

Keeping the Collaborative Fire Burning

BRUCE TORFF, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY: *There may be a window of opportunity during pre-service education that perhaps does not exist in professional education at the inservice level. Do you have any insight as to exactly what goes on between this learnable pre-service moment and the later, more problematic time in a teacher's career?*

GAIL BURNAFORD: *When students are at the university, they are in discussions all of the time; they are engaged in the collaborative dialogue. When they go out into schools, much of this collaborative dialogue is gone. There is no infrastructure for such collaboration in most schools. Teachers and artists tell me repeatedly that they have never really had the occasion to examine their teaching on video before. They say that they have never sat across a table with peers to look carefully at a piece of art work or composition that children produced in order to learn what they could about that child and the curriculum teaching and learning process that resulted in that piece.*

In the CAPE model, if schools want to be part of the CAPE program, they must build in common planning time for artists and teachers. We need to continue to encourage collaborative planning, collaborative feedback sessions. Steve Seidel (Harvard Project Zero) has described the Saturday morning sessions he calls "rounds" where teachers come together with a piece of student work or performance and they all do an analysis on it. I think if we in this community could organize more venues for teachers to be able to do that as parts of arts partnership programming, they would sustain that excitement. If we can find avenues for teachers and musicians to participate in such collaborations, they will become more active and reflective in their work. These activities can – and should – include preservice teachers.

At Northwestern, there are several grant projects in which participants gather in what they call "work cir-

cles." Doctoral students, pre service, 30-year veteran teachers from the Chicago Public Schools, faculty members and technology coordinators problem-solve together. The structure within schools, at this point, doesn't allow such a process. Partnerships can keep that collaborative fire burning while we try to examine how to make such events more systemic in education.

COMMENT: *I want to second that. Gail is talking about the isolation of teachers and particularly arts teachers in schools. They are extraordinarily isolated. In small school systems and in rural communities, there isn't an overall supervisor to even bring them together. They are disengaged, and I think it's wonderful to try to engage them in the conversation with the classroom teachers because they also experience alienation. I think opportunities for reflection and opportunities for time alone, as well as time in collaboration, would make significant changes in the culture of our schools.*

BURNAFORD: *One thing we explored for Renaissance in the Classroom was, "What is the role of the art specialist in the building? Is the music teacher threatened in any way by visiting artists?" Not if the work is rich; not if there is a good collaborative model working there, where the music teacher and the musician quartet or quintet, in our case, is working well with the classroom teacher.*

One question I ask in teacher research collaboratives is, "Who is your partner?" And they'll say, "I don't really have a partner." "Well, you've got to have a partner," I say, "So let's find a partner in another school. Ideally, you would have a partner in your own school, but if not, then it would also work to partner with someone in another school." Partnerships can facilitate that where, in many cases, individual schools cannot. The Spencer Foundation through the Practitioner Mentoring Grants Program has made it possible for us to find such partners for teachers. Currently, in our teacher research network, a classroom teacher and a drama

artist are examining the research question, "What impact does a drama artist have on student learning?" Their inquiry focused on a cluster of fourth grade classrooms will indicate larger issues that evaluation researchers should examine.

ARNOLD APRILL: *I want to add one specific Chicago context around the issue of music teacher isolation. By contract, often the music teacher's job is to cover students while the rest of the faculty does curriculum planning. So by contract the music teacher is excluded from school culture; in fact, as a result some music teachers have retreated so much that they actively push away the rest of the school, because it is the only way they can maintain their integrity. You also get kids*

AT NORTHWESTERN, THERE ARE SEVERAL GRANT PROJECTS IN WHICH PARTICIPANTS GATHER IN WHAT THEY CALL "WORK CIRCLES." DOCTORAL STUDENTS, PRE SERVICE, 30-YEAR VETERAN TEACHERS FROM THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, FACULTY MEMBERS AND TECHNOLOGY COORDINATORS PROBLEM-SOLVE TOGETHER. THE STRUCTURE WITHIN SCHOOLS, AT THIS POINT, DOESN'T ALLOW SUCH A PROCESS. PARTNERSHIPS CAN KEEP THAT COLLABORATIVE FIRE BURNING WHILE WE TRY TO EXAMINE HOW TO MAKE SUCH EVENTS MORE SYSTEMIC IN EDUCATION.

who are profoundly alienated from the rest of school, who hide out and protect their integrity inside the music department. It becomes a bunker mentality. One of the purposes of the CAPE partnerships was to create some flow between the music teachers and the rest of the faculty.

Collaborations of Artists, Teachers, and Scholars

COMMENT: *You mentioned that what you are studying is the relationship between an artist and a teacher, and I wanted to point out that you are also looking at what happens with an artist, a teacher, and a scholar, as conceived of in the model that NEC is working on. You are an active participant by asking them to reflect on what they are doing; you are adding a real depth that just the artist and teacher might not get. I would suggest that some of the improvements in student performance that you are seeing as a result of the artist-teacher relationship is also due to the scholar's role.*

BURNAFORD: *Yes, my hope is that they see themselves as scholars of their work, and we can provide them the support for doing that work. But I think that if you asked the deep teams themselves, they wouldn't credit us with that; they'd credit their own hard work, the two of them, which is absolutely appropriate. The partnership context has afforded them the resources and continuity to accomplish what they describe. I am also suggesting, though, that the university can play much more of a role as you describe. Universities can provide the circumstances where artists and teachers can investigate their work. University faculty can, as you note, facilitate those discussions. They can provide research tools and training and the incentives, such as graduate credit or professional development credit, for inquiry.*

FOLLOW-UP: *And that is a credit to you for giving them the opportunity to see it that way. It is a great failure of in some teaching models which place the teacher on an island. I've been on that island myself, and when I made the request for some support, it actually didn't show up. Building these relationships, having someone out there saying, "You should try talking*

to this person," will strengthen that teacher as a person, strengthen the students because of the strength of the teacher, and will also strengthen the community in general.

BURNAFORD: *That is the value of a partnership. In the Ravinia program, we have clusters of schools in some of the most depressed areas of the city, but they are clusters of schools, so we hope to get to the point where we connect those schools in the community. Our professional development sessions offer teachers the rare opportunity to talk with each other and with musicians who can contribute positively to their students' education. Ravinia has, to their credit, dedicated significant resources to this approach, which is, by every research standard, a sound one. Teacher quality is the single most important determinant of what children know and are able to do. If we work on developing teacher capacity, we increase the capacity of their students to learn.*

FOLLOW-UP: *And it takes a very long time.*

BURNAFORD: *It does take a very long time, absolutely. We are seven years going with CAPE and we are just beginning to see those kinds of patterns.*

ERIC BOOTH, JUILLIARD SCHOOL: *I would like to add the clear value of bringing together teachers, or teachers and artists, from various programs to look into student work, to actually put the student work at the center of the dialogue in a more or less structured way for long chunks of time, sometimes for two to three hours looking at a single piece of student work or listening to a single piece of student work. This has been the process by which I have seen whole new vocabularies begin to develop between artists and teachers, whole new relationships between teacher and teachers, whole new understandings or refreshed understandings of the potency of the work that they do so in many of their projects outside of the institution. This is becoming a real pivotal part of the professional development, and it's a very simple practice. It's one that teachers themselves can adopt and begins to become a part of the functioning of the school.*

BURNAFORD: *We are still exploring the work of Liz Lerman and her critical response approach to performance as another way to look at that. Liz Lerman's critical response is a structured system that engages audience and performers in meaningful and timely feedback. Some of those very same responses or protocol lead to much more meaningful assessment in schools and classrooms. We need a variety of such assessment tools and feedback structures. We need exit slips, learning logs, listening logs, and video anecdotes. We need conference based discussions and traditional tests. We need expert panels and peer reviews ...all happening in classrooms.*

APRILL: *Concerning this issue of collaboration, I would like to add that it's important to be in dialogue with people from other cities, with people from all over the country who have strong models of how teachers and artists reflect on their practice as they are developing it.*

BURNAFORD: *Yes, that's something we've found to be enormously helpful. When Rhoda (Bernard, New England Conservatory) came from Boston to describe the work of teaching artists in schools there, the teachers were very excited: "Oh you're from Boston and you do this kind of thing there? How exactly does the music program work there?" Just the suggestion that this work is going on elsewhere is very stimulating. And our artists and teachers are still talking about presentations and speakers that we have introduced from Boston and New York. There is something profound about this cross-city process of nurturing partnerships.*

APRILL: *And think about structures of access. For instance, we took a group of Chicago public school teachers to visit our sister project in London, and we stayed in British teachers, houses and the US Embassy threw a party for our teachers, and treated our teachers as the important people that they are. We need to create structures so that world-class musicians can participate in this practice without disrupting their schedules, in the way that Philip Glass came and spent some time in the Charter School associated with NEC. They created structures that allowed him access and the school access to him. We've got to think of multiple access points.*

JUST THE SUGGESTION THAT THIS WORK IS GOING ON ELSEWHERE IS VERY STIMULATING. AND OUR ARTISTS AND TEACHERS ARE STILL TALKING ABOUT PRESENTATIONS AND SPEAKERS THAT WE HAVE INTRODUCED FROM BOSTON AND NEW YORK. THERE IS SOMETHING PROFOUND ABOUT THIS CROSS-CITY PROCESS OF NURTURING PARTNERSHIPS.

ers in these schools greet visitors with comments such as, “We have this National Science Foundation grant and, we’re doing the Chicago River Project, oh yes, we also work with the Metro History Project. Which project are you?”

I suggest we all find out what else is going on in that building. If the Symphony Orchestra is there, what are they doing? What is the Chicago River Project? Are there points where their projects intersect? How is impact being assessed? What are students learning through these other partnerships that we might build upon? There is often an amazing amount of synchronicity between the work that we are doing and the projects that others introduce in schools. Teachers, just to save their sanity, will tend to segregate that. But if you say, “Oh I understand you are working with the National Science Foundation” and they say, “Yes... what does that have to do with you?” The door is open. We can continue to increase our capacity by making the connections in and across school sites.

Using Popular Agendas

COMMENT: *One of the things I’ve learned from observing this group over the last few years is they really do know about politics in Chicago, and we have a lot to learn from them on that front. I think one of the themes that runs through their work is that they always have been able to attach themselves to larger, popular agendas—using the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards was a perfect example. Another example to keep in mind, where I know you have done some good work, is around the technology agenda, where the arts are very much the content. There is another resource in the National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, which is a teacher’s union foundation. Again, this strategy of being part of somebody else’s agenda in order to advance your own is something that has been done despite countless obstacles in Chicago, and I would just recommend that all of us think about how this can happen in our own respective organizations and circumstances.*

BURNAFORD: *In Chicago, we call the schools that have multiple projects “Christmas Tree Schools.” Teach-*

Process and Product

LOLITA MAYADAS, NATIONAL GUILD OF COMMUNITY SCHOOLS OF THE ARTS: *You brought up the issue of quality, which is always a slightly loaded word. The question you asked was, how does the role of quality overshadow what you are trying to get students to do? This suggests another question, what is the role of quality in what you are trying to get them to do? How are you addressing issues of quality in student learning?*

BURNAFORD: *This is a question of process and product. Especially with music, it takes a long time to become proficient, and so the quality to me is more in looking at the four quadrants and not just one. I mean the issue of quality is about making people smart. I think that the learning coupled with the process and the ability to articulate that process in multiple venues, is quite important. We look for multiple kinds of evidence that learning has happened, multiple meanings of accessing how kids are thinking about the music*

and how kids are thinking in an integrative model about the connections across that. That is quality.

The final performance might not always reveal that. We are really exploring that with *Ravinia*; we have final culminating performances, but then we are also encouraging the collection of evidence that shows what the kids did along the way. So that it is not just a matter of inviting people and decorating the barn and putting on a show, but rather it is a way of saying, "Here is what the children did; here is what they have learned; here is what they are still learning."

We are also exploring the model called *The Parent Project*, which is designed to involve inner city parents, particularly in Milwaukee. Some Chicago schools have incorporated it as well. There is a book called *The Parent Project* by Jim Vopat and I highly recommend it. It is a literacy based model where parents have the same kinds of experiences that the kids do during the day. There is a lot of writing, reading, and publishing their own work. There is a similar program called *Family Math*, in which children and their parents or caregivers come to the school in the evening to do math activities together.

Similar models, of course, work with arts education. If we really believe in this idea of learning by being performers, critics, audience members, and composers, then we need to bring the parents in long before the "performance." We bring them in to play the drums; to compose music, to critique, to listen, and then we can see whether the evidence indicates that this is worth the investment.

MARTIN GARDINER, BROWN UNIVERSITY: I wonder to what extent you think that you are able to develop significant skill in the kids in the area of the arts. My sense is that is a critically important part of the story. Would you agree, and how have you been looking at that?

BURNAFORD: I think the story in terms of music has yet to be told. We are really looking at it closely and collecting some documentation with the *Ravinia* pro-

gram. In the other art forms that CAPE has been working with, I think we see a lot more progress.

Overall I would note again that our emphasis is not on performance; in fact, the inquiry around this work might be to look at the notion of performance, since it is so dominating in the world of music. What we need to do is study the role of performance in music in education and contextualize it in a way where it makes sense. I hear the anxiety of music teaching artists. Their residencies are often focused on a culminating performance to the detriment of learning in and through music. They are necessarily concerned about making sure the students perform their parts well, stand in the right place, and behave on stage. Sometimes the pressure to produce a model performance at the end of a residency may reduce the attention to composing, critiquing, and reflecting that is part of learning through music. Occasionally, I have talked to children during a rehearsal for a final performance, "What is this all about? What is your role? What have you learned about?" Recently, when I asked these kinds of questions, a young child responded, "I have to stand on this spot and I have to sing when he points to me." And I think, "Hmm, what's the learning here?"

DAVID MYERS, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY: One of the long-standing challenges in music teacher education for those of us who try to train music specialists is this whole process/product problem, because many people who come into music education mainly want to teach performance. They like to be error-detectors and we've had far too much of that. So part of the knowledge base we attempt to develop in pre-service and inservice teachers at undergraduate and graduate levels is an understanding of the relationship between learning process and the outcome, which in our particular case is the performance, or the product. Part of what needs to be understood is that there does not have to be a sacrifice of the quality of musical performance in the interest of process. They are not really separable; they together form a part of understanding children's development, a part of understanding children's musical development, a part of understanding musical process, a part of understanding what people

do in the field of music. That's all content-based and content-rich knowledge.

Which leads me to the question, because one of the terrific things about Rob Kapilow's presentation (see Part I) was that he invited us to build on our own innate musical intrigue. We began with the question of what do you hear, did you notice it, what was there? We tend to forget that children are naturally intrigued with music and so to build on that intrigue requires a certain amount of content knowledge. Now my question to you is this: a long standing criticism of colleges of education is that they have attempted to separate the pedagogy from the content, and so as terrific as Eric Booth's list of principles is, I discovered yesterday that I was thinking of those in terms of inherent musical processes. And then Lois (Hetlund, Project Zero) pointed out that those are examples of good teaching regardless of the content. Well, this then begins to beg the question, what is the relationship between pedagogy and content? Can you really separate it out and to what extent do classroom teachers need to learn the content in order to maintain the integrity of the process? Much that passes for composition in schools is not composition, it is manipulation; it is picking sounds from a sound bank and slapping them together and saying we've composed. But it does not get at the thought process involved in composition. The same is true of criticism, which too frequently becomes opinion rather than thoughtful criticism based on musical ideas. So, to what extent do classroom teachers need to become conversant with the content, or don't they need to become conversant?

BURNAFORD: *I think that's part of what this consortium can generate. We don't know the answer to that, but I think that the criticism of schools of education's isolation of pedagogy apart from content is fair and consistent. My point in bringing higher education into this circle is that we in the academy need you. We need to ask ourselves, "What are the pedagogical principles specific to science? What are the teaching approaches inherent to specific art forms? How can these principles and approaches be applied to partnerships, methods courses, and professional development? How can*

schools be living laboratories that partner with universities and arts partnerships to examine the central questions in the arts education field?

Prospective teachers are trying to figure out the how and the what. The who is the piece that does not seem to be addressed adequately. We need musicians, teachers, researchers, and administrators at the table. We need to tap into the varied experiences of the participants in this work.

Larry said earlier that we forget that some of us have backgrounds that cross career path boundaries. I was a high school English teacher. I am a singer and a musician. People forget that part of me because now I'm in the box called teacher education. But our multiple roles and experiences can inform our present work. This brings me back to my original remarks. We must explore our multiple identities as we go forward to deepen and expand our partnerships in arts education. ¶

IF WE REALLY BELIEVE IN THIS IDEA OF LEARNING BY BEING PERFORMERS, CRITICS, AUDIENCE MEMBERS, AND COMPOSERS, THEN WE NEED TO BRING THE PARENTS IN LONG BEFORE THE "PERFORMANCE." WE BRING THEM IN TO PLAY THE DRUMS; TO COMPOSE MUSIC, TO CRITIQUE, TO LISTEN, AND THEN WE CAN SEE WHETHER THE EVIDENCE INDICATES THAT THIS IS WORTH THE INVESTMENT.
