional musician. You may write down some sketches, but this is what we're gonna do. You see? So she would often say, "Where's the music in this? Who are you talking about?" "What do you mean, 'where's the music?' We sing." And she says, "Yes, you sing in the lesson, but your lesson doesn't have to do with. . . . " So I had to make sense of that, you know, so, I mean, you know, so there was that part. And I grew as a teacher. I grew so much because now, as you can see, I'm able to break it down and say, "Okay, we end up here." [laughs] But my lesson plans now, I must say, I'm very grateful, they're very spelled out to the point where if I miss something and it's blatant, then I have to go back and fix it.

Wilson felt he had to convert parts of his musician self over to the educator self, and connect the rehearsal process to a learning experience for the students.

While Stew has been committed to the repertoire driving the rehearsal process in his first few years of teaching, he has begun to bring a more pedagogical lens to his work in light of particular components of the Danielson Framework, specifically showing evidence of planning and preparation in Domain 1. He is trying to build a band program in an urban school which has its own issues over programming students into ensembles and lack of student interest. He reported that his administrators want to see him writing objectives on paper and on the board. At first, Stew hated having to write down his plans, although he knew how to write them from his undergraduate experience, but he needed flexibility to rehearse for all his performances and feared his observers would not understand throwing out the lesson plan to fix trouble spots that arose. He reflected that he was approaching his rehearsal planning a bit differently than thinking as conductor, and more with a keen eye toward the process of teaching:

> But now, this has forced me to take a, um, sort of more organized look at what skills and concepts are really required to master this piece of literature, so it's . . . it kind of is going . . . it's providing me a road map for, um, for building those skills before they become, you know, rehearsal issues.

Over the past few years, Anna has reflected on the duality of being an artist and an educator, and negotiating how to balance both. She asked: does one outweigh the other? Traditionally in ensembles, yes, she believes, as the music is the driving force aimed toward performance, with growth and enjoyment as secondary aims. However, she challenges herself beyond the artist: "But my role here is to be an educator. My content is music. Every kids loves music, you know, so my job is to make that connection more rich." Using her educator role first, Anna has been able to consider differentiation in her

band class beyond Trumpet I, II, and III, providing space for students to play, sing, arrange, and compose in band class. While it takes time away from the traditional rehearsal, she feels the quality of musical skill and playing have improved due to better understanding and involvement.

Anna has challenged the traditional notion of band pedagogy and her role as constant conductor, and she has embarked on more project-based learning with her students in their daily rehearsals, using the repertoire as the basis. She approaches her classes from the point of view of educator first and musician second, and warns against the traditional conductor-led rehearsal set-up:

> If the kids are quiet and they listen to you, you assume they're engaged and you can run your rehearsal. And the kid sitting there playing Clarinet III who's looking at you and smiling and it probably totally checked out. And engaged . . . maybe they're listening to you but are they engaged in the process of making music or are they following your direction? And that for me would be what I was looking for.

For Anna, traditional ensemble pedagogy is anti-student-centered, and may be the reason why many music teachers are frustrated with current evaluation systems, saying they do not "fit" into the musical process. Rather, she said, perhaps this is a calling to our profession to rethink the role of conductor and school ensembles. She hypothesized that if the profession does not change the role of conductor, fewer students will want to play in the band or sing in the chorus, and people will find other means of making music outside of schools, for example, by looking at *School of Rock* or YouTube.

Wilson grew up as a chorister, following conductors in the Boys Choir of Harlem since he was six years old. He reflected on his growth as an artist who acknowledges that children now learn differently than he did as a child. He shared that he has seen great

changes in a more student-centered approach to teaching in the music classroom, specifically in ensemble, beginning with the choices of repertoire:

> I've slightly evolved as a teacher because my background is Boys Choir of Harlem, so I'm gonna say I was taught in an environment that was a little more of a dictatorship, if you will. Not knowing any better, I didn't mind it, but being a teacher in 2014 versus 1984, 1994 . . . it's different, you know. I don't . . . and I don't want to think the difference is so . . . I don't know how to say . . . less . . . um . . . less good? Or lower standards . . . I just would like to think that it's different. You know, um, I don't think I would want any. . . . I don't think I would have wanted any input when I was a child, but now I think it's a different case. I think there's just a lot of liberties that children are allowed—internet, a lot of social media, things like that, that really help build the teacher-student relationship, the classroom, you know. So then, you know, ten, fifteen years ago it was very adult-driven. Now it's very children-driven. So a lot of repertoire we pick. . . . I'm very big on "tell me what you want to do." Because I'd rather adjust to what they want versus, say, "You know, we're going to learn this Palestrina" and then be bored out of their minds, you know. Now, of course, they heard the remix on the Beyonce song, and so a different thing like "Oh my god, she wrote 'Ave Maria.'" But . . . not exactly. [laughs]

According to Wilson, students do not have to drive the learning agenda, but they do need to bring their world to the classroom in order to make better sense of it:

> It doesn't have to be Palestrina, it does not have to be Pergolesi, it does not have to be John Coltrane. As long as it's something that they're learning, even, you know, Beyonce stuff. You know, if I'm able to take stuff out it. You know Jay-Z . . . there's an ostinato. This is an ostinato, here's an example. You know, that's something that's gonna . . . they're gonna hear it differently.

Poloses

Within tension, there is striving for balance. The balance of artist and educator may connect with the notion of *poloses*, a Greek term to describe "continua upon which teachers might be working to seek balance, based on their perceptions of self and self-other in their individual teaching contexts" (Stamou & Custodero, 2007, p. 5). This balance may be based upon relationships, agency, and interaction, both solitary and communal within the school setting. The demands of the external forces outside the

rehearsal setting, such as the principal, school culture, and student interest (or lack thereof), play a large part in the development of *poloses* for teachers.

Sometimes one's perception shifts depending on who is observing. Within her projects in band, Anna's class can get noisy and energetic, with talking and moving around, not the traditional playing of instruments:

> If they would walk in here and think there's chaos, for example, but there are times when you've got kids over here and I've got kids in other rooms and it looks messy at times. You know, and somebody could easily come in and say "Oh, she has no management. I mean. . . . " But another person could put a different lens on it and be like "oh wow! They're all engaged doing different things."

Anna has been able to find a sense of balance through the kinetic nature of student-centered learning, accepting the "messiness" of the process. She recalled a moment when she felt that as a music teacher, she was acknowledged as an educator for her work, when she was on a par with the other academics in terms of teaching:

> I think it might have been "Ode to Joy" or some simple melody and I had the kids apply expression markings . . . it was about dynamics. And she said to me after "That was one of the best lessons I've seen." It was like . . . she was surprised. And it wasn't that amazing of a lesson, I think administrators aren't used to seeing good educational lessons from music teachers. They just think, "It's band or it's music and I don't know music as an administrator so okay. They're probably doing fine."

While Anna was aware of the stigma that music teachers are more musician than educator, she was amused by her administrator's surprise of the pedagogical elements of her lesson and was able to latch on to them.

Andy felt that because he is in the role of artist, he does not fit in with his "academic" colleagues. He is often left alone to work with the other music and art teachers in professional development and receives no direction on planning. As such, he has felt that he has almost regressed in his progress as an educator because he does not

have a mentor who can speak his language or model for him. He has also questioned his own musicality and his strengths as musician. When asked what has been most helpful for him as a teacher as policies have changed in the past school year, Andy replied:

> As music teachers, it's very difficult because you're usually an island. You're alone in the building. But to find a network of good teachers. But yeah, finding . . . even if it's not other mentors, finding a mentor, or even other people who are determined and passionate, because at least you can double down on other people's areas also. And share it. And drink.

Despite other arts teachers being in the school, Andy is the only band teacher. He feels alone and unguided, although his colleagues are feeling the same as he. Continuing, Andy stated that the school culture, with its emphasis on ELA and math, have him feeling that he does not belong, and this tugs at his belief systems as a musician, a teacher, and a music educator (he believes all three are different and serve different purposes).

For some, the balance of self and other comes from the students. Wilson, who has been asked to turn in unit and lesson plans and who has received proficient ratings leaning toward ineffective, has found a solid sense of who he is and what he does from his students' energy:

> They're in middle school and they can be tough, but if you show who you are, even if you suck . . . even if you suck as a teacher, but you don't wanna suck, but you suck for whatever reason. . . . you may suck because you're overthinking, you may suck because you've never taught in an urban school, you know whatever the reason . . . as long as you're being yourself and you're trying and you're . . . the kids . . . they'll love you back, you know.

With striving for this balance as a teacher, mid-career teachers are often more comfortable and solid with their teaching practices, sense of self, and speaking with administration. This is the largest characteristic between beginning teachers and mid-career (Coulter & Lester, 2011). Many of the ensemble directors were able to discuss their growth as they transitioned from new teacher to mid-career. Tim, while comfortable

in his teaching, is always seeking a better balance, a better sense of comfort, to improve consistently. His students have also helped him establish a solid balance:

> At this point, you know, 10 years ago I would have been like, "Oh, I just want to make sure they had great concert experiences and they learn to play their instruments really well." And I think when you start out, those are the kinds of things that you think about because that's what you're thinking about as a teacher. But once you start to get comfortable with your own pedagogy and your methodology and things of that nature, like, you can start to peel away, "Well, what's the next thing? Let's start to get at it." And so, and I don't know if all teachers do things like that, but at least that's sort of how my eyes have evolved over time.

When the students are present, the participants on a whole shared they have a greater sense of self, purpose, and meaning. They are confident in their role and in fulfilling it. The participants shared that new teachers must have the hardest time with the new evaluation system because they are seeking balance of identity while securing content and pedagogy. The ensemble directors all noted they felt new teachers should be evaluated differently than those in their mid-career, perhaps using fewer of the Danielson components or just using a different lens, which they are not always sure their administrators bring to observations. Lou reflected on the changes between his new teacher self and now—and how he has not changed as a result of the new teacher evaluations:

> If someone asked me to produce one [lesson plan] for today, I could make one. And it's not gonna be BS or anything, it's . . . I can get to the point. I can cite all the specific standards that it's addressing. But I didn't know how to do that in the beginning. And I think that was my fear. I didn't want to go out there and look unqualified and not reputable. Like, I'm very big about that. If I'm gonna do this job I'm gonna do it right. And I think that's why I spent all the time doing it. It was . . . it might have been more to qualify myself in my own mind. To make sure that I knew what I was doing.

Lou did not think that anyone should have to change who they are in the classroom just because someone is watching for a specific point in a lesson. Additionally, Jacob's perception of self has not been changed by his administrators' comments or feedback:

> Uh, I don't change my teaching. Sometimes I'll ask more questions just so she can't say I'm not asking questions. I don't want her to think that my class is completely teacher driven because it's not, but when she walks in I make sure that she knows it's not. No, it's not that I don't let it affect me, it's that I just doesn't. Somebody walks into my classroom, I don't care when they walk in, I don't care who they walk in with. It doesn't matter. I don't care. I just don't. I am going to teach. You want to watch? You want to write some stuff down? By all means, knock yourself out. Have fun. Do it in different colors if you want. I'm not changing a thing.

Jacob felt that his confidence and strong professional identity helped him be an agent for his students. That is, he has not been affected by observations and demands in pedagogical shifts such as questioning tactics:

> I am who I am; I teach how I teach. If you don't like it, tell me. I'll see if I can make some changes if I agree. That's it. I'm just not going to let it affect me. And one way or another, I'm coming out highly effective because that's how it works.

Norming: Enforcers, Compliance, and Appeasing of Policies

All of the ensemble directors recognized that they must undergo observation and evaluation as part of their job. They realized that when a principal or assistant principal asks them for paperwork, they must turn it in. While they all expressed moments of frustration about being asked to make shifts in their teaching or produce paperwork or data documents, they spoke to having moments of clarity to negotiate their roles in the midst of their new responsibilities. As Stew reflected:

> We are tasked with doing so many things and so many different things and so many things that pull our attention away from what we really love to do on the administrative side of the responsibilities of the teacher. Determine what is important . . . to, um, take a stand on and what you can let slide and kind of, um, what . . . what . . . what you . . . what you need to comply with versus what you're

> going to take a stand on . . . and this is something that I've tried to keep in mind in order to keep my focus where I think it needs to be and apply the extra energy and effort that I want to give to, um, to the aspects of my job that I'm passionate about.

Stew is aware he must comply with the policies in place, but he tries to remember the larger picture and his purpose. In Andy's pre-observation conference with his assistant principal, he was told to show much evidence of questioning (Domain 3b in the Danielson). Preparing for his lesson evaluation, Andy made sure to add as many questions as possible to score an effective rating. He reflected on this experience:

> 3b. Um, so I knew going in that that had to be in there. So I made sure it was in there. But even the planning before wasn't "Why are you doing this?" The questions about why you make these decisions, why did you choose this, why are you going about it this way? None of the answers were supposed to be, nor were they, "because my students needed it." It was, "I need this one . . . " It's like a ratings bingo.

Andy appeased his assistant principal's desire and requirements in order to receive a high rating, but felt it had no bearing on his work with the students because it was not contextualized in pre- or post-observation conversation. Lou followed his supervisors' orders because he knew they had his best interest, and the interest of the students, at the core:

> They're not there to screw you over. This is not . . . their job is not to kick students . . . or teachers out. It's to develop a good school program. If they see something and they think it needs to be avoided or you're not doing something correctly, and you have a good relationship with them, they'll tell you. They may not write it down on paper because they want to help you out, and then they'll want to see growth and want to see you improve. Is that correct? I dunno if that's right or wrong, but I think that's the way to do it.

Lou questioned if the administrators were following the "right" protocol for helping teachers, but believed that teachers should follow suit as it can help them become better. Shortly following this, Lou spoke on the pre- and posttests he is required to give his

students to show growth, which affects his APPR score and ultimately his yearly overall evaluation rating. He said he puts very little effort into it because much of the testing is about "beating the system"; for Lou, the tests provide no value for the students and show nothing about what happens in his orchestra. To appease the requirement, his pre- and posttests contain elements of rhythm, pitch identification, vocabulary, and repertoire, which students have never seen, so they fail in the beginning.

While Anna does not mind the pre- and posttests given in her districts, she did feel it is positive for ensemble directors and arts educators to be asked to do such tasks because it serves as an equalizer for all subjects when contextualized differently in each class. Additionally, she did not think any teacher should be evaluated by means of pre- and posttest scores, state test results, and a handful of observations:

> I think our typical ensemble pedagogies and the Danielson don't match, but I think they need to mesh more. I'm critical of our traditional ensemble pedagogies and at the same time it's unfair to evaluate any teacher, music or otherwise, with all of that in one shot. It's just ridiculous.

Music in Context: The Role of Supervisor

The role of supervisor was an important factor in how the ensemble directors viewed themselves and their purpose in their schools. When asked whether music teachers—specifically ensemble directors—should be observed by a music specialist, the ensemble directors had many mixed feelings. While all of them initially immediately agreed that yes, they wanted a music specialist to observe them, they quickly questioned their answers. Jacob recalled his previous years being evaluated solely by non-music administrators who attempted to bring their own musical knowledge—or lack thereof—to

their feedback, commenting on musical issues and how unfulfilling the experience was, musically, pedagogically, and professionally:

> Now Luis [supervisor] fancied himself a musician even though he was really a . . . he played saxophone. He wasn't a musician, he played saxophone. Luis would try to get me, I don't know whether he was trying to get me to react. He would say things to me that I wanted to throw a chair at him. He came, I was teaching a music technology unit in orchestra, this was so funny. And he comes to observe my music technology class. So, I'm teaching Garage Band and it was a great lesson. It was very good and we were having a good time. And I go up for my post-obs and he says, "So, what were you doing?" He talked just like that. And I said, "Well, I was doing this, we were putting music to the film and we were trying to demonstrate what the film would be like without the music. Then we add the music that the students produced." And he said, "Because you make it much too complicated." "What do you mean?" "Well, I don't understand what you do. All you have to do is you go bleep blop bloop, you have music." And I just stared at him, just like you're staring at me. Cara, I will . . . [laughs] . . . I swear to you. I was raging. But, that time I just looked at him and stared at him with that blank stare and said, "Can I go now? I have things to do."

While Jacob's assistant principal had good intentions to try giving some feedback to him, he fell short and offended Jacob and his work as a professional musician and teacher. Jacob felt there was no context or even an attempt to understand the musical or teaching context of the class, or how it might relate to his orchestra class. Jacob acknowledged that many schools, particularly in the city, have daily situations like his, where non-music supervisors attempt to make musical comments but fall short. However, in discussing having a sole music observer (and Jacob has an in-house music observer) or an observer from the outside (such as a district supervisor), Jacob showed signs of uneasiness:

> J: I think there's a lot of danger there. There would be a lot of distrust.
>
> C: On the part of the teacher or the evaluator?
>
> J: On the part of the teacher. I don't think the teacher would trust somebody from outside. You know, the one thing I will say, having somebody within your building assess you or judge you or evaluate you, um, they understand the circumstances and how you're teaching. They understand the students that you're teaching. They understand the overall atmosphere of the

> building. Um, and I think that certainly makes a difference. Um, but if you're going specifically on a rubric, anybody can do it.

For Jacob, the cultural context of the school is almost more important than the musical material, and the culture influences what happens in the classroom daily. All of the ensemble directors enjoyed the idea of having both a non-music supervisor (in-house) and a music specialist observe, to target both the musical material at hand and the pedagogical material. When asked if the non-music supervisor could speak to particular string pedagogy, such as how one might scaffold certain skills and techniques, Lou said that through a teacher's language, the administrator would be able to glean enough information. Also, with the assistance of a music specialist, they may be able to translate what happens. Lou, who has a music supervisor and a principal observe him, thought that having both a music and non-music observing together protects the system, especially in light of such policies as APPR and evaluation ratings, which only show snapshots and do not show his music mastery or teaching process in context:

> This whole APPR thing . . . I . . . I don't think it shows anything about me. Um . . . the observations that I receive from all administrators have very valuable things, but they're completely different points of view. One person's just all about the music and one person's about everything else. And I like what we have here. I think it's working well.

However, many administrators often overlook the musical context, and instead of looking at the content—what happens musically—they look with pedagogical blinders for teaching tactics. Tim's principal likes to see students having conversations in which they listen to each other to form opinions or arguments, aligning with the Common Core, and often brings this up in post-observations. While Tim likes the idea of conversations, they cannot happen constantly because many times he as the teacher has to go around the room to fix bow holds or adjust a student's first-position fingering:

> Let the kids have a discussion, because they [administrators] want the kids to talk. It's like our worst nightmare, but they want the kids to talk. So, let them talk to each other. Today, for instance, we did a peer reflection exercise. Half the group played, their stand partners watched, criticized, reverse, switch places, same thing. Then when we were done with that peer reflection exercise, it was one hundred times better because of the suggestions that were made. They know, they understand, they know what has to be done, they just can't always do it technically. So, that's when we jump in and we try to help them technically. The, um, the tricky part is, is that there's only so much that we can explain verbally and have the kids *think* about. We have to actually get in there. . . .

None of the participants faulted their non-musical administrators for having a lack of musical knowledge or background. However, they felt that they needed to speak the language of that particular administrator when conversing about pedagogy, either explaining musical concepts to them or leaving them out, depending on their relationship with their administrators. Andy's administrators in his large, urban middle school never ask questions or give remarks on the music—they are strictly pedagogy. If Andy tries to insert a comment on how students played a measure differently after his questioning or watching another student conduct, his administrator quickly dismisses it and moves on to reporting his low-inference notes. Anna likewise cannot fault the administrators because they are living in a world of observing and talking pedagogy, and leave the professionals—the music teachers—to filter the information in context themselves:

> But their conversations are almost always about education, pedagogy, learning, assessment. The things that they feel they're experts at and the things the Danielson talks about. I don't think it leaves room for much musical discussion except if you're talking about the teacher's knowledge of the content. And there are very few administrators, I think, who are going to challenge, unless they're a musician are they going to challenge a music teacher's knowledge of their content. So here they're hands-off in that way, they just trust that we know what we're doing and that's it.

Many of the non-music supervisors cannot apply musical content, nor even try to, because they are overwhelmed and intimidated by the unfamiliar material, as Stew

explained. Yet this certainly makes Stew feel he could be the worst musician and it still would not matter as long as he asked good questions and engaged the students. Additionally, Stew felt there is an ensemble pedagogy—a process of teaching tuning, listening, and son—that his administrator does not understand. The assistant principal observed one of Stew's observations, consisting of the tuning part of the warm-up. He tuned one student; the rest of the students visually indicated with a thumbs-up or a thumbs-down if that student needed to raise or lower the pitch to match the piano, providing their own feedback. The observer did not notice the feedback, although Stew was using a technique where students have this experience and participate and make their own judgments. Stew would also like a music person to observe him so he does not have to defend choices in his rehearsals, although he respects his assistant principal as an educator:

C: Do you wish that your observer, your evaluator was a music person?

S: Yes.

C: Why?

S: Because, well . . . there's a lot of reasons. One is, uh, what I just experienced with my little conversation after I recently got observed. To be honest, I'm a shred nervous about having to defend my actions to someone who doesn't understand them. The past four years before this one I've had a different supervisor who was also not familiar with music, but this observer or this supervisor had a tendency to only look for the positive. So I didn't feel that I had to defend much. My current supervisor is not necessarily looking for anything negative, she's a very intelligent person and I think she's just using a critical eye when she's observing, as she should.

C: She's looking for pedagogy.

S: Right. And that's what I'm afraid of. There's pedagogy going on that she's not aware of because she's not a musician.

While Tim's students often come to him with experience in ensembles and private lessons, he is responsible for teaching them new musical concepts, skills, and techniques. When his principal, who is a non-music person, observed him, Tim was given the suggestion to have students teach each other rather than being in a teacher-centric room. Tim defended his reasons, which his administrator understood in the context:

> I'm not trying to, you know, be conceited or anything, but like, I'm the expert in the room. I want to share that with them and then . . . and then once they have some kind of foundation, at least, I'll allow them to . . . to, um, deepen their understanding and, uh, and that can be done, kind of, through the questioning and the inferring and . . . and making connections through . . . through different, um, avenues and relating something that we're doing now to something that we've done, you know. But there has to be some sort of foundation for that to occur for that, I think.

Administrators

In the previous chapter, the administrators described how they try to make the evaluation experience as palatable as possible for their faculty. In the city central office, Lucian has devised professional developments and documents to aid principals in their evaluations of ensemble directors and other arts teachers. He tries to equip them as best he can to make the evaluation process easier, and to foster better discussion between teacher and evaluator.

In small ways, some administrators have pushed back on compliance-related issues. In addition to being a district music supervisor, Joel also holds office in the state music education association. Each year following the state music festivals, the state journal publishes ensemble ratings in one of their editions. When the Danielson Framework began to infiltrate many of the districts around the state, Joel felt that this

could be dangerous for ensemble directors if used as documentation and evidence of performance; he pulled the printing of festival ratings. His reasoning was as follow:

> We saw the potential for that document, now public, to be used against teachers if they didn't get the gold with distinction, if they didn't get the gold, if they didn't, if they didn't, if they didn't. We saw the possibility of principals who are not musicians, don't understand our association, to use that as a negative for the teachers.

On the whole, the administrators felt that the premise for the evaluation systems have not affected the education community the way policymakers intended them to. When I asked them what the purpose of the system was, and if it was helpful or made for better teachers, many of the participants showed frustration and discussed the politics driving the system. As Mauro illuminated:

> M: This entire, don't get me started, this entire regime has had zero impact on the number of teachers terminated for incompetence.
>
> C: So what do you think this is doing? What do you think it's all doing?
>
> M: Make work. Um, it's a political agenda. It's very clear. Um, I don't know what rate of turnover they would like, but there are people who think you can you can fire your way to Finland or fire your way to excellence. No. You know, in fact, industries or companies with high turnover are usually thought of as problematic. Like, fast food has a really high turnover because who the hell wants to work at McDonald's? Um, and so, what is the rate that they want? Tell me what the rate is? Let's talk about that, because until you decide what rate you find satisfactory, um, well, there's so much I could say about this, I don't want to bore you to tears.

For Mauro to negotiate and comply with the political agenda, he reminded himself that he needs to try to make "sane, sound policy, a compassionate policy that conforms with what the state wants."

Bradley struggled with his role as supervisor under the new evaluation system. While he discussed that he often omits the rubric from his observations, he said he felt he must uphold a particular community vision of what the supervisor should do or be—

someone who is serious and enforces policies in place within the school: "So finding my way with how do I fulfill people's expectations of what an administrator is, but also mold the role to what I'm comfortable with, um, took some time." Bradley felt he needed to bring his philosophy of teaching to his observation process, fostering a comfortable space for teachers to reflect and speak freely.

Rapport and Bedside Manner Are Key

Each administrator felt that their primary role under the new evaluation system was to have a good rapport with their teachers. On the whole, they wanted to ease the fears of their faculty and empower them to be thoughtful and student-centered educators. A good "bedside manner" is needed to communicate with the many different personalities of the faculty, as Caleb described. He said that a good administrator has "the ability to read a situation and, uh, be sensitive to another party's needs and . . . and wants and, and, and seeing the style of speaking they need so that I don't offend and I don't upset and they don't shut down, but I am able to get through." The administrators all spoke to fostering an environment where teachers are not afraid to speak up or be authentic to themselves and their students. Providing support for the teachers means allowing the space and comfort zone for them to reflect on their practices. Post-observation, Mauro allows a teacher to assess and reflect upon the lesson before he makes any comments:

> My three questions are, "What was your goal? What do you think went well? What would you change if you had the opportunity?" Because, you know, in the best case, and this happens a lot, the teacher identifies what went well and what didn't, and then the conversation's much easier. When the teacher thinks it was great and it wasn't, or is too hard on himself, that's also a conversation. Because the self-assessment, you would hope the self-assessment is happening every day.

> My observation's happening once a year, so if I can insure that their lens of self-assessment is accurate, then that makes the overall picture much better.

Mauro added that inviting teachers to reflect first allows them to trust his feedback much more and be more open toward receiving it in a constructive way. José echoed Mauro's post-observation protocol and felt turning the discussion over to the teachers truly opens space for more trust and greater conversations: "When you have someone that you respect that's asking for your opinion, I think it makes you even work even harder to be reflective enough to share that to someone and to continuously push yourself."

In Joel's case as district music supervisor, his rapport with both his faculty and his colleagues is important. Joel sees himself as the glue between the two, both musically and pedagogically:

> I think I figured out my job. I'm the translator. I stop my teachers from talking to their principals and I don't let the principals talk to the teachers. I will translate between them because the teachers don't understand education speak and my principals don't understand music speak.

With that, he works hard to provide support to the teachers to "help them grow." Joel reminds his teachers that no teachers lose their job because they had one bad lesson; the take-away is what is learned from that poor lesson and what happens afterward.

Overload

It is difficult for administrators to provide support to their teachers when they themselves need their own support systems. When asked to describe their current role as administrator, three of the principals began by saying how overwhelmed they were with paperwork and responsibility that can often drive them away from what is important—providing support for teachers and students. Mauro joked that he would never suggest anyone to become an administrator now. He told me about a typical day as principal,

which changes constantly; it is filled with meetings, visiting classrooms, phone calls, and paperwork, from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. or later. When I told Mauro he was very extended, he flailed his arms and responded, “Busy. It’s crushing.” Frank expanded upon Mauro’s feeling and pulled a large file—about three inches thick—out of his bag, which he was to review at home that evening. Our meeting was at 7 p.m. and Frank had a 45-minute commute home, which meant he would not get to his paperwork until after 9 p.m. Frank said that while he keeps a sharp eye on data daily, he stays at work very late and still brings home paperwork so it does not pile up. He does not want the paperwork aspect taking over his supervisor role during the school day. His evening’s paperwork consists of items related to the new teacher evaluation system, including inadequacies and deficiencies in the data systems from the Central Office:

> To be honest with you, I’m inundated with a lot of paperwork over the last year. I think the paperwork has increased over the last year. They feel that they . . . I think Central Office feels that they diminished it, but I think it’s increased in the last year.

Caleb has so much paperwork and responsibility, in addition to teaching two classes, that he tries to carve out time during the day to visit with teachers:

> I can’t . . . can’t certainly say that I am there [in teachers’ classrooms] every single day but, um, if at any moment I find myself . . . if, um, enough time to do so, I, my first move is to go into the classroom because I think that’s where I am most useful.

While the administrators—principals, assistant principals, and district supervisors—felt overwhelmed and overloaded with responsibility and paperwork, they all spoke to having to manage their time well. Three of the administrators (two in urban schools and one suburban, but with an urban background) spoke to the importance of time to present and engage with incentives and policies in a school building. Frank knew

that the Danielson Framework was going to become the model for observing teachers; he had the foresight before the official roll-out to begin engaging with specific components of Domains 2 and 3 (classroom environment and instruction). Frank spent two years working on Domain 3B (questioning) with his teachers in professional developments, observations, and faculty meetings to help them recognize and make small shifts in their teaching and learn to be objective and reflective. As a result, his faculty performs well in these domains because they have lived with these new concepts and have made small changes over time. Frank recalled that the official release of the Danielson Framework happened so quickly, and he—who had been engaging with the evaluation tool for two years prior—remembered asking the superintendents to allow more time to roll out the new teacher evaluation system because it required all teachers to reflect on their pedagogy and make stark changes:

> This [change] doesn't happen [snaps] like that, that you turn on the light switch and it's done. We need time to develop it and refine it. So, for example, um, shifting teacher practice . . . one of the instructions, you know, talking about instruction shifts . . . that's multifaceted and takes time to help change. You don't change that overnight.

The continuous roll-out of new evaluation systems brings a jaded mentality to teachers, as Caleb said: "You can get numb to them and it's very easy to stop recognizing that, um, this is, this is the same or similar to our consistent ideas of good pedagogy going back to Dewey and philosophers that we learn about in grad school." The new systems are coming in a new package, he added, and taking time to present them will make a huge difference in their success.

Certain themes emerged from both participant groups. While the concepts may be contextualized differently by the participants, the next section provides a composite of all the participants' voices, illuminating how they spoke together and separately.

Speaking Together

(Relinquishing) Control

The music administrators directly described that the new evaluation systems may serve as openings for ensemble directors to give up control as conductor in a rehearsal, or in other words, finding moments for more student-directed learning. José felt that the ego of the ensemble directors goes hand in hand with their desire to control their rehearsals and not giving up the reins to the students. However, the classroom seems like a better place where different learning is happening when control is relinquished. José saw that veteran teachers have a harder time visualizing their role in a classroom without the omnipresent conductor:

> And I think we have to give up control a little bit in a band classroom for the sake of, of student engagement and I think that's something that is a little different for some older teachers to kind of handle. So . . . but . . . and, and it's not traditional music education. But it's good teaching. And it's a little crazy. But that it's good on the Danielson rubric. And it's good when you go in and watch a room like that.

Having lived the life of a choral director in a high school, José quickly followed up by saying he is not naïve to the reality that the ensemble classroom cannot always be student-centered and lack control from the conductor: "You know there's a time where you gotta clap your hand and say, 'Write it in. I, I'm not goin' . . . I'm not gonna discuss that again. Crescendo on measure eight. We'll do it 'til it's right.'" The practical element

of a performance class has to take precedence, and often. There is a time and place for the teacher to be in charge and Danielson does speak to this, as José described.

Frank saw this in his performing arts middle school as well and believed it is a personality of ensemble directors: the idea of the conductor as the powerful one, the one who gets and drives the attention:

> Um, the challenge comes more in how much control is the teacher willing to relinquish . . . if somebody wants to be in control and feels they have to be in control, I find that those are the people who have difficulty transferring the learning over to the students.

Frank often finds himself in post-observation discussions with his ensemble faculty, speaking toward putting more ownership on the student. For example, instead of giving the child the answer or going over and doing a problem for them, Frank suggested that the teacher assist them with more guiding questions before fixing the problem. This transfers control from teacher to student.

The ensemble directors gave mixed responses about giving more control over to the students. Jacob's orchestra cannot always run in a student-centered and student-directed way. As the teacher, his role is to know what he wants them to learn in terms of musical and non-musical skills. To accomplish these skills and goals, he chooses a particular repertoire, although sometimes he lets the students pick:

> That's how it works. Yeah, there's a democracy in place, until I say it's not anymore. I mean, that's sort of the right . . . it is. I mean, you know, you spent how many years in a high school classroom. You know how it works. You can't always be a democracy, but we can talk.

According to Anna, many ensemble directors feel that giving up control means chaos will ensue. Not always does messy mean bad, she added, yet, in order to be messy, conductors need to relinquish a little control and escape their traditionally-structured

rehearsals and roles, which do not always equate with good pedagogy: "It's a very different model than the conductor and that's what I . . . there's this conductor pedagogy and then there's teaching. And they're not the same really! And how do you make that?"

Lou has tried to remove himself from being the "always in charge" conductor by having orchestra officers, who are responsible for leading particular sections of a piece during rehearsal or when Lou is absent from school. Lou believed that the officers help to remove some of his bias in the rehearsal, allowing space for students to make musical decisions and interpret the musical text. Lou has also explored having conductor-less rehearsals. He reflected that although they cannot be constant, those rehearsals are often the most productive "because they don't have someone directing them as to how to interpret something." Thus, he strives for a balance between conductor and educator within his rehearsals.

Shifts in Pedagogy and Persona: The Chameleon Effect

Gloria used the term *chameleon* in our discussion to describe her changes in pedagogy according to who is watching her in her choral rehearsals. When her choral colleague comes in to visit a rehearsal, Gloria finds herself adapting to his style of teaching, which is very much rote-based (he comes from a gospel background). When her assistant principal or principal observes her, she tends to take more time to ask questions and wait longer than "one second for the students to throw out an answer." As her assistant principal is a big fan of the "pair and share" method, as she called it, where students pair up to discuss something and then report out to the group, she makes sure to incorporate that teaching tool when he visits, even if she had not planned to use it. Chameleon changes are often a reaction to social signaling around her, and the changing

color varies depending on circumstance or species present. Gloria admitted that she plays to the strengths and desires of the people observing in the room—changing her colors—while also attending to the needs of the students, and she can pull these tools out at any given moment. While it is easy enough for her to maneuver, she felt that she has to blend in with the culture or set of beliefs of the person watching her, as a chameleon has the ability to blend in and change color. Gloria made conscious her SLOs through questions or explanations to the students. She described her motives for doing so:

> I felt like everybody felt very weighed down by this APPR, you know, they have to, and what we wound up doing is teaching to the test, you know, is, is do we want the kids to do really poorly in September. I made it obvious when I was observed, too. And you know, I'm gonna be honest. I don't think anyone looked at my objectives anyway. And, worst of all, these scores didn't impact my overall rating, at all.

While he did not consciously use the term *chameleon*, Lou also said he finds himself changing color with the prospect that administrators will be in the room, specifically in terms of technology use. His principal is a big proponent of technology and has told the music and art department to use more. As a result, Lou has gone to great lengths to incorporate as much technology as possible, to the point that his pedagogy has drastically changed because the use of recording aids in assessment and student reflection:

> It can change because, um, I love to use technology in the classroom and if you've seen any of what I've done, there's cameras and microphones all over the place. Some days I'll just be isolating the sound of one section, like directing the microphones one way, and I'll be playing back a lot of what they play.

After recording the students, Lou will play back and have students contribute to making changes in their playing, working together. He will also upload group and individual recordings on a secure website where students can critique themselves and the group. Lou

believed that pedagogical shifts away from traditional band rehearsal has been positive for him and his students; he as conductor is no longer making all the comments.

The rise of social media has connected people together from different cities, states, and countries. Anna's music teacher friends—especially band, chorus, and orchestra teachers—are constantly posting comments complaining about the new teacher evaluation systems and how they have to jump through hoops to look more like the other classes and show evidence of rigor. However, Anna felt that ensemble teachers should shift from their conductor-centered podiums and embrace rigor in a non-performance and skill way, perhaps adopting many of the ideas coming from their administrators and the Danielson Framework, which was intended as a pedagogical professional development tool. As a result, Anna has changed, not because she takes on the colors of those watching or suggesting, but because she believes that the profession needs to embrace a less conductor-centered model.

Anna was also realistic in talking about her expectations for her students in light of the collective rigor being placed upon them; students have hours of homework in addition to extracurricular afterschool activities: "So I've had to sort of reel back my expectations in terms of, not their investment but their ability to commit. They commit when they're here and then I have very little expectations for what they would do after-school." In a sense, she may seem like a chameleon to her friends or a conformist. However, she does feel that approaching the situation and the nature of students realistically will make teachers complain less and think and act more proactively:

> . . . it must be difficult for a lot of ensemble teachers. And just my friends on Facebook, I have music teacher friends everywhere . . . constant frustration. And, um . . . so it's a complicated question because I think teachers need to change.

Tim, who has taught for 14 years, feels unaffected by the evaluation system and secure in his teaching decisions and pedagogy. He asks students to "pair and share" and "turn and talk," to write, listen, and respond, which are all components of student-centered pedagogy that lie in Danielson's Domains 2 and 3. I asked Tim why he thought so many people were consumed and worried about the new evaluation systems and being rated lower than highly effective. He speculated that fear of losing jobs paralyzes people, changes them into what others want even if it does not work or fit. Additionally, he felt many people—especially music teachers—have never thought of asking questions of their students that are not related to the performance agenda.

When new teachers begin their career, they are often trying on different personalities and identities in the classroom, seeing what best fits them and their students. This is the most important characteristic that distinguishes early-career teachers from mid-career teachers—a sense of professional identity (Coulter & Lester, 2011). Some ensemble directors, in the presence of a non-music administrator, described that they changed their teaching or terminology in the moment to play to the observer, or could not ask open questions in their post-observations. For example, Lou recalled the difference between being observed by a music specialist versus a non-music specialist:

> If it was a music supervisor like last year, I felt like I was just able to teach the way I wanted to teach and I wanted to get feedback on just like "What's wrong with this. What do you like, what don't you like?" And I had that relationship with that supervisor to be able to take that risk and do that.

Now in his mid-career and having tenure, Lou is no longer afraid of being observed and will not compromise his teaching identity in the classroom based on who was watching. Instead of taking on the role he thinks his administrators might want to see, he is himself and portrays a real representation of what happens daily in his orchestra classroom. He

remains confident based on previous observations that his administrators have liked what they saw and felt he was doing an effective job:

> I was completely authentic to myself and maybe it's because it's I knew this was my tenure year and I wasn't worried about. Are they really gonna get me on an observation. They probably would have told me before. So I did my thing and it was, both the chamber orchestra and the string orchestra, so it wasn't just one class, and they all came. I felt they were good representations of myself.

During each formal teacher observation, an administrator gives positive feedback to the teacher. In that meeting, suggestions for improvement are given that are often pedagogical. For the ensemble directors in this study, each of them was asked to improve questioning, which is Domain 3B in the Danielson framework. Jacob described that his assistant principal, who is a music specialist overseeing seven music teachers, has taken on a role of what he thinks an assistant principal should be—one who is always professional, providing support and feedback. However, as Jacob portrayed, the human element of understanding the reality and nature of teaching is missing; namely, one cannot hit every element of highly effective pedagogy in every lesson. This assistant principal has assumed a position of power in many ways, daily visiting classrooms unannounced and giving feedback constantly, sometimes after only seeing a lesson for three minutes and taking the teacher out of context. Jacob complained:

> Oh, god. There are times that I want to take his pulse to see if he's even alive. So if he has one weakness it's as a person. But he feels . . . he feels that he needs to be that way in order to be an effective leader. He and I have had this discussion because I can say to him, "What happened to you?" I do say it. I've said it to him. And he says, "What do you mean?" I say, "You never did this much in a day." And I say that to him because I can, but I never do it in front of other teachers. This is just he and I. Um, and he really believes that he needs to be that way.

Bradley spoke to the stigma of having to be or act a certain way as an administrator. When he worked in an urban school, he found himself being personal with

the students, trying to connect with them. Disciplining students involved a stern tone and sometimes yelling because the students responded better to it, Bradley said. Coming to a suburban middle school, however, Bradley quickly changed his demeanor with students and became more thoughtful about how he spoke with parents and students. He recalled that he needed to "tighten up my language to help get my message across without angering anybody." Bradley spoke about having to find his footing as an administrator in a suburban district and forming his professional character:

> I think that forming my professional character, if you will, um, is something that I worked a lot on both as a teacher and as an administrator. I sometimes wonder if that, um, professional character is, like, maybe not, um, I mean nobody ever, in any of the classes I taught, nobody ever sort of explained that piece of the job to me. I think it's kind of important, because if it doesn't match your personality, people are going to see right through it.

Bradley discussed that no one in his teacher certification courses explained this part of the job, and as a result he had to try on different parts of himself in his administrative role to see how teachers, students, and parents responded.

Location Matters

While the idea of location—or urban vs. suburban—was not an intended conversation point in the interviews, seven of the eight ensemble directors and the three suburban administrators who previously taught in an urban setting spoke about how their current locations reinforced their particular roles. The participants made clear delineations between what they did in their respective school locations and what has—or might—happen elsewhere.

Anna felt, for example, that the largest challenge for her as an ensemble director in her wealthy suburban school was dealing with a more homogeneous population of

student, racially and economically. With this demographic, she noted, the students were highly motivated and yielded consistently high test scores. Anna said that the high tests scores allowed certain privileges to the teachers because they are not required to change much pedagogy or curriculum design to accommodate current evaluation systems. Because the community is well invested in the public schools, her music program has many resources and good funding. When I asked her what would make her current program more ideal, Anna responded: "You know, there's a lot of things that we already got that were sort of these pie in the sky things." She was aware that her school is very different than other schools in that the ensembles are highly regarded and well-funded and she has been given much autonomy in her position, both in developing pedagogy and curriculum. Throughout our conversation, Anna used the term *privilege* multiple times when speaking about the freedom to teach and take risks in her classroom:

> We're very privileged to work in a district that the students do well, so there's not administrators who are dealing with so many other more important issues, you know, like student learning and diversity issues and, you know, English language learners and poverty. I mean, so, I can't imagine a district like that also having to do all the insane work it takes to get APPR done. It just takes them away from these other things. Here, we have the privilege to not have a lot of that. We have administrators who very much trust our professionalism and so it was this unified approach.

Anna also knew that what worked with her students in suburbia might not transfer into an urban or rural setting. She added, "And what a good lesson would be right here. . . . I could take what I do somewhere else and it could just be awful." Anna felt that her lessons might not work in another setting because the students' mindset and the community's mindset are different. Students respond differently and bring different values and backgrounds to their learning.

Tim also felt very lucky to be in a district that is "incredibly supportive and really proud of the music program. The administration is supportive, the parents are great, so it's, um, I'm really fortunate that I had an opportunity to earn a position here." He feels very at home in his school where he can challenge himself and his students musically and pedagogically. He mentioned that if he were to change jobs, he would want to stay within the county because the community values and funding for ensembles are strong. He attributed the strong programs to having a music coordinator and imagined that areas without a music supervisor have less resources and support:

> I think it really affects teachers in smaller school districts. I think it affects teachers probably in rural districts. Teachers that don't have the resources to put in to a school music program or don't have a . . . you know, like a coordinator type who is in charge. We're lucky here that we have a coordinator, an oboe player. Administrators can have the . . . the, um, the background that they need to truly assess what's going on in your classroom for observations, but I think it can really do teachers a disservice in smaller districts and places where they don't have the resources. And I'm not . . . not resources in terms of money and equipment and stuff, but . . .

The community in Lou's district is appreciative of music and ensembles as well. All of the chamber orchestra students take private lessons outside of school. This makes it easy for Lou to program high-level repertoire without having to worry about technical ability, and he admitted having the luxury to have such a unique performing group. Additionally, the high school ensemble faculty in Lou's district communicates regularly with the middle school teachers. Lou recognized that the strong relationships between the schools foster high performance quality across the ages, and he considered himself "lucky."

Joel's suburban school district also performs high on tests, which yields for high evaluation ratings across the faculty:

> I'm okay with that here because all of my teachers are effective or highly effective. Why would I make them go through all the work of doing something else just to find out the same thing? Just go ahead and teach kids and let the test scores take care of themselves. We're in a district that can do that. So that's what we do.

Bradley attributed the high test scores and high evaluation ratings of teachers to the experiences of the faculty. Often, teachers will come to the suburban district in their mid-career. Bradley felt that this added to greater overall school success because the buildings are filled with more master teachers than struggling teachers:

> I think this is probably true of a lot of the suburban school districts, they're really hard places for novice or poor teachers to learn because especially in . . . well, in all subject areas actually, not just music where you obviously perform in music, but, um, the attention of the community is on the school and there is not a lot of room for mistakes.

Bradley said that community values drive the outcomes in the school, and particularly the caliber of the music department.

The urban teachers responded differently to elements of support and resources. Andy has never received any suggestions on how to approach requirements for Danielson or curriculum development. The only advice he was given was: "Approach the Danielson kind of stuff in a way that's relevant to me, so it doesn't matter, because it's not important. As long as it's done." Andy further described that the Danielson Framework was approached with the mindset of "just get it done." For him, the evaluation system has not been helpful to his teaching in any way. He admitted that he longed for a supervisor who was invested and not going through the motions to get through the requirements. As he said, Andy needed:

> somebody who questioned what I do and engaged me in it. . . . Like, thinking about my long-term planning, and I think my assessments are not great, so that's something I want to work on. . . . I guess it forces bad observers to say things that make responsible teachers respond. So it's more of a cattle prod, I guess.

Wilson has felt a difference in evaluation at the state music festival, when non-urban teachers adjudicate his chorus. He felt the evaluators were bringing their own values and backgrounds to the performance, instead of observing what was happening in that moment:

> There are people there that adjudicated us, but they have no idea. Was that helpful? For me? To see, ok, they don't know what they're talking about. Or at least they don't have the fundamentals. Now, if they said "I was in the city for five years and I know these kids scream like this on the schoolyard every day. Or their mothers scream at them down the hall, down the block saying 'Get home. It's getting dark.'" Then maybe we can talk. But having no point of reference . . . no.

Wilson felt that the evaluators had no sense of what it took to get the chorus to that point of being performance-ready because they were used to high school choruses that had been singing since fourth grade, with pure sounds. Wilson's group was different: his students came to him singing for the first time formally in high school. Yet, he felt his group was evaluated in the same way as a suburban chorus that had been singing in ensembles for years. Wilson also noted that students' experiences in ensembles in the city are dependent on middle school programs and where they attended high schools. There are specialized high schools for the arts in the city where the top students usually go. According to Stew, this makes growing ensembles in the city high schools difficult:

> So, a lot of the, uh, potential for developing the levels of the high school ensembles is taken away from the schools that are not specialized for performing arts or have audition-based programs. And that's why I think so many of . . . you know, I don't want to speak for other schools. That's why at my school the music program always feels like it's starting from scratch, that the students who come in and take beginning level classes are playing for the first time ever.

There is a distinct lack of parental and community involvement in Andy's urban middle school. He described that parents at his concerts will come mid-performance or during another group's performance to take their children home. Andy becomes sad

thinking that he feels more invested in the students' learning and experiences than the parents do. Mauro, who was once a teacher and an assistant principal in the city, added that the city has a tendency to not attract high-level educators:

> It's like a totally different mindset. I don't think you get a lot of quality people attracted to the profession. The entrance bar is so low. So . . . so low. Um, and I don't know. I don't know why. It's sad.

The participants reflected on moments of conflict and struggle, stress and the need for having or giving up control. While each participant's role is different, their words combine to give deeper understanding and meaning to the phenomenon of music teacher evaluation. Chapter VII offers a discussion based on these findings.

Chapter VII

DISCUSSION

This chapter begins with a discussion and an interpretation of the findings, including conflicting identities, issues of agency regarding both ensemble directors and administrators, and the way they engage and enact within these roles. The discussion aims to support the three research questions that framed this study and asked how ensemble directors and administrators negotiate and manage contemporary evaluations systems and how they view their role in this new context. The discussion of new pedagogies for teaching and learning and notions related to discourse is followed by an analysis of implications for practice and recommended areas to consider for further research.

Conflicting Identities

All of the participants in this study described a change in their roles, pedagogies, or perceptions of teaching that has occurred as a result of current evaluation systems. There is a tension between the role of the artist or musician and that of the teacher. In undergraduate school, music education majors hone their skills as artists while building a sense of pedagogy as well. Traditionally, preservice teachers take eight semesters of ensemble, singing or playing for the same conductor. During this time, they observe the ensemble director in rehearsal as she runs through pieces, isolates measures, and focuses

on one voice part of the instrument section at a time. Methods classes often mirror this musical process, with the aim being a strong musical result. Graduates leave their college experience with the hope of becoming their high school band director or assuming the role of conductor, with repertoire and musicality at the core of their teaching philosophy. New teachers must ease into the teaching part and understand the unstable nature of time-consuming activities and learning experiences that never go according to plan (Conway, 2006).

Interestingly, three of the ensemble directors pointed to changes—or conflicts—in identity. For example, Gloria referred to herself as a chameleon, someone who changed her teaching according to who was watching her. She admitted that she played to the likes or strengths of the observer. Gloria compromised her professional self—her teaching style and beliefs—and, more importantly, her identity (Knowles, 1992). This is similar to what a new teacher faces as she tries on different teaching personalities during the first few years of teaching. Although Gloria was a mid-career teacher, she almost displayed traits of a new teacher in "trying on" different roles (Intrator, 2006), fabricating an image of what others expected her to be. Darling-Hammond and Baratz-Snowden (2007) discussed how teacher growth is maximized and professional identity is reformed when there is support from other professionals. Even though Gloria had administrative support, she still felt pressured to perform in a certain way.

While Gloria's professional identity will likely reform many times over the course of her career, it seemed to be in a state of disequilibrium or imbalance that occurred within the workplace (Gallagher & Stahlnecker, 2002). In disequilibrium, teachers lose sight of who they are and the identity they may have created or fabricated in this loss.

Gloria seemed to have lost her balance of what is best for her students and what is expected of her under the new evaluation reforms, and she reflected on this in her interview. In a sense, when Gloria's observers enter the classroom, she falls into a more routinized way of teaching (Froelich, 2007), one that is not static, but plays to the preferences of the observer. Routine is one of the most common traits of a new teacher trying to find her way; it is often called survival mode. While a new teacher would not be able to reflect on this, Gloria is well aware that she has changed and that her sense of teaching self is unstable. She is in survival mode to secure her effective or highly effective rating. Additionally, she is giving her identity to a higher authority, letting other preferences dominate and drive her (Foucault, 1972).

Andy's professional identity has been greatly compromised; in many ways, he too is in survival mode, feeling like a new teacher without a mentor or an administrative supporter. His role has become conflicted. Andy cannot find his balance between work and self, known as *poloses* (Stamou & Custodero, 2007). His relationships, agency, and interaction, both solitary and communal, are all in flux, and he described feelings of helplessness in terms of the purpose of the band program at his middle school as well as how his teaching does not fit into what the principal's goals are for effective teachers.

Lastly, Wilson reflected that he had a difficult time negotiating between his musician self and his educator self, something which new teachers often do. For many years, he equated learning to teach with learning to perform, which is not only a new teacher trait but also a preservice teacher trait, according to Conkling (2003) and Chong and Low (2009).

Among the administrators, each participant except José and Joel (two district music supervisors) portrayed elements of an identity conflict between being an educator and an administrator. Neumann (1998) spoke to the personal nature of teaching, and asked "how much of our 'selves' is inextricably bound into our work?" (p. 429). I believe that José and Joel did not experience identity and role conflicts because they worked with music teachers, namely ensemble directors, on a daily basis. Their work from their classroom days transcended directly into their work supporting teachers. Working within their discipline provided them an advantage and common basis for work. They saw themselves as musicians and educators and honored both of those "selves" in their supervising. José mentioned that to be a good administrator, one needed to be an excellent teacher and there could be no separation between them. Joel described that he "speaks their language" and can play to his strengths, such as musical skills and rehearsal technique expertise.

While each administrator described that he or she was are not competent in content across all subjects, each tried to foster good pedagogy. However, Bradley questioned his credibility in providing feedback to any teacher, especially the ensemble directors. He felt he might be of better use as a full-time teacher. This points to Bradley experiencing disequilibrium, that is, he is not who he currently is (or should be) nor is he who he was. This supports the work of Cook (2009) and Gallagher and Stahlnecker (2002), both of whom said that a state of disequilibrium might be productive or counterproductive, depending on the amount of reflection and acknowledgment of this stark professional change. Though it was not clear whether Bradley's disequilibrium was productive or counterproductive, he was beginning to work through thinking critically

about his role, how others experience him in his role, and whether he has made the right choices in constructing his administrator self. He was clearly undergoing an "experience that I am not myself, or that I am beside myself, the experience of a distinction between who I am and the self I have created" (Kegan, 1982, p. 169). Bradley questioned whether he was in the best role to do a good job and affect outcomes in the best way, and he thought perhaps that the classroom would allow him to do this. This also points to the need to take on the role of administrator, one who watches and is watched, as Foucault (1972) noted. In a sense, Bradley's identity is not his own. He has been wrestling with his identity and role, and honestly and humbly admitted this—something which most administrators would have difficulty acknowledging because they may look weak in doing so. Bradley might benefit from having a mentor or someone to facilitate his reflections as he modeled for his faculty. He is an example of someone whose work might better be informed by communicative systems—that is, the processes of meaning making and transformative learning. Bradley is in fact challenging his current frame of reference and reflecting on his experiences to better guide his actions, and these are the basis of meaning making and transformative learning (Mezirow, 2000).

In short, the administrators might benefit from having to practice the reflective process with one another. As Mezirow (2000) and Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) reminded us, adults learn through dialogue and reflection. It might be fitting for the administrators to work on communicating openly about their process and positions because they might inform the ways in which they engage with their teachers and arrive at their meaning and intention (Habermas, 1984). As a result, they can make better meaning for themselves in their roles and positions or help themselves "become aware of

more possible ways of being and attending to the world" (Greene, 1994, p. 21)—the world being their teachers and, ultimately, the students.

Emergence of Subgroups

While reading and rereading the transcripts and looking for the formulated meaning of the participants' words, I began to notice particular characteristics and descriptors associated with certain individuals. The data suggested that specific personality subgroups emerged within the participant groups. Within the teacher participants, three groups formed: compliants, subversives, and flounderers. The compliants were those directors who followed their administrators' demands, making changes in pedagogy or in classroom setup and protocol. The subversives appeared to comply on the outside, yet carried on with their normal routines or did not enact what was asked of them in their classrooms when no one was looking. The flounderers felt completely over their heads, overwhelmed and downtrodden by the incentives put forth, and feeling that the situation was futile given the demands or changes asked of them by their administrators. They could not make sense of nor reconcile the current policies with their teaching philosophies, practices, and selves.

Compliants. While each ensemble director participant could fit into this group, a few had tendencies to be considered full-on compliants; that is, someone who obeys the rules, often to an exaggerated or excessive degree. The compliant group, though small, were those who did not advocate for themselves nor find the space for more open dialogue with their administrators in post-observation conferences. In a sense, they were, as Foucault (1995) would say, docile, allowing the system to hold authority over them.

For example, urban middle school choral teacher Wilson, as per his post-observation discussions with administrators, changed his lesson plans accordingly and tried to incorporate questioning tactics suggested to him. While Wilson believed that chorus is naturally student-centered and many components listed in the Danielson rubric were innate, he never discussed these reasons with his administrators, perhaps for fear that they would come back to observe with a different lens. Wilson's fear kept him "in check" to comply, as he was aware that he could be watched at any time. This supported Foucault's (1995) idea of the Panopticon, where one behaves in a particularly appeasing and passive way when being watched or surveyed.

Gloria regarded herself as a pedagogical chameleon depending on who came in to observe her. As stated earlier, she constantly changed what she did to appease the observer, ranging from changing her style of questioning to fostering a small-group activity to see more student engagement. While it appeared she had much autonomy over curriculum and lesson planning, she seemed to be giving up her independence in the classroom (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005) and relinquishing the possibility for fruitful musical and non-musical moments with her students to make meaning. Gloria was yielding to "the restrictive social environments [that] exist across places and cultures" (Hubard, 2011, p. 5); she was imposing a particular environment and process upon her students that were desired by her administrators.

Subversives. A subversive may be regarded as someone who disrupts an institution or established system—in short, a rebel. In this group, the subversives were those who appeared to be complying with the policies and administrative requests, yet took small or even subtle actions to negate the system in their own classroom.

Jacob might have been the most subversive participant among the teachers. He was not afraid to have conversations with his music assistant principal and principal and assert himself in his pedagogical decisions, regardless of the rubric. He prided himself on being the expert at what he did and he did not change what he did or who he was whenever he was given feedback. While an administrator might be taken aback by someone like Jacob, he fulfilled the premise of Danielson's (2007) philosophy, which is to have honest conversations between professionals.

At first, Anna, the suburban middle and high school band teacher, might be categorized as a compliant as she believed that good pedagogy surpassed skill and excellence. This might have appeared that she was playing to the political agenda, putting her in a different category. To some, it might have seemed she was appeasing the policies in her teaching. Yet, Anna warned against the dangers of a conductor-centered ensemble setting, and urged teachers to rethink their traditional ways, embracing more student-centered learning and projects in the classroom (Palmer, 2007). Anna was subversive toward her role as conductor, not toward her administrators. In this sense, she was subversive as she challenged the traditions of her ensemble paradigm, embracing a more critical pedagogy in which students pose problems and leave behind the routines and rituals (Freire, 1970) of the ensemble classroom.

Flounderers. There was one flounderer within the ensemble directors—Andy, the urban middle school band director. Andy did not have a music supervisor nor did he ever have one. He was asked to compromise his ensemble program from five days to four, and was told to align his curriculum with the academic subjects, without any guidance or contextualization of how to do so. Andy felt torn between complying and doing what he

felt was best for his program, which he questioned because of a lack of openness on the part of his supervisor. Overall, his attitude toward his teaching and the ways in which he was evaluated were negative, almost defeatist. With regard to improving questioning tactics, Andy felt lost and did not know how to improve on this—or how his administrators wanted him to improve—in his band rehearsals. Andy has advocated for his program many times, including having his students play for the fifth grade school interest sessions, to no avail, which has caused him to rethink his role in the school as being more of a filler during the day. He has felt like an incompetent musician and teacher because he has not been given any positive feedback in observations. Andy's outlook has changed drastically as a result of the new systems and protocols and functions differently in his roles. I noticed a telling example of this:

> C: I just find it an interesting observation in that the way that you are articulating yourself, it is so evident that you speak to non-arts people all the time.
>
> A: [Laughs]
>
> C: The way that you're kind of, and I'm not saying it's a bad thing or a good thing, I'm just saying that this is an observation, but you're like skirting around, like, some words. And there are sometimes little musical things, but you're trying to get to, like, the core of what you're saying and it's, like, I think it's so telling of the nature and climate of what you're experiencing right now.
>
> A: That's really funny.
>
> C: I don't know if you're aware of it.
>
> A: No, but I think it's absolutely that.
>
> C: But I know, based on previous conversations, you can, like, totally nerd out with your music knowledge and talk of repertoire. And I just think it's an interesting . . . piece.
>
> A: No, a lot of things get beaten out of you, I think. It's drained from me.

C: How does that make you feel?

A: It's, um, demoralized?

C: Mmhmm.

A: Uh, to think I'm the only one who cares what's going on in my classroom at any time ever. Except if there's something on a list that's not right. And that's the only time someone cares what goes on in my classroom.

Andy used the world "demoralized," a word that Santoro (2011, 2013) used when discussing a stress overload. Andy felt that his work and teaching pedagogy were inaccessible to him. Moreover, he felt he could not describe his experiences to me in an articulate or eloquent way. While I found him to be very understandable, this may also point to more areas of stress and bullying, where teachers feel such struggle in their jobs that they cannot translate their experiences into words.

In many ways, Andy appeared to have qualities similar to those of a new teacher: not being able to find footing in his classroom, and questioning his motives and purpose. His lack of professional identity has been compromised as a result of the changing policies. Andy also has had a struggle with finding his musician and teacher selves, a common descriptor of new music educators (Conway, 2006). While floundering, Andy displayed signs of someone who has been bullied in the workplace. According to Salin (2003), workplace bullying is "the repeated and persistent negative acts towards one or more individual[s], which involve a perceived power imbalance and create a hostile work environment." (p. 1214). In school settings, this may translate into professional incompetence (or questioning competence), criticisms, and monitoring of work (De Wet, 2011). While it could be said that all of the ensemble directors in this study have experienced some sort of bullying due to the elements of criticism and work monitoring

that occur during an evaluation (De Wet, 2011), they did not display traits of someone who has been bullied. Conversely, José pointed out that because of teacher egos, administrators are bullied into believing “that doesn’t apply to me” when it comes to incentives and pedagogical tools. To a degree, Andy has experienced bullying and tension between his professional self and his personal self, and cannot compromise the two as he receives excessive demands from his supervisors to change but with no guidance or support.

Administrator Groups

I identified only two subgroups within the administrators: compliants and subversives. There were no flounderers in this group, given the reality that as a school building leader or supervisor, one must possess leadership qualities (whether through enacting policy and job duties or morale); there is no space for these administrators to completely flounder, although at times I am sure they have felt this way, as a few of them described their overwhelming responsibilities.

Compliants. Due to their leadership responsibilities of having to uphold and enforce policy, each of the administrators fell into the compliant group, yet the most prominent compliant was Lucian. I found Lucian to be more compliant than the others because of his title of director of teacher effectiveness in the arts. The very purpose of his job is to comply with policy and use the evaluation tool in a specific way as a communicator between teachers and administrators. In a sense, Lucian was being watched by those in the central offices to make sure he was effectively administering the demands of the evaluation system. If one were to liken this to the Panopticon, Central Office is the watchtower and Lucian is the prisoner. His job is to keep the arts educators

in check and provide as much help as possible to the administrators. His role involves keeping others in check while he too is being kept in check. This is a cyclical role of employing docility, as Foucault (1995) might say. Lucian oversees teachers' engagement with the rubrics; simultaneously, he must enact his duties which are given to him from authorities. This shows a virtual trickle-down ladder of docility and compliance.

Subversives. Bradley ventured to admit that he often did not even bring the rubric into classrooms with him to observe/evaluate because he felt it lowered teachers' vices and blinded him from seeing what happened in the classroom. In many instances, it prevented him from fulfilling his role of supervisor/support giver. While he followed the premise of the evaluation system, which is open communication between teacher and administrator, he did not let the actual rubric or idea of evaluation cloud his relationship with his faculty or allow the conversations to be at the expense of the rating system. I believe that through his experiences of evaluating teachers outside of his content area, Bradley has begun to question the usefulness of his role in the evaluations and whether he would be of better use teaching students full-time, especially as they should be the main concern and priority.

Joel, district music supervisor, was another example of a subversive because he used the Danielson Framework to suit his ensemble faculty's needs. He knew that some of the components do not apply to ensembles—such as having a paraprofessional—and made this known to teachers and his district-level colleagues. I received the impression that Joel enjoyed being a bit of a renegade and prided himself on being able to use his role in a powerful way against the system whenever he could.

Agency

The current teacher evaluation systems—contracted by and through stakeholders and policymakers—aim to disrupt what was thought of as a solid and working education system. The education system was not a good business model and did not produce maximum results; in a business model, competition fosters excellence and yields results. Adding high-stakes teacher evaluation to education then became grounds for competition to yield high productivity. While those in the educational systems must comply—or their jobs will be terminated—the participants in this study engaged in acts of agency within and against the political systems and discourses at play. They lived in a space in which these multiple discourses competed with each other. The ways the participants worked within and against these discourses fostered an opportunity of agency, the ability to select among discourses and resist those that were undesirable. Additionally, with finding *poloses*, or the balance of work and self (Stamou & Custodero, 2007), they may yield a sense of agency.

Foucault (1984, 1990) discussed the space of possibility among discourses, "the possibility of no longer being, doing, or thinking what we are, do, or think" (Rabinow, 1984, p. 46). These possibilities point to the human strength—or power—of resistance to domination and the ability to self-create and proclaim, while still being within social and political limits. The administrators in this study did participate and comply with the models, but they did not want to foster the competition that comes with the system. Each administrator in school-based positions was at odds with the system and its implementation. When I first began this research, I had a hunch that principals, namely those in suburban districts, would function differently within the systems. I felt there

would be more freedom to interpret and implement the evaluation systems as they saw fit. Yet I quickly came to learn that all of the school building leaders in this study took great strides to subdue the sense of fear and competition that accompanied the evaluation ratings. They acted as they seemed fit within their spaces to foster positive environments. However, it should be noted that only three of the seven administrator participants were currently in urban schools, one at a district-level with no direct contact with students; additionally, the two school administrators were in high-functioning schools, with consecutive A's on their school report cards.

Regardless of location, the ways in which the administrators enacted within the system are spaces of agency, small ways in which they can resist the political agenda. They see the incentives as coercive rather than formative and create space for possibility within the discourse of teacher evaluation. Weedon (1997) noted that as we make conscious the discourses that shape us, we have the ability to resist and question their role. Here, discourses become a site of political struggle. As Weedon wrote:

> The collective discussion of personal problems and conflicts, often previously understood as the result of personal inadequacies and neuroses, leads to a recognition that what have been experienced as personal failings are socially produced conflicts and contradictions. . . . This process of discovery can lead to a rewriting of personal experience in terms which give it social, changeable causes. (p. 33)

The "changeable causes" for the administrators and teachers resulted in acts of subversion. While one cannot determine the degree to which the participants enacted agency, many of them were able to foster acts of change in their classrooms, despite the rules and regulations. Wilson articulated the difference in how he was taught and how he was hoping to teach his own students. He has embraced new ideas of pedagogy, both in his own experiences of working with urban youth and in receiving feedback from his

administrators. Stew and Andy, in their urban schools, enacted agency in the ways they chose repertoire and tried to advocate for their student performances within the school community. Yet each teacher also felt limited in the degree to which they could enact agency. Gloria enacted agency through her pedagogical practices as she embraced more student-centered learning, yet was limited in having to change herself for her evaluators. Jacob, who spoke to having much freedom in his classroom to choose repertoire and engage in the rehearsal process, admitted to being limited by the constraints of having to write lesson plans and put his curriculum down on paper before someone made him do so or gives him a pre-scripted curriculum. He attributed this to having to “justify his existence” to the higher-ups.

New Pedagogies: Embracing the Role of Educator

School ensemble pedagogy is modeled after the practices of a conductor and large performing group (Hoffer, 2008), which intend to replicate the traditions of large ensembles, where the conductor makes the musical decisions and communicates them through gesture and verbal direction. This practice is seen in the training one receives when preparing to be a conductor or music teacher, as one often chooses a choral or instrumental track in undergraduate training. The role of traditional ensemble pedagogy, modeled in the image of the conductor, provided a source which the participants both borrowed from and resisted.

With the majority of their experiences in this model as students in school and as undergraduate music majors, the participants succeeded in the traditional role of ensemble teacher, building successful programs, engaging students through musical

performance, and fulfilling the expectations of successful concerts. The image of the conductor as teacher is a central set of practices which the participants both drew upon and questioned. As such, music education majors are taught in the traditional sense, without modeling of what an orchestra rehearsal could look like without the conductor, or including projects or activities that stray from the performing process. Teaching may be seen as being good when it contests logical, moral, and psychological standards, and students demonstrate (through interaction with the teacher and their peers) that they are engaged with the content. Successful teaching is seen as learner-dependent and measurable (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005). Such teaching may find its roots in behaviorism. In ensembles, the norm is successful teaching—the outcomes. APPR and evaluation systems like the Danielson Framework may be seen as measures of successful teaching rather than good teaching.

Anna warned about conductor-centric school ensembles, speculating that if the profession does not shift to involve students in the musical learning process, students will seek musical performance experiences elsewhere and ensembles will cease to exist in schools. While other subjects are changing to incorporate more student-generated learning, ensembles have fought against it. Hubard (2011) suggested that it is our responsibility to break down normative practices. Yet the nature of ensembles is one of perpetuated normative traditions, of depositing knowledge and skills to the students. To shift these normative practices, there needs to be a shift from a “banking concept” (Freire, 1970) to having students be more conscious of their knowledge by engaging actively in the learning process. Now, as Anna said, is the time for conductors to consider new ways of teaching beyond the rehearsal. Caleb and Joel shared that most rehearsals they have

observed are diagnostic—the conductor/teacher fixes trouble spots in the moment and continues through the repertoire agenda. Yet, rarely have they observed ensemble directors asking questions to engage students beyond diagnosing issues. This changes the quality of teaching and learning and supports Fenstermacher and Richardson's (2005) descriptors of good and successful teaching: "The quality of teaching, how good and how successful it is, will depend—sometimes to a small and other times to a considerable extent—on how well the teacher adapts his or her instruction to the context at hand" (p. 207). While they stated the nature of school ensembles cannot be divorced entirely from having a conductor, teachers need to make changes in how they structure the rehearsals, adopting a student-centered or subject-centered approach to the classroom (Palmer, 2007). A more student-centered approach embraces new pedagogies for the profession. This approach to education looks to—and embraces—the future and a changing world rather than replicates past rituals (Freire, 1998a).

School ensemble repertoire and rehearsal processes have greater freedom because they do not have prescribed curricula, according to Caleb. These are huge opportunities to change our pedagogies from a traditional paradigm. Questioning was a point of conversation for every ensemble director in their post-observations. As the administrators described, their questions were quick, rendering one-word answers which often point to a specific occurrence in the music (a tenuto marking, a measure number, etc.) to rehearse that specific section. In a student-centered classroom, or through a critical pedagogy, teachers can ask "the type of questions that their own future students should ask" (Gutstein, 2005, p. 208).

Ensemble directors often assume the role of conductor first, educator second (Allsup, in press). The participants in this study assumed the role of musician first, teacher second, and stated their struggles with finding balance within the new school policies. Neumann (1998) stated that as educators, we are models to our students of reflection, critical thinking, care, and self-expression. Breaking down the role of conductor as "all knowing" and embracing the educator will not only shift the ensemble classroom, but could bring ensembles on a par with other subjects and with a more unified agenda of educating students. José touched on the idea that pedagogy is pedagogy, regardless of subject or art form and process. Gloria described that, as a result of post-observation discussions with her administrators to incorporate better questioning and more student-centeredness, she has had to negotiate the structure and expectations of the large ensemble classroom within her own pedagogical goals. Lou, who assigned student conductors in his orchestra, discussed how he enjoys having multiple interpretations and voices involved in the rehearsal and learning. This aligns with Giroux (1998), who stated that through adopting a critical pedagogy, students who were once voiceless (the subcultures, subordinates) in comparison to the dominant culture (the conductor) are now speaking up. This results in a paradigm shift.

Instead of marginalizing ensembles in relation to other classrooms, embracing the role of educator first, conductor second, could be a key to lessening the divide in the school setting. This is especially important in the new evaluation systems and policies, where administrators are looking for examples of student-led activities, student-centered questioning techniques, and flipped classroom instruction where the teacher is not depositing knowledge. This change can be a learning experience for the ensemble

directors and a space for them to reflect on their own work, which is the philosophical premise of the evaluation system (Danielson, 2007). Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) described how adults may learn in the following ways: reflection, dialogue, drawing on past and reflecting on current experience, observation, role models, mentors, and experimentation/trial and error. While the intention of the evaluation systems is to foster teacher reflection and dialogue, and set up an open relationship between teacher and administrator, this is not always the case. For example, Stew has described almost being stunted in his growth because of lack of help or mentoring. This may support Eros' (2013) study that teachers may feel taken for granted in their positions. As a result, some teachers in this study—namely Wilson, Andy, and Stew—have not been able to experience different levels of learning, as described by Habermas (1984).

Discourse of Location and Privilege

While the context of the rehearsal process prevailed as one of the biggest findings for both the ensemble directors and administrators, I found the context and discourse of location to be one that some voices spoke to and others suppressed or ignored. Their words spoke to particular meanings and values embedded within locations. The type of locations—urban versus suburban—yielded particular spaces for privilege and support, with suburban areas emitting more power in terms of student performance and teacher "success."

Discourses are ever-present. They are evident when one speaks and when one is in silence. In predominantly White schools, issues of class and race often go unaddressed (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Leonardo, 2004). These issues of

location were addressed through my sample, as I chose both urban and suburban schools. These schools are usually institutions of privilege, having many resources and much community support. Societal privilege—the advantages that are received because of one's race or socioeconomic status—constructs a space of silence in schools outside of an urban setting. This was prevalent in the wealthy, suburban schools where Anna, Lou, and Tim worked. There were minimal racial and class differences between Anna and her students, which she acknowledged; this caused issues of class and race to go unrecognized. But such issues were clearly at play in that the suburban upper-class students came from a particular place of privilege or social system; the majority of students in these three schools took private lessons outside of school, raising the quality of repertoire selection for the ensembles. The administrators, specifically Bradley and Mauro, spoke to having few to no discipline problems in their schools, which, by contrast, they dealt with regularly when teaching in the city schools. The majority of these students were White and from a particular socioeconomic background; since difference in terms of class, race or privilege was not encountered or discussed daily, the students were unconsciously silenced. While the suburban teachers did not explicitly make conscious the differences between urban and suburban teaching, there was an unspoken message that they would not succeed as well artistically or even pedagogically if they had been in an urban setting. Unconsciously, they were adding to the discourse of suburban White privilege.

The ensemble directors in the suburban locations did not speak much about feeling overwhelmed with the new evaluation systems. They spoke to loving their schools and programs, and acknowledged the support they received from parents and

supervisors, both morally and monetarily. They have received high ratings up to the present, and have not been told to change or implement new styles of pedagogy; rather, they have been given food for thought to improve. Their students perform well on the state exams, which average into their overall rating; there is never a concern about low test scores. As evidenced by administrators Mauro, Joel, and Bradley, no teacher receives ratings below effective; in post-observation discussions, there is space and time for teachers to disagree with their evaluator and come to common ground.

The suburban districts are often smaller than urban, which allows the ensemble directors to keep in regular contact with one another, to know better what music and teaching occur within the district, and to work together for cohesive curriculum across ages and grades. The presence of a music or art supervisor limits the content gap between administrator and teacher, as was seen in Joel's school, where he regarded his role as being a translator between principals and teachers; Joel was able to contextualize the rehearsal process for the other administrators in a language they understood. In many ways, he was an ally to the music faculty, in particular the ensemble directors.

The evaluations are supposed to be equalizers for all teachers. Hammerness (2003) suggested that when teachers' visions are constrained to technicist reflections, they often ignore "differences in school and classroom contexts . . . demands and issues that may vary considerably from setting to setting" (p. 44). Yet, in urban areas, there are different resources, different factors, different student backgrounds. The discourse of location and privilege is not silenced, but quiet. Evaluative policies have little to no space to address the issues of poverty that impact educational achievement based on location (Otterman 2011). As such, the system is skewed. Teachers in urban areas are kept to the

same standards as suburbia. There is no equalizer without evaluation, in the stakeholders' eyes. As such, it is a setup for disaster. As Amrein-Beardsley (2014) stated, "student background and out-of-school factors are significantly more important" (p. 85) than the influence of in-school factors and resources on teaching and learning outcomes. Given the nature of urban areas, which have pockets of poverty, the typical urban school cannot function—or perform—as a policymaker might describe, in the same way as a high-functioning urban or most suburban schools. There is a serious disconnect between the importance of implementation within urban areas and the context. As seen in this study, it was prevalent in ensemble classrooms.

In suburban settings, the community mindset is invested in music and art, providing cultural opportunities for children both inside and outside of school. Conversely, as Andy described, some urban parents do not often come to school auditorium concerts. This echoed Benedict's (2006a) observation, that typically urban music education is not quality or something in which a school community invests. Wilson expanded upon the norms of the urban community mindset, explaining that "serious music education" is only at the performing arts schools. There are very few ensemble programs which are deemed "good programs" in elementary or middle school. These anecdotes negate what Secretary of Education Arnie Duncan reported in 2011:

> School districts and their local partners in inner cities and rural communities are overcoming poverty and family breakdown to create high-performing schools, including charters and traditional public schools. They are taking bold steps to turn around low- performing schools by investing in teachers, rebuilding school staff, lengthening the school day and changing curricula. (n.p.)

While the evaluation systems are goals to rebuild—or eliminate school staff—they cannot overcome poverty and family dynamics, the extrinsic factors of a child's school life. The ensemble directors' teaching experiences pointed to this.

The three suburban administrators who came from an urban background—Mauro, Bradley, and José—spoke to the difference in quality of teachers and administrators in each location. Bradley has seen many teachers get their "growing pains" out in the city and then come to suburbia. He, too, was a product of this phenomenon. Mauro said that the bar is low in the city because of low job qualifications; as a result, the administrators have poor content knowledge, which causes them to adhere to rubrics. This supports the issue that urban and suburban schools are being held to the same standards, yet are innately different because of community mindset, preparation of content and pedagogy, and resources. Hargreaves and Braun (2013) described that the evaluation systems, in order to be more equalized among schools, "holds schools and districts accountable for effective delivery of results, but without holding system leaders accountable for providing the resources and conditions that are necessary to secure those results" (p. 24).

While some music educators and administrators (such as Frank) felt that part of music teacher evaluation must include festival ratings, the rate of difference among location (and in turn, privilege) would be great. As Wilson described from his own experiences taking his chorus to festival, the adjudicators were listening for a particular sound for the repertoire, a more refined sound. This supported Hash's (2012) findings that results vary widely depending upon adjudication panels. As such, his urban chorus was rated against the model sound for the repertoire, most likely with a suburban sound in mind. The chorus received lower ratings because it was full of students with no prior

formal music education, and whose voices were different because they "scream like this on the schoolyard every day. Or their mothers scream at them down the hall, down the block saying 'Get home. It's getting dark.'" There was no point of reference from the adjudicators. This experience for Wilson could be equated to the discrepancies of evaluation ratings. If ensemble directors are to have festival ratings added to their evaluations, there needs to be a clear delineation of context.

Surveillance

The ensemble directors discerned that their administrators and the larger school community were watching them, both in musical concert performances and through observation evaluation ratings. For the directors, these onlookers may seem to be in the watchtower of the Panopticon. As a public school teacher, I too felt that "everyone else" was watching me. Yet, after speaking with the administrators and hearing their stories, I believed that it was clear that *all* of the participants were in the Panopticon, always being surveyed. Foucault (1995) reminded us that the observer in the watchtower "will be able to judge them continuously, alter their behaviour, impose upon them the methods he thinks best; and it will even be possible to observe the director himself" (p. 204). The judgments are in the forms of ratings and the ability to give an ineffective rating. Changes in behaviors are evidenced by the participants' changing pedagogical strategies, such as Gloria and Lou adopting a "chameleon-like" teaching identity. There is a discourse of power and fear at play. Watching all of the players automatically holds them accountable. As such, everyone complies.

There are different levels or layers of the Panopticon, in a sense, controlling the players of the educational institutions. The ensemble directors are in the prison cells as

the administrators watch them. On another level, the administrators, too, are in cells, with the community, district supervisors, and policymakers silently watching them. They are being watched in the form of data results and evaluation rankings, the number of Highly Effective and Effective ratings per school building.

According to Foucault, such actions would make prisoners/people docile and, in a sense, powerless, objectified. And yet, the participants of this study—through their words, teachings and actions—are anything but objects. They are living people, subjects, who are enacting in ways of agency, creating a narrative for themselves. Perhaps this may be attributed to the fact that all of the participants are mid-career teachers, and retain some sort of professional identity (though at times compromised).

The Male Dominance

It is critical to note that all of the administrator participants were male; there is a gender discourse present, though unbeknownst to the participants. There is a silencing of female voices from the administrator group. According to a 2013 population survey by the U.S. Department of Labor, 43.3% of high school teachers are male. In middle school, only 19% of teachers are male. In 2012, 43.3% of high school arts and music teachers were male (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). Phyall (2013) believed that "statistics are often explained in terms of how our society perceives (and often teaches) women to behave: as nurturing figures who care for children" (n.p.). Each administrator had over five years teaching in his content subject prior to his leadership position. The role of administrator is one of leadership, and may be seen as one of power and authority

within the community. These descriptors may negate the qualities of our societal notions of females as nurturing and caring.

Had some of the participants been female, I fathom that their responses might be different, especially on issues of building trust and relationships with teachers. While some female administrators might show a personal and caring side, others might have been less human and more business-like in order to emit a more professional and sterner or controlled tone—as if to solidify the rationale for them being in a role which has traditionally been held by men. They might feel they need to adhere to the rubric to show a more business-side element to their role; by contrast, Bradley, Frank and Mauro omitted the rubrics in their beginning observations to allow for more objectivity. As such, I suspect females might not have responded to admitting their weaknesses as a supervisor, something which the men did not avoid doing. I am reminded of Bradley's openness and vulnerability in speaking about how he might have been of better use in the classroom than as an administrator, and I wonder if a female administrator would respond in such a way. Stew, the urban high school band director who has a female non-music assistant principal, discussed that his supervisor does not know what she does not know. This might hint that she is trying to convey a particular professional identity or character to her faculty that she is in control of knowing good pedagogy, regardless of subject or content. This speaks to the larger discourse of power, as Foucault (1984, 1990) stated, of the female wanting to exert importance or dominance, which may be construed as a masculine trait, thus silencing the spaces for others to speak or act.

Comfort Levels and Contradictions

These interviews revolved around the topic of teacher evaluation, specifically in music ensembles. The very nature of teacher evaluation lends itself to educators being guarded or tensing up, as the policies change constantly and their high-stakes nature makes people uneasy. Additionally, the participants were speaking about their professions, something which they all took very seriously. I noticed a divide between the ways in which the two groups engaged with me. The ensemble directors were very happy to speak with me, to open up and talk about their programs and their experiences. They told many stories and quickly became personal in sharing them with me, as if to let their guard down. While I asked them about how they chose their repertoire to see if the evaluation systems affected how they approached the musical texts, the directors jumped at the opening to speak more about this. It was as if they had not opportunities to speak about musical material with anyone in a while and relished this discussion topic. Even Andy, a flounderer who felt a sense of futility in his program and purpose, perked up at the chance to speak about band repertoire. I might attribute this to the stress they feel in this age of accountability. This supported Griffith et al.'s (1999) research, which described how work-related stress may yield low social support. In a sense, I was providing a sense of social support for the ensemble directors by fostering a space in which they could speak and reflect on their experiences. For the participants, my role as a music teacher was more important than as a researcher because they felt a connection to me, given that I, too, had once been in their shoes.

The principals, as public figures for their school communities, began their conversations in an almost rehearsed way, as if they had scripted answers which they

continually use in speaking with teachers, parents, and community members. At first, I felt they were trying to see if my role was to catch them off guard with questions; I felt them fixate on me, as if to keep one step ahead of my questions to feel more in control of the conversation. These administrators were used to being watched and were always on their toes as a result. In many ways, they are like the prisoners living in the Panopticon, so their actions reflect the norm of keeping themselves in check. However, our interviews became more casual as I tried to ask questions based on what they had previously said and gave side comments, commending them on their ideas. I feel they soon realized I was not out to “get them” by any means, but was more interested in their experiences. Three suburban administrators—Bradley, Mauro, and José —all taught in urban areas prior to their current positions. When beginning our interviews, I shared my background with them as an urban teacher. This became a starting point to have a casual conversation about my time there, and they all knew the school in which I taught and the principal. It appeared that knowing I came from the same “roots” as they did helped us form a quick bond, and allowed the three to open up to me more honestly. Again, I was an insider to them—one of them—instead of just a researcher. They were not afraid to describe the stark contrasts between their time in urban schools versus the current suburban school, in terms of how they were evaluated and how they themselves evaluate now. Many of the administrators became very open with me, to the point of asking me multiple times to be sure to change their names in this study or not quote them on anything they divulged too honestly so they could protect themselves. The only administrator whom did not seem to change demeanor throughout the interview was Lucian. While he was perfectly informative and interesting to speak with, I felt he was the most rehearsed of the group,

giving me "safe" answers I could not misinterpret. Again, I attributed this to his new role as director of teacher effectiveness; he clearly has much pressure to perform and produce at a high level, and as such was not able to remove himself from his role.

Additionally, at times I noted contradictions in the participants' words. For example, Gloria spoke about how she was trying to adopt a more student-centered approach in her choral rehearsals, which was suggested to her in a post-observation discussion. She understood the importance of trying to shift her practice for this because it would yield better student engagement. Yet within the same conversation, she spoke about being a chameleon and changing her pedagogy based on who observed her. Similarly, Lou the orchestra teacher described a high level of comfort in being observed and feeling secure in his teaching pedagogies and professional identity. However, he too has changed his pedagogy to meet the desires of his administrators by incorporating more technology into his rehearsals. Joel, whose role is to provide support for his music staff, contradicted himself in terms of contextualizing student-centered learning. Once saying that ensembles are innately student-centered, he further explained that our questioning techniques do not often engage students in deeper thought. There was a contradiction here, as higher-level questioning techniques are more student-centered because the aim is to spark student thought and participation.

Half of the ensemble directors outwardly noted they would like to have a music supervisor evaluating them instead of their current evaluator. Their responses were such because they wanted specific music feedback in their rehearsals. This supported Taebel's (1990a) study which found that music teachers generally supported their evaluation program; however, they doubted the qualifications and expertise of their evaluators. Yet,

some of the ensemble directors, such as Wilson and Jacob, changed their minds very quickly after saying they desired a content specialist because there could be a debate in sound quality or pedagogical preference between two musicians, while the administrator would expect the teacher to make the changes. This may relate to Hash's (2012) research that there may be uneven musical expectations between an evaluator (a festival adjudicator in Hash's study) and the conductor-teacher.

Chapter VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Pedagogy is ever-changing, and is formed and reformed daily in the classroom through engagements with students and personal reflection. It is a process. While evaluation systems aim to provide equity and fairness in rating teachers, they have disrupted the teaching and learning process for students, teachers, and administrators. Additionally, many pedagogical techniques have favored standardization; that is, making all classrooms look similar. This closes off space and opportunity for critical pedagogies and student-centered learning. For the teacher, it limits the space for growth, reflection, and learning (Habermas, 1998; Mezirow, 2000). This study aimed to describe the ways in which music ensemble directors and administrators negotiate these disruptions in their routines and pedagogies.

Although state and national evaluation policies dictate the responsibilities of administrators and teachers, the ways in which they are implemented can alleviate much pressure and fear. The rapport and bedside manner administrators have with their teachers can open space for conversations about pedagogy. For ensemble directors, this should be a space not to defend one's actions, but to contextualize musical material for supervisors and take into consideration feedback, which may be easily implemented into rehearsals. When either the teacher or the supervisor fails to recognize the specific context of teaching, they adopt what Myers (2013) referred to as "standards that reduce

us to the mean" (n.p.). What might the implications for our field mean if we challenge and negate to adopt such "standards"?

My desire to pursue this research stemmed from my own personal experiences with teacher evaluation as a choral and piano teacher working in the New York City public schools. I needed an outlet to make sense of my experiences with evaluation. I realized that other teachers, specifically ensemble directors, might need the space to think through how their teaching and learning have been affected by the new evaluation policies and incentives.

The purpose of this phenomenological interview research was to share, both individually and collectively, how a group of secondary school ensemble directors and administrators with musical and non-musical backgrounds described the effect of implementing standardized teacher evaluations in their practices and perspectives. The participants' personal and shared narratives help to better explain and navigate the changing waves of educational policy in light of their own experiences. Three research questions drove the study, focusing on mid-career middle and high school ensemble directors and administrators with music and non-music backgrounds.

A qualitative study was deemed most appropriate for providing space to solicit the voices of the participants and highlight the essence of their words. This qualitative research focused on interview research through a phenomenological lens. The methodologies used in this study included interview research (Kvale, 2007) and document review (Danielson, 2007, 2013). Semi-structured interviews were selected as the primary method of data collection in this study. This method was most useful in this research because it allowed great potential for rich, thick description from the

participants. It also allowed me as the researcher to stray from my questions; supplement with additional questions, comments and statements; and provide space to refine statements and probe the participants for stories and information. Semi-structured one-on-one interviews took place during the Fall of 2014. Data collection and analysis were employed through an adaptation of Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) (Smith & Osborn, 2003). Accessing the participants' points of view—their narrative—was of utmost concern.

Conclusions

This study began with three questions:

1. How do mid-career middle and high school music ensemble educators negotiate and manage the regulations of the contemporary teacher evaluation systems? How do these negotiations affect the planning of curriculum, preparation of repertoire and rehearsal, and performance goals/ends?
2. How do administrators both with and without music education expertise negotiate and manage the regulations of the contemporary teacher evaluation systems, specifically in terms of the role and purpose of musical ensembles?
3. How do middle and high school ensemble directors and administrators understand and articulate their roles in this new context?

Considering the analysis of the findings in this study, several conclusions can be drawn. These conclusions are organized by research question.

Research Question 1

Each of the participants articulated his or her own experiences with teacher evaluation in ensembles. Overall, the ensemble directors felt a sense of autonomy in writing curriculum. They were not asked to change or construct curriculum to align with other subjects. Only one participant, Andy, was asked to bridge his curriculum to ELA and math, incorporating the standards for these subjects and making his classroom look more mainstream. Additionally, the participants stated that repertoire drives their curriculum. Each teacher had begun to consider planning differently. For example, Jacob began writing curriculum because he knew it was a better alternative to being scolded for not having one or handing in a pre-existing curriculum that did not fit with his teaching style. Conversely, Anna chose repertoire to yield project-based learning, often straying from the traditional band rehearsal.

Student-centered pedagogy was a topic the participants said their administrators wanted to see implemented in the ensemble classroom room. It was not mentioned as part of the curriculum, but used constantly instead of assuming the traditional conductor role. Some teachers reported that ensembles are naturally engaging and innately student-centered. To honor the students' worlds (Giroux, 1998), they chose repertoire that students might like to request. Anna let her students drive their own learning through her questioning and facilitating of projects; she relinquished her role as conductor and embraced her role of educator to accomplish this, focusing on a student-centered model (Palmer, 2007). Other ensemble directors made changes to their pedagogy as a result of their post-observation conversations with their administrators, and noted more musical and engaging performances of the repertoire as the students took more ownership.

Regarding performance goals—which may be contextualized in terms of musical performance or student growth performance—the teachers contextualized this more to describe their purpose within the building, or what their overall goals were for their students. In general, however, the teachers felt their purpose was not to supplement other classes, but to help students be able to use their tools and understandings from ensemble and draw on them in their lives. Additionally, in the urban schools, the teachers felt their purpose was to bring music to a different part of the students' worlds and to the school community.

However, when looking at performance goals through the lens of teacher evaluations, the ensemble directors' feelings were mixed. Some felt the evaluations were inapplicable to them. The questioning techniques suggested to them by their supervisors did not fit because conductors have to model, detect, and fix errors, often showing how to fix. Moreover, questioning appeared low-level to non-music administrators, such as "was that in tune?" which is a more complex question for an ensemble student than may appear to be. The other half of the teachers felt that the inapplicability of ensembles and evaluations had been self-imposed by the profession.

The ensemble directors seemed to have boxed themselves off from the rest of the school and taught administrators to do the same for years. Now, in attempts to equalize under the teacher evaluation systems and policies, ensemble directors were fearful and unsure of how to make the pedagogical changes their supervisors suggested to them that are not conductor-led. Good pedagogy applies to all, regardless of subject, and ensemble directors need to embrace this new world of student-centeredness and less conductor-centric models. Approaching rehearsals away from the podium may lead to more student

engagement and interest, and yield greater musical and non-musical results, as it did in Anna's and Gloria's classrooms. A more student-centered approach to ensemble teaching may also narrow the gap between music class and other subjects for students, teachers, parents, and administrators, as particular approaches may transcend discipline. Additionally, it is vitally important to have conversations with administrators—specifically non-music administrators—to talk through the ensemble process while remaining open to making certain pedagogical changes. This echoes Danielson's (2007) premise of her framework. Each teacher and administrator is growing. While they are professionals, there is always something to learn and improve. This also supports Mezirow's (2000) theory of transformative learning—that we as adults, specifically educators, may constantly change if we reflect on and guide our practice. While ensemble directors have not always had to construct curriculum in the same fashion as other course subjects, it would be useful to do so to provide students with better teaching and learning opportunities. Spending time thinking through the rehearsal process and locating the conductor in the space may allow students to take greater control of their rehearsals, which is fruitful for overall learning and pedagogical change.

Research Question 2

The job of an administrator is endless. Paperwork, observations, evaluations, and meetings infiltrate an administrator's daily routine. The administrators in this study described that the evaluation systems and policies are a formality. That is, they are part of the biznocratic agenda to make education look more like a business model and yield high productivity from teachers and students. The administrators comply because they have to; yet, as a result, they tweak the evaluation systems to fit their schools and teachers more

effectively. With these tweaks is the acknowledgment of having clear expectations between the administrator and teacher. The administrators articulate what will be observed and evaluated and acknowledge the teacher as a person. The participants noted that they did not expect perfection; every teacher cannot constantly live in the world of Highly Effective on Danielson's rubric. However, Danielson provided a basis for conversation and expectations, which allows administrators to find common ground with their teachers. It is up to administrators to foster these conversations in an open and honest way, instead of as a formality to obtain the evaluation. The purpose of conversations is for teachers to reflect on their practice and consider ways of improvement. The participants in this study approached observations with an open mind, yet not all administrators do; rather, they stick religiously to a rubric may cloud the observation experience.

Complementing clear expectations of teachers and observation protocol is the issue of trust. Regardless of subject, the administrators felt that teachers must feel safe to try new pedagogies and take risks in the classroom. Regarding the purpose of music ensembles in schools specifically during this age of accountability, the administrators' feelings have not changed. On the whole, the participants wanted the students to love music beyond school, and to be dedicated and committed while they experience social learning through music. However, to achieve this, student-centered learning must be emphasized to allow students to take control of their experiences. For the administrators, this begins with asking questions, which involves thought. Musically, this means looking at a score and considering the extra-musical concepts that can be pulled from music. This carries the music off the page into the students' worlds, helping them to think and engage

with the music instead of having to follow a conductor. Small tweaks in ensemble practice may make a world of difference for students, instead of keeping conductors static and hidden behind the differences between ensembles and other subjects. Finding a pedagogical focus and good teaching is more important than a high-quality performing group, according to the administrators. The administrators' words are a call to the ensemble profession to push past traditional notions, ego, and fear of change to embrace alternative pedagogies.

Lastly, location often determines success. This may be urban versus suburban, or having a quality administrator in the building who can maneuver around student and teacher data. The administrators in this study were open and honest, and spoke together to help improve teacher reflection and pedagogy. Had the administrator sample been different, this might have changed. In my own personal situation, I was observed by an administrator who was mechanical and tied to the rubric. She had no mal intent, but was overloaded with responsibility and wanted to breeze through the observations due to time restraints. In two of the suburban schools in this study, in order to better deal with teacher evaluation, they have omitted the Highly Effective rating from the rubric to prevent competition, fear, and stress. They were able to do this because their state test scores were high, which means teacher average scores will always come out to be Effective and nothing less. Such was the case for Frank's urban school and Mauro's suburban school. In other schools, teachers can never attain a Highly Effective mark because of the percentage weigh-in of these state tests—that 20% of the teacher's overall rating for ELA and math affects the teacher's rating. In some urban schools in this study, such as

Wilson's, teachers have experienced this. A more careful eye on these data is needed to make sense and allow for teachers to be more fairly rated.

Research Question 3

How do middle and high school ensemble directors and administrators understand and articulate their roles in this new context? The ensemble director participants have wrestled with the duality of conductor and teacher more under the new evaluation systems and policies. Many of them needed to identify which role was presiding more—the conductor or the educator. The participants entered their teaching knowing how to run efficient and effective rehearsals, which were conductor-led and driven. Learning to think more curricularly and embracing the educational side have been challenging. Traditional ensemble pedagogy has a tendency to be more behaviorist or anti-student centered because it is teacher-led. Anna spoke to this and challenged it in her ensemble rehearsals. Wilson experienced the conductor-centric rehearsals growing up in a chorus. The teachers in this study were seeking balance between their teacher and musician selves, or finding *poloses* (Stamou & Custodero, 2007).

Andy has had to negotiate his musician self in his school because he felt he did not fit in with his colleagues due to his artistic side. He often felt left out and alone to figure out what certain pedagogies looked like in band. For Andy and for other ensemble directors, having a network of colleagues in a similar location and discipline was important to find the musician/conductor-teacher balance and realize the pedagogical concepts in the rehearsal space.

The ensemble directors admitted that much of their role involved appeasing and complying with their administrators' post-observation suggestions in order to yield an

appropriate (or high) rating. There is also the issue of music versus non-music administrator support. A non-musical supervisor may not be able to provide musical feedback or suggestions that might be applicable to an ensemble setting. Such was the case for Stew and Wilson. Stew felt the lack of a music specialist stunted his professional growth. While administrators cannot be experts in every subject, they can foster conversations to help teachers work through their pedagogical choices and work towards making better musical decisions; they may also seek the expertise of other music colleagues, which Joel—who is a music specialist—often did.

The administrators struggled with finding a balance in their new role as evaluator, which also encompasses data specialist, because they have to be keen on test scores, student growth improvement scores, and teacher rubric (Danielson) ratings. For Bradley, who was a teacher for many years before being an assistant principal, he struggled with having to uphold the community expectations of what an administrator should be and do as well as his own expectations. The community expected someone serious who could discipline, whereas Bradley wanted to connect with the students to understand them and their motives more deeply. As well, Bradley questioned whether he would be more useful as a teacher than as an administrator under the new evaluation policies.

Additionally, fostering positive learning environments and observation spaces is a large part of the administrator's role, that is, being able to read teacher needs and provide support—pedagogically and beyond. The music administrators said they often felt they were translators for the other administrators. Joel attested to this when he spoke to superintendents and principals on behalf of his music teachers.

On the whole, the administrators felt overwhelmed. It was proving difficult to provide as much support as they would like to for their teachers because of time. Also, there was little to no time to roll out and practice new policy incentives that came from the district. Change does not occur quickly, and without time, teachers and administrators cannot effectively tweak their pedagogy and practice in the ways they should.

Our different identities shape our roles as educators and supervisors. The ways in which the teachers and administrators reacted to the evaluation policies clustered them into subgroups of compliants, subversives, and flounderers. For some teachers and administrators, their identities were muddied as a result of these new evaluation policies. Gloria and Lou found themselves being chameleons—changing their pedagogy to the preferences of the evaluator/observer when being watched. Bradley felt pulled between his teacher self and his administrator self, and had a hard time negotiating the two. For many of the participants, their professional identity (Coulter & Lester, 2011) was in flux. This was due to the demands from the evaluation incentives. Yet, despite the evaluation implementations, some participants remained unchanged. Teachers such as Jacob and Tim felt secure in their teaching selves, and were confident that administrators would not challenge their pedagogy or musical decisions.

Findings

The findings of this study, stemming from the participants' voices and experiences, were many. Findings pointed to issues of validity (or invalidity) of the Danielson Framework for music ensembles. The ways in which the Framework is used within ensembles is questionable, and is often based on evaluator/administrator, and

location. Additionally, the use of the Framework may point toward the invalid implementation in other types of music instruction, such as general music. Yet, the participants' experiences, particularly the ensemble directors, point toward shifts in what student-centered learning may look like, rethinking the role of conductor in public school ensembles.

Depending on their individual experiences and the ways in which they responded to their experiences, participants were identified into groups of compliants, subversives and flounderers. Compliants followed the suggestions and rules asked of them; subversives made small shifts of defiance within their teaching to cheat the system. Flounderers could not make sense of their situations and felt a sense of hopelessness and futility. However, each participant, including administrators, engaged in ways of both complying and cheating the system to yield positive ratings outcomes. While the participants engaged in these acts of agency, many of them remained compliant, changing their practice and pedagogy to yield a desired rating or positive feedback, or made small acts of subversion, almost unnoticeable to their evaluators. Additionally, professional identities were questioned and compromised, and teacher and administrator roles were continuously negotiated.

There was a stark contrast of evaluation protocol, teacher ratings and the notions of pedagogical privilege related to location, such as urban versus suburban. The political climate changed depending on school district and the ways administrators implemented the evaluative Framework. Linked to the political climate, the concept of surveillance was great within this study: the notion that the participants were being watched by a higher authority, which kept them in check and complying. While Foucault (1977) would

argue that surveillance would create a power struggle and ultimately objectify those not in power, these specific participants broke free from this norm. Their acts of agency and the ways in which they were not afraid to share their experiences with me and acknowledge the realities of the high-stakes evaluative world in the classroom proved false against the theory of surveillance and the Panopticon. Lastly, the dominance of male administrators and the ways in which their experiences—as well as their teachers' experiences—may be different than if a female were evaluating.

Implications

The implications of this study are divided into two parts: implications for practice and implications for teacher education programs. While the two are connected in many ways, it is important to distinguish between both because there are different end goals associated with each. For practitioners, knowing how to navigate the choppy waters of teacher evaluation is important. For teacher education programs, a keen eye on how to construct courses and curriculum is needed to prepare students for the field during the ever-changing age of accountability.

Application to Practice

The implementation of these systems is imbalanced depending on location, which speaks to a larger discourse and discrepancy of privilege and location. While data may yield much information on student progress, data also have limitations. The interpreters of these data—administrators and, more importantly policymakers—have a responsibility to use data in a mindful and meaningful way, and recognize that the data cannot solve problems; primarily human interaction—teaching and learning, providing support and

opportunities for growth—can. Not all the components of the Danielson Framework might apply to music, specifically ensembles, as the participants said. At the same time, many of the components that ensemble teachers think do not apply really do, as mentioned by Anna, Caleb, and José, a band teacher and music administrators. This study affirmed that conversations between teacher and administrator are vital in speaking and working through these issues and any discrepancies.

The findings of this study, while supporting much of the literature on teacher evaluation and specifically music teacher evaluation, do negate some key points. The largest point involves the application of the rubrics to the ensemble and rehearsal process. School ensembles have been crucial locations of the preservation and perpetuation of normative practices. More than half of the administrators noted that good pedagogy transcends a rehearsal process, and that all teachers should be practicing good pedagogy, even if it means making shifts in what they have done for years. These shifts involve making changes in the rehearsal process, beginning with the role of conductor and embracing a more student-centered rehearsal. In this way, there is more of a balance between acquiring skill, which is often a teacher-led activity, and having students engage in learning experiences to create, arrange, or make musical decisions for their section or the whole ensemble. Additionally, perhaps tweaking the component and domain headings to point to more musical competencies may aid in evaluation for both teachers and evaluators, along the lines of the Indiana Music Educators Association's (2012) Music Teacher Effectiveness Rubric. This rubric examines comprehensive teaching, engages students in varied musical experiences, differentiates instruction, provides for application of musical skill and knowledge, utilizes musically appropriate assessments, demonstrates

commitment to cross-curricular instruction, and provides a model for professionalism. Headings such as these combine the Danielson headings but situate them in a more musical way, yet they are palatable and easy for non-music administrators to follow.

While Domain 4 of the Danielson Framework points to professional responsibilities and activities, there is no mention of showing joy or passion for working with children. Yet, every administrator pointed to these qualities as the core of being a quality teacher. While currently there is no way to measure the passion and heart of a teacher or an ensemble director, perhaps having a space for narrative on the side of the components would help bring (and document) these qualities to the post-observation conversation. Mauro has created a template in his school for his observations which contains the rubric on the left-hand side of the page and a space to write comments and narratives on the open right-hand side. For him, this space reminds him to look for and acknowledge the parts of teaching that count—the positive interactions with students. Small shifts in the layout of the rubrics might help administrators recognize these qualities while trying to measure "good" or "successful" teaching (Fenstermacher & Richardson, 2005).

Teacher Education Programs

Within teacher education programs, there is not often one consistent view of ensemble director for preservice teachers. Rather, there is much emphasis on acquiring musical skills to run rehearsals and write successful lesson plans (Nierman et al., 2002). As such, it may be predictable that new teachers face dilemmas in functioning within a larger educative setting as well as balancing their identity as both musician and teacher. Perhaps teacher education programs may consider fostering dispositions of creative

problem solvers and reflective practitioners. While edTPA has a reflective component for preservice teachers, which many teacher education programs have adopted into their courses, a more careful eye on problem solving and problem-based learning may be needed to prepare teachers with the proper language and pedagogy to see beyond a conductor-centric and skill-based world.

Additionally, there is often no emphasis in teacher education programs on teaching in urban schools and the differences that accompany this. The teachers and administrators in this study had different needs and populations of students, yet the majority of the conductors were trying to build choruses in the traditional fashion. Urban settings are often looked upon by music educators as "places of desperation . . . as places where 'quality' music programs don't stand a chance" (Benedict, 2006a, p. 3). All music teacher education programs should incorporate issues of urban teaching and curriculum, including practicums and student teaching experiences in an urban setting. This image of urban music education must be challenged and re-envisioned, and teacher educators should be presented with the possibility of urban music programs (Benedict, 2006a), both in critical and creative pedagogies as well as performing ensembles.

Areas of Future Research

The world of high-stakes evaluation is not disappearing from the climate of education anytime soon. Politicians will continue to watch over the schools with a careful eye to ensure productivity and growth results. As such, we need to continue to examine the effects of evaluation systems on our practice because research may inform action. Given the reality that administrators believe change happens over time, longitudinal

studies would benefit research by examining the discourses that arise as ensemble teachers and administrators experience them. Since the policies on evaluation change constantly, it would be interesting to see how administrators' and teachers' perceptions and experiences change over time as a result. To spend a year speaking with Wilson, for example, who has had low evaluation ratings, would uncover a more defined trajectory of his thinking and pedagogical shifts. Additionally, to have multiple conversations with someone like Bradley, who has questioned his role of administrator in light of enacting evaluations, would uncover more about the underlying identities of administrative roles.

Having focus groups with the participants may also prove useful because they are opportunities for the ensemble directors to be with colleagues, as many of them were singletons in their school. The same may prove true for administrators, as a chance to think about music in a different light, with music and non-music backgrounds sitting together and reflecting.

While the participants' narratives are present in this study, they are more collective to better understand the phenomenon of music teacher evaluation, particularly in ensembles. Focusing on three or four ensemble directors or administrators through a narrative lens over the course of a school year would provide more long-term insight into how participants fare with the new evaluation systems. Additionally, a more in-depth study looking at administrators and how they gain their knowledge of music instruction might provide better understanding of the evaluation process, such as spending a year with three new or mid-career principals in urban and suburban settings.

A larger survey study, either by region or nationally, would reach a more extensive population beyond the metropolitan area delimited for this study. This future

study could solicit participants through NAfME membership or social media such as Facebook groups (Music Teachers, Choral Directors, etc.).

The new NAfME Workbooks, which are tailored to the Danielson Framework but situated musically, are tools to help both teachers and administrators contextualize what the components of teaching and learning may look like in different musical settings. The workbooks provide specific examples and critical attributes of each domain, fitted to general music and ensembles. It would be of value to our community to interview the developers of these workbooks for insights into how they constructed them because they are more at a national level and dealing with policy. Also, speaking with principals about the workbooks and helping them use the books for observations would provide more context on musically-situated evaluations.

Similar studies such as this should be expanded to other types of music teachers and not be limited to ensemble music teachers. For example, what are the ways elementary general music teachers are experiencing policy changes as they usually see their students once per week?

I would be eager to speak with music teachers and administrators in the same school buildings to see how they may work as co-change agents, navigating the choppy waters of teacher evaluations and incentives, and to examine the individual experiences of the music teachers and administrators based on the grade level they currently teach. For example, do high school ensemble directors display a higher level of stress or dissatisfaction with evaluation systems than do elementary schools? Do elementary administrators have less support in their evaluations of ensemble directors? The experience of guided reflection on practice to a trusted third party might be a process that

can benefit professional development not only for practicing teachers but also for teacher educators as well.

Epilogue

As the researcher of this study, I aimed to bracket my own experiences from the research (Moustakas, 1994), especially in speaking with the participants, so as not to cloud their thoughts or answers. Yet, as a result of engaging with these participants, both ensemble directors and administrators, I feel transformed as a thinker, researcher, and teacher. Learning about the participants' teaching lives caused me to reflect on my practice in a new way, as both a practitioner and a teacher educator. At times, my own pedagogical struggles and beliefs, not only related to teacher evaluation but also to adopting new pedagogies, were validated by the stories shared. In addition, I gained a sense of possibility for my own classroom with young students as well as preservice teachers. Through the participants' words, I am able to gain a keener awareness of the importance of modeling and facilitating student-centered learning experiences in the preservice teacher music classroom, specifically in methods courses. Many music education majors have not had student-centered experiences in their own learning careers, specifically in ensembles in middle and high school. I also acknowledge the importance of creating space for reflection with preservice teachers. While there is a reflective component in edTPA, preservice teachers might not have the opportunities to reflect on their planning or teaching. Bringing a more learner-centered lens to the reflective practice, students may reflect in a variety of ways via written response, video response, visual response such as drawings or comics, or even podcast. This may help new teachers

prepare more mindfully for their new career and adopt a reflective practice to their everyday teaching.

Although the nature and function of teaching is a very personal and private endeavor, I was not prepared for the participants to open up in such a personal and vulnerable way. The participants wanted to talk about their experiences with me and share their stories, ideas, and feelings because many of them have not had anyone ask them how they are dealing with the new changes. The ensemble directors relished the discussions on repertoire selection and the rehearsal process, and felt at home speaking with someone in their discipline. The band teachers especially enjoyed speaking about repertoire and rehearsal techniques with me, even though I do not have an instrumental background. This space was important for them to honor their worlds and for me to recognize the need to honor these worlds while allowing others to make meaning of their situations and experiences.

REFERENCES

Aaronson, D., Barrow, L., & Sander, W. (2007). Teachers and student achievement in the Chicago Public High Schools. *Journal of Labor Economics*, *25*(1), 95-135.

Abeles, H. F. (2010). The historical contexts of music education. In H. F. Abeles & L. A. Custodero, (Eds.), *Critical issues in music education: Contemporary theory and practice*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Aguilar, C. E., & Richerme, L. K. (2014). What is everyone saying about teacher evaluation? Framing the intended and inadvertent causes and consequences of Race to the Top. *Arts Education Policy Review*, *115*(4), 110-120.

Allsup, R. E. (in press). *A longing for openings, reforming school and university music education*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. London, England: New Left Books.

Amrein-Beardsley, A. (2014). *Rethinking value-added models in education: Critical perspectives on tests and assessment-based accountability*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Armor, D., Conroy-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A., et al. (1976). *Analysis of the school preferred reading programs in selected Los Angeles minority schools* (Report No. R-2007-LAUSD). Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). *Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement.* New York, NY: Longman.

Barrett, J. (2011). Judging quality and fostering excellence in music teaching. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 21*(1), 1-6.

Benedict, C. (2006a). Defining ourselves as other: Envisioning transformative possibilities. In C. Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Benedict, C. (2006b). Chasing legitimacy: The US National Music Standards viewed through a critical theorist framework. *Music Education Research, 8*(1), 17-32.

Benedict, C. L. (2012). Critical and transformative literacies: Music and general education. *Theory Into Practice*, *51*(3), 152-158.

Bernard, C. (2015). The shoe that doesn't fit: Contextualizing music teacher evaluation. In S. Conkling & D. Orzolek (Eds.), *Navigating crossroads*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bowman, W. D. (1998). *Philosophical perspectives on music*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Brandt, C., Mathers, C., Oliva, M., Brown-Sims, M., & Hess, J. (2007). *Examining district guidance to schools on teacher evaluation policies in the Midwest region. Issues & Answers. REL 2007-No. 030* (p. 37). Available from http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.cl.msu.edu.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/docview/62051055/13A3BEA6843676621E4/1?accountid=12598.

Breedlove, P. H. (2011). *Teacher evaluation in North Carolina: Teacher perceptions during a time of change* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3456442)

Brophy, T. (1993). Evaluation of music teachers: Toward defining an appropriate instrument. Unpublished paper. Retrieved from http://0-files.eric.ed.gov.opac.msmc.edu/fulltext/ED375029.pdf

Brophy, T., & Colwell, R. (2012). *Teacher evaluations: Issues of reliability and validity* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from http://smte.us/teacher-evaluation/resources-from-2012-nafme-conference/

Brown, S. W. (2005). Emily and Rebecca: A tale of two teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(6), 637-648.

Butt, G., & Lance, A. (2005). Secondary teacher workload and job satisfaction: Do successful strategies for change exist? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, *33*(4), 401-422.

Chambliss, M. J., Alexander, P. A., & Price, J. (2012). Epistemological threads in the fabric of pedagogical research. *Teachers College Record, 114,* 1-35.

Chong, S., & Low, E. (2009). Why I want to teach and how I feel about teaching—formation of teacher identity from pre-service to the beginning teacher phase. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 8*, 59-72. doi: 10.1007/s10671-008-9056-z

Coggshall, J. G., Ott, A., & Lasagna, M. (2010). *Convergence and contradictions in teachers' perceptions of policy reform ideas*. (Retaining Teacher Talent, Report No. 3). Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates and New York: Public Agenda. Retrieved from http://www.learningpt.org/expertise/educatorquality/genY/CommunicatingReform/index.php

Coldron, J., & Smith, R. (1999). Active location in teachers' construction of their professional identities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31*(6), 711-726. doi:10.1080/002202799182954

Conkling, S. (2003). Uncovering pre-service music teachers' reflective thinking: Making sense of learning to teach. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *155*, 11-23.

Conway, C. (2006). Navigating through induction: How a mentor can help. *Music Educators Journal, 92*(5), 56-60.

Cook, J. S. (2009). Coming into my own as a teacher: Identity, disequilibrium, and the first year of teaching. *The New Educator, 5*(4), 274-292.

Cooper, K., & Olson, M. R. (1996). The multiple 'I's of teacher identity. In M. Kompf, W. R. Bond, D. Dworet, & R. T. Boak (Eds.), *Changing research and practice: Teachers' professionalism, identities and knowledge* (pp. 78-89). London, England: Falmer.

Coulter, S., & Lester, J. N. (2011). Finding and redefining the meaning of teaching: Exploring the experiences of mid-career teachers. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 5*(2), 5-26.

Cranton, P. (2007). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning: A guide for educators of adults*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Danielewicz, J. (2001). *Teaching selves: Identity, pedagogy, and teacher education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Danielson, C. (2011). Evaluations that help teachers learn. *Educational Leadership*, *68*(4), 35-39.

Danielson, C. (2013). *The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument, 2013 Edition: The newest rubric enhancing the links to the Common Core State Standards, with clarity of language for ease of use and scoring*. The Danielson Group.

Danielson Group, The. (n.d). General questions about the framework. Retrieved from https://danielsongroup.org/questions-about-the-framework-for-teaching/

Darling-Hammond, L. (2013). *Getting teacher evaluation right: What really matters for effectiveness and improvement.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Baratz-Snowden, J. (2007). A good teacher in every classroom: Preparing the highly qualified teachers our children deserve. *Educational Horizons, 85*(2), 111-132.

David, J. L. (2010). What research says about . . . using value-added measures for evaluate teachers. *Educational Leadership*, *67*(8), 81-82.

De Wet, C. (2011). The professional lives of teacher victims of workplace bullying: A narrative analysis. *Perspectives in Education, 29*(4), 66-77.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008a). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2008b). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Derrida, J. (1973). *Speech and phenomena.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of grammatology.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

diFate, T. L. (2009). *Stress factors of elementary and middle school teachers associated with high stakes testing as required by No Child Left Behind* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI: 3329774)

Duncan, A. (2011). School reform: A chance for bipartisan governing. *Washington Post*, January 2. Accessed December 21, 2013, at http://www. washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/02/AR201101020 2378.html?referrer=emailarticle.

Dust, L. J. (2006). *The negotiation and reconciliation of musician and teacher identities* (M.Ed.). University of Alberta (Canada), Canada. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/dissertations/docview/304959138/abstract/13E242AE1BD7D35C25/1?accountid=14667

edTPA. (2015). Accessed from www.edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy

Ellis, C., Adams, T. E., & Bochner, A. P. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung*, 273-290.

Emert, D., Sheehan, S., & Deitz, O. D. (2013). Music teacher evaluation in Pennsylvania. *Music Educators Journal, 100*(1), 30-31.

Eros, J. (2013). Second-stage music teachers' perspectives of their professional development. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *22*(2), 20-33.

Featherstone, H. (1993). Learning from the first years of classroom teaching: The journey in, the journey out. *Teachers College Record*, *95*(1), 93-112.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*(6), 1013-1055.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2003, February). The multiple meanings of teacher induction: Implications for policy and practice. Address given at the Fifth Annual New Teacher Symposium, San Jose, CA.

Fenstermacher, G. D., & Richardson, V. (2005). On making determination of quality in teaching. *Teachers College Record, 107*, 186-213.

Ferrara, L. (1991). *Philosophy and the analysis of music*. New York, NY: Excelsior Music Publishing.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse of language.* New York, NY: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977.* New York, NY: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1984). The subject and power. In B. Wallis (Ed.), *Art after modernism* (pp. 417-432). Boston, MA: David R. Godine.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: Volume 1. An introduction.* New York, NY: Vintage.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum International.

Freire, P. (1998a). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Oxford, England: Rowman & Littlefield.

Freire, P. (1998b). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare to teach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Froelich, H. (2007). Institutional belonging, pedagogic discourse and music teacher education: The paradox of routinization. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6(3).

Gallagher, C., & Stahlnecker, K. (2002, April). Recreating teacher development through productive disequilibrium. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Gerrity, K. W. (2013). Measuring music education teacher evaluation in Indiana. *Music Educators Journal, 99*(4), 17-19.

Gill, B., Bruch, J., & Booker, K. (2013). Using alternative student growth measures for evaluating teacher performance: What the literature says. (REL 2013–002). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic. Available from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.

Giroux, H. (1998). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. New York, NY: Bergen & Garvey.

Goddard, H. J. (2004). *Elementary music teachers' and principals' perceptions of music teacher evaluation*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (UMI No. 3144268)

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 479-507.

Greene, M. (1994). Multiculturalism, community and the arts. In A. H. Dyson & C. Genishi (Eds.), *The need for story: Cultural diversity in classroom and community* (pp. 11-27). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Griffin, L. (2013). Charlotte Danielson on teacher evaluation and quality. *School Administrator, 1*(20). Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/content.aspx?id=26268

Griffith, J., Steptoe, A., & Cropley, M. (1999). An investigation of coping strategies associated with job stress in teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *69*(4), 517-531.

Gutstein, E. (2005). *Reading and writing the world with mathematics*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalization of society*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hadikin, R., & O'Driscoll, M. (2002). *The bullying culture*. Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Hall, P. S. (2005). Bullying and the teacher. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, *27*, 45-49.

Hammerness, K. (2003). Learning to hope, or hoping to learn? The role of vision in the early professional lives of teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *54*(1), 43-56.

Hargreaves, A., & Braun, H. (2013). *Data-driven improvement and accountability.* Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Accessed November 15, 2014, at http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/data- driven-improvement-accountability/.

Hash, P. M. (2012). An analysis of high school band contest ratings. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 60,* 81-100.

Hellman, D. (2007). *Impediments to the development of the music teacher: Impact of the social context in the music school on the emerging identity of future music educators*. Retrieved April 13, 2007, from http://smte.us/wpcontent/uploads/ 2007/02/rolesidentitysocialization conflict.pdf

Henry Barton, S. N. (2010). *Principals' perceptions of teacher evaluation practices in an urban school district.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (UMI No. 3420551)

Heston, M., Dedrick, C., Raschke, D., & Whitehead, J. (1996). Job satisfaction and stress among band directors. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 44*(4), 319-327.

Hill, H. C., Kapitula, L., & Umland, K. (2011). A validity argument approach to evaluating teacher value-added scores. *American Educational Research Journal*, *48*(3), 794-831. doi:10.3102/0002831210387916

Himmelein, M. E. (2009). *An investigation of principals' attitudes toward teacher evaluation processes.* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (UMI No. 3399151)

Hodge, G. M., Jupp, J. J., & Taylor, A. J. (1994). Work stress, distress and burnout in music and mathematics teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 64*(1), 65-76.

Hoel, H., & Beale, D. (2006). Workplace bullying, psychological perspectives and industrial relations: Towards a contextualized and interdisciplinary approach. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, *44*(2), 239-262.

Hoffer, C. (2008). *Introduction to music education*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Hout, M., & Elliott, S. W. (Eds.). (2011). *Incentives and test-based accountability in education*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Hubard, O. (2011). Being across homes. *Teachers College Record, 113*(10).

Indiana Music Educators Association (IMEA). (2012a). *Draft of Supplemental Self-Assessment Form*. Retrieved from http://www.imeamusic.org/advocacy/taskforce/downloads/assessmentsupplement.pdf

Indiana Music Educators Association (IMEA). (2012b). *Music teacher effectiveness rubric*. Retrieved from advocacy.nafme.org/teacher-evaluation/Indiana

Intrator, S. (2006). Beginning teachers and the emotional drama of the classroom. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *57*(3), 232-239.

Johnson, S. M. (2006). *The workplace matters: Teacher quality, retention, and effectiveness*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Kegan, R. (1982). *The evolving self: Problem and process in human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2003). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment.* London, England: Routledge.

Knowles, J. G. (1992). Models for understanding pre-service and beginning teachers' biographies. In I. Goodson (Ed.), *Studying teachers' lives* (pp. 99-152). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kohn, A. (2011). *Feel-bad education and other contrarian essays on children and schooling*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Koretz, D. (2008, Fall). A measured approach: Value-added models are a promising improvement, but no one measure can evaluate teacher performance. *American Educator*, 18-27, 39.

Kupermintz, H. (2003). Teacher effects and teacher effectiveness: A validity investigation of the Tennessee Value Added Assessment System. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *25*(3), 287-298.

Kvale, S. (2007). *Doing interviews*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kvale, S., & Brinkman, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kyriacou, C. (2001). Teacher stress: Directions for future research. *Educational Review, 53*(1), 27-35. doi:10.1080/00131910120033628

Kyriacou, C. (2011). Teacher stress: From prevalence to resilience. In J. Langan-Fox & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Handbook of stress in the occupations* (pp. 161-173). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Lacan, J. (1977). *Ecrits.* London, England: Tavistock.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a *nice* field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47-68.

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *Sociology Quarterly,* 34(4), 673-693.

Leonardo, Z. (2004). The color of supremacy: Beyond the discourse of 'white privilege.' *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 36*(2), 137-152.

Loup, K. S., Garland, J. S., Ellett, C. D., & Rugutt, J. K. (1996). Ten years later: Findings from a replication of a study of teacher evaluation practices in our 100 largest school districts*. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 10*(3), 203-226.

Lutgen-Sandvik P. (2003). The communicative cycle of employee emotional abuse: Generation and regeneration of workplace mistreatment. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *16*(4**)**, 471-501.

Lutrell, W. (2010). *Qualitative educational research: Readings in reflexive methodology and transformative practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Maranzano, C. (2002). *Evaluating music teachers in Virginia: Practices and perceptions*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (UMI No. 3041366).

Marion, S., & Buckley, K. (2011). *Approaches and consideration for incorporating student performance results from "non-tested" grades and subjects into educator effectiveness determinations*. Report of The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.nciea.org/ publications/Considerations%20for%20non-tested%20grades_SMKB2011.pdf

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCaffrey, D. F., Sass, T. R., Lockwood, J. R., & Mihaly, K. (2009). The intertemporal variability of teacher effect estimates. *Education Finance and Policy*, *4*(4), 572-606.

McLaren, P. (1989). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In A. Darder, M. Baltondano, & R. Torres (Eds.). *The critical pedagogy reader* (pp. 69-98). New York, NY: Routledge.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study application in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mertz, N. T., & Anfara, V. A. (2006). Conclusion: Coming full circle. In V. A. Anfara, Jr. & N. T. Mertz (Eds.), *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research* (pp. 189-196). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MetLife. (2013). *The MetLife survey of the American teacher: Challenges for school leadership*. Retrieved from https://www.metlife.com/assets/cao/foundation/ MetLife-Teacher-Survey-

Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to think like an adult: Core concepts of transformation theory. In J. Mezirow & Associates (Eds.), *Learning as transformation* (pp. 3-34). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mills, J., & Smith, J. (2003). Teachers' beliefs about effective instrumental teaching in schools and higher education. *British Journal of Music Education, 20*, 5-27. doi:10.1017/S0265051702005260

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murphy, M. M. T. (2008). *Teaching in the context of NCLB: A qualitative study of the impact on teachers' work, morale, and professional support* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest.

Music Educators National Conference (MENC). (1994). *Opportunity-to learn standards for music instruction: Grades preK-12*. Reston, VA: The National Association for Music Education.

Myers, D. (2013). Navigating and building capacity for music teaching. Paper presented at Society for Music Teacher Education conference, Greensboro, NC, September 27, 2013.

Myricks, N. B. (2009). *Principals' perceptions: The use of formative evaluations to assist marginal teachers.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI 3374151)

National Association for Music Education (NAfME). (June 2012). *Teacher evaluation position statement*. Retrieved from http://smte.us/wp-content/uploads/ 2011/11/NAfME-Teacher-Evaluation-Position-Statement.pdf

National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). Accessed http://nces.ed.gov/ programs/digest/d13/tables/dt13_209.50.asp

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. (2010). *Enhancing teacher evaluation: Effective practices of evaluating teachers of all students*. [Webcast]. Retrieved from http://www.tqsource.org/webcasts/evaluatingTeachers/webcast/

National Council on Teacher Quality. (2013). State of the states 2013: Connect the dots: Using evaluations of teacher effectiveness to inform policy and practice. Accessed May 15, 2014, at http://www.nctq.org/dmsStage/State_of_the_ States_2013_Using_Teacher_Evaluations_NCTQ_Report.

Neumann, A. (1998). On experience, memory, and knowing: A post-Holocaust (auto)biography. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 28(4), 425-442.

Newberg-Long, D. (2011). *Narrowing of curriculum: Teaching in an age of accountability: A phenomenological study* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3426052)

New York State Education Department (NYSED). (2013). *Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR).* Retrieved from http://www.highered.nysed.gov/ tcert/ pdf/TeachingStandardsQA.pdf

New York State Education Department (NYSED). (2014). *Guidance on New York State's Annual Professional Performance Review for teachers and principals to implement education law §3012-c and the commissioner's regulations*. Retrieved from http://www.engageny.org/sites/default/files/resource/attachments/appr-field-guidance.pdf

New York State School Music Association (NYSSMA). (2012, June). Teacher evaluation position statement. Retrieved from http://www.nyssma.org/files/486/nyssma%20 teacher%20evaluation%20position%20statement%2Epdf

Nierman, G. E., Zeichner, K., & Hobbel, N. (2002). Changing concepts of teacher education. In C. R. Richard Colwell (Ed.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Nieto, S. (2003). *What keeps teachers going?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Nowacek, S. L. (2008). *A critical examination of practices and perceptions of current performance evaluation models for theatre arts teachers in Virginia*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3334931)

Otterman, S. (2011, May 23). Test for pupils, but the grades go to teachers. *NY Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/24/education/24tests. html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Palmer, P. (2007). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oakes, CA: Sage.

Pearson Education, Inc. (2013). *edTPA handbook*. Retrieved from http://www.edtpa.com

Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly*, *29*(1), 38-54.

Pellegrino, K. (2009). Connections between performer and teacher identities in music teachers: Setting an agenda for research. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *19*(1), 39-55. doi:10.1177/1057083709343908

Peterson, J. (1996). Assessing art teachers*. Arts Education Policy Review, 98*(1), 22-26.

Phyall, E. (2013). Where are men in elementary school teaching jobs. USC Rossier Online Blog. Retrieved from https://rossieronline.usc.edu/where-are-men-in-elementary-school-teaching-jobs/

Pietersen, C. (2007). Interpersonal bullying behaviour in the workplace. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *33*(1), 59-66.

Pink, D. H. (2009). *Drive: The surprising truth about what motivates us.* New York, NY: Riverhead.

Polikoff, M. S., & Porter, A. C. (2014). *Instructional alignment as a measure of teaching quality. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. Accessed November 21, 2014, at http://epa.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/04/11/0162373714531851.full.pdf+html?ijkey=Uwvo4Eg6.hQHI &keytype=ref&siteid=spepa

Prince, C. D., Schuermann, P. J., Guthrie, J. W., Witham, P. J., Milanowski, A. T., & Thorn, C. A. (2009). *The other 69 percent: Fairly rewarding the performance of teachers of nontested subjects and grades*. Report of the Center for Educator Compensation Reform. Retrieved from http://www.cecr.ed.gov/guides/other69Percent.pdf.

Principal Journal. (2012). Assessing teachers: A conversation with Charlotte Danielson. *Principal*, *91*(4), 26-27. Accessed from http://www.naesp.org/sites/default/files/Danielson_MA12.pdf

Rabinow, P. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York, NY: Pantheon.

Ravitch, D. (2013). *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger to America's public schools*. New York, NY: Alfred K. Knopf.

Robinson, M. (2005). The impact of beginning music teacher assessment on the assessors: Notes from experienced teachers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 164,* 49-60.

Robinson, M. (2015). The inchworm and the nightingale: On the (mis)use of data in music teacher evaluation. *Arts Education Policy Review, 116*(1), 9-21. doi: 10.1080/10632913.2014.944966

Rothstein, R., Jacobsen, R., & Wilder, T. (2008). *Grading education: Getting accountability right.* Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Russell, J. A. (2007). I know what I need to know: The impact of cognitive and psycho-social development on undergraduate music education majors' investment in instrumental techniques courses. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *171*, 51-66.

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitation structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations*, *56*(10), 1213-1232.

Sanders, W. L., Ashton, J. J., & Wright, S. P. (2005). Comparison of the effects of NBPTS certified teachers with other teachers on the rate of student academic progress. Final report. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Santoro, D. A. (2011). Teaching's conscientious objectors: Principled leavers of high-poverty schools. *Teachers College Record, 113*(12), 2670-2704.

Santoro, D. A. (2013). "I was becoming increasingly uneasy about the profession and what was being asked of me": Preserving integrity in teaching. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *43*(5), 563-587. doi:10.1111/curi.12027

Sass, T. R. (2008). *The stability of value-added measures of teacher quality and implications for teacher compensation policy. Policy Brief 4.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute, National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.

Scheib, J. W. (2003). Role stress in the professional life of the school music teacher: A collective case study. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51*(2), 124-136. doi:10.2307/3345846

Scheib, J. W. (2004). Why band directors leave: From the mouths of maestros. *Music Educators Journal, 91*(1), 53-57.

Scheib, J. (2007). School personnel role-related tension and job satisfaction. In J. Scheib (Ed.), Roles, identity, socialization, and conflict: The transition from music student to music teacher (a literature review). Online publication of the Society for Music Teacher Educators. Retrieved from http://smte.us/aspa/music-teacher-socialization/

Schmidt, P. (2005). Music education as transformative practice: Creating new frameworks for learning music through a Freirian perspective. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, *6*. Retrieved September 9, 2007, from www.rider.edu/~vrme

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Seidman, I. (2012). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shaw, R. D. (2013). Music teacher evaluation in Michigan: Navigating choppy waters. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA: The power of education research for innovation in practice and policy, Philadelphia, PA.

Shuler, S. C. (2012a). Music education for life: Music assessment, part 2—Instructional improvement and teacher evaluation. *Music Educators Journal*, *98*(3), 7-10.

Shuler, S. C. (2012b). Music assessment, part 2: Instructional improvement and teacher evaluation. *Music Educators Journal*, *98*(7), 7-10.

Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2003). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods* (pp. 51-79). London, England: Sage.

Sogin, D., & Wang, C. (2002). An exploratory study of music teachers' perception of factors associated with expertise in music teaching. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *12*(1), 12-18. doi:10.1177/10570837020120010101

Springer, M. G. (2009). *Performance incentives: Their growing impact on American K-12 education.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Guba & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 235-254). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stamou, L. & Custodero, L. (2007, July). Flow experience seminars as catalyst for discovery: Greek music teacher identity and pedagogical change. Paper presented at the Greek Society for Music Education Conference, Thessaloniki, Greece.

Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE) (2013). *edTPA*. Retrieved from https://scale.stanford.edu/teaching/edtpa

Surber, J. P. (1998). *Culture and critique: An introduction to the critical discourses of cultural studies*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Taebel, D. (1980). Public school music teachers' perceptions of the effect of certain competencies on pupil learning. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 28,* 185-197. doi:10.2307/3345236

Taebel, D. K. (1990a). Is evaluation fair to music educators? *Music Educators Journal*, *76*(6), 50-54.

Taebel, D. K. (1990b). An assessment of the classroom performance of music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *38*(1), 5-23. doi:10.2307/3344826

Tracy, S. J., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Alberts, J. K. (2006). Nightmares, demons, and slaves: Exploring the painful metaphors of workplace bullying. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *20*(2), 148-185.

U.S. Congress. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991). *America 2000: An education strategy*. Washington, DC: Department of Education, Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education. (1995). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* (Contract No. RR93002002). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved January 29, 2014, from http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html.

U.S. National Commission on Excellent in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform: A report to the nation and the Secretary of Education, United States Department of Education*. Washington, DC: The Commission on Excellence in Education.

Valli, L., & Buese, D. (2007). The changing roles of teachers in an era of high-stakes accountability. *American Educational Research Journal, 44*(3), 519-558.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. London, England: Althouse Press.

Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

White House Press Office (n.d.). *Fact sheet: Race to the top*. Retrieved from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/fact-sheet-race-top/

Winerip, M. (2011, November 6). "In Tennessee, following the rules for evaluations off a cliff." *New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/07/education/tennessees-rules-on-teacher-evaluations-bring-frustration.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Witherell, C., & Noddings, N. (1991). Prologue: An invitation to our readers. In *Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education* (pp. 1-12). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Yeh, S. S. (2012). The reliability, impact, and cost-effectiveness of value-added teacher assessment methods. *Journal of Education Finance*, *37*(4), 374-399.

Zembylas, M. (2005). Discursive practices, genealogies, and emotional rules: A poststructuralist view on emotion and identity in teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*(2005), 935-948.

Appendix A

Danielson Framework Domains and Components

Domain 1: Planning & Preparation 1a: Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy 1b: Demonstrating knowledge of students 1c: Setting instructional outcomes 1d: Demonstrating knowledge of resources 1e: Designing coherent instruction 1f: Designing student assessments	**Domain 2: Classroom Environment** 2a: Creating an environment of respect and rapport 2b: Establishing a culture for learning 2c: Managing classroom procedures 2d: Managing student behavior 2e: Organizing physical space
Domain 3: Instruction 3a: Communicating with Students 3b: Using questioning and discussion techniques 3c: Engaging students in learning 3d: Using assessment in instruction 3e: Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness	**Domain 4: Professional Responsibilities** 4a: Reflecting on teaching 4b: Maintaining accurate records 4c: Communicating with families 4d: Participating in the professional community 4e: Growing and developing professionally 4f: Demonstrating professionalism

Appendix B

Invitation Letter to Ensemble Directors/Administrators

Teachers College, Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York NY 10027
212 678 3000
www.tc.edu

Dear (Ensemble Director/Administrator),

I am a doctoral candidate in Music and Music Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, currently working on my dissertation. My research topic is Music Teacher Evaluation: Support, Survival and Creating Change in an Assessment-Charged World. I am writing to seek your help with my research through your participation in an interview.

Research in the area of teacher evaluation in music ensembles is very limited. It is my hope that through my dissertation, we can learn more about the current evaluation practices for music teachers, how to support both teacher and administrator, and find ways to improve the evaluation process.

I invite you to participate in this research study with me. Your background, teaching experience, and expertise will help to better describe the current trends in music education, and to improve the experiences of the students we teach. I would appreciate your review of the attached consent form describing the research project. Should you agree to participate in this study, I will contact you at a later date to set up a mutually convenient meeting time. Administrators and teachers will complete their interviews separately and all names will be kept confidential. Your responses will not be compared; rather, I will be looking at the collective responses of groups of teachers and principals.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 203-521-6559, or at cfb2131@tc.columbia.edu.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and assistance with this research.

With my best,

Cara Bernard
Doctoral Candidate, Music & Music Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Appendix C

Informed Consent/Participant's Rights

Teachers College, Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York NY 10027
212 678 3000
www.tc.edu

INFORMED CONSENT
for Ensemble Directors, Assistant Principals, Supervisors and Principals

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH: You are invited to participate in a research study on music teacher evaluation. Research in the area of teacher evaluation in music ensembles is very limited. It is my hope that through this study, we can learn more about the current evaluation practices for music teachers, how to support both teacher and administrator, and find ways to improve the evaluation process.

Your participation will involve one one-on-one interview with the researcher regarding the practices of teacher evaluation in your school or district. This interview will be approximately 1 hour and will be audio-recorded. The research will be conducted by Cara Bernard. The research will be conducted at Teachers College, Columbia University.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no direct benefits from participating this study. I do not anticipate any risks to you participating other than those encountered in day-to-day life. Sharing your experience with music teacher evaluation will help the community to better understand how to adapt current teacher evaluation trends to a more musical environment and setting. Your participation in this study is voluntary, and all names will not be disclosed. You may choose to withdraw from the study at any time.

PAYMENTS: There will be no payment for your participation.

DATA STORAGE TO PROTECT CONFIDENTIALITY: The records and audio-recordings of this study will be kept private. I will not include any information that will allow your name, position or school district to be identified. All names will be changed to protect your privacy. All notes and a written transcript will be made of comments to be kept in a confidential file by the researcher until the research is completed, and then destroyed. Audiotapes shall also be destroyed at the conclusion of the project.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: Your participation will take approximately 1 hour.

HOW WILL RESULTS BE USED: The results of the study will be used for my current dissertation, for educational purposes, and anticipate to be used in future presentations and publications.

Teachers College, Columbia University
525 West 120th Street
New York NY 10027
212 678 3000
www.tc.edu

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS

Principal Investigator: Cara Bernard

Research Title: Music Teacher Ensemble Evaluation: Support, Survival And Creating Change In An Assessment-Charged World

- I have read and discussed the Research Description with the researcher. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about the purposes and procedures regarding this study.
- My participation in research is voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw from participation at any time without jeopardy to future medical care, employment, student status or other entitlements.
- The researcher may withdraw me from the research at his/her professional discretion.
- If, during the course of the study, significant new information that has been developed becomes available which may relate to my willingness to continue to participate, the investigator will provide this information to me.
- Any information derived from the research project that personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.
- If at any time I have any questions regarding the research or my participation, I can contact the investigator, who will answer my questions. The investigator's phone number is (203) 521-6559.
- If at any time I have comments, or concerns regarding the conduct of the research or questions about my rights as a research subject, I should contact the Teachers College, Columbia University Institutional Review Board /IRB. The phone number for the IRB is (212) 678-4105. Or, I can write to the IRB at Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, New York, NY, 10027, Box 151.
- I should receive a copy of the Research Description and this Participant's Rights document.
- If video and/or audio taping is part of this research, I ( ) consent to be audio/video taped. I ( ) do NOT consent to being video/audio taped. The written, video and/or audio taped materials will be viewed only by the principal investigator and members of the research team.
- Written, video and/or audio taped materials ( ) may be viewed in an educational setting outside the research
  ( ) may NOT be viewed in an educational setting outside the research.
- My signature means that I agree to participate in this study.

Participant's signature: ________________________________ Date:____/____/____

Name: ________________________________

Appendix D

Ensemble Director Interview Protocol/Administrator Interview Protocol

Objectives	**Questions**
Introduction	Thank you for having me here today. My name is Cara Bernard. The purpose of this project is to document the effect of standardized teacher evaluations on ensemble directors' practices. Today I'll be asking you about your own musical and teaching background in addition to your current teaching practices and experiences. Do you have any questions before we start?
Musical/Professional Background	I'd like to start with you and your background. How many years have you been teaching? *Follow ups*: What did you do before teaching? Tell me a bit about your professional training (music: kodaly, orff backgrounds? Methods classes? Conducting?) What led you to be a choral/orchestra/band director? How many years have you been teaching at this school? How many classes do you teach? What are they? Do you teach any classes outside of music? How many students are in each class?
Ensemble Background Curricular planning: Repertoire Performance Goals Rehearsal Structure	Tell me a bit about your ensemble program (how many ensembles, what levels, student musical background) *Follow ups/Possible probes*: How has your program developed over the years? What's helped to shape your program (internal and external, artistic and admins)? Tell me a bit about how you choose your repertoire for your ensembles. What do you look for in repertoire? *Possible Probes*: How do you go about planning from the repertoire? How do you choose your Performance goals? Tell me a bit about a typical rehearsal. Do you have a set structure? What do your lesson plans look like? How do you involve your students in the rehearsal? Do you have student conductor? Movement in the classroom, ear training, composition, improvisation—student centered? I'd like to return to your planning—your curriculum. How do you go about writing your curriculum? What does it look like? Do you feel there's an overall goal of an ensemble in a school setting?

	What's one important thing you want students to get out of your ensemble when they leave? Describe your ideal program. What's in it? If you could make your current program even more ideal or better, what would you do?
Reflection: Evaluation	Tell me a bit about your observations/evaluations as a new teacher. *Possible probes*: What did your administrator look for as a new teacher? How have the evaluations changed since the beginning of your teaching career? Can you talk a bit about what it's like to experience the whole evaluation process?
Teaching Identity	Tell me about your first few years of teaching. *Possible probes*: Tell me more about that. What was that like? What was the best part of your first year or two? What were some of the more difficult things you had to deal with in the beginning? What did you do to get through these challenges? What helped? What didn't help? You've been teaching awhile now. You're pretty comfortable. How would you describe your teaching now? What advice would you give a new teacher now? What do you feel are your biggest rewards teaching today? What is your biggest challenge?

	Do you think a good lesson can be recognized by anyone? What is the best indicator of a good teacher? *Possible Probes*: How do you know it's good teaching? Can you tell by walking into a room?
Personal Experience with Observation/Evaluation Procedures	Tell me about your last observation. How did you learn about the new evaluation system in your school? *Possible probes*: Were any goals established prior? Who evaluated you? What was the format? For how long? What did your post observation look like?
Observation Feedback/Post-Evaluation Meeting	What kind of comments did you receive regarding musical issues (in-tune singing, conducting, error detection)? What kind of feedback did you receive as far as professional growth by your administrator?
Evaluator Background/Administrative Support	What were the strengths of your evaluator? What were the weaknesses? What aspects of the evaluation pertained directly to music or music teaching? Did you feel your evaluator had an understanding of your program and goals? *Follow up:* How well do you think your evaluator's understanding of music program is?
Negotiations	Do you feel you've had to negotiate anything that you know you do well, or need to improve on? Do you feel this new system is helpful in any way? How so? Has it made you look at your teaching differently? In what ways?
	What kind of feedback would be most meaningful and helpful for you from your admins?
Vision of Music Teacher Evaluation	Describe your vision of an ideal process for music teacher evaluation. What would evaluations look like in chorus/band/orchestra, etc.? What is most important to be seen, and evaluated?

Anticipated total interview time: 1 hour

Objectives	**Questions**
Introduction	Thank you for having me here today. My name is Cara Bernard. The purpose of this project is to document the effect of standardized teacher evaluations on ensemble directors' and administrators' practices. Today I'll be asking you about your own teaching background in addition to your current teaching and administrative practices and experiences. Do you have any questions before we start?
Professional Background	I'd like to start with you and your background. How many years have you been an administrator? *Follow ups*: What did you do before your current position? How many years have you been teaching at this school? Do you teach any classes? Tell me a bit about your daily routine at work.
Musical Background	Did you participate in the music program in your schools? High school, middle school? Tell me a bit about that. What are some of your favorite memories? What's one important thing you want students to get out of their music ensembles when they leave? If you could make the current program even more ideal or better, what would you do? I'd like to talk a bit about your teaching experience, especially in your first few years.
Reflection: Evaluation	Tell me a bit about your observations/evaluations as a new teacher. *Possible probes*: What did your administrator look for as a new teacher? How have the evaluations changed since the beginning of your teaching career? Can you talk a bit about what it's like to experience the whole evaluation process?
Teaching Identity	Tell me about your first few years of being an administrator. *Possible probes*: Tell me more about that. What was that like? What was the best part of your first year or two? What were some of the more difficult things you had to deal with in the beginning? What did you do to get through these challenges? What helped? What didn't help? What advice would you give a new administrator now? What do you feel are your biggest rewards today? What is your biggest challenge?

	Do you think a good lesson can be recognized by anyone? What is the best indicator of a good teacher? *Possible Probes*: How do you know it's good teaching? Can you tell by walking into a room?
Personal Experience/Training with Observation/Evaluation Procedures	Tell me about your training in teacher evaluation. What model do you use? Tell me a bit about these systems and procedures. *Possible Follow-Up Questions*: What are the steps given with these new evaluation systems? How many times per year do you observe your teachers? For how long? What do you look for specifically in a teacher observation? What are the strengths and weaknesses of this evaluation process? What are the weaknesses? Do you feel that any aspects may be specific to music? How so?
Evaluation Process in Music	How can you decide whether students were enjoying class and engaged? Who evaluates music teachers in your school or district? Would you talk to students to weigh in on evaluations/observations? Why/not? What do you expect music teachers to do during the evaluation process? Do you feel comfortable evaluating the music teacher? Why/not? Are music areas more challenging to you? How do you approach them? How have you handled post-observations where music teachers disagreed with your comments? What kind of suggestions and recommendations do you generally make for music teachers? If a teacher asked, "did you notice anything I need to improve on or need help with" in terms of something musical, what would you say? What about Non musical? Do you approach evaluations with a beginning teacher differently than a non? How so? What are you looking for differently? What do you think is most important to see or hear in an evaluation for chorus/band/orchestra? Do you feel music teachers should be evaluated as specialists? By specialists?

	How do you feel about other music professionals doing the evaluating? Regarding SLOs, how do you judge these in practice? When you're observing the teacher? How has your view of teaching evaluation changed over the years? What is the most challenging thing for you as a leader with regards to this evaluation process? What would principals write about a music lesson that was *heard* and not *seen*?
Musical Issues in Evaluation	What do you listen for musically when observing? Do you feel that this supports or negates the current frameworks for evaluation? Do you think the music stuff fits? Have you demonstrated any rehearsal techniques or teaching to your teachers? Do you think an administrator without musical training would have a hard time observing in a music class? Why? Do you observe non-music classes? What's the difference between observing a musical class and a non-musical class? What is your goal as administrator when evaluating a teacher? What do you feel is the purpose of these evaluations? Why are you evaluating them? Are you looking at their pedagogy? The success of the music making/product? Students' engagement? To help teacher better herself?
Negotiations	Do you feel you've had to negotiate anything that you know you do well, or need to improve on because of this system? Do you feel this new system is helpful in any way? How so? Has it made you look at teaching and learning differently? In what ways? Has it made you look at your role as leader differently?
Vision of Music Teacher Evaluation	What is your vision for an ideal process for evaluation? What is your vision for an ideal process for music teacher evaluation?

Anticipated total interview time: 1 hour