Evaluation and Games That Music Teachers Play:

A Case Study of a Peer Review Program

Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy

in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Betty Josephine Hill

Graduate Program in Music

The Ohio State University

2019

Dissertation Committee:

Julia Shaw, Ph.D. Advisor

Jan Edwards, Ph.D. Co-Advisor

Antoinette Miranda, Ph.D.

Abstract

The professional development of teachers is an ongoing process of learning that is essential to their personal and professional growth and plays a significant role in students' achievement and success. The purpose of this study was to examine how participation in a peer review and assessment program catalyzed changes in teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and practices as a part of their professional growth. Specifically, the study examined how participation in a peer review and assessment program catalyzed music teachers' professional growth (Borko, 2004; Desimone, 2009; Stanley, 2009). Nine music teachers were interviewed in this case study of a peer review program designed for the review and assessment of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) and set in a large urban Midwestern school district in Ohio. The peer review program presented a unique opportunity to examine the capacity for music teachers' professional growth in varied contexts as teachers created and applied measurable student learning targets. Five key themes emerged from the findings: a) attitudes of resistance resulting from reviewee's misinterpretations of the SLO process and its purpose; b) advocacy for music teaching for the purpose of teaching and learning with clarity; c) asset-based vs. deficit ideology in which teachers examine standards for student achievement in urban; d) reflection and review upon individual teacher's practice; and e) enacting the role of reviewer as policy enactor, to enforce the authenticity and rigor of the content-specific initiative. Findings

hold implications for: (a) informed peer review planning; (b) teacher evaluation; and (c) effective professional development linked to collaboration.

Dedication

This document is dedicated to my sons: Christopher Myers and Cory Lyle Myers, my grandson Dejonte Bowen, and my parents, the late Elton Lyle Hill Sr., and the late Mrs. Josephine F. Hill.

Acknowledgments

First, this undertaking was only made possible through my Maker, in whom I live and move and have my being, and could not have been completed without the prayers, support and love of my family, friends, and mentors. Further, I dedicate this document to my cherished sons, Christopher Myers and Cory Lyle Myers, and my grandson Dejonte Bowen, and soul-mate, Tony, who put up with carry-out, dirty laundry, and all other inconveniences… all in good humor.

I recognize the love invested in me by my beloved parents, the late Elton and Josephine Hill, who taught me by example to focus on the task at hand and what I believed in, to work tirelessly, and to never quit. To my wonderfully supportive and patient sisters, Mary Frances Catchings, Margaret Jean Johnson, and Paula Jane Mathon, I would not have made it through this endeavor without your support. I love and appreciate each one of you. I thank my dear friend, Krista, for always being there during my lowest moments, patiently listening and cheering me on, throughout this journey.

I would be remiss if I did not express my gratitude to my mentors - Dr. Milton Ruffin, thank you for working with me throughout this process and checking in on my progress on a regular basis. Your friendship and guidance has been invaluable. Dr. Miranda - thank you for your guidance, and for working with me throughout this endeavor. Dr. Edwards - I am so grateful to have worked with you and for your

encouragement throughout this process. Thank you so much for your guidance and mentorship. To my advisor, Dr. Shaw - thank you for your patience throughout this process and for your expert advice at each turn. I appreciate and value your expertise. Finally, I thank the dynamic group of teachers who voluntarily participated in this study and shared their personal and academic experiences.

Vita

August 30, 1966……. Born - Zanesville, OH

1989……. B.M., Keyboard Performance
Capital University

1994……. Music Education Licensure
Capital University

2000……. M.A., Music Education
The Ohio State University

2016……. Principal Licensure
The Ohio State University

2016 – Present……. Administrator/Supervisor
Arts & Physical Education K-12,
Columbus City Schools

2014 – 2016……. Unified Arts Coordinator K-12,
Columbus City Schools

1999 – 2014..... Choral Music Director and Teacher,
Eastmoor Academy High School
Columbus City Schools

1994 – 1999..... Choral Music Director and Teacher,
Johnson Park Middle School
Columbus City Schools

Fields of study:

Music

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1. Introduction

Over the past three decades, teacher evaluation has changed dramatically due to strong criticism of the inadequacies of traditional evaluation systems. Toch & Rothman (2008) attested that traditional teacher evaluation systems fail to address the quality of instruction and student learning. In addition, Weisberg, Sexton, Mulhern, and Keeling (2009) explained that evaluation systems fail to provide accurate and credible measures of teachers' individual instructional performance. Two reports on teacher evaluation, *Rush to Judgment* (Toch & Rothman, 2008) and *The Widget Effect* (Weisberg et al., 2009) propelled the subject of inadequate teacher evaluation into public discussion and inspired federal legislation.

In 2009, President Barack Obama announced the Race to the Top (RTTT) education initiative. Intended to inspire nationwide education reform in K-12 schools, RTTT comprised a major component of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The program offered states significant funding if they were willing to reconstruct their teacher evaluation systems. States had to agree to implement new systems to weight student learning gains as part of annual teacher evaluation scores and to implement performance-based standards for teachers and principals. Schools participating in the initiative differentiated among teachers and principals based on student growth and additional professional development measures for educators. Evaluation of teachers was

based upon quality of performance affecting student growth, yet many school districts overlooked key performance distinctions treating all teachers as interchangeable and creating a phenomenon labeled the "widget effect" (see Weisberg et al., 2009).

In many states, a major percentage of teacher evaluation is determined by "student growth measures" or how much their students learn over the course of a year. Wesolowski (2015) defined student growth measures as the "change in student achievement as demonstrated by differences in scoring data between two points in time, specifically by comparing the differences between a pretest (e.g., evaluation prior to instruction) and a posttest (e.g., evaluation at the end of instruction)" (p.43). The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) presently describes two primary components of teacher effectiveness to encourage high quality teaching, increased student learning, achievement, and accountability. The components are: (a) teacher performance rating based on classroom observations and other factors; and (b) a student academic growth rating. Measurement of student growth is a challenge for evaluators and educators due to the inability for all teachers to use the same type of assessment. In Ohio, there are three ways to measure student growth for teacher evaluations: (a) value added; (b) approved vendor assessments; and (c) locally determined measures.

Value Added

Value-added analysis is intended to measure the impact schools and teachers have on the academic progress of students annually and the implementation of value-added analysis varies from state to state. In Ohio, a value-added method (VAM) provides measurement that can inform educators on how data can be used to focus instruction.

Overland (2014) described the value-added growth model as a "statistical calculation that attributes the growth of individual students to one particular teacher, school, or district" (p. 58). Economist Erik Hanushek introduced value-added in 1971, however the process of measuring student achievement through the value-added growth model was adapted for educational use by William Sanders, a senior researcher in statistics (Overland, 2014).

The use of a VAM as a primary source of teacher evaluation has faced significant opposition and scrutiny. The insertion of value-added for the evaluation of music teachers presents distinct issues in that it assumes the ability to track standardized data. In a statement on VAMs, the American Statistical Association (ASA, 2014) noted:

> most VAM studies find that teachers account for about 1% to 14% of the variability in test scores, and that the majority of opportunities for quality improvement are found in the system-level conditions. Ranking teachers by their VAM scores can have unintended consequences that reduce quality. (p. 2)

Dissimilar to math or reading, the traditionally non-tested artistic content of music provides fewer options for this type of testing. With no music-specific data to track, some districts have substituted and averaged data from other sources. In essence, it unfairly evaluates arts teachers on factors other than their own "pedagogical skill and student achievement" (Overland, 2014, p. 58).

Music educators are wary of the types of data used to determine their effectiveness as teachers. They are especially distrusting of the use of standardized tests and student achievement in subjects other than music in their own evaluations (Robinson, 2015). Robinson described two primary purposes in educational evaluation as the

improvement of instruction and increasing the accountability of programs in education. Music performance, festivals, and music contests exemplify public performance and scrutiny of music teachers' work in ways that standardized tests can never address. These events provide parents and community members opportunities to engage with schools and students and witness firsthand the transforming power of music and its influence on student growth in positive ways (Robinson, 2015).

Approved Vendor Assessments

In the absence of value-added data for the measurement of student growth, other state-approved assessments can be used. Alternative assessments provided by vendors nationwide must meet criteria set by the state of Ohio and have the ability to measure growth of high and low achieving students. In addition, ODE requires that assessments meet their standards of test reliability (ODE, 2018).

Locally Determined Measures

In the absence of value-added data and approved vendor data, schools must establish local measures. This is the case for specialized content areas and applies to this study of music educators. To measure student growth, teachers create Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), defined as measurable, long-term academic targets of growth set by teachers for all students or subgroups of students, at the beginning of a school year. The objectives purportedly indicate the impact a teacher has on student learning (ODE, 2018). In an ideal case SLOs have the potential to definitively influence student learning and provide student growth data between two points in time that are comparable across classrooms (Goe & Holdheide, 2011). However, scholars have found that connecting

student growth to the appropriate teachers can present challenges. Goe and Holdheide (2011) posited that teachers mistrust of accountability systems can be decreased if teachers see the system as fair and authentic.

Wesolowski (2015) suggested that the measurement of individual student growth is the focus of many educational reform policies. Increased accountability and scrutiny have compelled music educators to design assessment strategies to track and report individual student growth data that demonstrates music performance achievement. Wesolowski found this practice to result in a greater emphasis on individual assessment and achievement over the course of an instructional period. Thiessen and Anderson (1999) related three overlapping dimensions of teachers' work described as "realms"; in the classroom; in the corridors; and in the communities to teachers dedicated to ongoing learning and innovation in varied ways. Additionally, Barrett (2006) linked these dimensions to current policies for teacher growth and development and described how teachers move with flexibility, in and out of the different realms throughout their careers. The realms have been used to shape policies and design of professional learning for teacher education and development.

Background

In an age of standards-based accountability and reform, teachers work amid extraordinary expectations of performance and change. Prior literature indicates that professional development is fundamental to improvement of teachers' practice (Barrett, 2006; Conway, 2008; Conway & Christensen, 2006; Desimone, 2009; Evans, 2008), and the perspective of policymakers is evident in federal and state funding for the

development of standards to increase teacher quality. Miles, Odden, Fermanich, and Archibald (2005) examined how school districts allocate resources to professional development and evaluate the effectiveness of these programs. The researchers described teachers' perceptions of limited transparency and knowledge of how district funding was distributed for professional development of educators.

Barrett (2006) suggested that educators' standards for teacher growth are developed to apply to all teachers but overlook the distinctive needs of arts specialists. Thiessen and Barrett (2002) contrasted the current era of accountability with that of a reform-minded conception of teachers' work. Reform-mindedness, a term adopted in this study from Thiessen and Barrett (2002), refers to "teachers' orientation toward continual improvement on behalf of their classrooms and school communities" (p. 759). While the term 'reform' presently carries connotations of substantial school endeavors that depend on teachers for implementation, Barrett (2006) uses it to describe teachers' orientation toward enduring improvement on behalf of their classrooms and school communities. The idea is centered on meaningful change initiated from the ground up just as often as it is administered from the top down. For example, the Race to the Top initiative (2009) with a top-down approach intended to inspire K-12 educational reform nationwide.

Thiessen and Barrett (2002) posited that through eras of reform, teachers began to assume leadership roles making key decisions in the design of professional standards, practice, and learning. The researchers described a reform-minded teacher as an educator with inherent dedication to the improvement of classroom practices that engages their influence beyond the realm of the classroom, corridors, and in the community. Thiessen

and Barrett (2002) suggested a restructuring of the prevailing image of the music teacher as specialist in music education by redefining classroom practices, creating opportunities that support collaboration and innovation, engaging in more collaborative forms of professional development, and expanding learning opportunities beyond the classroom through student-led and community-based experiences. In addition, the researchers held that a reform-minded image of teaching both builds on foundational strengths of music teachers and serves to address long-standing issues in ways that would recast music teachers' roles and significance in educational reform (p. 776).

Johnson (1996a) described teacher professional development as "opportunities for learning" and re-conceptualized development for educators to embed their professional growth into the ongoing work of the school. This theory includes placing professional development of teachers in realistic contexts (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000). While authors use different terms to describe various interpretations of teacher change, the perception of teachers as learners and schools as learning communities is vital to views on teacher change and professional development.

Boylan, Coldwell, Maxwell & Jordan (2018) critiqued five significant analytical professional learning models suggested by Guskey (2002), Desimone (2009), Clarke and Hollingsworth (2009), Opfer and Pedder (2011), and Evans (2014). Research indicates significant diversity in the use of the terms 'professional learning,', 'development,' and 'change' (O'Brien and Jones, 2014; Webster-Wright, 2009). For the purposes of this study, I used the term 'professional development' as in the research of Boylan and

colleagues (2018) to refer to "activities or experiences that may lead to professional learning and/or development" of educators (p.121).

Boylan and colleagues (2018) described an analytical framework based on the model elements: purpose, scope and capacity, explicit and implicit theories of learning, agency and philosophical foundation, and processes of change. A brief outline of the change processes associated with each learning model provided insight into theories of agency and correlations to professional development. The models, in various ways and to different extents, address the relationship between teacher beliefs and practices and the catalyst for learning. The models are general examples of professional learning intended to have broad applicability and inform the research, evaluation and design of professional learning.

Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) described the role of teachers as learners, shaping their professional growth through reflective participation in professional development programs. The model offers greater consideration of ways in which learning may occur and provides more visibility to individual teachers and their ability to influence their own professional learning. These professional learning models will be explored more in-depth in Chapter 2.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine how participation in a peer review and assessment program catalyzed music teachers' professional growth. Specifically, the study investigated changes in teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and practices they perceived to be related to their participation in the peer review and assessment program (Borko, 2004;

Desimone, 2009). Research on collaboration and the professional development of teachers (Borko, 2004; Desimone, 2009; Conway & Edgar, 2014) and literature exploring connections between peer review and teacher evaluation (Robinson, 2003, 2005) informed this investigation. The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do teachers describe their experiences in the peer review program?
2. How do teachers describe changes in their attitudes, beliefs and pedagogical practice in relation to their participation in a peer assessment and review program?

Related Literature

Two categories of literature research on peer review and mentoring informed the conduct of this study. Peer review, as defined by Petersen (1995), is "a process or system for evaluation of teacher performance by a peer or colleagues" (Kumrow & Dahlen, 2002, pg. 238). In this study, peer review refers to the collaborative assessment and review of teaching practices with colleagues. Opportunities to collaborate and discuss teaching practice with colleagues are rare, especially in urban school districts (Sindberg, 2014; Shields, Esch, Humphrey, Young, Gaston & Hunt, 1999). School districts that successfully implement peer review and mentoring programs find it an effective means to systematically improve teaching and learning (Goldstein & Noguera, 2006). In addition, peer assistance and review programs offer leadership opportunities to veteran teachers and help to teachers that need it. Collaborative experiences between experienced, successful teachers to attain agreed-upon goals can provide professional development for both educators involved (Hartnett, 2011).

Robinson (2005) linked teacher evaluation to professional growth, asserting that teachers need opportunities to advance through the creation of new professional roles and responsibilities within school districts. Opportunities for teachers to become involved with teacher mentoring, induction, and assessment initiatives indicated potential for veteran educators to experience growth in teacher leadership and remain in the classroom. The peer assistance and review program referred to in Robinson's (2005) study engaged skilled and experienced teachers, termed "consulting teachers", to mentor, support, and evaluate new or low-performing veteran teachers who are identified through intervention.

In 2008, a mentoring project focusing on the support of teachers in Orlando, Florida, was created as part of a federally funded professional development program for teachers working in Title I schools (Conway, 2008). The program was designed to meet the needs of urban educators teaching in schools with diverse student populations and learning styles. Mentors provided collaborative support to mentees in developing and demonstrating practices linked to planning, teaching, assessing, and reflecting on music teaching. Conway (2008) described challenges to the collaborative process of mentoring, and issues related to balance between teacher support and evaluation (Feiman-Neimser, 1993) that were addressed in professional development sessions for mentors. Despite challenges identified by researchers such as Conway (2008) additional literature suggests meaningful relationships between peer review and peer mentoring (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Robinson, 2005) as well as contextually-specific approaches to peer mentoring and the processes of teacher evaluation and professional growth (Cochran-Smith, 2010; Conway,

2003a; Robinson, 2005; Shaw, 2018, Smith & Ingersoll, 2004). The disparity that has emerged between prevailing standards-based teaching approaches and traditional practices in the past decade or more, has set the course for teacher educators to make earnest efforts to embed preservice education in authentic and collaborative settings with practicing music educators, and to ensure that those who assess beginning music educators are knowledgeable of preservice education content. Additionally, designers of state-sponsored evaluation and national assessment of beginning teachers should determine if these standards be developed as guidelines, or to reflect current practice (Robinson, 2005).

Research has identified the significance of supporting mentoring relationships in urban contexts that is built on specific knowledge of urban settings (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004; Cochran-Smith, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 2001). Recommendations for music teacher evaluation that is research-based can better inform teacher mentoring policies (Edgar, 2012; National Association for Music Education, 2011; Robinson, 2015). Shaw (2018) suggested that rather than placing great emphasis on student growth components of teachers' evaluations, policies addressing mentor qualifications might highlight skills and inclinations of effective mentors.

J. Shaw (2018) discussed the value of mentoring and collaborative communities of practice for supporting beginning music educators' professional growth in urban settings. The researcher described advantages of programs that engage new teachers with more experienced colleagues in these collaborative communities (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004), and the ability of the collaborative community to provide an environment

conducive to self-exploration of beliefs, understandings, and potential change (J. Shaw, 2018). J. Shaw also shared research (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004; Cochran-Smith, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 2001) on the importance of linking beginning music educators in urban settings with successful urban mentors in content- specific areas and contended that "an approach to mentoring built upon specialized knowledge of the urban context supports early career teachers' professional growth" (J. Shaw, 2018, p. 29). Additional components of mentoring in urban contexts will be examined in Chapter 2.

Theoretical Framework

Clark and Hollingsworth (2002) described change developing through mediating processes of "reflection" and "enactment" with a focus on the relationship between four domains of professional growth: the external domain (professional development activity), the domain of practice (teacher beliefs, knowledge, and attitudes), the domain of consequence (student outcomes), and the personal domain (teacher practices). The term "reflection" refers to active consideration that leads to change in beliefs and practice (Clark & Hollingsworth, 2002). The term "enactment" is characterized as "the translation of a belief or pedagogical model into action" (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002, p. 951). Clarke & Hollingsworth (2002) asserted that the structure of their Interconnected Model has significant implications for future professional development programs and broader implications for professional development. The non-linear structure enables identification of unique "change sequences" and "growth networks" that relate to individual teachers (p. 958). The model of professional growth provides visible evidence of individual teachers' influence and their agency on their own profession learning.

When change in one domain leads to change in another it is referred to as a "change sequence" (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002). When the occurrence of change is more than momentary, the change is referred to as professional growth. A more enduring change sequence indicative of professional growth is identified by the researchers as a "growth network" (2002, pg. 958). Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) suggested that professional development programs for teachers should anticipate the possibility of multiple change sequences and a possibility of various teacher growth networks (p. 958). The professional growth of educators is shaped through the roles they play as reflective and active learners in professional development programs.

Methodological Overview

Research Design and Context

This intrinsic case study Yin (2014) examined how participation in a peer review and assessment program catalyzed music teachers' professional growth. Research literature (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Yin, 2014) supported case study research as an investigative strategy, a methodology, or a comprehensive research strategy. However, Stake (2005) contended that case study research is a choice of what is to be studied, not a methodology (p. 21). Creswell and Poth (2018) defined case study research as a qualitative approach to authentic and contemporary inquiry of a bounded system (systems) over time, through detailed and in-depth collection of multiple sources of data (p. 96-97). The peer review program set the boundary of analysis for revealing

Yin (2014) described intrinsic case study as the case itself holding the point of interest. The peer review program that served as the context for this study was set in a

large urban Midwestern school district in Ohio. In this program, accomplished veteran teachers were appointed as peer reviewers to review student learning objectives (SLOs) created by K-12 arts and physical education teachers as a required component of the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) teacher evaluation system. Peer reviewers continued to teach in their classrooms on a full-time basis, however, were provided three full days out of their classrooms to review SLOs with team members and to communicate with colleagues in regard to creation or revisions of their SLOs. A teacher could be appointed to the peer review program for an unlimited number of years.

Robinson (2005) asserted that teachers need opportunities to advance through the creation of new professional roles and responsibilities within school districts. Opportunities for teachers to become involved with teacher mentoring, induction, and assessment initiatives hold potential for veteran educators to experience growth in teacher leadership while remaining in the classroom. That the Peer Assessment Leader Program provided opportunities for veteran teachers to grow professionally by assuming leadership roles within the district was a distinguishing feature of the program, affording a view of experienced teachers' professional growth in the context of a peer review program.

Volunteer teachers included nine early career and veteran music teachers with varying subspecialties (e.g. instrumental, vocal, and general music). Within this single school district, individual school contexts varied from those serving diverse populations of cultures and ethnicities to those serving those of varied socioeconomic ranges. The disparate classroom and community settings in which music teachers created and applied

measurable learning targets district-wide presented a unique research case, with opportunity to study capacity for professional growth in response to the school system's peer review and assessment teacher leader program.

Participant Recruitment and Selection

I selected teachers to participate in the study through a purposeful sampling strategy (Creswell, 2016). As district supervisor and administrator of arts, physical education, and health, I had access to an email distribution list for all K-12 music and physical education teachers. I created a Google survey to seek music teacher participants. The recruitment email stated that participation in the research was voluntary and teachers could withdraw from the study at any time. The email also provided written assurance that participation in the study would in no way affect their teacher evaluations, participation in the program, or their employment. I based participating teacher selection upon a volunteer basis, diverse demographic classroom contexts, and early career and veteran educator status. To support maximum variation sampling (Patton, 2002) I sought teachers who differed in terms of content specialization (i.e., instrumental music, vocal, and general music), grade levels (elementary, middle, or high school), school location(s), and status in the district peer review program.

Data Generation

Scheduled interviews with music teachers took place in their classrooms during non-teaching hours, at times and dates convenient for teachers and researcher (Roulston, 2010). To collect data, I used a semi-structured interview format (Fontana & Frey, 1994) in two individual interviews of each teacher and one focus group interview (Porter,

2013). The semi-structured protocol included predetermined questions about peer review and professional development while allowing additional follow-up questions to evolve organically in response to information provided during the interviews (Roulston, 2010). With teachers' consent all interviews were recorded and transcribed for subsequent analysis. To facilitate member checking, I provided teachers with copies of each interview transcript, which they reviewed for modifications, additions, or deletions. In addition, I collected documents and artifacts, including peer review program handouts, documents detailing the peer review process, policies and procedures, program schedules, lesson plans, and handouts distributed by the music teachers. Additional methodological detail regarding my approach to data generation follows in chapter 3.

Analysis

Throughout the process of data generation, I used the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to generate broad themes related to the professional growth of teachers. Preliminary analysis of individual, in-depth interviews facilitated the discovery of themes, which in turn generated additional interview questions. Ongoing analysis of interview data served to narrow and refine these themes (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). At the conclusion of the data generation phase I summarized key findings that resulted in the emergence of several key themes from analysis of the individual interviews conducted with teachers.

Verification and Trustworthiness

I used several strategies to verify the study's findings and bolster the trustworthiness of the report: (a) triangulation - I sought triangulation of corroborating evidence through multiple sources (Bazeley, 2013; Glesne, 2016; Yin, 2014) including individual and group semi-structured interviews documents and artifacts lending clarification to individual teacher contributions; (b) member checking - I used member checking to enhance the credibility of the study. Teachers were contacted via email to review transcripts and interpretations to confirm the validity of the information (Hays & Singh, 2012). Each teacher interviewed participated in this process and confirmed agreement with interpretation of the findings.

Researcher Role

Establishing my role as researcher, rather than administrator (for the purpose of investigation) and providing assurance to all teachers that no repercussions for participation existed, was essential to positioning my role for the purposes of the study. As a district arts supervisor and administrator, I observed distinct interactions between early career and veteran music teachers in collaborative planning and review. As a former music teacher in the school district, I knew many teachers as colleagues, musicians, or constituents. This established rapport with music teachers facilitated access to a research context that supported investigation of teachers' experiences in a peer review program.

In the role of administrator as researcher, it was essential that I develop a rapport with teachers to enable them to feel comfortable enough to share their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs as they evolved through peer review participation. Awareness of

teachers' perception of my role as an administrator and the possible impact to their employment, assignment in the district, or position in the peer assessment leader program, served as knowledge to inform teacher recruitment and elicit more authentic responses for research. Wanat (2008) contrasted gaining access and gaining cooperation from research participants with potential perceptions of outcomes and ways in which research might impact their lives. These were identified as publicity of research findings, resentment due to feeling obligated to participate, and perceptions of underlying links to teacher evaluation (p. 203-4).

To address the dual roles of researcher and administrator, I gathered writing materials to engage in reflective memoing in preparation for each interview and a change of casual clothing. The practice of changing from my customary formal office wear was a strategy employed to address teacher perceptions of authority and possible outcomes, in addition to awareness of the impact that my situational role might have on the research (Wanat, 2008).

Managing Subjectivity

Throughout the study, documented comments in regard to self-understanding of bias, values, and experiences captured in the form of observations or reactions in the data collection process, were crucial to reflexive practice. As a primary data collector and district administrator of the peer assessment and review program, prior knowledge, assumptions, and subjectivity had potential to shape the interpretation of findings. I had to, as Creswell and Poth (2017) suggested, reach self-understanding in research of potential bias, values, and experiences. In addition, open acknowledgement of my own

subjectivity, as Peshkin (1988) advised, allowed the opportunity to systematically seek and investigate my own position relative to the research. Chapter 3 details the specific strategies I used to manage subjectivity throughout the research process.

Limitations

This study provided an account of how participation in one peer review and assessment program catalyzed music teachers' professional learning and growth. This study is limited to the perspective of the nine music teachers, and the findings cannot be extended to teachers serving similar content and demographics in the school district. I intentionally decided not to investigate how the evaluative component of peer review and assessment impacts music teachers' professional development, in addition to social justice issues and teacher efficacy relative to collaboration, professional development, and peer review. The central phenomenon of music teachers' professional learning and growth is distinct to each individual and cannot be generalized to a broader population of teachers.

Conclusion

Chapter 2 will provide a literature review that centers on collaboration and the professional development of teachers. The third chapter presents the methodology used to examine how the peer review and assessment program catalyzed music teachers' professional growth. The research context, teacher recruitment and selection process, approach to data generation and analysis, strategies for verification and trustworthiness, role of the researcher, and limitations of the study are discussed in this chapter. Chapter 4 presents key findings from individual interviews conducted with K-12 vocal and

instrumental music teachers that participated in the peer review program. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the methodological approach taken in the study and the study's findings, followed by a discussion of the relationship of data to the research questions, implications of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Definitions of Terms

Change sequences: Two or more domains that are connected by reflective or enactive links (Clark & Hollingsworth, 2002, p. 958).

Content-specific initiative: A content area specific view of learning (Dexter, Doering, & Reidel, 2006).

Enactment: The act of putting learning or a changed belief into practice (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).

Growth networks: A change sequence that is associated with change that is lasting (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).

CCS: An acronym for Columbus City Schools.

ODE: An acronym for Ohio Department of Education.

Peer Review: The "participation of colleagues in the development and/or evaluation of one's teaching activities" (Wisconsin Teaching Academy)

Professional development: "Activities or experiences that may lead to professional learning and/or development" of educators (Boylan et al., 2018, p.121).

Reflection: Active thought leading to conclusions that inspire change in beliefs and practice (Clark & Hollingsworth, 2002).

Reform-minded teacher: An educator with inherent dedication to improvement of classroom practices (Thiessen & Barrett, 2002).

SLO: An acronym for "student learning objective" which is a measurable, long-term academic growth target that a teacher sets annually for all students or for subgroups of students. Student learning objectives demonstrate a teacher's impact on their students' learning (ODE, 2018).

Student growth measures: The "change in student achievement as demonstrated by differences in scoring data between two points in time, specifically, by comparing differences between a pretest (e.g., evaluation prior to instruction) and a posttest (e.g., evaluation at the end of instruction)" (Wesolowski, 2015, p. 43).

TOSA: Acronym for teacher on special assignment.

Value-Added Growth Model: "a statistical calculation that attributes the growth of individual students to one particular teacher, school, or district" (Overland, 2014, p. 58).

VAM: Acronym for value-added measurement.

Chapter 2. Review of Literature

This chapter reviews literature centered on collaboration and music teachers' professional development (PD), specifically the examination of collaborative practice that informs the design of effective professional learning for music educators connected to collaborative assessment and peer review. I describe and compare collaborative approaches to professional development to shape a framework of effective professional learning for teachers in urban contexts involved in similarly collaborative forms of assessment and peer review as in this study. Embedded in accountability-based policies is an assumption that peer review, student learning objectives (SLOs), or other accountability-based policies practices might lead to improvements in teachers' practice, thus prompting their professional growth. I have included theoretical models of teachers' professional growth in this review as they informed my analysis and interpretations of the data.

The literature I have chosen examines teachers' professional learning and connections to the design of professional development activities for teachers' continued growth. I intentionally chose studies, dating primarily after 1993, that move away from the perspective of professional development design as "training" or as an "attempt to effect teacher change through professional development programs based on the deficit-training-mastery model" (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002). The inadequacy of this

approach for teachers' professional growth was the catalyst for much research connected to professional development (Guskey, 1986, 2002; Johnson, 1989, 1993, 1996a, 1996b; Teacher Professional Growth Consortium, 1994). Literature indicates that delivery formats of standard professional development opportunities hold specific concerns for educators (Fullan, 2001; Glazer & Hannafin, 2006; Grossman, Wineburg, & Woolworth, 2001; Killion, 1999). Teachers describe experiences provided by school systems such as stand-alone workshops, conference sessions and one-shot in-services as limited and with minimal educator interaction (Hammel, 2007). Teachers seek opportunities that accommodate their individual learning needs. They also seek meaningful professional development and realize to achieve that will require more than the in-service workshops of the past. Educators know the benefits of active, rather than passive, participation in professional development opportunities that they choose themselves and that are consistent with their specific classroom goals and objectives (Hammel, 2007, p. 27). This research collectively contributed to the view of teachers as active participants and ongoing learners in professional development activities and practices.

To find relevant literature for review, I searched online databases including ERIC, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, JSTOR, and Google Scholar using variations of the following terms: music, professional development, teacher learning, teacher growth, music education, educational reform, professional learning communities, collaborative learning, communities of practice, content based inquiry, collaborative inquiry, peer mentoring, peer coaching, and peer review. Literature included for review fits into four content areas: (1) learning theories and effective models of professional development for

music teachers; (2) collaboration as professional development that aligns with content and specific contextual needs of music teachers; (3) mentoring that acknowledges specific content and contexts; and (4) studies of peer review and assessment.

First, I review relevant models of professional development for music educators that align with particular needs of music educators (Barrett, 2006; Conway, 2008; Gruenhagen, 2008; Kastner 2015; Pellegrino, 2010, 2011; Stanley, 2009; Stanley et al., 2014) as well as educators in urban contexts (Frierson-Campbell, 2007; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; J. Shaw, 2018). Then, I summarize studies that include specific contextual and situational descriptions and issues in mentoring (Blair, 2008; Conway, 2003; J. Shaw, 2018), followed by studies on self-directed inquiry and adult learning (Brookfield, 1995; Densten & Gray, 2001). Finally, I review studies on peer review and assessment (Parkes, Rohwer, & Davison, 2015; Robinson, 2005; Smylie, Lazurus, & Brownlee-Conyers, 1996). These studies hold implications relevant to policymakers and can inform the design of professional development for music educators.

Learning Theories and Professional Development

Professional development is an ongoing process of learning that is essential to teachers' personal and professional growth, playing a significant role in educators' overall achievement and success. Major delivery models of professional development present educators with varied options and opportunities to increase their knowledge and skill. For the purposes of this study, I use the term "professional development" as in the research of Boylan and colleagues (2018), to refer to "activities or experiences that may lead to professional learning and/or development" of educators (p.121).

Often, music teachers are isolated as the only such specialists in their buildings and as such, have few professional development opportunities specific to their content. Hammel (2007) contended that music teachers are often asked to attend irrelevant professional development and implement school-wide initiatives with little significance to music curricula. The researcher suggested that music educators might find increased value in professional learning opportunities when provided the ability to collaborate in capacities such as mentoring, co-teaching, or observation (p. 23).

Effective Professional Development

Guskey (2000) described effective professional development as: (a) learning-centered programs focused on the school as an educational community; (b) programs focused on individual and collaborative continuous improvement; (c) programs centered on a single unified goal achieved through small, collaborative and incremental steps; and (d) ongoing programs that incorporate professional development into the daily schedule. Guskey (2002) asserted that the process of professional development is complex and should be ongoing with continued support and consistent use of acquired learning, rather than perceived as an event (p. 388). The researcher's linear path model links four elements of professional development that occur in a precise sequence: change in teachers' practice, change in students' learning outcomes, and changes in teachers' beliefs and attitudes. Significant changes in teachers' attitudes and beliefs occur generally after witnessing evidence of improvement in student learning (Guskey, 2000). Guskey's (2002) model has been widely applied to professional development design across a range

of fields and contexts (Armour & Yelling, 2004; Lumpe, Czerniak, Haney, & Beltyukova, 2012).

Professional Development and Student Growth

Desimone (2009) proposed the employment of a set of 'core features' and a 'common conceptual framework' in her single pathway model of professional learning (p.181). The researcher argued the need to provide answers to the question of how to best measure professional development and changes to teachers' practice and student growth through the use of core features: content focus, active learning, coherence, duration, and collective participation in professional development activity (2009, p.185). Desimone contended that the importance of each element in her single path model is reflected in literature that connects practice with student growth (Hill, Ball, & Schilling, 2008; Phelps, & Schilling, 2004), and professional development with teachers' practice (Fishman, Marx, Best, & Tal, 2003; Heck, Banilower, Weis, & Rosenberg, 2008). The elements of Desimone's (2009) professional growth model described as "core features" resemble the domains in Guskey's (2002) model although described differently. Desimone argued that research (Desimone, Porter, et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001) indicates that these features of professional development are essential to changes in knowledge, skills and classroom practice resulting in student growth as an outcome (Desimone, 2009, p.185; Desimone, Porter, et al., 2002; Garet et al., 2001).

Individual Professional Development

Clark and Hollingsworth's (2002) Interconnected Model of Professional Growth holds significant implications for professional development, understanding of teacher learning, and the individuality of teachers' growth. In Chapter 1, I presented Clark and Hollingsworth's model of change as developing through the mediating processes of reflection and enactment. The model centers on connections between varied elements of professional learning and characterizes the four domains that "encompass the teacher's world" as the external domain, the domain of practice, the domain of consequence and the personal domain (2002, p. 950). These domains are similar to the four domains presented by Guskey (1986) and the elements presented by Desimone (2009); however, they differ in significant ways. Clark and Hollingsworth's (2002) model accounts for professional learning that may occur in response to informal reactions or other external stimuli and offers varied sequences in which learning may occur. In addition, the model provides more visibility to individual teachers and their ability to influence their own professional learning. Conversely, Guskey and Desimone tend to place more emphasis on responses to formal professional development activities with external stimuli and look for interceding elements that influence teachers' professional development (Boylan et al., 2018, p. 125).

The structure of Clarke and Hollingsworth's (2002) non-linear model enables the identification of unique "change sequences" and "growth networks" that relate to individual teachers and their influence on their own professional learning (p. 958). Clarke & Hollingsworth make a conceptual distinction between "change sequences" and

"growth networks." The researchers outlined six alternative perspectives on teacher change and identify progressive links or sequences that mark the unique nature of teacher growth. These alternative perspectives are change as training, change as adaptation, change as personal development, change as local reform, change as systemic restructuring, and change as growth or learning.

Change as training, a perspective in which teachers are "passive participants" and professional development serves as a remedy to a possible shortcoming resulting in teacher change or correction (Clark & Hollingsworth, 2002, p. 948), is a deficit view of professional learning. Professional development programs operating from this perspective are designed to identify, correct, or provide "appropriate" teaching skills that a teacher may appear to lack. These programs may consist of short learning sessions or one-time learning opportunities intended to provide mastery of specific skills and knowledge. Professional development based on the deficit model has been criticized throughout extant literature (Loucks-Horsley & Motsumoto, 1999; Pianto, 2011; Spillane, 2002).

Change as adaptation encompasses the need for teachers to alter their practice due to changes in their work environment or conditions. Teachers inevitably adapt their behavior to environmental changes regardless of available resources, changes in policy or practice, adjustments to capacity of the school building, class size, assignments, or a new situation. Teachers experience *change as personal development* when participating in professional learning programs as self-motivated educators seeking to improve their skills. *Change as local reform* is a perspective in which teachers may purposely initiate

change in their working environment for reasons of personal growth that affects the local environment. An example is a change in practice as response to revisions or adjustments to curriculum. Teachers in this instance reform their practice and initiate change.

Change as systemic restructuring is a perspective in which teachers may become agents of external entities who are the initiators of change. The external parties provide prepared information and view the teacher as implementer of the provided information. Essentially, teachers become implementers of change in a causal relationship (Elmore, Peterson, & McCarthy, 1996). *Change as growth or learning* is a perspective in which teachers change through engagement in professional activity as educators and learners in a learning community. Learning is purposeful in nature and centered on continual improvement. The teacher and students maintain a respectful ownership of the learning process. Adoption of the growth perspective enables researchers of professional development and in-service programs to claim literature and theory related to learning (Guskey, 1994). Clark and Hollingsworth (2002) posited that many of these alternative perspectives on change are interrelated. The researchers suggested that the perspective of "change as growth or learning" most closely aligns with professional development efforts and has potential to account for both formal and informal professional learning (2002, p. 948).

Collaborative Communities and Professional Development

Richardson and Placier (2001) described teacher change as "learning, development, socialization, growth, improvement, implementation of something new or different, cognitive and affective change, and self-study" (p. 905). The researchers

suggested that in collaborative schools, teachers' confidence in their classroom practice increases with collaborative learning. Additionally, the researchers determined that teacher learning is linked to collaborative communities rather than isolated environments and examined contesting perspectives of how change occurs. The perspectives are characterized by three diverse approaches to change: empirical-rational, normative-reeducative, and power-coercive.

The empirical-rational approach is based on a linear process of teacher change that employs idealistic goals and a rational approach to achieve them (Richardson & Placier, 2001, p. 905). In this strategy, change originates outside of the classroom: teachers are introduced to the change topic and the expectation is that teachers be implementers of the change within their classrooms. The basis for this approach originates from external sources, such as policymakers, administrators, researchers, staff developers, teacher educators, or teams of teachers, who determine the direction and process of the change phenomena, as opposed to the teacher engaged in the process. This change strategy is akin to Clark and Hollingsworth's (1994) "change as systemic restructuring" in which teachers act as agents of outside entities to implement a proposed agenda (p.158). Richardson and Placier described this view as difficult in that an entity outside the classroom holds power over change. In this perspective, teachers are often portrayed as "recalcitrant and resistant if they do not implement the suggested change" (Richardson & Placier, 2001, p. 906). J. Shaw (2018) described urban situations in which an empirical-rational approach to change can be accompanied by a "salvationist attitude"

(Benedict, 2006), and external entities insert “best practices” assumed appropriate for teachers and students in all contexts (J. Shaw, 2018, p. 28).

The *normative-reeducative* approach to change is focused on cultivating teachers’ “personal growth and development, and on collaborative practice leading to collective change” (Richardson & Placier, p. 918). This approach considers the nature of individuals to rationally reflect upon themselves, in which connection to change is made through intensive reflection on beliefs and practices. Whereas the empirical-rational approach is systemic in that teachers become agents of outside learning agendas, the normative-reeducative process involves dialogue and development in understanding one’s beliefs and knowledge to determine teacher agency. This difference between the two strategies pertains to the direction of change. For instance, in the normative-reeducative approach, the direction for change is directed by individuals involved in the process, whereas in the empirical-rational approach, the direction of change is determined by individuals outside of the classroom.

Richardson and Placier’s (2001) literature review described the *naturalistic* concept of change which suggests that teachers change constantly. These changes may be characterized by classroom reorganizations, curriculum revisions or change, and diverse ways of “thinking, teaching, and learning” (p. 908). Changes such as these might be initiated by teacher evaluations, teachers’ collaboration with colleagues, professional development, or any variation to a teacher’s environment, and are ongoing and voluntary throughout a teacher’s career. In addition, the naturalistic concept of change may be characterized by differences among teachers’ approaches to change. Change that

originates from outside of the classroom provides teachers with opportunities to work as change agents implementing and determining the direction and process of the change within their classroom and/or within the school (p. 905). Teachers' attitudes of resistance can inhibit their ability to exercise their agency, which would enable them to enact particular pedagogies in urban contexts including culturally relevant practice and context-specific practices within peer review frameworks. Teachers could employ their agency to function as "musical arrangers, extracting the prominent themes and motives of the reform initiative to create a new setting of the ideas" (p. 768).

The *power-coercive* approach to change seeks to influence change through collective action strategies, often supported by powerful leaders. These strategies encompass non-violent movements, the use of political institutions, and management of celebrities to achieve change. The power-coercive approach is seldom associated with literature of teacher change.

Teacher Agency and Professional Development

Thiessen and Barrett (2002) examined the role of teacher agency in school reform efforts. Teachers focused on reform are devoted to ongoing learning and innovation in multiple ways, which are described as "realms" in three overlapping dimensions of work: in the classroom, in the corridor, and as part of communities (Thiessen & Anderson, 1999). These dimensions build on teachers' collaborative efforts with colleagues and commitment to continued growth for educators' practice, their students, community engagement as well as school and district partners. Thiessen and Barrett (2002) suggested a restructuring of the prevailing image of the music teacher as a specialist in music

education. The researchers argued that a reform-minded image of teaching not only builds on foundational strengths of music teachers but also serves to address long-standing issues in ways that recast music teachers' role and significance in educational reform (p. 776).

Reform-minded music teacher. Thiessen and Barrett (2002) referred to a music teacher with inherent dedication to the improvement of classroom practices as a "reform-minded" teacher (p. 766). These teachers transform their practice and move beyond the classroom to engage in collaborative work with teachers in the school and other individuals in the community. This leads to an expanded definition of the role of the music teacher as a specialist and has implications for the reform-minded teacher in music education programs.

Self-Directed Professional Development

Barrett (2006) described music teachers working in the context of reform as faced with extraordinary expectations of change and under a broad umbrella of general terms applied to all teachers. Such a lack of discipline-specific expectations for change makes it challenging for teachers to meet these expectations and for administrators and teacher educators to determine how to meet their specific needs. When faced with the task of meeting multiple self-directed accountability measures, teachers may become encumbered with record-keeping and checklists connected to evaluation and other methods of accountability. Teachers may take alternative paths to meet required standards at varied levels and achieve desirable outcomes that meet state and/or district guidelines (p. 20). State and federal teaching standards developed to assess teachers'

strengths and weaknesses inform the levels of support teachers need from administrators, mentors, and teacher educators.

Barrett (2006) suggested that educational change requires a structured approach to teachers' learning and contexts that support their work. The researcher identified the most common types of professional development venues as: conference sessions and courses, workshops, graduate classes, school-wide professional development initiatives, mentoring, developing partnerships with arts or community organizations, working toward national board certification, and/or participating in performing ensembles (Barrett, 2006, p. 24). Barrett suggested effective professional development opportunities along four dimensions for reform-minded teachers: contextual fit, disciplinary fit, self-directed inquiry, and collaborative interaction. Implementing a condition of "disciplinary fit" as in the present peer review program may not guarantee participant's receptivity toward the process. *The empirical-rational* approach, as previously noted, similarly engages teachers as agents of change to implement a proposed external agenda (Richardson & Placier, 2001). Teachers are often portrayed as "recalcitrant and resistant if they do not implement the suggested change" (p. 906).

Barrett (2006) identified teaching and learning that includes inquiry on social, cultural, and political contexts of the school that suggests and informs what happens in music classrooms. In addition, teachers working collaboratively with other educators to refine abilities in critiquing and evaluation of program and curricula, as well as interactions with varied community partners characterizes an effective dimension of teachers' work. Music educators may engage in collaborative leadership roles with arts

organizations and community partnerships on behalf of their schools or for their districts at large. The work that teachers implement in one realm influences the other realms, as Borko and Putnam's (1996) study indicated: teachers' knowledge extends in diverse ways across domains, actions, and contexts (p. 677).

Professional Development Delivery Models

In the following sections, I explore empirical research on professional learning delivery approaches most closely related to collaborative professional development (Blair, 2018; Conway, 2003; Conway & Jeffers, 2004b; Kastner, 2015; Pellegrino, 2011; Stanley, 2009; Stanley et al., 2014; J. Shaw, 2018) and collaborative assessment and peer review (Brookfield, 1995; Butler et al., 2007; Conway & Jeffers, 2004a; Frierson-Campbell, 2007; Matsko & Hammerness, 2013; Parkes et al., 2015; Robinson, 2005; Shaw, 2018; Smylie et al, 1996; Thiessen & Barrett, 2002; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). Research abounds on professional delivery approaches; however, literature exploring collaborative assessment and peer review is limited. Given the scarcity of research on collaborative assessment as a professional learning opportunity, I broaden the scope of the review to include models that incorporate elements of collaborative interaction, mentoring, inquiry-based learning, self-directed learning, and other models of innovative collaborative learning communities.

Collaborative Inquiry

Collaborative inquiry has been defined as a setting in which teachers work together to examine relevant data, teaching practices and common issues (see David, 2009). The premise behind this approach is that student gains will occur through

systematic application of collaborative teacher practices (David, 2009). Coburn and Stein (2010) described collaborative inquiry as a four-stage cyclical process that supports exploration of classroom practices and student achievement. The cycle begins with planning: identifying a learning focus or a specific learning need. Stage two continues with implementing strategies built on research and assessing the outcomes. This is followed by observation, recording, and sharing of student learning. Finally, teachers assess the findings of both student and teacher learning outcomes (Drake, 2010).

Conway (2008) interviewed veteran music teachers to explore their views of the most and least valuable professional development experiences throughout their teaching careers. A goal of the study was to provide informed insight for the design, implementation, and evaluation of music teacher professional development. Conway suggested that teachers at all levels need time to collaborate and share classroom practices with other educators. Findings indicated that teachers perceived informal interactions with other music teachers as meaningful professional development. Additionally, educators valued leading professional development for their peers, participation in formal professional learning, presenting at professional conferences and learning from their students, student teachers, colleagues, and administrators. Teachers suggested that participation in professional inspired thoughts of future roles they might pursue as they progressed through their careers.

Literature suggests that professional development for music teachers should be positioned within music education (Conway, Albert, Hibbert & Hourigan, 2005; Hookey, 2002). Ongoing, career-length professional learning is essential for music educators

teaching in environments of constant change (Conway & Edgar, 2014). Additionally, literature supports collaborative interactions as essential elements of PD design, a finding that can inform policymakers and professional development designers in the development of professional learning activities for music educators (Borko, 2004; Clement & Vandenberghe, 2000; Grossman, Wineburg & Woolworth, 2001; and McCotter, 2001).

Communities of Practice

J. Shaw (2018) proposed that communities of practice provide structure and engagement with key advantages for new teachers in urban settings (p. 29). Prior literature indicates that such communities increase teacher retention (Smith & Ingersoll, 2004) and provide a safe environment for teachers to explore, challenge and consider change of their own beliefs and understandings. Studies addressing settings that enable teachers to effectively collaborate and engage in meaningful interdisciplinary practice hold particular significance for music teachers and professional growth.

Pellegrino's (2011) study examined the benefits of music-making as professional learning for music educators and as a means to inform policymakers of the value found in related activities for professional growth. Pellegrino described collaborative learning opportunities for music educators, such as teacher study groups that include chamber music collaboration or opportunities in collaborative groups to conduct action research based on integrated music-making and music teaching. These opportunities create professional development credit for music educators involved in professional music groups or music opportunities in the arts community. Additionally, professional

development opportunities are created for music-making at divisional and district-wide meetings.

Pellegrino explored educational and psychological arguments linking engagement, health, and identity for broader perspectives of professional development policies. The researcher suggested that making music has been a means of developing presence in teaching and is linked to self-awareness, concentration, and pedagogical knowledge. Pellegrino contended that music-making, in fact, can attend as a "powerful pedagogical tool" (2011, p. 79), and relates to teachers' assumptions and characters (Day, Kington, Stobart, & Sammons, 2006; Sammons, Day, Kington, Gu, Stobart, & Smees, 2007). In two separate studies (Day et al. 2006, and Sammons et al. 2007) exploring the premise that there is a connection between "a teacher's identity and his or her commitment, motivation, self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and sense of purpose," results indicated a connection to the teacher's identity, well-being, and effectiveness (Pellegrino, 2011, p. 81).

Professional Learning Community

Smith and Gillespie (2007) connected professional development, teacher knowledge, efficacy, and student outcomes in a review of literature highlighting job-embedded professional development. Literature suggests that these job-embedded professional learning programs are successful when they include the following components: (a) "a focus on helping teachers to study their students' thinking, (b) collaborative learning activities among teachers, (c) activities in which teachers make use of student performance data, and (d) help from facilitators to organize job embedded

professional development" (p. 82). Collection of classroom data and group analysis in collaborative professional learning communities (PLCs) or teacher-based teams (TBTs), as explored in this study are, therefore, ideal job-embedded settings for teachers according to Smith and Gillespie's criteria. In light of their criteria, the peer review program that served as the context for the present research holds potential to inform professional development planning for the district's music educators, to inform the evaluation of the district's music educators with greater specificity in terms of content and context, and to plan and provide effective professional learning linked to collaboration.

Stanley's (2009) study examined how teachers' participation in a Collaborative Teacher Study Group (CTSG) impacts their practice, affects student learning, and leads to transformative professional development. Stanley (2009) linked her CTSG to Heck's (1991) perception of a compassionate artist-teacher dedicated to relevant educational experiences, suggesting that recalling what it is like to be a music learner has the ability to impact teachers' practices and student outcomes (p. 83).

Stanley's (2009) findings indicated that the teaching practice of participants changed as a result of the concentration on collaboration in the CTSG in her study. The CTSG promoted professional learning of teachers in that it somewhat addressed teachers' feelings of isolation from other music professionals teaching similar content. Additionally, the CTSG addressed the lack of community that some teachers not only felt in their buildings but with other music teachers as well.

Stanley, Snell, and Edgar (2014) interviewed eight practicing teachers regarding their experiences with collaborative music teacher professional development. The authors identified seven key elements of effective collaborative PD for music teachers. Such PD is musical, formed around content-specific techniques and strategies, ongoing, voluntary with elements of teachers' choice, [values] existing teacher knowledge and wisdom, [and encompasses] reflection, site-specific support, and mentoring (p. 78). Stanley and colleagues (2014) suggested that "collaboration could be one of music education's best and most promising tools for increasing the musical achievement of students" (p. 86).

Kastner (2015) examined a professional development community (PDC) of four teachers that met bi-monthly to discuss and share student work, network with colleagues, and share literature on informal music learning, sharing and best practices. Three themes that emerged from the research included experiments and modifications, pedagogical practices, and finding value. Over the course of the PDC meetings, the participants learned from each other's experiences. Additionally, participants created learning activities individually or collaboratively. Finally, participants found value in students' increased motivation and independent musicianship that developed while using informal practices. Horn (2005) suggested that informal interactions of teachers participating in PDCs often inspire common awareness and knowledge.

Stanley (2009) examined professional development communities in music education as a way for music teachers to connect with colleagues. Teachers shared classroom practices, exchanged ideas, and reflected on their teaching in these PDCs with colleagues. However, they required a period of adjustment before openly talking about

their teaching, a finding that might extend to teachers collaborating in peer review dyads. Stanley (2009) also described how showing teaching videos and implementing a "collaborative consultancy protocol" assisted discussion and created a safe environment for teacher collaboration. The present study complements research conducted with collaborative groups of teachers by exploring music teacher collaboration in the context of peer review dyads.

Although not all professional development can be voluntary, when teachers know that they have choice and control over their own professional learning they are more inclined to adopt and retain new teaching approaches. Teachers engaged in collaborative professional learning can choose the manner in which they will participate, and in what type of role. This allows for a perception of professional development more meaningful than seemingly going through the motions to complete performance requirements.

Elpus and Prichard (2014) described perceptions of music teachers' positive attitudes when provided autonomy in creating and designing student learning objectives (SLOs). Teachers identified the process of goal setting and focus on student strengths and weaknesses as key to the improvement of their pedagogy and individual professional learning. Scholars reported that 90 percent of teachers were able to achieve desired objectives suggesting their capability to design SLOs that were easily achievable (R. Shaw, 2016). Findings of this study did not provide evidence that teachers' participation in the program catalyzed their teaching practice or professional growth.

Mentoring

Mentoring is a professional learning approach that generally involves a less-experienced teacher and peer guide or coach. The mentor, possibly a veteran teacher, may work in the same building or in the school district, possibly teaching a different content or grade level. A mentor can be an individual whose character suggests an ideal match for the novice teacher (Feiman-Nemser, 2003; Robinson, 2003; Smith, 2003). Mentoring provides opportunities for colleagues to share ideas, curricula, best practices, and teaching strategies. The approach offers an individualized method that can benefit both educators involved in the learning activity.

Blair's (2008) study centered on mentoring of novice elementary general music teachers as professional learning, and data were collected on the lived experiences of the teachers throughout the year. In addition to mentoring, a collaborative community of practice developed among teachers involved in the study, in which novice teachers shared issues, concerns, ideas and plans that developed during the school year. Two fundamental concerns emerged as salient to the professionalism of these teachers: classroom management and teacher evaluation. Teachers' participation in these collaborative communities proved beneficial in that teachers have opportunities to explore beliefs and understandings in a safe environment (p. 99). Literature indicates that novice educators experience unique issues referred to as "praxis shock" (Ballantyne, 2006, 2007; Gold, 1996) or "the gap between expectations and reality in the practice of teaching take their toll" (Blair, 2008, p. 100).

Blair (2008) described a collaborative community developed for novice teachers to process feedback from their experiences with initial teacher evaluations. The researcher shared that the teachers worked collaboratively to process primarily negative feedback from their evaluations through the use of videotapes after some coaxing, and discussed ways to address what was happening, and how to improve practices in their classrooms. Blair indicated that the environment of the novice teachers' collaborative community developed into a safe space for the teachers to explore their teaching practices and interact with colleagues with similar issues and concerns.

Blair's (2008) findings revealed that through collaborative meetings and supporting each other, with regular emails, phone calls, and through other spontaneous activities the teachers developed a community of practice (Wenger, 2011; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2007). Conway (2003) conducted a study in mid-Michigan school districts involving beginning music teachers' mentoring practices that included factors such as inconsistent types of mentoring programs in the schools and varied levels of teacher satisfaction with the programs. Conway described the lack of consistency in relation to school types, teaching responsibilities and contexts, the type of mentor assigned, the level of pay, and training which the mentor was assigned. The researcher described teachers' perceptions of the program's value in relation to the quality and capacity of interaction with assigned mentors. J. Shaw (2018) contended that mentoring built on contextual knowledge of urban settings supports novice teachers' individual and professional growth. Further, literature indicates the relevance of pairing music teachers in content-specific pairings (Conway, 2003a; Robinson, 2003b; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004)

and thus, J. Shaw (2018) asserted that novice teachers in urban situations benefit from pairings with mentors who have successful teaching experience in urban contexts (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004; Cochran-Smith, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 2001). J. Shaw (2018) offered recommendations addressing mentor selection, assignment, and oversight, and explored how these related to present state-level policies (p. 29). The researcher argued that policy, therefore, can be devised to support the unique environment for urban music teachers and mentoring practices.

J. Shaw's (2018) article suggested that mentoring involves specific knowledge and experience, with understanding of adult learners (Achinstein & Athanases, 2006; Carver & Feiman-Nemser, 2009). J. Shaw highlighted two elements significant to successful interaction: effective teaching and learning on implementation of mentoring tasks, and ample time to complete mentoring duties (p. 31). Achinstein and Athanases (2006) suggested that new teacher mentors, similar to new peer reviewers in the present research, are not born but instead are made through education and mentoring (p. 254). J. Shaw (2018) identified communities of practice and university partnerships as avenues for mentors with social-justice-orientation (Hammerness & Matsko, 2012; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014; Quartz & TEP Research Group, 2003). Additionally, J. Shaw (2018) argued that in order to achieve productive mentoring relationships, mentors should be allowed release time from their teaching responsibilities in order to "regularly observe, meet, and collaborate with beginning teachers" (p. 31).

Akin to teachers' effective professional development, Carver and Feiman-Nemser (2009) suggested that learning opportunities for mentoring are most effective when they

are long-term and sustained, providing means of ongoing problem solving and skill development. Similarly, the professional development occurring for peer reviewers in this study has connection to J. Shaw's (2018) elements for successful interaction. Further, there is meaningful connection to the understanding of adult learners, and particular settings for urban teachers and mentoring practices.

Matsko & Hammerness (2013) described a "context-specific" approach to professional development pulling from program descriptions and interviews from within the Chicago Urban Teacher Education Program that works to prepare teachers for the Chicago Public Schools. The program "values content embedded within context" and enables teachers to have greater understanding of their students as well as develop stronger collaborative working relationships with colleagues, parents, and students, and to refine their practice in more equitable ways. The researchers investigated designing a program in such a way as to prevent the automatic generalization of a culture on the basis of geographical location and the circumstantial facets of that setting, and to provide candidates and new teachers a view of this particular local school and its classrooms unobstructed by preconceived notions and beliefs (p. 138). Music educators with particular knowledge of urban contexts can increase opportunities to enact culturally responsive practice in their classrooms and their own professional growth. According to Matsko and Hammerness (2014), a teaching approach that gives educators the ability to have greater understanding of their students, increased collaboration with colleagues, parents and students, as well as the ability to navigate through urban school systems

effectively and to empower students equitably with knowledge, might be of most significance in teaching students.

Peer Review

Smiley, Lazarus, and Brownlee-Conyers (1996) examined a school reform approach in a longitudinal study of teaching outcomes and collaborative decision-making. The approach created greater teacher leadership opportunities for educators and identified teachers' change as a varying element related their participation and student outcomes. Specifically, the study conducted in a Midwestern urban K-8 school district with 200 classroom teachers, studied variations of collaborative decision-making, teaching practices, and student learning over a five-year period. The elements of teacher autonomy, accountability, and professional learning opportunities were analyzed to determine their influence on participating teachers. These variables may inform teaching and learning outcomes and shared decision-making between administrators and teachers (p. 182).

The researchers found considerable declines in teachers' views of autonomy, but increases in their perceptions of accountability. Smiley and colleagues (1996) asserted that some teachers thrive in isolation and by making individual choices for teaching, however some prefer engagement with other educators and seek the ability to interact with other teachers in collaborative activities (see Wohlstetter, Smyer, & Mohrman, 1994). Additionally, findings showed opportunity for student learning and connections to student outcomes, participation, and instructional improvement.

Parkes, Rohwer, and Davison (2015) investigated student growth measures in music classes by surveying participants in four phases: helping teachers to create measurement instruments based on state standards using the measurement instruments in professional development, choosing items to display in a portfolio that illustrate long-term student growth, and developing and providing professional learning for a team of reviewers (p. 26). The results of the study indicated that music teachers and supervisors of fine arts or music in Virginia, recognized that student growth measurement in music classrooms was significant and should be used for teacher evaluation rather than using standardized scores from other content areas. This finding was key due to the Virginia Department of Education (2011) standards and guidelines established for evaluation of teachers requiring 40% of a teacher's evaluation to consist of measures illustrating student academic progress. If teachers in Virginia were unable to provide appropriate student growth outcomes in music, school administrators could use outcomes from the standardized scores in tested content areas such as math, English language arts, and science.

Conway, Edgar, Hansen, and Palmer (2014) explored experiences of seven music teachers to report whether teachers and policymakers qualify the research conducted in classrooms as professional development (p. 404). Hookey (2002) suggested:

> Research carried out by *teachers or other practitioners* represents a significant opportunity for professional development. This could include various individual strategies and approaches such as action research or self-study, self-evaluation or writing, working in mentoring or coaching pairs and diverse group strategies (p. 890).

Findings from Conway and colleagues' (2014) study indicated that participants viewed their experiences as positive and purposeful. The researchers noted that while the teachers' research was valuable as professional development, some participants faced difficulty completing their projects and not all participants achieved completion. This experience extended beyond a one-time learning experience, and the collaboration between the university and teacher to explore research was valued by all participants. (Conway, Eros, and Stanley, 2009; Conway and Jeffers, 2004b; Roulston et al., 2005).

Conway and Jeffers (2004a, 2004b) investigated evaluation processes connected to a specific teaching practice on instrumental music techniques. Jeffers, a retired music teacher from the public schools of Connecticut, worked with Conway, a university professor and researcher in Michigan on a collaborative action research study. Jeffers, while still working in the Connecticut Public Schools, used the project as the primary goal for his professional growth plan with approval from his evaluating administrator in 2001. The teacher outlined a plan of data collection for his project which included assessment procedures in beginning instrumental music.

Development of the assessment procedures included collaboration with other music educators as Jeffers's process to create a document began with a model. One salient finding was Jeffers's perception that previous professional learning activities were without the benefit of autonomous self-guided experience. Additionally, "arranged in-services had little or no relevance" to his classroom practice or that of other educational specialists (Conway & Jeffers, 2004b, p. 42).

Roulston, Legette, DeLoach, Bukhalter-Pittman, and Grenier (2005) examined the ways in which a teacher research community that included both university educators and teachers, could be built upon a 'practice-based-orientation' to research (2005, p. 4) in which teachers would create and conduct individual research projects. The collaborative group included two university educators serving as mentors and elementary music teachers. The university educators provided guidance to the teachers by assisting with the location of literature, creating research instruments, and helping teachers access study approvals. The teachers created research questions and collected and analyzed data. Roulston and colleagues (2005) described how the teacher research community evolved as a collaborative team that provided a supportive and safe climate for teachers to ask questions and discuss classroom practice. The collaborative practice addressed feelings of isolation often experienced by music teachers and enabled elementary teachers to increase their professional educator identities. Their findings suggested that collaborative research between university educators and teachers has potential to "supplement existing mentoring programs and contribute to the development of professional learning communities" (Roulston et al., 2005, p. 17).

Robinson (2005) connected teacher evaluation to professional growth contending that mentoring and peer evaluation creates new professional roles and responsibilities within school districts that provide veteran educators with pathways for growth in teacher leadership while remaining in the classroom. Robinson's study characterized "consulting teachers" (teacher mentors) as those who serve to mentor, support, and evaluate new or low-performing veteran teachers identified through intervention (Papay & Johnson,

2012). Robinson (2005) suggested that an element at issue for many educators when assuming the task of evaluating colleagues is that "support and evaluation are incompatible, or mutually exclusive, functions" (p. 49). Robinson posited that the evaluation of teachers has long been the responsibility of administrators and "according to conventional wisdom, mentors should assist not assess on the grounds that novices are more likely to share problems and ask for help if mentors do not evaluate them" (Feiman-Nemser, 1996, p.1). Robinson concluded that mentors need extensive support and professional development, as this issue can be trying for many that manage this task. Findings from the study elicited four themes on the experiences of teachers evaluating their colleagues: "Professional Awareness/Recognition of 'Best Practices,' Confidence/Validation, Reflection and Critical Analysis of One's Own Practice, and Professional Development and Growth" (2005, p. 54).

Robinson (2005) asserted that the question of "best practices" in music education has been a focus of literature for a number of years and involves the integration of what he referred to as the Three Artistic Processes: Composing, Performing and Responding to music (Schuler, 1996). The provision of this supporting literature simplified the issue for assessors tasked with beginning teachers. The researcher noted that the assessors involved in the assessment process experienced significant increases in their levels of confidence. The teachers involved were accomplished educators, performers and administrators that were highly respected by their colleagues and held leadership roles in the community and state and local professional organizations.

Robinson indicated that a finding of the study was that teacher participants become more reflective practitioners, and indications were that the scoring process had a similar effect on the veteran assessors as well (p. 56). The researcher described the mentoring program as having created capacity for veteran teachers to experience professional growth without leaving the classroom. Mentoring, peer evaluation and teachers assuming leadership roles offering assistance to colleagues while remaining in their classrooms are key elements of the present study. Additionally, teachers' awareness of their dual roles as evaluator and colleague and their attitudes and beliefs with regard to that particular element is significant.

Conclusion

This chapter reviewed literature on collaboration and peer review in connection to professional development. I described theories of teachers' professional growth including Clark and Hollingsworth's (2002) Interconnected Model of Professional Growth to discuss shape a framework of professional growth for teachers involved in collaborative assessment and peer review programs as in this study. The chapter also reviewed theoretical and empirical literature on varied delivery approaches for professional development, including collaborative inquiry, communities of practice, professional learning communities, mentoring, and peer review.

In Chapter 3, I outline the methodological approach used in this study. Chapter 4 presents findings of my analysis of interview data generated with teachers who were engaged in a peer review process. In Chapter 5, I present a summary of the methodological approach taken in the study and the study's findings, followed by a

discussion of the relationship of data to the research questions, implications of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Chapter 3. Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine how participation in a peer review and assessment program catalyzed changes in teachers' attitudes, beliefs, and practices as a part of their professional growth (Borko, 2004; Desimone, 2009). Research on collaboration and the professional development of teachers (Borko, 2004; Desimone, 2009; Conway & Edgar, 2014; Pellegrino, 2010, 2011; Stanley, 2009) and literature exploring connections between peer review and teacher evaluation (Robinson, 2005, 2015; Parkes, Rohwer, & Davison, 2015; Smylie, Lazarus, Brownlee-Conyers, 1996) informed the conduct of this study. Guskey (2002) noted that professional development should be viewed as a 'process, not an event' (Guskey, 2002, p. 388). Many studies exist on the topic of professional development (Borko, 2004; Desimone, 2009; Opfer & Pedder, 2011; see Bautista, Yau, & Wong, 2015; Conway & Edgar, 2014). The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do teachers describe their experiences in the peer review program?
2. How do teachers describe changes in their attitudes, beliefs and pedagogical practice in relation to their participation in a peer assessment and review program?

Research Design

Case Study Research

I used an intrinsic case study design (Yin, 2014) to examine how participation in a peer review and assessment program catalyzed music teachers' professional growth. This methodological design provided an appropriate fit with focus on the "particularity and complexity" of the program "coming to understand its activity within important circumstances" (Stake, 1995, p. xi). The structure of Clarke and Hollingsworth's (2002) non-linear model of professional learning enables the identification of unique "change sequences" and "growth networks" that relates to individual teachers and influences their own professional learning (p. 958). The Interconnected Model of Teacher Professional Growth, an analytical tool for understanding teacher learning and professional development, centers on connections between varied components of professional learning that recognizes the individuality of every teachers' learning and practice and as such provides an appropriate fit to the individual nature of learning represented by the teachers in the peer review study.

Yin (2014) described case study research as inquiry in an authentic, contemporary context. Cases may include entities such as individuals, groups and organizations, or possibly a community, a relationship or specific illustrations that are less tangible (Yin, 2014). Thomas (2016) suggested that case study is a "frame" that provides a perimeter for a study. The study is defined more by the boundaries placed around the case rather than the methods used to do the study (pg. 21). I examined the case of the peer review

program for specific manifestations of the phenomenon of music educators' professional growth. The boundaries of my study were established by this single, specific peer review program.

Research literature (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Yin, 2014) supported case study research as an investigative strategy, a methodology, or a comprehensive research strategy. However, Stake (2005) contended that case study research is a choice of what is to be studied, not a methodology (p. 443). Further, Thomas (2016) defined case study as: analyses of persons, events, decisions, periods, projects policies, institutions or other systems which are studied holistically by one or more methods. The case that is the subject of the inquiry will illuminate and explicate come analytical theme, or object (p. 23).

Research Context

This peer review program was set in a large urban Midwestern school district in Ohio serving 50,000 students. Data provided by the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) indicate that the district's population is characterized by racial and ethnic diversity in varied contexts and communities district-wide. See a summary of the district's racial and ethnic demographics in Table 3.1 below.

Demographics	Students
Black, Non- Hispanic;	54%
White, non- Hispanic;	24%
Hispanic	11%
Multi-racial	7%
Asian	4%
Limited English	1.9%

Table 3.1 District demographic table.

The disparate classroom and community settings in which music teachers created and applied measurable learning targets district-wide presented a unique research case, with opportunity to study capacity for professional growth in response to the school system's peer review and assessment teacher leader program.

The peer review program established as a pilot program in the 2016-2017 school year, served all elementary fine arts and physical education teachers district-wide. In the 2017-18 school year, the program increased in capacity to include all K-12 fine art, physical education and health teachers district-wide. The district peer assessment and review model utilized teams of teachers paired with educators for review of Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), which are defined as measurable, long-term academic targets set by teachers, at the beginning of each school year. The objectives are required

from each educator as a component of teacher evaluation. The SLOs intend to offer one indication of the impact a teacher has on their students' learning (ODE, 2018).

District peer reviewers volunteered to participate as members of the peer review team; however, they were required to meet an additional list of criteria to participate as peer review team members. These requirements included: a minimum of five years' teaching experience, annual professional development to support peer review and collaborative work with colleagues, exemplary communication skills, demonstration of effective and positive interpersonal relationship skills, and submission of a letter of interest (via email) to the Arts and Physical Education Administrator/Supervisor. The Arts and Physical Education Division Committee (which consisted of the district coordinators of Physical Education and Fine Arts, and the district administrator/supervisor of the Arts and Physical Education) determined selection to the K-12 Arts and Physical Education Peer Review and Assessment Team.

Participant Recruitment and Selection

Following the approval of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the school district's research committee for research practices (see approval document in Appendix C), I created a Google survey to seek music teacher participation from K-12 music teachers (vocal, general, and instrumental). Music teachers who completed the Google survey received emails to thank them for participating in the initial survey. In addition, music teachers selected for research received emails to schedule a meeting to further discuss the study and to sign consent forms. Creswell and Poth (2017) proposed that the concept of purposeful sampling provides greater understanding of a research problem and

is most appropriate in qualitative research. In this approach to sampling, participants are specifically selected because of their ability to purposefully inform an understanding of a research problem and central phenomenon of a study (p. 158).

As the district supervisor and administrator of arts, physical education and health, I had access to all K-12 music and physical education teachers through a district email distribution list. The recruitment email stated that participation in the research was voluntary and teachers could withdraw from the study at any time. The email also provided written assurance that participation in the study would in no way affect their teacher evaluations, participation in the district peer review program, or employment with the school district.

The maximum variation sample (Patton, 2002) of teachers selected differed in terms of content specialization (i.e., instrumental music, vocal music), grade levels (elementary, middle, or high school), school location(s), and status in the district's peer review program. I based the eventual selection of teachers upon specific criteria: (1) Although I prioritized intact dyads when selecting teachers, it was not always possible to enroll in peer review dyads for participation in the research; (2) diverse demographic classroom contexts and; (3) early career and veteran music educators. I met with each selected teacher individually to discuss the research and obtain their consent to participate. Through this process, I initially selected 10 teachers to participate in the study. One was unable to continue his participation after an initial individual interview and withdrew from the study, yielding a total of nine voluntary research participants.

The sample represented a lack of ethnic diversity due to limited response by the already existing small percentage of ethnically diverse music educators in the district. In addition, pursuing teachers beyond initial invitations to participate in the research with follow up presented a challenge due to the nature of my dual role as administrator and researcher. See Table 3.2 for a summary of selected teacher characteristics.

Participant	Gender Ethnicity	School(s)	Content	Grade Level	Experience	Peer Review Role
Chloe	Female Caucasian	Mason High School	High School Choral and Vocal General	Grades 9-12	6-10 years	Reviewee
Emma	Female Caucasian	Harbor High School	High School Choral and Vocal General (Keyboard)	Grades 9-12	2-5 years	Reviewee
Cathy	Female Caucasian	Spirit Elementary Adams Elementary	Elementary Vocal General Music	Grades P-5	21 years +	Reviewer
Olivia	Female Caucasian	Jackson Elementary King Elementary	Elementary Vocal General Band and Strings	Grades P-5	6-10 years	Reviewee
Jake	Male Caucasian	Lake High School Johnson Elementary Howard Elementary	Elementary and High School Band and Strings	Grades 4-12	5 years	Reviewer
Samuel	Male Caucasian	Lake High School	High School Band, Orchestra and General Music	Grades 9-12	16-20 years	Reviewer
Thomas	Male Caucasian	Canyon High School	High School Band, Orchestra and General Music (Drumming)	Grades 9-12	16-20 years	Reviewer
Michael	Male Caucasian	Perry Middle School	Band, Orchestra and Middle School General Music	Grades 6-8	2-5 years	Reviewee
Nathan	Male Caucasian	Harbor High School	Band, Orchestra and High School General Music (Keyboard)	Grades 9-12	16-20 years	Reviewer

Table 3.2 Demographics of nine participants

Data Generation

Data were collected from a purposeful sample of nine early career and veteran music teachers originally, that represented varied demographic classroom contexts and teaching experiences. To collect data, I used a semi-structured interview format (Fontana & Frey, 1994) in two individual interviews of each teacher and one focus group interview (Porter, 2013). Interviews were conducted in both individual teacher's classrooms and in convenient and central locations for teachers and the researcher. All interviews were scheduled at times convenient to teachers, each lasting between 45 and 60 minutes. The schedule for interviews and their durations is summarized in Table 3.3.

Participant	Interview Date	Time	Interview Location
Chloe	4/16/19	1 Hour	Mason High School
	5/9/19	45 Minutes	Mason High School
Emma	4/7/19	45 Minutes	Restaurant in School Community
	5/3/19	50 Minutes	Harbor High School
Cathy	4/12/19	1 Hour	Harbor High School
	5/7/19	1 Hour	Harbor High School
Olivia	4/5/19	50 Minutes	Jackson Elementary
	5/2/19	1 Hour	Jackson Elementary
Jake	4/3/19	45 Minutes	Harbor High School
	5/6/19	50 Minutes	Harbor High School
Samuel	4/3/19	55 Minutes	Harbor High School
	5/6/19	1 Hour	Harbor High School
Thomas	4/12/19	1 Hour	Canyon High School
	5/3/19	1 Hour	Canyon High School
Michael	4/15/19	45 Minutes	Harbor High School
	5/6/19	1 Hour	Harbor High School
Nathan	4/3/19	1 Hour	Harbor High School
	5/7/19	1 Hour	Harbor High School

Table 3.3: Peer Review participants' interview schedule

Semi-structured interview. A semi-structured interview includes a prepared interview guide with a number of open-ended questions that enable interviewees to use broad guidelines to formulate responses to questions posed by the researcher. After

presenting open-ended questions, the interviewer seeks additional detail about what the interviewee has said through probes or follow up questions. Each semi-structured interview using the same set of discussion topics will vary, given the response of individual interviewees and how the interviewer uses probes to evoke additional description (Roulston, 2010).

Individual Interviews

I conducted individual interviews with music teachers using open-ended questions about their experiences with peer review. In addition, I posed questions to teachers about attitudes, beliefs and contextual knowledge that might have impacted their pedagogical practice. Scheduled interviews most often took place in teachers' classrooms during non-teaching hours, at times and dates convenient for participants and researcher (Roulston, 2010). Each interview was recorded using a digital audio recorder and later transcribed. In the final individual interviews of this study, I used open-ended questions and focused on teacher's reflections on their pedagogical practice, attitudes and beliefs related to the peer review process.

Focus group interview. Research has suggested that group settings provide environments in which individuals are more willing to reveal personal thoughts (Krueger & Casey, 2000). The combination of individual responses and group interaction contribute multiple perspectives and ideas. To structure group interaction in a way that would generate data relevant to the research questions, I designed a focus group interview as a component of the case study research.

In focus group interviews, the researcher fills the role of 'facilitator' or 'moderator' in a discussion among participants. The group, generally 8-10 individuals, is provided a topic or range of focus materials to discuss in an informal setting. As facilitator, the researcher stimulates the discussion and maintains a marginal role in the activity (Thomas, 2016). Preparing in advance for interaction between teachers is essential. Roulston (2010) suggested to engage participation of all group members, an environment of geniality should be fostered by providing an informal, relaxed setting and possibly light snacks (p. 43). In addition, explaining protocols for group discussion is key to successful facilitation of the focus group interview (Roulston, 2010).

In this study, a focus group interview technique was used to explore how music teachers discussed the peer review process with colleagues. This interview, which all teachers except Chloe attended, was scheduled for 60 minutes and conducted at a central location in the school district. I provided light snacks, soda, and water for the participants and requested that they arrive 10-15 minutes in the library before the scheduled interview to allow time to get snacks, get situated in a group setting, and prepare for discussion. The interview was recorded using two digital recording devices. A second device was utilized as a back up and strategically placed for optimal recording. Six predetermined questions were provided to participants to stimulate discussion; however, the goal was to generate as much dialogue between the teachers in relation to peer review, teaching, and professional development as possible.

Interview Protocol

I employed an interview protocol (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015) to examine specific elements of peer review and professional development (see Appendix B for Interview Protocol). Interview protocols ensure that all parts of the research are discussed during the interview process (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). I included predetermined questions about peer review and professional development based on prior research, allowing additional follow-up questions to evolve in response to information gathered from individual interviews (Roulston, 2010). All interviews were recorded and then transcribed for subsequent analysis. Teachers were invited to review the transcripts and to suggest modifications, additions, or deletions. In addition, I collected documents and artifacts, including peer review program handouts, documents detailing the peer review process, policies and procedures, program schedules, lesson plans, and handouts distributed by the music teachers to lend additional clarification to the information provided during interviews.

Analysis

Creswell and Poth (2017) described data collection, data analysis, and documentation as correlated and often concurrent steps in a research project (p.185). Based upon literature reviewed (Bazely, 2013; Creswell & Poth, 2017), I employed a data management strategy early in the research process to organize data into labeled digital files and identified plans for long-term secure storage of files and conversion of data. Throughout the process of data generation, I used the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to generate broad themes related to collaboration and effective

professional development of teachers in the context of a peer review program. Preliminary analysis of the individual, in-depth interviews and group interview facilitated discovery of salient themes and generated additional interview questions. Ongoing collection of interview data served to narrow and refine these themes (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

As the analysis process progressed, I used a data analysis spiral procedure to analyze qualitative data. This process is represented by a spiral image suggesting a researcher moves in analytic circles instead of in a "fixed linear" path (Creswell & Poth, 2017, p.185). A researcher enters the process of analysis with data in the form of text, images or other forms of media and exits the process (spiral) with an explanation (Creswell & Poth, 2017).

Coding

Coding involves grouping data into small categories, finding evidence for the code in different areas being used in a study, and assigning a label to the code. Corbin and Strauss (2015) characterized the process as "doing analysis and denoting concepts to stand for data" (p. 216). I began my analysis with open coding, in which information is broken into parts, examined and compared for similarities and differences (Corbin & Strauss, 1998, p. 102). I continued the process of intense review, analysis, and recoding of collected data for greater dimensionality and development of themes for the remaining participant interviews. Throughout the collection of data, I examined transcripts, identified categories and subcategories, and detailed additional in-depth categories through axial coding, which as characterized by Saldańa (2016), described a "category's

properties and dimensions and explores how the categories and subcategories relate to each other" (p. 291). Finally, I explored intersections of selected categories through selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 2015, p. 84).

Verification and Trustworthiness

Triangulation. Creswell and Poth (2017) urged qualitative researchers to locate evidence to document a theme in varied sources of data, and thereby, corroborate or triangulate information and validate their findings (p. 260). I employed the strategy of triangulation in this study to validate my findings. I sought triangulation of corroborating evidence through multiple sources (Bazeley, 2013; Glesne, 2016; Yin, 2014) including individual and group semi-structured interviews, documents, and artifacts lending clarification to participant contributions (i.e., lesson plans, hand-outs, peer review documents), and memos.

Member checking. Member checking or seeking feedback from research participants is another validation technique employed in this study (Bazeley, 2013; Glesne 2013). Lincoln and Guba (1985) described this strategy as the "most critical technique for establishing credibility" (p. 314). In most qualitative research, this involves sharing data, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions with participants so they could determine the accuracy and credibility of the account (Creswell & Poth, 2017, p. 261). Stake (1995) contended that participants should be given the opportunity to provide alternative language, to the researcher's rough draft. Hays and Singh (2012) further contribute that participants play crucial roles by confirming their contributed portion, stating that participants should "play a major role directing as well as acting in case

study" research (p. 206). Teachers were contacted via email to review transcripts and interpretations to confirm the validity of the information. All of the nine teachers interviewed participated in this process, in which some teachers provided minor edits but confirmed agreement with interpretation of findings.

Subjectivity

As a district arts supervisor and administrator, I was aware of teachers' perceptions of my position and my potential to impact their employment, assignment in the district or position in the peer assessment leader program. Shank (2006) saw subjectivity as a problem and something to avoid in scientific research. This view of subjectivity means that a researcher's data collection will be negatively impacted by various factors that may lead to biased reporting (Shank, 2006). Peshkin (1988) presented a contrasting perspective that a researcher's subjectivity can be openly acknowledged and consistently identified throughout a research study. Open acknowledgement of my own subjectivity, as Peshkin (1988) advised, allowed the opportunity to systematically seek and investigate my own position relative to the research. Preissle (2008) identified this practice as examination and acknowledgment of a researcher's subjective positioning in a study in connection to their research topic.

In this study, awareness of subjectivity served to inform the development of strategies to position myself as researcher and acknowledge that participants may consistently respond with perceptions of my role as an administrator. To address my dual roles as researcher and arts administrator, I gathered writing materials to engage in reflective memoing in preparation for each interview, and a change of casual clothing to

temper participant's perception of myself as an authority figure (Wanat, 2008). Thomas (2016) suggested that when interpreting a case study, a researcher's subjectivity should be made explicit, and readers need to know the researcher's position and fundamental principles guiding the research (p. 68). As a former music teacher in the school district, I knew many participants as teachers, colleagues, musicians, or constituents. Wanat (2008) contrasted gaining access to research participants with gaining their cooperation in light of their potential perceptions of outcomes and ways in which research might impact their lives. These were identified as publicity of research findings, resentment due to feeling obligated to participate, and perceptions of underlying links to teacher evaluation (p. 203-4). As the sole data collector for this research and as an arts administrator for the district that served as the context for the study, I acknowledge that prior knowledge, assumptions, and subjectivity had potential to shape my interpretation of the findings. I had to, as Creswell and Poth (2017) suggested, reach self-understanding of potential bias, values and experiences. Establishing my role as researcher, rather than administrator (for the purpose of investigation) and providing assurance to all teachers that no repercussions for participation existed, was essential.

Limitations

This study provided an account of how participation in a peer review and assessment program catalyzed collaboration in music teachers' professional learning within a specific research setting. The phenomenon of teachers' professional growth is idiosyncratic and complex, characterized by individual teacher agency over their own learning. Findings of this study may not transfer to other contexts and are limited to the

perspectives of the nine music teacher participants in the context of this particular peer review program. I intentionally decided not to investigate how the evaluative component of peer review and assessment impacts music teachers' professional growth. Additionally, I did not confirm changes in teachers' practice through classroom observation but relied on their self-reports of learning and growth. In the role of district administrator, a possibility that I was unable to avoid entirely was the ways in which teachers may have positioned accounts of their experiences in particular ways. Finally, given scholars assertions that teachers' professional growth unfolds over an extended period of time (Barrett, 2006; Hargreaves, 2000; Richardson, 2003; Richardson & Hamilton, 1994), the compact timeframe for data generation in this study (four months) presents additional limitations. Given these potential limitations, readers should exercise caution in drawing conclusions from the study's findings.

Conclusion

This chapter has described the methodological approach taken in this investigation of teachers' professional growth in a peer review and assessment program. Chapter 4 will present the study's findings illuminating themes that emerged from the analysis. Chapter 5 includes a present a summary of the methodological approach taken in the study and the study's findings followed by a discussion of the relationship of data to the research questions, implications of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Chapter 4. Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine how participation in a peer review and assessment program catalyzed music teachers' professional growth. This chapter presents key findings from individual interviews conducted with K-12 vocal and instrumental music teacher peer review program participants. Several themes emerged from analysis, each of which is listed below with a brief introductory description. Subsequently, I describe each theme in greater depth in light of illustrative data excerpts.

Themes

1. *Attitudes of resistance*. Peer reviewers described encountering attitudes of resistance resulting from reviewee's misinterpretations of the SLO process and its purpose. Reviewees' expectations of lesson planning were misaligned with their views of a discipline-specific peer review program focused on increasing levels of rigor. For example, reviewers described a lack of understanding of the peer review program's centrality and revealed a wide breadth of perspectives. This led to levels of resistance to the extent that some reviewees failed to complete district mandated documentation.
2. *Advocacy for music teaching*. For the purpose of teaching and learning with clarity, reviewees described advocacy for music teaching. For example, some reviewees used extensive writing strategies, student learning objectives (SLOs) or

learning targets when assessed by an evaluator potentially unfamiliar with their content, and/or legitimizing classroom practices for teacher evaluation.

3. *Asset-based vs. deficit ideology.* Reviewers in the peer review program examined established standards for student achievement within urban contexts and explored innovative ideas to maintain confidence in students' ability to meet those expectations. Conversely, some reviewees inhibited their own teaching through deficit ideologies.
4. *Reflection and review upon individual teaching practice*. Ideally, the peer review program should foster reflection and review upon teachers' individual practice, however findings of the study indicated that reflection was inhibited by teachers' attitudes toward the SLO process. Additionally, teachers identified elements of the peer review program that held potential for music teachers' professional development.
5. *Enacting the role of reviewer.* Teachers participating as reviewers in the peer review program were placed in the position of policy enactor to enforce the authenticity and rigor of the content-specific initiative.

Theme 1: Attitudes of resistance.

Before the implementation of the discipline-specific initiative, the peer review process varied district-wide and was often hindered by the level of reviewers' knowledge of music content. Knowing that reviewers may not question them, reviewees in some cases did not instill standards of rigor in their learning targets that would stimulate authentic growth in their students' educational experiences. Reviewees described the

building-specific initiative as less exacting than that of the content-specific review process. Chloe explained:

> I think when people don't speak the same language that you speak on a daily basis it's hard for them to look at your SLOs [student learning objectives] and truly understand what you're talking about. So I think there was a level of, "I'm gonna approve this because there's a lot of words in here I don't understand, but since they sound fancy, they must be right." (4/16/19).

This assertion was not made by all reviewees, but Chloe indicated that in her building, SLO reviewers would ask clarifying questions:

> "What does this mean?" "How are you doing this?" "Can you put it in normal words that I understand so that I can help you to make sure you have SLOs that are going to benefit you and benefit your kids?" (4/16/19).

When the district implemented a discipline-specific structure and the expectation of rigorous content from reviewees increased, reviewers expressed resistance with regard to the level of scrutiny placed upon student growth targets by subject area specialists. Reviewees did not seem to have a clear understanding of the SLO process or the program's central focus and significance. When reviewers were asked to compare the discipline-specific peer review experience with the non-specific building experience, many described interactions and communication with reviewees that held diverse perspectives of the SLO process. These diverse views held by music teachers led to misinterpretation of the SLO process which in turn led to attitudes of resistance. Reviewers discussed a system of "gameplay" used by some reviewees in which strategy or a plan of action was used to achieve desired results on student growth outcomes. They described revealing conversations with reviewees after the implementation of the discipline-specific initiative in the district. Chloe relayed:

> [My reviewee would say:]" But, you don't understand, this was approved two years ago." [I would think:] *Well, I don't know how it was approved two years ago; I have my supervisor telling me you need a rubric.* So again, walls went up. We [reviewers] were being critical but it had nothing to do with the teaching. It was literally [identifying] missing components for the SLO. We finally got to the point where I think everyone understood if you play the game, you'll get an SLO that's approved. This is the recipe: put all the ingredients in, and out will come the SLO. I mean, unfortunately, it's gameplay (4/16/19).

Additionally, reviewers identified varied attitudes of compliance or "going through the motions" in order to meet requirements connected to teacher evaluations. Reviewees indicated that the SLO process represented "one more thing" in their list of things that needed to be done, or one more item to check off the list versus a possible tool of professional learning. They adopted attitudes of compliance that masked their objection to the SLO process in order to take the shortest distance from point A to point B, or they resisted in the opposite direction by not acting at all. Nathan shared his thoughts about reviewee's attitudes toward SLOs stating:

> I feel personally that it is a thing to do and I think that people approach it that way. I am guilty of approaching it that way. There's a timetable. We gotta get this done. It's a thing to do. I have taken SLOs from previous years and kept them pretty standard. I've cut and pasted the data changes every year. But there is that portion of it and I've gotten that from the people's SLOs that I've reviewed, as if I'm just trying to get this done. I've had that on my own as "I need to get this done for this deadline." So I tried to make it as streamlined as possible for myself and I'm also empathetic towards my colleagues that I'm reviewing in that they have a whole lot of things going on in the classroom (5/7/19).

Scholars have repeatedly emphasized the importance of disciplinary fit as a characteristic of effective professional development for music educators. Professional development that is relevant and engaging, well-informed and supported with resource take-aways tends to have popularity with experienced educators. Professional learning at educational conferences lean toward disciplinary fit and address the needs and interests of

teachers (Barrett, 2006). In the instance of the current peer review program, implementing the condition of "disciplinary fit" did not guarantee music teachers' receptivity toward the process, which was made evident by the teachers' attitudes of resistance.

Theme 2: Advocacy for music teaching.

When discussing themes important to informed professional development planning, reviewees described feeling as if their classroom practices required affirmation. In addition, they reported feeling as if their teaching and learning activities were potentially missing the mark when assessed by an evaluator possibly unfamiliar with their content. Olivia shared that prior to the discipline-specific initiative, the reviewers in her building transparently indicated their limited knowledge of her content. However, she reported that the team in her school provided opportunity for her to explain the SLOs. Olivia further indicated that she faced additional issues in writing lesson plans for the purpose of evaluation which led to detailed writing of her SLOs and lesson plans. Olivia stated:

> I specifically remember my assessment leaders being like, "We don't even know what you're talking about." So, I have gone the path of overwrite. I'm sure my SLO is very obnoxious to read this year: it is pages (laughter), pages and pages and pages. It's insane; it is so long. I didn't want to confuse anybody, so I am obnoxiously clear (4/30/19).

Olivia indicated that in addition to the focus on creating effective SLOs for student growth, steps taken to help reviewers understand her content resulted from issues faced in her buildings with the SLO process and evaluation. She found it necessary to use clear and precise language with consistency when crafting SLOs or lesson plans. These steps

would help to confirm her teaching and learning and advocate for informed discipline-specific evaluation and informed professional development.

Theme 3: Asset-based vs. deficit ideology.

When asked to describe their music programs, schools and communities, reviewees described their programs and shared expectations for students in diverse ways as well as standards for student achievement. Some reviewees described confidence in their ability to inspire these student achievements, while others portrayed classroom practices that promoted or inhibited effective teaching and increasing levels of rigor. Chloe described her expectations in her choral music programs, stating:

> Currently, I have four performing ensembles. They all get to know my expectations. The majority of the girls in my sixth period girl's glee are non-English speaking. There is an element of oral tradition that we use. The majority of my kids come to me not reading music. We do as much as we can with the schedule that we keep, with performances and testing and all of that, to get them understanding musical concepts and reading so that they are prepared for Mixed Ensemble. There is a lot of oral teaching that goes on. I sing, you sing back. I play, you sing it back, because that's how they've learned. Not only harmonies and melodies, but as well as the rhythms (4/16/19).

Chloe, teaching music at the high school level, described factors of managing a high school vocal music program that not only demanded unique elements of teaching and learning but student preparation for performances, and sometimes competition at district, community, and state levels. She used inclusive language that encompassed all students, their cultures, ethnicities, and backgrounds while maintaining the expectation and confidence that students would reach established and increasingly rigorous goals in the familial culture of her music program. J. Shaw (2018) suggested that increasing knowledge of specific urban contexts, developing as culturally responsive educators, and

integrating social justice into educational roles stand as key elements in urban teaching for early career educators (p. 26). Additional literature suggests knowledge of socio-cultural context in teaching situations as essential to the success of all educators navigating the urban landscape (Fitzpatrick, 2008; Matsko & Hammerness, 2013, 2014).

Chloe specifically indicated that her 6th period women's glee was comprised of ELL (English Language Learners) students that were new to not only the school but the country. The expectations for these students, even with their status, was to learn to read the English language and music. Chloe never indicated that she considered her expectation of learning to read or read music as "difficult" or unattainable for her students. A plan was created by the reviewer for her classroom practice utilizing the cultural strengths (oral traditions) that the students brought to the classroom, as well as integration of this foundation into the curricular plan to achieve a targeted goal.

Conversely, Emma indicated that reading music was "difficult" for her group of predominantly African American choral music students and that the students' cultural tradition of oral learning was all they had ever learned. The indication was that while Emma enjoyed the oral traditions of her students, she perceived these strengths as significant to their experience however less so to the continued expansion of rigorous learning in her music classroom. Emma stated:

> A lot of them [students] have just never done anything but learned by rote. They've learned in church and they've learned well. They can harmonize and do those things. Most of them again they don't read music (4/7/19).

Emma described her participation in the peer review program and required submission of SLOs which by her design focused on music literacy. I found her assertion that reading

music was “difficult” for her students and that most of the students had never learned anything other than by rote in church, to be incongruent with her previous acknowledgment of her students’ ability. In addition, Emma stated:

> There’s an expectation that you [African American students] know music and certainly some of my kids are really strong singers. They are that because they learned in church. They know how to harmonize, they know how to do things, but they can’t put a term with it (4/7/19).

Here, Emma made an assumption that her students could not make appropriate associations between musical techniques and related terminology. She continued and explained:

> I guess [that’s] what we do when we use musical terminology, we are demystifying what they’ve learned that doesn’t have vocabulary. So, it’s a system of demystification and I think that they are not ever going to know, at least in my classroom, what a suburban school would know, but they certainly have the heart to be able to (4/7/19).

Emma’s belief that her students needed someone to “demystify” things they’ve learned without learning the associated terminology suggested a lack of awareness to her own perceptions connected to education in urban contexts (Benedict, 2006; Cochran-Smith, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014). Emma’s beliefs impacted her SLO process in that she designed SLOs that were less engaging and that were culturally irrelevant to the existing knowledge, interests, and experiences of her students. Perry, Steele and Hilliard (2003) explained that teachers may hold deficit perspectives in which they hold preconceived assumptions about students of color living and attending school in urban communities. Literature suggests that understanding students’ communities and building distinct relationships with families and within those communities is a key component for teaching and learning in urban contexts (Gay, 2002;

Irvine, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2001). Additionally, as indicated by the University of Chicago Urban Teacher Education Program (UTEP), teachers' acknowledgment of the multiple strengths present in urban students' families and communities develops successful avenues for urban teaching and learning (Matsko and Hammerness, 2014). These connections help to eliminate teachers' assumptions of student achievement in urban settings and to develop knowledge of students and the relationship of teaching and learning to their families, communities and traditions.

Essential to teachers' success in these contexts is their understanding of the often greater constraints of working within large urban districts such as limited resources, higher teacher turnover, and inordinate numbers of students labeled with special needs (Ingersoll, 2001; Matsko & Hammerness, 2014). For example, Cuban (1989) suggested that teachers may inhibit their own capacity to acknowledge students' abilities if they limit their understanding of student ability in the context of "urban" settings.

Theme 4: Reflection and Review

Teachers shared perspectives on their experiences in the program and reflection and review upon individual practice. Ideally, the peer review program should foster teachers' reflection on their practice. However, there were revelations that indicated teachers' reflections were inhibited by their attitudes toward the SLO process. Reviewers described strategically designed SLOs that may have inhibited reflection in the peer review process. Jake reported:

> I could tell from some of them how it was a hoop to jump over. The instrumental [teachers] would give these kids something on page 20 of the book and they'd never picked up an instrument before. They automatically got a 0. Of course,

> you're going to show growth. My frustration was that clearly they saw it as a hoop to jump (4/30/19).

Thomas described reviewees' that treated the SLO process as gameplay, inhibiting their practice by inputting less than rigorous learning targets to achieve greater results. He asked:

> Is this rigorous enough to do all year, or a semester? [when reviewing SLOs] Is that what you're going to focus on in one lesson? I understand that it's one lesson, but scales? I mean I work on scales all year and I do agree with the fact that because some people play this exercise - "Oh you got a zero." Then six months from now you're going to get a one or whatever. "Of course they are!"

In the current study, teachers' reflection was inhibited at times by the SLO process and at other times not. For instance, some reviewees described the process of completing SLOs as just another thing to do without indicating clear understanding of connections between increasingly rigorous growth targets for students, their classroom practice and professional learning. Teachers identified practice that works and that does not in their individual classrooms as well as elements of the peer review program that held potential for professional development in music education. They described situations in which collaborative interactions between teachers could occur face-to-face and practice that held potential for meaningful learning opportunities for both reviewer and reviewee without the inhibitive confines of the SLO checklist.

Reflection provides relevant ways for teachers to gain knowledge and understanding of effective and ineffective elements of their practice. Teachers' ability to reflect relates to how well they learn from own their personal experiences (Boud, Keogh, & Walker, 1985). Boud and colleagues (1985) contended that effective learning is supported by the link between learning experiences and follow-up by reflective activities.

Designing reflection into professional development helps teachers to understand their own practice and how new ideas can impact teaching and learning (Stanley, Snell & Edgar, 2014).

Theme 5: Enacting the role of reviewer.

Reviewers identified the need for learning opportunities to enact their roles as peer reviewers and indicated that they felt ill-equipped to address many of the issues that emerged during the process. The preparation process for peer reviewers prior to their work with reviewees was limited to a single, required, workshop-style professional development and included coverage of state guidelines and updates. This particular model of professional development identified as a "training model" has been criticized throughout literature (Loucks-Horsley & Motsumoto, 1999; Pianta, 2011; Spillane, 2002) in that it is designed to correct or provide teaching skills that teachers appear to lack.

Michael described his peer review experience in his middle school building that required him to navigate the issues of an early career teacher in an urban school district. He stated:

> I come from a weird position because I am a new teacher. I should have come with everything you just learned in college, but I had a gap from my undergraduate degree in 2006. I didn't get my teaching license until 2008 and didn't land an actual teaching job until 2013. So, I didn't know what a SLO was. I had to Google it. That was when the principal told me I was going to be on the assessment team in my first year (4/30/19).

Michael indicated that additionally, he had to learn about the SLO process, and then assume a position of leadership as an early career teacher to review SLOs in connection to the evaluations of his new teacher colleagues. He outlined his situation:

> The first year I was not sure what to write, what to do, or what to assess. So, when we had our first PD, after we [music teachers] started assessing ourselves, you [arts supervisor] sort of gave it as an open session for us to discuss. It was nice to see that I was on the same path that other people were thinking, rather than wandering around in the dark thinking: *Well this is what I think my students should know and learn, and these are the assessments that I would do and fall in line with where I think they should be as students* (4/30/19).

Here, Michael referred to the district-wide conference style PD for arts and physical education teachers. Flyers were provided prior to the full day PD so that teachers could develop a schedule to attend specific sessions categorized by content. Michael explained that prior to the content-specific initiative, the ability to interact with reviewers in buildings was beneficial because the reviewers were accessible. However, the reviewers were not necessarily experts in music or special content areas. Arts and other specialists are generally isolated in their buildings as singleton subject experts. Michael asserted, "My content might as well have been written in Chinese! It seemed as if you were trying to legitimize your content."

Additionally, reviewees were concerned with district guideline changes that took place mid-way through the year. One change the teachers identified was the exclusion of professional development related to SLO writing, which in previous years served as a helpful learning tool. All teachers felt the changes connected to the peer review program were communicated ineffectively. However, with PD to prepare reviewers presented in a workshop style model, effective and consistent communication districtwide for K-12 music teachers posed a challenge. Teachers discussed changes in the attitudes of their colleagues connected to the peer review process preparatory PD leading up to the onset of the peer review program. Samuel stated:

> I think most of us we were in a sense kind of middle people. We were kind of taking what we were trained to do in professional development and translating that to basically just what we are asked to do. In terms of going through the checklist (see Appendix A); in our professional development day, we had a little session on that. [Role playing] We are just going through as a checklist here. We are here to help you (4/30/19).

Samuel continued and identified a key issue of concern for some teachers during the peer review process:

> The complaint from some of our colleagues was that some of the things we were being asked to check on were not necessarily communicated on the front end, in terms of what their SLOs should look like, and there were changes that the district made along the way (4/30/19).

Some reviewers described distressed email exchanges with colleagues that lacked a clear understanding of the increasing rigor of the SLO process when the district implemented the content-specific initiative. Reviewers described feeling empathy for reviewees with another assessment task to complete, but could not excuse them from their responsibilities. Cathy stated:

> Sometimes we have different standards when we're involved versus we're not involved. I know that doesn't excuse me, but I guess the challenge was that there were a few people unwilling to change things and you're like- 'Yeah, but I can't let that go through'. 'I'm not trying to make more work for you, but that's just not accurate, and I can't pass it, it's not right' (4/12/19).

The level of resistance by reviewees was evident in communications received by peer reviewers. At times, communications would reach points of impasse and situations were turned over to the arts administrator/supervisor or professional learning coordinator. Reviewers were placed in positions of policy enactors by ensuring the authenticity and rigor of the content-specific initiative. In doing so, reviewers precipitated levels of resistance from some reviewees possibly falling short of responsible practice. Richardson

and Placier's (2001) empirical-rational model of teacher change described earlier in the study relates to the music teachers in the roles of reviewer and reviewee who were resistant to the SLO process.

Reviewers were required to meet a set of criteria that included a minimum of five years' teaching experience. Reviewers that fell within the early range of the required minimums shared that some veteran teachers needed "corralling" when the time came to submit required SLO documentation or were even indifferent to the SLO process and its deadlines. Reviewers described reviewing SLOs they perceived as less than "authentic" or as having been created with unreasonable or impractical student goals as well as strategically designed to generate desired outcomes. Olivia indicated that not only was this a factor that proved disheartening, but the act of pursuing her colleagues to meet the district SLO deadlines for their own evaluation purposes also increased that frustration:

> One challenge that I found was that after reviewing my colleagues having different standards for achievement - some of them - and trying to bridge the gap of peers who are significantly more experienced than I am, with how to tell them that their assessment isn't necessarily authentic, or adequate for a state document. I had several people the very first year that I was chasing down, until midnight the day it was due. I felt more like a parent than a peer. I just didn't appreciate having to ask my colleagues - to do their work, to keep their license: Not my job (4/30/19).

Jake and Olivia were both early career teachers participating as reviewers in the peer review program and described experiences in which their age and experience was a factor. Jake stated:

> I enjoyed working but it was a lot of extra time, a lot of corralling teachers, getting teachers to meet deadlines, and sending reminders to get their stuff in. But, I enjoyed doing that and being there, helping some teachers and having a different

> perspective as a young teacher; helping out some of the teachers that have been there for 20-25 years (5/6/19).

Olivia described her experience in the peer review program as different than what she had expected. After the initial year of the SLO program in the buildings, she explained that her role as that of peer reviewer for two years during the content-specific program and she was seeking opportunities for growth. Olivia stated:

> I did not like being an assessment leader as much as I thought I would. I enjoy helping people. An in-career goal for me is to be a teacher of teachers or a mentor. I was really hoping that would give me the insight I was searching for, but I really hated telling adults to do their work. That was exhausting! (5/2/19).

The peer review process led Olivia to the realization that the role of assessment leader was not for her.

A finding of this study that contributes to the body of literature on the topic of peer review is the theme: *attitudes of resistance* that resulted from misinterpretations of the SLO process, its purpose and expectations of rigorous lesson planning involved in a discipline-specific peer review program connected to the professional growth of music educators. Reviewees' attitudes of resistance as described by reviewers aligns with current research and issues faced by music educators faced with assessment based on student growth outcomes (R. Shaw, 2019). Development of performance assessment can identify and remove low performers, or it can inform professional development and mentoring (R. Shaw, 2019). In Chapter 5, I provide implications for further research and a summary of the study's findings. In addition, I present a discussion of the relationship of data to the research questions, conclusions of the study, and suggestions for future research.

Chapter 5. Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine how participation in a peer review and assessment program catalyzed music teachers' professional growth and affected changes in their attitudes, beliefs, and practices. This chapter presents a summary of the study and its findings. I then discuss the relationship between the data and the research questions, implications of the study, and provide suggestions for future research.

The peer review program under study was set in a large urban Midwestern school district and the participants consisted of five early career and four veteran music teachers who taught in diverse socio-cultural contexts. In addition, the teachers taught in varied musical disciplines, grade levels, and school locations. Consequently, I used a method of maximum variation to sample teachers who could contribute unique perspectives on experiences within the peer review program. Final selection was based upon particular criteria pertinent to answering the research questions. The phenomenon of teachers' professional growth is distinctive and complex, and illustrated by teachers' agency over their own individual learning. Their experiences may not be representative of music teachers in general; however, they may relate to those of teachers in similar programs in large urban districts.

I conducted individual interviews with music teachers using open-ended questions about their experiences in the peer review program as well as factors that may have

presented barriers to their professional learning. A focus group interview was conducted to maximize data collection. Group interaction was structured in a way that would provide multiple perspectives and yield insights different than those gleaned through individual interviews. Group interviews provide an environment in which individuals may be more willing to reveal personal thoughts (Krueger and Casey, 2000). Interviews were transcribed for subsequent analysis. I used a data analysis spiral procedure to analyze qualitative data which is represented by a spiral image as a researcher works in analytic circles instead of in a "fixed linear" path (Creswell & Poth, 2017, p.185).

Key Findings

The findings from the study focused on responses to the following research questions:

1. How do teachers describe their experiences in the peer review program?
2. How do teachers describe changes in their attitudes, beliefs, and pedagogical practice in relation to their participation in a peer assessment and review program?

Five key themes emerged from the findings regarding teachers' experiences in a peer review and assessment program. Table 5.1, which follows, outlines these themes.

Key Themes
• Attitudes of Resistance • Advocacy for Music Teaching • Asset-Based vs. Deficit Ideology • Reflection and Review • Enacting the Role of Reviewer

Table 5.1 Key themes

In response to the first research question, these themes are: a) attitudes of resistance resulting from reviewee's misinterpretations of the SLO process and its purpose; b)

advocacy for music teaching for the purpose of teaching and learning with clarity; and c) asset-based vs. deficit ideology in which teachers examine standards for student achievement in urban contexts. To address the second research question, the following findings are discussed under: d) reflection and review upon individual teacher's practice; and e) enacting the role of reviewer as policy enactor, to enforce the authenticity and rigor of the content-specific initiative.

Attitudes of Resistance

The first key finding of this study was that the implementation of the peer review program's content-specificity and review of student learning objectives (SLOs) by peer subject area specialists, did not necessarily satisfy or increase reviewees' receptivity to the SLO process. Reviewers descriptions of interactions with reviewees evidenced their resistance to the SLO process and their attempts at taking the shortest route to complete the process as quickly as possible. In addition, reviewers shared distressed emails from reviewees concerned about requests for more rigorous SLO planning and clarification of questionable submitted baseline data. Some reviewers described intense email exchanges with colleagues who didn't have a clear understanding of the SLO process and its associated expectation of rigor. At times, communications would reach points of impasse and reviewers turned situations over to the arts administrator/supervisor or professional learning coordinator. Reviewers further described the strategy of "gameplay," as situations in which teachers set the rigor of pretest data at unreasonably low standards so that growth outcomes would indicate greater gains.

Some reviewees that worked in multiple buildings indicated that the curriculum used was the same in their classes in each building but set at different levels of rigor. The reviewees missed opportunities to employ culturally responsive practice in which classroom practice teaches "to and through the strengths" of students and validates and affirms students' individual cultures (Gay, 2000, p. 29). Literature indicates that the assumed intellectual inferiority of minority students has a long history in the legal systems of United States (Clay, 1993; Takaki, 1993) and connections exist between assumptions built on inferiority ideals and the structures of educational policies and law (Elliot, 1987). Building relationships with urban students, parents, and communities helps teachers to eliminate misconceptions associated with lower-income communities and develop relationships founded on culture and education (Gay, 2000; Irvine, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 2001; Matsko & Hammerness).

Reviewees participating in the study described activities in their classrooms intended to be inclusive of their students' cultural backgrounds, yet many indicated practices that conflicted with the traditions and strengths of many of their students. Emma reported her own attitudinal issues connected to her peer review experience including worry, deception, and anger. She revealed feeling like she was "going through the motions" in submitting SLOs that were not what she considered relevant to her classroom plan. Like many reviewees, she was resistant to the SLO process upon the implementation of the content-specific initiative. Emma's initial attitude of distress and resistance got in the way of her ability to exercise her teacher agency, which would

enable Emma and other reviewees to enact culturally responsive practice and context-specific pedagogy within the peer review framework.

Reviewers described understanding why reviewees would think formative elements of their SLOs seemed like busy work, especially if the SLOs they created were not relevant to their classroom practice or year-long plan. They shared that they wanted to help reviewees, yet at the same time be accountable to the fidelity of the SLO process. Reviewers reported discussing the lack of rigor in SLOs with reviewees for reasons ranging from concern over whether students could reach stringent goals, to the exercise of gameplay. Reviewees indicated that the SLO process represented "one more thing" in their list of "things" that needed to be done, or one more item to check off the list versus a possible tool of professional learning. Reviewees' adopted attitudes of compliance that masked their resistance to the SLO process in order to take the shortest distance from point A to point B, or resisted in the opposite direction by not acting at all.

Less experienced reviewers described reviewing SLOs that they perceived to be designed with less than "authentic" student goals to generate desired outcomes. They indicated that not only was this a factor that proved disheartening, but the act of pursuing colleagues to meet the district SLO deadlines for their own evaluation purposes increased their levels of frustration. Reviewers in the peer review program were required to meet a set of criteria that fell within the early range of the required minimums. They shared that some veteran reviewees needed "corralling" when the time came to submit required SLO documentation or were even indifferent to the SLO process and its deadlines. The level of resistance by reviewees was evident in communications received by peer reviewers.

Many reviewees were resistant to the SLO process upon the implementation of the content-specific initiative and described a lack of understanding of the central focus of the peer review program with a wide breadth of perspectives and understanding of the significance of the required task. Levels of resistance led to some reviewees' failure to complete district mandated documentation required in part to complete annual educator evaluations. In reality, rigorous planning had always been an expectation of the district. With the implementation of the content-specific initiative placing specialists with specific areas of knowledge in positions to evaluate SLOs for levels of rigor and authenticity, reviewees, in fact, were resisting accountability to stringent district expectations and mandates. The reviewers in the program were placed in a position to enforce the authenticity and rigor of the content-specific initiative and in doing so, precipitated levels of resistance by specific reviewees potentially falling short of responsible practice.

Additionally, reviewers indicated that the peer review program inhibited their ability to communicate with adult learners by limiting the ability to address reviewees submitted information to only the items on the district SLO checklist (see Appendix A). This was not only inhibiting to the reviewers but to the professional learning of reviewees as suggested by Merriam and colleagues' (2007) theory that relevance and immediacy of application is essential to the professional development of adults.

Advocacy for Music Teaching

Another finding of this study described reviewees overwriting their SLOs in order to justify lesson planning for student growth targets and classroom activities. Teachers' submissions of SLOs varied by amounts of information and degrees of clarity. They suggested needing to articulate student learning targets to validate their classroom practice and to avoid complicating reviewers work with unfamiliar disciplinary pedagogy. Reviewees' with perceptions of the need to focus on justifying their content, experienced an inability to plan and design increasingly rigorous student learning objectives which hindered their ongoing professional growth.

Conversely, reviewees who had previously resisted the SLO process, indicated their ability to use their objectives in the classroom to increase students' musical knowledge and establish themselves professionally as urban music educators. Emma suggested that her SLOs were a "good thing" and that she had been looking for something she could "feel proud of," now she indicated that she was using her SLOs in the classroom. Only when reaching a turning point such as this, were reviewees able to implement rigorous SLOs with fidelity and a goal of increasing student outcomes.

Asset-Based Versus Deficit Ideology

The next key finding of this study was that reviewers needed to understand individual contexts in which reviewees created SLOs and established expectations for their students' growth outcomes. Reviewers found that participation in the program provided them with the ability to explore lesson plans submitted by reviewees. In addition, they described reviewing diverse teaching strategies and opportunities to

develop increased understanding of their colleagues' varied instructional settings and contexts. Participants described elements of managing high school music programs that not only demanded unique teaching and learning skills, but student preparation for performances, and sometimes competition at district, community, and state levels. Some reviewees used inclusive language that encompassed all students, their cultures, ethnicities, and backgrounds while maintaining the expectation and confidence that students would reach established and increasingly rigorous goals in the familial culture of their music programs. In addition, some reviewers in analyzing the SLOs described reading confidence in the writers' ability to inspire students to achieve, while others portrayed classroom practices that inhibited effective teaching.

In contrast, other reviewees expressed the belief that specific activities such as reading music was "difficult" for students in predominantly African American classrooms. The belief that the students' cultural traditions of oral learning representing all they had ever learned presented a possible deficit perspective in reviewees' classroom practice. This view had the capacity to inhibit reviewees' professional growth and limit their students' learning outcomes.

The assumption as an educator, that reading music is "too difficult" for a specific group of students suggests limited awareness of teachers' instructional perspectives in specific contexts and calls for professional learning for those with particular views. While activities described in classrooms were possibly intended to be inclusive of students' cultural backgrounds, the study indicates that reviewees' practices were incongruent with traditions and strengths of many students. In urban settings, it is essential to teach in a

culturally responsive way, or in alignment with the strengths and needs of students from varied cultural backgrounds (Delpit, 2006; Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2001). Reaching students in urban situations requires "thoughtful educators" versus "technicians" that work to develop and understand the unique needs of students in specific contexts (Matsko & Hammerness, 2013, p. 129). The researchers suggested that teachers develop awareness of divergent perspectives in which their actions are interpreted. Matsko and Hammerness (2013) indicated the importance of knowing individually, as characterized in the following:

> Teaching children is really about knowing the kids and being able to tailor what you're doing to help meet their needs and to push them to the next level... and to look at the [whole] student instead of just looking at them from a deficit point of view, [and] looking at what they can do (p.135).

Teachers would benefit from collaborative communities of practice in which they could explore their tacit beliefs in environments where they felt comfortable. In collaborative communities of practice teachers can find safe spaces as J. Shaw (2018) suggested, to contemplate and explore their individual tacit beliefs, and consider change.

Reflection and Review

The next finding and answer to the second research question was that participants shared perspectives on their experiences in the program and reflection and review upon individual practice. Reviewers' described varied forms of resistance to creating SLOs, communicating with reviewers, implementing lesson plans in classrooms with students, in addition to submitting required objectives for partial fulfillment of their teacher evaluations throughout the study. In addition, reviewers consistently described

strategically designed SLOs that along with other attitudinal postures may have inhibited reflection in the peer review process. Boud, Keogh, and Walker (1985) identified reflection as connected between personal experiences, gained knowledge and supported by follow-up reflective activities. Ideally, the peer review program would foster teachers' reflection and review, however findings indicated that reflection was inhibited by teachers' attitudes toward the SLO process. Strategies designed to set the rigor of pretest data for greater student outcomes inhibited teacher reflection and review in the peer review process.

Enacting the Role of Reviewer

The final finding and answer to the second research question was that reviewers in the peer review program identified the need for learning opportunities before they are expected to enact their roles as peer reviewers. Specifically, the participating reviewers were placed in the position of "policy enactor" or "enforcer" with little preparation for reviewees varied perceptions of authentic and increasingly rigorous SLOs in the content-specific initiative. Teachers suggested that the peer review program could operate more effectively by including a collaborative professional learning component to enact teachers' roles in the SLO process. Existing research has found significant value in the delivery and design of collaborative professional development for music educators (Beitler, 2011; Blair, 2008; Conway, 2003, 2014; Eros, 2011; Gruenhagen, 2008, 2009; Hammel, 2007; Pellegrino, 2011; Stanley, 2011, 2012; Wanzel, 2009; West, 2011), however less research exists on the design of student learning objectives to influence student growth outcomes in music (Elpus & Prichard, 2014; R. Shaw, 2019).

Teachers in this study indicated the need for pairing with reviewers in the program that understand specific content, communities, and cultures. Further, they described experiences that were incompatible with their needs by content and context. Conway (2003) suggested that music teachers be actively involved in policy decisions that affect teaching and learning in music education in order to address the inconsistencies that exist for mentoring programs for new and experienced music educators (p. 391). Meaningful professional development opportunities that align with the specific needs of music educators in urban settings is essential to their early-career success (Barrett, 2006; Conway, 2003c, J. Shaw, 2018). J. Shaw (2018) asserted that mentoring built on contextual knowledge of urban settings supports novice teachers' individual and professional growth. Literature indicates the relevance of pairing music teachers in discipline-specific pairings (Conway, 2003a; Robinson, 2003b; Smith & Ingersoll, 2004).

Implications

The current study provides valuable information about what music educators think of participation in a peer review program and insight into particular elements of the program that were meaningful to teachers' ongoing professional learning and other aspects that inhibited their continued growth. Teachers described vivid experiences in the program in connection to writing and reviewing student learning objectives (SLOs), and how their attitudes and beliefs developed throughout the study. Music teachers recognized the value of collaboration as meaningful and effective to their practices and as a means to provide professional learning in both non-traditional and innovative ways.

Peer reviewers described the online process using the SLO Checklist (see Appendix A) as inhibitive to conversation and interaction. Although the initial research questions were not designed to elicit some of the information that the teachers offered, the nature of the semi-structured interview enabled them to share supplementary material that informed how teachers describe effective professional development. Teachers' suggested that the peer review program could operate more effectively by including a collaborative professional learning component to enact teachers' roles in the SLO process. Change that originates from outside of the classroom provides teachers with opportunities to work as change agents implementing and determining the direction and process of the change within their classroom and/or within the school (Placier & Hamilton, 2001, p. 905). Autonomy in creating and designing SLOs is significant to teacher attitude (Elpus & Prichard, 2014). Reviewees working within the peer review program could employ their agency to function as "musical arrangers, extracting the prominent themes and motives of the reform initiative to create a new setting of the ideas" (Thiessen & Barrett, 2002, p. 768).

The findings of this study provide implications relative to effective and collaborative professional development for music educators. This approach enables music teachers to engage in musical activities designed to increase musical knowledge and plays a significant role in sustaining their individual identities and classroom practices. Implications that are congruent with Pellegrino's (2011) findings include participation in professional music groups or music experiences in the arts community and provide

significant resources for educators. These activities present valuable professional learning opportunities in collaborative learning communities.

The process of self-directed inquiry, a professional learning activity that researchers (Barrett, 2006; Stanley, Snell, & Edgar, 2014) have identified as effective professional development should be included as a component in a peer review program. Music educators could employ self-directed inquiry in the design of their own individual pathways of learning and exercise teacher agency by determining their own students' learning objectives with incremental levels of rigor. Michael, an early career teacher, indicated that his experience with self-directed inquiry began in response to the circumstances in his building, which created a barrier to his own individual professional learning. Not only did Michael need to navigate the issues of a novice teacher in an urban school district, he also found it necessary to learn about the SLO process despite a lack of associated professional development. He then was placed in a position in his building to review SLOs connected to the evaluations of new colleague reviewees. In this instance, the peer review program presented a barrier to Michael's professional growth.

Olivia's self-directed inquiry stemmed from her need to create a plan for her individual practice. She reported that she did not experience professional growth as a result of the SLO process, however each time the process evolved she learned something new due to collaborative work with other teachers and the need to develop her individual classroom plan. Olivia indicated that once she achieved an understanding of the process, her learning progression plateaued. She shared that the particular knowledge needed to meet the district guidelines, including collecting and analyzing data was obtained through

self-led graduate work in her Master's program. An important implication of the current study was the significance of Olivia's understanding that she did not experience professional growth from the peer review program's SLO process. Research indicates that teachers seek effective professional development that meets their individual learning needs. These opportunities require more than the in-service workshops of the past, and look to active, rather than passive, participatory professional learning activities that are self-directed and consistent with their specific classroom goals and objectives (Hammel, 2007). In the current study, meeting the needs for educators such as Olivia requires ongoing, participative professional development design for teachers and capacity for professional growth of educators that seek new and extended opportunities that lie within or outside of the classroom. It is key for administrators to recognize such individuals and seek opportunities to explore avenues of leadership and learning for early career teacher leaders that excel in their content, buildings and extended programs. Teachers such as these bring innovative ideas to the table and have the ability to inspire other educators to learn and lead. It is essential to continue to design innovative learning activities that meet their needs and continues to forge ahead in the exploration of new and innovative ways in which to challenge their existing knowledge.

Finally, the SLO process enabled reviewees to have agency over the design of their individual student learning objectives; however, as educators in a large urban district, many failed to implement SLOs based on the cultural traditions of their students. While reviewees had a desire to teach in a manner that was inclusive of students' backgrounds, culturally responsive practice was absent from the analysis of data in the

current study. Elpus and Prichard (2014) described the process of goal setting and setting a focus on student strengths and weaknesses as significant to the improvement of teachers' pedagogy and individual professional learning. It is essential for administrators to encourage practice that respects the cultures of students, communities, their existing knowledge, and traditions, that enables effective teaching and learning in urban contexts.

Future Research

Reviewers in the study described levels of resistance to the accountability of the content-specific initiative which resulted in reviewees either pushing back against the process or simply refusing to complete the required SLO submissions altogether. Further research is needed to determine if teachers in urban setting are less likely take risks in crafting SLOs due to accountability pressures or "playing it safe". Additionally, further research is needed on factors connected to teachers' resistance to the SLO process to identify specific reasons for their resistance and to further interpret actions of "gameplay strategy" or compliance taken to complete the SLO process. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) presently requires the integration of SLOs for fifty percent of teachers' annual educator evaluation. In addition, further research is needed on the application of student learning objectives (SLOs) for all educators that are assigned to teach in multiple buildings. The development of students in which teachers consider their primary buildings may vary from the secondary building based upon the application of a teacher's SLOs.

Conclusions

Clark and Hollingsworth's (2002) description of teacher's influence and agency over their own individual learning provides visible evidence of the varied roles they play as reflective and active learners in professional development activities. As I reflect on teachers in the peer review program that I had the pleasure of interviewing and the experiences that they shared, I find myself revisiting Thiessen and Barrett's (2002) description of reform-minded teachers with inherent dedication to the improvement of their classroom practices that engage their influence beyond the realm of the classroom, corridors, and in the community. Many of the teachers interviewed shared their deep commitment to their students and their own professional growth while collaborating with each other and community partners to create learning experiences for urban students in their programs. The teachers' commitment to students that come to their classrooms and their understanding of students needs stands as inspiring models for the teaching profession. Findings of this study illuminated possibilities for delivering the ongoing, collaborative professional development such teachers richly deserve.

References

Achinstein, B., & Athanases, S. Z. (2005). Focusing new teachers on diversity and equity: Toward a knowledge base for mentors. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(7), 843-862.

Achinstein, B., & Barrett, A. (2004). (Re)framing classroom contexts: How new teachers and mentors view diverse learners and challenges of practice. *Teachers College Record, 106*(4), 716-746.

Allen, D., & Blythe, T. (2004). The facilitator's book of questions: Resources for looking together at student and teacher work. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. R. (2004). Continuing professional development for experienced physical education teachers: Towards effective provision. *Sport, Education and Society, 9*(1), 95-114.

Arroyo, A. A., Rhoad, R., & Drew, P. (1999). Meeting diverse student needs in urban schools: Research-based recommendations for school personnel. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 43*(4), 145-153.

American Statistical Association. (2014). ASA statement on using value-added models for educational assessment. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Barrett, J. R. (2006). Recasting professional development for music teachers in an era of reform. *Arts Education Policy Review, 107*(6), 19-28.

Bautista, A., Yau, X., & Wong, J. (2017). High-quality music teacher professional development: A review of the literature. *Music Education Research, 19*(4), 455-469.

Beitler, N. S. (2011, April). *Collaborative reflection: A deeper understanding of the reflective practices of middle school teachers*. Paper presented at the MENC Eastern Division Biennial In-Service Conference, Baltimore, MD.

Benedict, C. (2006). Defining ourselves as other: Envisioning transformative possibilities. In Frierson-Campbell (Ed.), *Teaching music in the urban classroom: A guide to survival, success, and reform* (Vol. 1, pp. 3-12). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Blair, D. V. (2008). Mentoring novice teachers: Developing a community of practice. *Research Studies in Music Education, 30*(2), 99-117.

Blase, J. J. (1990). Some negative effects of principals' control-oriented and protective political behavior. *American Educational Research Journal*, *27*(4), 727-753.

Borko, H (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain, *Educational Researcher*, *33*(8), 3-15.

Borko, H., & Putnam, R. (1996). Learning to teach. In D. Berliner, & R. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (673-708). New York, NY: MacMillan.

Boud, D., Keogh, R., &Walker, D. (1985). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning*, London, UK: Kogan Page.

Boylan, M., Coldwell, M., Maxwell, B., & Jordan, J. (2018). Rethinking models of professional learning as tools: A conceptual analysis to inform research and practice. *Professional Development in Education*, *44*(1), 120-139. doi: 10.1080/19415257.2017.1306789

Brookfield, S. (1995). Adult learning: An overview. *International Encyclopedia of Education,10*, 375-380.

Carver, C. L., & Feiman-Nemser, S. (2009). Using policy to improve teacher induction: Critical elements and missing pieces. *Educational Policy*, *23*(2), 295-328.

Chew, C. L. (2013). Instructional rounds as professional development for teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University).

Chin, R., & Benne, K. D. (1969). *General strategies for effecting changes in human systems* (pp. 22-45). Boston, MA: Boston University Human Relations Center.

Choksy, L. (1974), *The Kodály method: Comprehensive music education from infant to adult.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Clarke, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (1994, July). Reconceptualising teacher change. In Proceedings of the 17th annual conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia (pp. 153-164).

Clarke, D. J., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*, 947-967. doi: 10.1016/S0742-051X (02)00053-7

Clay, W. L. (1993). *Just Permanent Interests: Black Americans in Congress* 1870-1992. New York, NY: Amistad.

Clement, M., & Vandenberghe, R. (2000). Teachers' professional development: a solitary or collegial (ad)venture? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*(1), 81-101.

Coburn, C. E., & Stein, M. K. (2010). *Research and practice in education: Building alliances, bridging the divide*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Reinventing student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 42*(2), 104-118.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2010). Toward a theory of teacher education for social justice. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.) *Second international handbook of educational change* (pp. 445-467). New York, NY: Springer.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Gleeson, A., & Viesca, K. (2010). Teacher education for social justice: What's pupil learning got to do with it? *Berkeley Review of Education, 1*. DOI:10.5070/b81110022

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Chapter 8: Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education, 24*(1), 249-305.

Conway, C., & Garlock, M. (2002). The first year teaching k-3 general music: A case study of Mandi. *Contributions to Music Education, 29*(2), 9-28. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24127096

Conway, C. (2008). Experienced music teacher perceptions of professional development throughout their careers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education,* (176), 7-18. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319429

Conway, C., & Christensen, S. (2006). Professional development and the beginning music teacher. *Contributions to Music Education, 33*(1), 9-25. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24127197

Conway, C., Edgar, S., Hansen, E., & Palmer, C. M. (2014). Teacher research as professional development for P-12 music teachers. *Music Education Research, 16*(4), 404-417.

Conway, C., Hansen, E., Edgar, S., & Palmer, C. M. (2015). Teacher research and adult learning in music education. *LEARNing Landscapes, 8*(2), 135-155.

Conway, C., Eros, J., & Stanley, A. M. (2009). Perceived effects of the Master of Music in music education on P—12 teaching practice. *Research Studies in Music Education, 31*(2), 129-141.

Conway, C., & Jeffers, T. (2004a). Parent, student, and teacher perceptions of assessment procedures in beginning instrumental music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education,* (160), 16-25. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319215

Conway, C., & Jeffers, T. (2004b). The teacher as researcher in beginning instrumental music. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, *22*(2), 35-45.

Conway, C. M. (2003). An examination of district-sponsored beginning music teacher mentor practices. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *51*(1), 6-23.

Conway, C. M. (2008). Experienced music teacher perceptions of professional development throughout their careers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, (176) 7-18.

Conway, C. M., & Edgar, S. N. (2014). In-service music teacher professional development. In C. M. Conway (Ed.) *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research in American music education*. (pp. 479-500). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cuban, L. (1989). The "at-risk" label and the problem of urban school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, *70*(10), 780–801.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Snyder, J. (2000). Authentic assessment of teaching in context. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*(5-6), 523-545.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2015). Can value added add value to teacher evaluation? *Educational Researcher, 44*(2), 132-137.

Day, C., Kington, A., Stobart, G., & Sammons, P. (2006). The personal and professional selves of teachers: Stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal, 32*(4), 601-616.

Delpit, L. (2006). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York, NY: The New Press.

Densten, I. L., & Gray, J. H. (2001). Leadership development and reflection: what is the connection? *International Journal of Educational Management, 15*(3), 119-124.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Desimone, L. M. (2009) Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher, 38*(3), 181-199. doi: 10.3102/0013189X08331140

Desimone, L. M., Porter, A. C., Garet, M. S., Yoon, K. S., & Birman, B. F. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(2), 81-112.

Dolloff, L. (2007). All the things we are: Balancing our multiple identities in music teaching. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 6*(2), 1-21.

Drake, S., & Reid, J. (2010). Integrated curriculum: Increasing relevance while maintaining accountability *What Works? Research into Practice*, Research monograph #28. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/literacynumeracy/inspire/research/ww_integrated_curriculum.pdf

Elliot, R. (1987). *Litigating intelligence: IQ tests, special education, and social science in the courtroom*. Dover, MA: Auburn House

Elpus, K. & Prichard, S. (2014). Navigating the student learning objectives process for music teacher evaluation (Paper presented at the National Association for Music Education Music Research and Teacher Education Conference, St. Louis, MO, April 10).

Eros, J. (2011). The career cycle and the second stage of teaching: Implications for policy and PD. *Arts Education Policy Review, 112*, 65-70.

Evans, L. (2008). Professionalism, professionality, and the development of education professionals. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 56*(1), 20-38.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2003). What new teachers need to learn. *Educational Leadership, 60*(8), 25-29.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. B. (1993). Mentoring in context: A comparison of two US programs for beginning teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research 19*(8), 699-718.

Fishman, B. J., Marx, R. W., Best, S., & Tal, R. T. (2003). Linking teacher and student learning to improve professional development in systemic reform. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*(6), 643-658.

Fitzpatrick, K. R., (2008). *A mixed methods portrait of urban instrumental music teaching*. (Doctoral dissertation). Northwestern University, Evanston, Il. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database (AAT 3303647).

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. (1994). The art of science. *The Handbook of Qualitative Research, 361376*.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106-116.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 915-945.

Glaser, B.G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Glesne, C. (2016). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Goldstein, J. (2007). Easy to dance to: Solving the problems of teacher evaluation with peer assistance and review. *American Journal of Education, 113*(3), 479-508.

Goldstein, J. (2010). *Peer review and teacher leadership: Linking professionalism and accountability.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Goldstein, J., & Noguera, P. A. (2006). A thoughtful approach to teacher evaluation. *Educational Leadership, 63*(6), 31-37.

Gruenhagen, L. M. (2008). Investigating professional development: Early childhood music teacher learning in a community of practice (Ph.D. thesis, University of Rochester, Eastman School of Music).

Gruenhagen, L. M. (2009). Developing professional knowledge about music teaching and learning through collaborative conversations. In L. K. Thompson & M. R. Campbell (Eds.) *Research perspectives: Thought and practice in music education.* (pp. 125-151). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Guskey, T. R. (1986). Staff development and the process of teacher change. *Educational Researcher, 15*(5), 5-12.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers & Teaching, 8*(3/4), 381-391. doi:10.1080/135406002100000512

Guskey, T. R., & Peterson, K. D. (1995). The road to classroom change. *Educational Leadership, 53*(4), 10.

Guskey, T. R., & Sparks, D. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hammel, A. M. (2007). Professional development research in general education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 17*(1), 22-32.

Hammerness, K., & Matsko, K. K. (2013). When context has content: A case study of new teacher induction in the University of Chicago's Urban Teacher Education Program. *Urban Education, 48*(4), 557-584.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing teachers. *Changing Times, 11*(11).

Hartnett, J. E. (2011). *Professional growth through working together: A study of reciprocal benefits for teacher and education advisor through classroom based professional development* (Professional Doctorate thesis, Queensland University of Technology).

Hays, D. G., & Singh, A. A. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry in clinical and educational settings.* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Heck, D. J., Banilower, E. R., Weiss, I. R., & Rosenberg, S. L. (2008). Studying the effects of professional development: The case of the NSF's local systemic change through teacher enhancement initiative. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 39*(2), 113-152.

Hill, H. C., Ball, D. L., & Schilling, S. G. (2008). Unpacking pedagogical content knowledge: Conceptualizing and measuring teachers' topic-specific knowledge of students. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 39*(4), 372-400.

Hookey, M. R., (2002), Professional development. In R. Colwell, & C. P. Richardson, (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 887-902). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Howard, G. R. (2006). *We can't teach what we don't know: White teachers, multiracial Schools (2nd ed.).* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (2005). *Interstate new teacher assessment and support consortium standards.* Washington, DC: Council of Chief State Schools Officers.

Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Johnson, N. (1996). Reconceptualising schools as learning communities. *Reflect, 2*(1), 6-13.

Johnson, N. J. (1996). School leadership and the management of change. *Seminar Series: Incorporated Association of Registered Teachers of Victoria.*

Kastner, J. D. (2014). Exploring informal music learning in a professional development community of music teachers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research In Music Education* (202), 71-89.

Kelly-McHale, J. L. (2011). *The relationship between children's musical identities and music teacher beliefs and practices in an elementary general music classroom* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University).

Krueger, P. J. (1999). New music teachers speak out on mentoring. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 8*(2), 7-13.

Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2000). Overview of focus groups. *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*, 3-19.

Kumrow, D., & Dahlen, B. (2002). Is peer review an effective approach for evaluating teachers? *The Clearing House, 75*(5), 238-241.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ladson-Billings, G. (n.d.). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7–24. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/10.1080/095183998236863

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). Crafting a culturally relevant social studies approach. In E. W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 201-215). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Establishing trustworthiness. *Naturalistic Inquiry*, *289*, 331.

Lind, V. R. (2007). High quality professional development: An investigation of the supports for and barriers to professional development in arts education. *International Journal of Education & the Arts, 8*(2), 1-18.

Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat. (2010). Capacity building series. Collaborative teacher inquiry. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/literacynumeracy/inspire/research/CBS_Collaborative_Teacher_Inquiry.pdf

Little, J. W., Gearhart, M., Curry, M., & Kafka, J. (2003). Looking at student work for teacher learning, teacher community, and school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *85*(3), 184-192.

Loucks-Horsley, S., & Matsumoto, C. (1999). Research on professional development for teachers of mathematics and science: The state of the scene. *School Science and Mathematics,* 99(5), 258-271.

Lumpe, A., Czerniak, C., Haney, J., & Beltyukova, S. (2012). Beliefs about teaching science: The relationship between elementary teachers' participation in professional development and student achievement. *International Journal of Science Education, 34*(2), 153-166.

Matsko, K. K., & Hammerness, K. (2014). Unpacking the "urban" in urban teacher education: Making a case for context-specific preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *65*(2), 128-144.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Miles, K. H., Odden, A., Fermanich, M., & Archibald, S. (2005). *Excerpts from inside the black box school district spending on professional development in education: Lessons from five urban districts*. Urbana-Champagne, IL: University of Illinois Finance Project.

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Murphy, J. (1995). Changing the role of teachers. In M. O'Hair & S. Odell (Eds.), *Educating teachers for leadership and change: Teacher education yearbook III* (pp.311-323). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Ohio Department of Education. *Teacher evaluations*. Retrieved from: http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Teaching/Educator-Evaluation-System/Ohio-s-Teacher-Evaluation-System/Student-Growth-Measures/Student-Learning-Objective-Examples

Opfer, V. D., & Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualising teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research, 81*, 376-407.

Overland, C. T. (2014). Teacher evaluation and music education: Joining the national discussion. *Music Educators Journal, 101*(1), 56–62. Retrieved from http://proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1037961&site=eds-live&scope=site

Papay, J. P., & Johnson, S. M. (2012). Is PAR a good investment? Understanding the costs and benefits of teacher peer assistance and review programs. *Educational Policy, 26*(5), 696-729.

Parkes, K., Rohwer, D., & Davison, D. (2015). Measuring student music growth with blind-reviewed portfolios: A pilot study. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education,* (203), 23-44. doi:10.5406/bulcouresmusedu.203.0023

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pellegrino, K. (2011). Exploring the benefits of music-making as professional development for music teachers. *Arts Education Policy Review, 112*(2), 79-88.

Peshkin, A. (1988). Understanding complexity: A gift of qualitative inquiry. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *19*(4), 416-424.

Peterson, K. D. (2000). *Teacher evaluation: A comprehensive guide to new directions and practices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Perry, S. & Steele, C. (2003). *Young gifted and black: Promoting high achievement among African-American students.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Phelps, G., & Schilling, S. (2004). Developing measures of content knowledge for teaching reading. *The Elementary School Journal*, *105*(1), 31-48.

Philpott, C., & Oates, C. (2017). Teacher agency and professional learning communities; What can learning rounds in Scotland teach us? *Professional Development in Education, 43*(3), 318-333.

Pianta, R. C. (2011). Teaching children well: New evidence based approaches to teacher professional development and training. *Center for American Progress, 11*, 1-36.

Porter, J. (2013). Be careful how you ask! Using focus groups and nominal group technique to explore the barriers to learning. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 36*(1), 33-51.

Randi, J., & Corno, L. (1997). Teachers as innovators. In B. Biddle, T. Good, & I. Goodson (Eds.), *International handbook of teachers and teaching* (pp. 1163-1221). Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Richardson, V. (2003). The dilemmas of professional development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(5), 401-406.

Richardson, V. (2001). Teacher change. In V. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of research on teaching*, 4th ed. (pp. 905-947) Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Robinson, M. (2005). The impact of beginning music teacher assessment on the assessors: Notes from experienced teachers. *Bulletin - 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.

Rodgers, C. R., & Raider-Roth, M. B. (2006). Presence in teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 12*(3), 265-287.

Roulston, K. (2010). Considering quality in qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Research, 10*(2), 199-228.

Roulston, K. (2010). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Roulston, K. (2016). Issues involved in methodological analyses of research interviews. *Qualitative Research Journal, 16*(1), 68-79.

Sammons, P., Day, C., Kington, A., Gu, Q., Stobart, G., & Smees, R. (2007). Exploring variations in teachers' work, lives and their effects on pupils: key findings and implications from a longitudinal mixed-method study. *British Educational Research Journal, 33*(5), 681-701.

Scheib, J. W. (2006). Policy implications for teacher retention: Meeting the needs of the dual identities of arts educators. *Arts Education Policy Review, 107*(6), 5-10.

Schilling, M. A., & Phelps, C. C. (2007). Interfirm collaboration networks: The impact of large-scale network structure on firm innovation. *Management Science, 53*(7), 1113-1126.

Schmidt, M. (2008). Mentoring and being mentored: The story of a novice music. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(3), 635-648.

Shuler, S. C. (1996). Assessment in general music: An overview. *The Orff Echo, 28*(2), 10-12.

Shank, G. D. (2005). *Qualitative research: A personal skills approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Shaw, J. T. (2018). Alleviating praxis shock: Induction policy and programming for urban music educators. *Arts Education Policy Review, 119*(1), 25-35.

Shaw, R. (2019). Jumping through hoops: Troubling music teacher dilemmas in the new era of accountability. *Music Educators Journal, 105*(3), 23–29. https://doi-org.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/10.1177/0027432118816146

Shields, P. M., Esch, C. E., Humphrey, D. C., Young, V. M., Gaston, M., & Hunt, H. (1999). *The status of the teaching profession: Research findings and policy recommendations. A report to the Teaching and California's Future Task Force.* Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.

Sindberg, L. K. (2014). Perceptions and perspectives of music teachers in urban settings: Isolation, conversation and collaboration. *Music Education Research, 16*(4), 387-403.

Smith, C., & Gillespie, M. (2007). Research on professional development and teacher change: Implications for adult basic education. *Review of Adult Learning and Literacy, 7*(7), 205-244.

Smith, T. M., & Ingersoll, R. M. (2004). What are the effects of induction and mentoring on beginning teacher turnover? *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(3), 681-714.

Smylie, M. A., Lazarus, V., & Brownlee-Conyers, J. (1996). Instructional outcomes of school-based participative decision making. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 18*(3), 181-198.

Sosik, J. J. (1998). Self-concept based aspects of the charismatic leader: More than meets the eye. *The Leadership Quarterly, 9*(4), 503-526.

Spillane, J. P. (2002). Local theories of teacher change: The pedagogy of district policies and programs. *Teacher College Record, 104*, 377-420.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Stanley, A. M. (2011). Professional development within collaborative teacher study groups: Pitfalls and promises. *Arts Education Policy Review, 112*(2), 71-78.

Stanley, A. M. (2012). The experiences of elementary music teachers in a collaborative teacher study group. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* (192), 53-74.

Stanley, A. M., Snell, A., & Edgar, S. N. (2014). Collaboration as effective music professional development: Success stories from the field. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 24*(1), 76–88. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rft&AN=A878768&site=eds-live&scope=site

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Tate IV, W. F. (1997). Chapter 4: Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education, 22*(1), 195-247.

The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. *The status of the teaching profession: Research findings and policy recommendations. A report to the Teaching and California's Future Task Force*. Santa Cruz, CA: Author.

Thiessen, D., & Anderson, S. E. (1999). *Getting into the habit of change in Ohio schools: The cross-case study of 12 transforming learning communities*. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Thiessen, D., & Barrett, J. R. (2002). The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *Reform-Minded music teachers: A more comprehensive image of teaching for music teacher education* (Vol. xxvi). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Thiessen, D., & Barrett, J. R. (2002). Reform-minded music teacher: A more comprehensive image of teaching for music teacher education. In *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music Educators National Conference* (pp. 759-785). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Thomas, G. (2016). *How to do your case study*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Toch, T., & Rothman, R. (2008). Rush to judgment: Teacher evaluation in public education. Education Sector Reports. *Education Sector*.

Wanat, C. L. (2008). Getting past the gatekeepers: Differences between access and cooperation in public school research. *Field Methods*, *20*(2), 191-208.

Wanzel, L. (2009). Independent music teachers conducting collaborative action research: A new paradigm. *Problems in Music Pedagogy*.

Wasley, P. A., (1991). The practical work of teacher leaders: Assumptions, attitudes, and acrophobia. In A. Lieberman and L. Miller (Eds.), *Staff Development for Education in the 90's: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*, (pp. 158-183). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Webster-Wright, A. (2009). Reframing professional development through understanding authentic professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*(2), 702-739.

Weisberg, D., Sexton, S., Mulhern, J., Keeling, D. (2009). The widget effect: Our national failure to acknowledge and act on differences in teacher effectiveness. *New Teacher Project*.

Wenger, E. & Wenger-Trayner, B. (2015). Communities of practice: A brief introduction. Retrieved from https://wenger-trayner.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/07-Brief-introduction-to-communities-of-practice.pdf

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.

Wesolowski, B. C. (2015). Tracking student achievement in music performance: Developing student learning objectives for growth model assessments. *Music Educators Journal, 102*(1), 39-47.

West, C. (2011). Action research as a professional development activity. *Arts Education Policy Review, 112*(2), 89-94.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Student Learning Objective (SLO) Template Checklist for *Columbus City Schools*

This checklist should be used for both writing and approving SLOs. It should be made available to both teachers and evaluators for these purposes. For an SLO to be formally approved, ALL criteria must be met, and every box below will need a check mark completed by an SLO evaluator.

Baseline and Trend Data	Student Population	Interval of Instruction	Standards and Content	Assessment(s)	Growth Target(s)	Rationale for Growth Target(s)
What information is being used to inform the creation of the SLO and establish the amount of growth that should take place within the time period?	*Which students will be included in this SLO? Include course, grade level, and number of students.*	*What is the interval of instruction that the SLO will cover? Include beginning and end dates.*	*What content will the SLO target? To what related standards is the SLO aligned?*	*What assessment(s) will be used to measure student growth for this SLO?*	*Considering all available data and content requirements, what growth target(s) can students be expected to reach?*	*What is your rationale for setting the target(s) for student growth within the interval of instruction?*
☐ Identifies sources of information about students (e.g., test scores from prior years, results of preassessments) ☐ Draws upon trend data, if available ☐ Summarizes the teacher's analysis of the baseline data by identifying student strengths and weaknesses	☐ Identifies the class or subgroup of students covered by the SLO ☐ Describes the student population and considers any contextual factors that may impact student growth ☐ If subgroups are excluded, explains which students, why they are excluded and if they are covered in another SLO	☐ Matches the interval of instruction of the SLO	☐ Specifies how the SLO will address applicable standards from the highest ranking of the following: (1) Common Core State Standards, (2) Ohio Academic Content Standards, or (3) national standards put forth by education organizations ☐ Represents the big ideas or domains of the content taught during the interval of instruction ☐ Identifies core knowledge and skills students are expected to attain as required by the applicable standards (if the SLO is targeted)	☐ Identifies assessments that have been reviewed by content experts to effectively measure course content and reliably measure student learning as intended ☐ Selects measures with sufficient "stretch" so that all students may demonstrate learning, or identifies supplemental assessments to cover all ability levels in the course ☐ Provides a plan for combining assessments if multiple summative assessments are used ☐ Follows the guidelines for appropriate assessments	☐ All students in the SLO have a growth target in the SLO ☐ Uses baseline or pretest data to determine appropriate growth ☐ Sets developmentally appropriate targets ☐ Creates tiered targets when appropriate so that all students may demonstrate growth ☐ Sets ambitious yet attainable targets	☐ Demonstrates teacher knowledge of students and content ☐ Explains why target is appropriate for the population ☐ Addresses observed student needs ☐ Uses data to identify student needs and determine appropriate growth targets ☐ Explains how targets align with broader school and district goals ☐ Sets rigorous expectations for students and teacher(s)

Revised January 2014

Appendix B. INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Study Title: A Case Study of Peer Review Fostering or Presenting Barriers to the Professional Growth of K-12 Music Teachers

Principal Investigator: Dr. Julia Shaw
Co-Investigator: Betty Hill

Teacher Interview Protocol

Time of interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee/Participant:

[Turn on the tape recorder.]

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this project. During this initial interview, I am interested in your personal background and experience with peer review, as well as attitudes, beliefs and contextual knowledge that may inform your pedagogical practice. I will be recording our conversation so that I can transcribe it later and will be taking a few notes during the interview. As a reminder, the consent form you signed assures that 1) this information will be held confidential, 2) you will not be identified by name in the report, and 3) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable. Again, thank you for agreeing to participate.

The interview will take approximately sixty minutes. I have planned several general questions on topics that I would like to cover, so if time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to move to the next question.

Participant Background

1. Including this current year, how many years have you taught music in a public school?
2. How many years have you taught in your current location(s) in Columbus?
3. With what ethnic/racial group(s) do you most identify?
4. Where did you complete your formal music training and any informal training you consider particularly relevant to your development as a musician?
5. Tell me about any current music endeavors you may have in the greater arts community, (i.e. church gig, musicals) or planned professional goals.
6. Tell me why you ended up teaching music in an urban school district.

Exploring Classroom Demographic Context (Research Questions 1 and 2)

8. Tell me about your current music program(s), the school culture and communities in which they are situated.
9. As you think about the school(s) in which you teach, do any of the following aspects of your lesson planning change depending upon the community in which you are

teaching? If so, please describe how.

- Curriculum
- Lesson plans
- Instructional strategies
- Concert planning
- Resource attainment and distribution

Exploring the Peer Review Experience (Research Questions 1 and 2)

9. Tell me about your role and experience in the collaborative revision and review process of the Columbus City Schools (CCS) peer review program. How would you describe the difference between a content-specific experience and previous experiences?
10. Tell me about context-specific aspects of the peer review experience you may have perceived as challenging or potential barriers to the collaborative process.
11. As you think about the peer review program, what role, if any, could collaborative review play in your professional growth?

Wrap-up

13. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about yourself or your music program(s)?

Concluding the Initial Interview

Thank the music teacher for their cooperation and participation in the interview. Discuss and review plans for the upcoming group interview and final individual interview. Coordinate time for the final interview.

Group Interview

Time of interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Participants:

[Turn on tape recorder].

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for this project. During this group interview, we will explore how you discuss teaching with your colleagues. I will be recording our conversation so that I can transcribe it later and will be taking a few notes during the interview. As a reminder, the consent form you signed assures that 1) this information will be held confidential, 2) you will not be identified by name in the report, and 3) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable. Again, thank you for agreeing to participate.

The interview will take approximately sixty minutes. I have planned several general questions on topics that I would like to cover, so if time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to move to the next question.

Exploring Collaborative Dialogue (Research Questions 1 and 2)

1. Have you encountered challenges in the peer review process? Describe these challenges from the perspective of assessment leader and/or teacher?
2. What barriers to professional growth do teachers experience in relationship to collaborative review and assessment?
3. Does the peer review process present or identify challenges to change and growth in pedagogical practice? If so, are these challenges more pronounced in specific teaching locations? Describe these challenges.
4. Does the peer review and assessment process account for demographic diversity present in urban classrooms and respond to context-specific team pairings of teachers? Describe the barriers to professional growth that are presented with oversight of this issue?
5. Tell me about your communication with colleagues. Does the way you communicate with colleagues change in the peer review process? If so, describe the way in which it changes.
6. Are there any questions you think are important to ask that I have forgotten to include?

Concluding the Group Interview

Thank the music teachers for their cooperation and participation in the research project. Discuss and review plans for the remaining individual interviews.

Concluding Individual Interview

Time of interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee/Participant:

[Turn on tape recorder].

Thank you for agreeing to this final interview. During this final interview, we will focus on reflections centered on your pedagogical practice, attitudes and beliefs related to the peer review process. I will be recording our conversation so that I can transcribe it later and will be taking a few notes during the interview. As a reminder, the consent form you signed assures that 1) this information will be held confidential, 2) you will not be identified by name in the report, and 3) your participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time if you feel uncomfortable. Again, thank you for agreeing to participate.

The interview will take approximately sixty minutes. I have planned several general questions on topics that I would like to cover, so if time begins to run short, it may be necessary to interrupt you in order to move to the next question.

Reflections on Pedagogical Practice, Attitudes and Beliefs (Research Questions 1 and 2)

1. As you reflect on the peer review process, what aspects of the program do you feel promote changes in your classroom practice with potential to lead to professional growth?
2. During this project, I identified various themes that seem important to informed professional development planning, linked to change in pedagogical practice that may result in the refinement of teachers beliefs for ongoing professional growth. As I describe these themes, please comment on their importance for ongoing learning as a music educator.
    a. Reflection and Review
    b. Classroom Management
    c. Content Specific Peer Review
    d. Personal Musicianship
    e. Professional Development

3. In light of your most recent peer review experience, did any of the following aspects of your professional practice change? If so, describe how.
    - Relationships with colleagues
    - Classroom practice/pedagogy
    - Attitude toward teaching/teaching location
    - Attitude toward rigor and revision of lesson plans/SLOs
    - Attitude toward collaborative work with colleagues
    - Belief in personal achievement and/or professional and musical ability

- Professional goals

3. As you reflect on your peer review experience, did the program present barriers to growth in any of the following aspects of your professional practice? If so, describe how.
    - Relationships with colleagues
    - Classroom practice/pedagogy
    - Attitude toward teaching/teaching location
    - Attitude toward rigor and revision of lesson plans/SLOs
    - Attitude toward collaborative work with colleagues
    - Belief in personal achievement and/or professional and musical ability
    - Professional goals

Wrap-up

4. Is there anything else you would like to share as an urban music educator?
5. Has your participation in these interviews been valuable to you as a teacher? In what ways?

Concluding the Final Interview

Thank the music teacher for their cooperation and participation in the research project. Remind them of the way that the data will be stored, analyzed and disseminated.

Appendix C. IRB Document

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of Responsible Research Practices

300 Research Administration building
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1063

orrp.osu.edu

01/27/2019

Study Number: 2019E0046
Study Title: A Case Study of Peer Review Fostering or Presenting Barriers to the Professional Growth of K-12 Music Teachers

Principal investigator: Julia Shaw
Date of determination: 01/27/2019

Qualifying exempt category: #1, #2b

Dear Julia Shaw,

The Office of Responsible Research Practices has determined the above referenced project exempt from IRB review.

Please note the following about this determination:

- Retain a copy of this correspondence for your records.
- Only the Ohio State staff and students named on the application are approved as Ohio State investigators and/or key personnel for this study.
- Simple changes to personnel that do not require changes to materials can be submitted for review and approval through Buck-IRB.
- No other changes may be made to exempt research (e.g., to recruitment procedures, advertisements, instruments, protocol, etc.). If changes are needed, a new application for exemption must be submitted for review and approval prior to implementing the changes.
- Records relating to the research (including signed consent forms) must be retained and available for audit for at least 5 years after the study is closed. For more information, see university policies, Institutional Data and Research Data.
- It is the responsibility of the investigators to promptly report events that may represent unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

This determination is issued under The Ohio State University's OHRP Fede[illegible] ssurance #00006378. Human research protection program policies, procedures, and guidance can be fou[illegible] e ORRP website.

Please feel free to contact the Office of Responsible Research Practices wit[illegible] any questions or concerns.

Jacob Stoddard
stoddard.13@osu.edu
(614) 292-0526