

University of Memphis

University of Memphis Digital Commons

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1-1-2018

Are We Lovin' It?: The edTPA and the McDonaldization of Music Teacher Training

Ellen Koziel

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Koziel, Ellen, "Are We Lovin' It?: The edTPA and the McDonaldization of Music Teacher Training" (2018).
Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 1906.
<https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/etd/1906>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by University of Memphis Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of University of Memphis Digital Commons. For more information, please contact khhgerty@memphis.edu.

ARE WE LOVIN' IT?:
THE edTPA AND THE MCDONALDIZATION OF MUSIC TEACHER TRAINING

by
Ellen B. Koziel

A Dissertation
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Major: Music

The University of Memphis

May 2018

Abstract

This qualitative study addresses the growing body of research about the implementation and impact of edTPA on the training and assessment of music teacher candidates at the college/university level from the viewpoint of 12 music education teacher trainers in the state of Tennessee. Ritzer's four dimensions of McDonaldization (efficiency, calculability, predictability and control) provided the sociological framework used to explore the lived experiences of the music teacher trainers. Constructivist grounded theory was used to analyze the 12 semi-structured qualitative interviews with the goal of determining themes and patterns. Out of 12 respondents, two were in support of continuing the use of this portfolio assessment as a capstone project for their music teacher candidates, two were for discontinuing the edTPA, and the remaining eight saw both positive and negative aspects of the edTPA. During the coding process, all research participants' responses echoed Ritzer's four dimensions of the McDonaldization of Society. The discourse related to efficiency/inefficiency mostly centered on the K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook. Concerns with calculability/incalculability focused on the scoring process. Discussions concerning predictability/unpredictability focused on issues of licensure and standardization. Experiences related to control/lack of control centered on state and federal mandates for teacher evaluation, the control of the scoring process by Pearson/SCALE, the relationship between music education program areas and their College of Education and the impact of the edTPA on coursework and the teacher candidates' clinical practice. Since the edTPA will be required for Tennessee licensure in January, 2019, the music education teacher trainers seem resigned to the fact that it will be a part of music education programs for, at least, the foreseeable future. The research participants did, however, offer advice to improve the process including creating a specific handbook for music, adding edTPA language to methods classes, training all stakeholders, maintaining a cooperative relationship between the College of Education and music education, developing a lesson plan more suited to a music classroom and focusing on areas of overlap between the edTPA and TEAM to reduce stress and burn out.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Overview	1
Methodology	4
Significance of the Study	4
Research Plan	5
Definitions	6
For the purposes of this dissertation, the following definitions will be used:	6
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	9
Introduction	9
Evolution of Teaching Evaluation	10
Summative vs. Formative Teacher Assessment	13
Teacher Evaluation Models	14
Teacher Performance Assessments	15
Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model	17
Teacher Work Samples	19
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	20
Performance Assessment for California Teachers	26
The edTPA	29
Scoring/External Scorers	33
Academic Language	34
Impact on Coursework	34
Impact on Clinical Practice	35
Summary of Teacher Evaluation	37
Sociology Framework	37
Ritzer's McDonaldization	38
The Irrationality of Rationality	39
McDonaldization of Education	42
Efficiency	43
Calculability	45
Predictability	46
Control	47

Summary of McDonaldization	48
Summary	49
Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods	50
Introduction	50
Methodology	50
The History of Constructivist Grounded Theory	52
Methods	53
Trustworthiness and Ethics	55
Participants	56
Timetable	57
Analysis/Implicit Interpretation	58
Representation	58
Summary	59
Chapter 4: Data	60
Introduction	60
Sociological Framework	61
Efficiency	64
K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook	66
Academic Language	67
Test of writing	70
Video recording	71
Calculability	73
Qualifying scores	75
External scorers	76
Predictability	78
Tennessee evaluation models	78
National Board Certification	79
Licensure	80
Standardization	81
Control	82
Parity with general education	83
State/federal	85
Pearson/SCALE	86

College of Education	87
Music education	92
Teaching to the test	93
Burn out/too much work	94
Summary	97
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations	99
Summary of Results	99
Research Question 1	99
Research Question 2	101
McDonaldization Applied to the edTPA	102
Efficiency	102
Calculability	103
Predictability	104
Control	105
Are We Lovin' It?: Implications of McDonaldization on Music Education	107
Implications for Music Teacher Trainers	108
Implications for the College of Education	110
Implications for Clinical Placements and Seminar	112
Adjustments to the Handbook	113
Implications for the Field of Music Education	118
Attrition in music education programs	118
Implications for Pearson/SCALE	119
Limitations of Study	121
Future Research	121
Summary	122
References	124
Appendix A	140
Appendix B	141
Appendix C	142
Appendix D	144
Appendix E	145
Appendix F	149
Appendix G	151

List of Abbreviations

ACCTE – American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

ADD - Attention Deficit Disorder

ADHD - Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

AERA - American Educational Research Association

ARRA – American Recovery and Reconstruction Act

AYP – Adequate Yearly Progress

BEST - Beginning Educator Support and Training

CAEP – Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation

CCSSO - Council of Chief State School Officers

CCTC – California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

CELDT – California English Language Development Test

edTPA – Teacher Performance Assessment

ELD - English Language Development

ELP - English language proficiency

ESEA - Elementary and Secondary Education Act

ESSA – Every Student Succeeds Act

FTTT – First to the Top Act

GATE – Gifted and Talented Education (California)

HLP – High-leverage practices

IEPs - Individual Education Profiles

IHE – Institutions of Higher Education

InTASC – Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium

IRB - Institutional Review Board

ITIP – Instructional Theory Into Practice

LEA – Local Education Agency

NBCT – National Board Certified Teacher

NBCTs – National Board Certified Teachers

NBPTS – National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

EMC – Early and Middle Childhood (ages 3-12)

EAYA – Early Adolescence through Young Adulthood (ages 11 – 18+)

NCLB - No Child Left Behind Act

NSPARC - National Strategic Planning & Analysis Research Center (Mississippi State University)

PACT – Performance Assessment for California Teachers

PLT – Principles of Learning Test

PEDS - Professional Education Data System

RTTT – Race to the Top

SB 2042 – Senate Bill 2042

TPA - Teaching Performance Assessment

SBOE – State Board of Education

SCALE – Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity

SMTE – Society for Music Teacher Education

TAP – Teacher Advancement Program (Milken Foundation)

TBR – Tennessee Board of Regents

TE - Teaching Event

TEAC - Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee

TEAM – Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model

TEP – Teacher Education Program

TPA – Teacher Performance Assessment

TPAC - Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium

TPE – Teacher Performance Expectations (SB 2042 Policies)

TPP - Teacher Preparation Program

TVAAS - The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System

TWS – Teacher Work Samples

USDOE – United States Department of Education

VUE – Virtual University Enterprises (Pearson)

Chapter 1: Introduction

Overview

There is a growing body of research about the implementation and impact of the edTPA on the training and assessment of teacher candidates at the college/university level. Formerly the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), according to a personal communication from a representative of the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity, Whitaker (as cited in Kilpatrick, 2016), states the “edTPA is not an acronym it [*sic*] is a trademark name” (p. 14). Therefore, this assessment will be referred to as the edTPA throughout this document.

Prior to 1980, statewide governing structures for higher education were concerned with tuition setting, budgets and a general overview of academic programs (McLendon, Hearn & Deaton, 2006). Individual institutions and the departments within them retained a certain amount of autonomy. The past two decades have seen a shift in higher education toward a different view of accountability required by state policy makers focusing more on outcomes. This may be a result of the increased accountability required of public education in general. An example of this is the Tennessee Board of Regents’ (TBR) requirement that the universities that they formerly had authority over adopt the edTPA in their teacher education programs during the fall of 2009. Although the TBR relinquished their jurisdiction of Tennessee four year universities in 2016, the implications of this decision have an ongoing impact on teacher training in the state of Tennessee.

Personal Context

Through my involvement with the edTPA by working with teacher candidates who are required to complete this assessment, I have discovered both positive and negative consequences

associated with the edTPA. In 1996, I was one of the first music teachers in Tennessee to complete the requirements for National Board Certification. This was a rigorous process that involved a set of computer-based tests as well as the submission of three tasks that included video submissions and written commentaries. The Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) used National Board Certification as a model for its performance assessment. National Board Certification led me to my work with the development of the Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model, a portfolio performance assessment adopted by the Tennessee Department of Education for inclusion in the evaluation of fine arts teachers. My experience with these performance assessment models offers a participant viewpoint for my work with the edTPA.

Since the National Commission on Excellence in Education published *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative of Education Reform* in 1983, states have increasingly focused on evaluating schools, students and teachers. In the early 1900's, teacher assessment was based on personal attributes such as grooming, enthusiasm, confidence and integrity (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). Current trends in teacher evaluation are moving away from this subjective model to a more objective model as evidenced by the current use of teacher performance assessments including The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification Portfolio (originating in 1987), the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (originating in 1998), the education Teacher Performance Assessment (originating in 2008) and the Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model (2011). Teacher Performance Assessments are currently used for both in-service and pre-service teachers. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification Portfolio, the Performance Assessment for California Teachers and the Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model are used for evaluating in-service teachers. The edTPA is used

as a capstone assessment required for graduation for some pre-service teachers as well as a licensure requirement for teachers in some states.

Theoretical Framework

This study seeks to view the preparation of music education teacher candidates for the edTPA assessment in institutions of higher education through the lens of sociology. The organizational structure of an institution of higher education can be identified as a bureaucracy according to Weber (1958/2012). Based on Weber's theory, a bureaucracy can confine its workers in an "iron cage" of rationality that can constrict an organization and the people that it employs. Ritzer (2008a) extended Weber's idea of rationality by employing the metaphor of the fast food restaurant, specifically McDonald's, to expound his view of the rationalization of society. According to Ritzer, "McDonalds has succeeded because it offers customers, workers, and managers efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control" (Ritzer, 2008a, p. 13). If we examine Ritzer's four dimensions of McDonaldization (efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control), we can identify applications of these aspects of rationalization in teacher performance assessments, specifically the edTPA.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to explore the lived experiences of music education teacher trainers in institutions of higher education while preparing music education teacher candidates for the edTPA.

I will endeavor to answer the following questions:

1. What are the experiences of the music education teacher trainers in Tennessee with the edTPA?

2. Does the framework of McDonaldization assist in understanding Tennessee's music education teacher trainers' discourse regarding their experiences with the edTPA?

Methodology

I conducted semi-structured qualitative interviews of 12 music education professors, adjunct faculty, residency supervisors and graduate students/teaching assistants. The interviews were transcribed and analyzed through the lens of constructivist grounded theory as put forth by Charmaz (2014) with the goal of determining themes and patterns. The respondents' years of experience ranged from one year to 28 years. Their Tennessee universities/colleges utilized the edTPA as part of their teacher candidate experience.

Significance of the Study

This study is important because it seeks to examine the lived experiences of music education teacher trainers in the state of Tennessee in reference to their experiences with the edTPA. Although studies have been conducted examining the effect of the edTPA on general education teacher candidates (Behney, 2016; Gillis, Zong, & Lim, 2014; Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015), scant research has been conducted on the impact of the edTPA on arts education. There is also little research on the experiences of music education professors or students with the edTPA (Barrett, 2011; Baumgartner & Council, 2017; Cangro, 2014; Elpus, 2015; Greene, 2015; Parkes & Powell, 2015). Examining the impact of the implementation of the edTPA in music education teacher preparation programs could promote a dialog between music education teacher trainers about their experiences with the edTPA. Although research about education has been conducted using the framework of McDonaldization (Bryman & Beardworth, 2006; Howes, Graham & Friedman, 2009, Hartley, 1995; Parker & Jary, 1995; Prichard & Willmott, 1997; Rizqi, 2016; Roach & Frank, 2007; Wilkinson, 2006), it has not been applied to teacher evaluation. This study

seeks to determine if Ritzer's four dimensions of McDonaldization can provide an explanation for the irrational consequences of the rational process of teacher evaluation.

Some higher education faculties may be forced to accept the edTPA as a required assessment for teacher candidates, becoming possibly the "new national bar exam for teachers" (Au, 2013). For the immediate future, teacher trainers will need to help their teacher candidates navigate the requirements of the edTPA. According to the edTPA website, 771 teacher education programs representing 40 states and the District of Columbia currently use the edTPA (edTPA, n.d.). The results of this assessment in teacher education programs can be used as a capstone project for pre-service teachers, as a requirement for graduation from a teacher education program at a college or university or a requirement for teacher licensure.

A relatively new assessment, the edTPA, has been criticized by various sources (Au, 2013; Chiu, 2014; Madeloni and Gorlewski, 2013). Jordan and Hawley (2016) go so far as to label it as "academic oppression" (para. 1). Regardless of the perceived shortcomings of the edTPA, it will be required for Tennessee state teacher licensure for all teachers beginning in January of 2019.

Research Plan

Approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to conduct this research was granted in March, 2017 (see Appendix A for IRB approval). After receiving approval from my dissertation committee, a recruitment e-mail was sent out in August, 2017, to music professors, adjunct faculty, residency supervisors and graduate students/teaching assistants who were identified as utilizing the edTPA in their teacher education programs in Tennessee (see Appendix B for recruitment e-mail). All respondents were recruited through purposive sampling or snowball sampling and participated in an online interview using the BlueJeans platform. Each

interview was transcribed as soon as possible. Interviews were conducted throughout the fall, concluding in October, 2017, with 12 respondents.

Definitions

For the purposes of this dissertation, the following definitions will be used:

Calculability - One of the four dimensions of McDonaldization as put forth by Ritzer, calculability deals with the quantization of processes and products, assigning a numerical value to each of the parts of the production process.

Cooperating Teacher – A P-12 licensed educator who supervises or mentors a candidate during their clinical experience (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, & Equity, 2016).

Clinical Practice – Field-based internships that provide candidates with real-world teaching experiences that include classroom responsibilities, assignments, assessments and other tasks that provide an opportunity for the candidate to develop their professional skills in order to become effective teachers. This experience is also referred to as *student teaching* (Council of the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2015).

College of Education – The academic department in a college or university that is responsible for teacher licensure.

Control – One of the four dimensions of McDonaldization as put forth by Ritzer. A bureaucracy exerts control over the workers or institutions underneath it often resulting in Weber's iron cage of rationality, constricting its workers and creating a mechanized way of living.

Efficiency - One of the four dimensions of McDonaldization as put forth by Ritzer, it refers to the best way to achieve an end product.

In-service Teacher – A teacher who is currently employed by a school and is actively teaching.

McDonaldization – Ritzer’s (2008) application of Weber’s theory of rationalization to American society. A McDonaldized society exhibits the characteristics of the fast food chain through efficiency, predictability, calculability and control.

Music Education Teacher Trainer – College/university professor, adjunct professor, residency supervisor or graduate teaching assistant who is connected to the edTPA in some way. This can include but is not limited to teaching methods courses, supervising teacher candidates during their clinical practice and/or teaching seminar classes in conjunction with the teacher candidates’ clinical practice.

Music Teacher Education Programs – College/university music programs that offer comprehensive courses that include general and professional education courses as well as music content and also provide clinical experiences that assist the candidate in meeting the Tennessee teacher licensure standards (Tennessee Teacher Licensure Standards: Music Education K-12, 2005).

Predictability – “The assurance that products and services will be the same over time and in all locales (Ritzer, 2008a, p. 14).

Pre-service teacher – College/university students who are currently enrolled in a degree program that will result in teacher licensure.

Residency Supervisor - College/university professor, adjunct professor, graduate teaching assistant or retired teacher who oversees teacher candidates during their clinical practice.

Seminar - An undergraduate class that meets concurrently with the clinical practice experience of pre-service music teachers.

Respondents - Music education professors, adjunct faculty, residency supervisors or graduate students/teaching assistants that are or have been involved in coaching teacher candidates through the edTPA process in the state of Tennessee. Also referred to as *subjects*.

Teacher Candidate – An individual who is actively engaged in the preparation process of obtaining professional education licensure or certification. Other terms used to describe these individuals include *student teacher*, *teacher candidate*, *residency candidate* and/or *pre-service teacher* (Council of the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2015).

The edTPA - A portfolio assessment consisting of three tasks that is based on the Performance Assessment of California (PACT) and developed by professors and researchers at Stanford University (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Introduction

This literature review examines the evolution of teacher evaluation from multiple perspectives including the models beginning with Hunter in the 1970's and continuing with the ideas of Marzano (2001) and Danielson (2001). The impact of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is also explored. Several prominent teacher performance assessments are discussed, specifically Teacher Work Samples (1999), National Board Certification© (1987), the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (2002) and the edTPA (2008). The Review of Literature includes research and commentaries about the edTPA and its relationship to teacher education programs in higher education that deal primarily with general education teachers. Also included are studies that address music education and the edTPA. The Review of Literature includes an introduction to rationalization as purported by Weber and the resulting irrationality of rational systems is discussed through research that applies Ritzer's *The McDonaldization of Society* (2008) to disparate topics. Responses to the implementation of the edTPA are also examined from the sociological perspective of Ritzer's four dimensions of rationalization.

Evaluation is an important topic in education. Since the National Commission on Excellence in Education published *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative of Education Reform* in 1983, states have increasingly focused on evaluating schools, students and teachers (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995). Teacher effectiveness in the classroom is evaluated through observation, teacher performance assessments, student growth data and written tests. This chapter will expound on the development of teacher performance assessments whose uses were extended to include capstone projects for teacher candidates as well as requirements for teacher licensure.

Evolution of Teaching Evaluation

Teacher evaluation has evolved from a casual, informal observation of personal attributes such as grooming, enthusiasm, confidence and integrity in the early 1900's (Shinkfield & Stufflebeam, 1995) to a rigorous, often state or federally mandated, multi-faceted instrument. This move toward standardization of teacher evaluation is a result of the increasing involvement of the federal government in public education.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

In 1965, President Johnson signed into effect Public Law 89-10 better known as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Part of Johnson's War on Poverty, the original impetus of the legislation was to help poor, disadvantaged and minority students through the creation of Title I, a federal aid program. This expanded the federal role in schools but was targeted at the disadvantaged student population. In 1968, congress added the Bilingual Education Act to better serve the immigrant population. President Carter in 1978 expanded the availability of Title I money to entire schools that contained at least 75 % of students who met the eligibility requirements for the funds. The Improving America's Schools Act was President Clinton's reauthorization of the ESEA requiring states to create standards and assessments as well as introducing the concept of Adequate Yearly Progress or AYP (Robelen, 2005). According to the United States Department of Education (USDOE) website, AYP is determined by each state and is defined as "the amount of yearly improvement each Title I school and district is expected to make in order to enable low-achieving children to meet high performance levels..." (para. 1).

In 2001, President George W. Bush signed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act as another reauthorization of Public Law 89-10 (Robelen, 2005). NCLB sought to eliminate the

achievement “gaps in test scores among racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, home-language, and special education status groups...” (Dworkin, 2005, p. 170). It also created a system of rewards and punishments for schools and teachers based on the academic achievement of students. (Dworkin, 2005). NCLB expanded the reach of the federal government by requiring that all teachers must be highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. In Tennessee, a highly qualified teacher must hold a bachelor’s degree, a teacher’s license and “demonstrate competency for grade/subject areas(s) being taught” (Fact Sheet on Highly Qualified Options for Tennessee Teachers: NCLB Act, 2003).

In reaction to the stricter requirements of NCLB, 43 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico requested and obtained waivers that allowed some flexibility in the implementation of this newest version of ESEA (USDOE, 2016). States sought exemptions or modifications from their state departments that, in turn, negotiated with the USDOE when the guidelines did not make sense to the local school districts (Karen, 2005). For instance, some states were allowed flexibility in determining AYP by using aggregated data from two-to-three years or even a single year (Dworkin, 2005). Tennessee was granted permission to develop its own teacher evaluation system in response to the higher standards required by NCLB. This system is called the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM).

The next step in increasing federal involvement in public education came in 2009 when President Obama signed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Designed to help stimulate the United States’ economy and create new jobs, it also included monetary investments in different sectors of the country including education. “The ARRA lays the foundation for education reform by supporting investments in innovative strategies that are most

likely to lead to improved results for students, long-term gains in school and school system capacity, and increased productivity and effectiveness” (USDOE, 2009, page 2).

Race to the Top (RTTT), also signed into law by Obama in 2009, was a grant program for which states had to compete. The core education reforms posited by RTTT were:

- Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;
- Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
- Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and
- Turning around our lowest-achieving schools. (USDOE, 2009, p. 2)

Not all states applied for the RTTT grants and some that applied were not given funding. Tennessee, however, was awarded one of the grants. The program required more rigorous and more frequent teacher observations as part of the evaluation process. A principal or other designated observer used a rubric to evaluate the teachers’ instruction. Student growth measures would count more, however, and the observation scores would count less (Davison and Fisher, in press).

The latest iteration of the ESEA is the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) signed into law in 2015. This latest reauthorization “builds on key areas of progress in recent years made possible by the efforts of educators, communities, parents, and students across the country” (Every Student Succeeds Act, para. 2).

Summative vs. Formative Teacher Assessment

According to Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1995), a survey conducted in 1993-1994 of kindergarten through sixth grade public school teachers revealed that both summative and formative evaluations were based on classroom observations conducted most often by the school's principal. The summative assessments were conducted at a single point in the year, served the aims and goals of the school and did little to improve teaching (Shinkfield and Stufflebeam, 1995). The formative assessments were conducted at multiple points during the school year and focused on specific ways for the teacher to improve. The results of either of these two types of evaluations did not meet the scrutiny of a public who was frightened by the seemingly poor standing of the nation's public school students as compared with other countries' students as put forth in *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (Gardiner, 1983). Considered a wake-up call to the American public, teacher accountability began a gradual shift toward an evaluation system based on more than classroom observation.

As defined by Danielson (2001), the purpose of teacher evaluation is to provide a qualified teacher in each classroom, a process she called "quality assurance" (p. 42). Ensuring that high quality teachers were in every classroom was tied to legislators' and policyholders' control of public funds provided for public education. Danielson (2001) argued for a merging of the summative and formative assessment models, resulting in a combination of quality assurance with ongoing teacher growth based on targeted professional development.

Some states have attempted to develop evaluation systems that are both summative and formative. According to Peterson, Wahlquist, Thompson & Chatterton (2001), Utah's Davis school system, teachers chose from multiple forms of data including "parent surveys, student surveys, student achievement data, documentation of professional activity and teacher tests..."

(p. 40). Allowing administrators to use various documents instead of only one source of teacher evaluation provided a more objective picture of a teacher's performance. Other states were using similar models, including Tennessee's Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) and TEAM that focused on multiple data sources including, but not limited to, teacher observations.

Teacher Evaluation Models

Many evaluation models focused on both student learning and teacher improvement. Some of these evaluation models were formative, some were summative and some offered both perspectives. In the 1970's, Hunter developed a model of evaluation titled Instructional Theory Into Practice (ITIP). According to Shinkfield and Stufflebeam (1985), this model focused on increasing teacher effectiveness and was not intended as a teacher evaluation tool. It was primarily a formative evaluation and focused on in-service training as its core principle. Teachers were trained to be the decision-makers in their classrooms. One of the aspects, *Lesson Design*, was a seven step guide to creating lesson plans that were student-focused using language that was part of current lesson planning such as "Objective", "Modeling", "Checking for Understanding", "Guided Practice" and "Independent Practice" (Hunter, 1994). Observations in this model focused on positive aspects of the teaching situation, providing a model that could be used for pre-service as well as in-service teachers.

The Danielson model of teacher evaluation, called the *Framework for Teaching* (2011), was often referred to as "The Framework". First published in 1996, this model divided teachers into three groups in order to provide a differentiated approach: Track 1 for nontenured teachers; Track 2 for tenured teachers; and Track 3 for tenured teachers who have dropped below expectations (Danielson, 2008). Different criteria, based on observation and artifacts such as student work samples submitted by the teachers, were used for each of these tracks to determine

a plan for professional development. Although primarily a formative assessment process that focused on teacher growth, it could also be used as an evaluation model. Praxis III, provided by the Education Testing Service and utilized by some teacher preparation programs as a requirement for certification, was based on the Danielson model.

Marzano's Causal Teacher Evaluation Model proposed a knowledge based system of "four domains: (1) classroom strategies and behaviors, (2) planning and preparing, (3) reflecting on teaching, and (4) collegiality and professionalism" (Marzano & Toth, 2011). School systems had the flexibility to begin only with Domain 1 the first year, and then expand targeted teaching behaviors to the other domains as familiarity with the approach was gained through staff development. The Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model provided evaluators clear guidelines for feedback. Used as a formative assessment, this detailed framework assisted administrators in providing useful feedback utilized to increase student achievement (Learning Sciences: Marzano Center, 2012).

Teacher Performance Assessments

Although teacher observation continues to be utilized as one component of teacher evaluation, more states are moving toward multiple-measure teacher evaluation systems due to mandates from NCLB and RTTP (Davison and Fisher, in press). According to Darling-Hammond (2010), teacher performance assessments (TPAs) are a "potent tool for evaluating teachers' competence and readiness, as well as for supporting needed changes in teacher education" (p. 5). TPAs often include lesson plans, video recordings of actual teaching, examples of student work and commentaries on classroom experiences and outcomes. According to Peck, Singer-Gabella, Sloan and Lin (2014), "studies from several fields of professional education

have found that both novices and experienced professionals can learn from participating in performance assessments” (p. 12).

As a result of Tennessee’s application for RTTT grant funding in 2010, the state passed the First to the Top (FTTT) Act. This legislation addressed the need for a stronger teacher evaluation system, one of the requirements for receiving federal money. The FTTT Act resulted in the creation of the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee (TEAC), which developed comprehensive guidelines and criteria used for the evaluation of both teachers and principals. After field testing four different possible models for evaluation, The State Board of Education (SBOE) approved the TEAM model in June of 2011 and it was implemented across the state of Tennessee in July, 2011.

The Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) is about principals and teachers working together to ensure the best possible instruction every day. Through frequent observation, constructive feedback, student data, and professional development, TEAM is designed to support all educators in doing their best work to help every student learn and grow. (TEAM-TN, n.d.).

The TEAM Observation Rubric is mandated for 50% of the total teacher evaluation. This qualitative component consists of four required domains – instruction, planning, environment and professionalism. The Instruction portion of the rubric is the most comprehensive, consisting of twelve indicators. The Professionalism rubric is contained in a separate document and consists of four indicators. The teacher is scored on each indicator using a five-point rubric: Significantly Above Expectations (5), At Expectations (3) and Significantly Below Expectations (1).

Evaluators are able to categorize an educator who falls between a Level 5 and a Level 3 as

Above Expectations (4) and an educator that falls between a Level 3 and a Level 1 as Below Expectations (2).

The FTTT act also created a quantitative component of the TEAM by requiring that 50% of a teacher's total score must be comprised of student growth and student achievement data. Thirty-five percent of this data represents student growth and 15% represents student achievement based on other measures that are determined by the Local Education Agency (LEA) from a list of approved measures provided by the SBOE. For teachers of tested grade levels or subjects, individual Tennessee Value Added Assessment System (TVAAS) scores are used for the student growth portion of their evaluation. If an alternative option is not available for teachers of non-tested grade levels or subjects, the teacher takes the school-wide TVAAS score. Student growth portfolio options for some non-tested grades and subjects have been developed including portfolio options for fine arts, first grade, physical education, pre-k/kindergarten and world languages.

Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model

The FTTT of 2010 was based on multiple measures of teacher effectiveness including indicators of student growth. To provide an option for fine arts teachers, the Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model was developed in order to address the need for data to complete the quantitative portion of the TEAM. This portfolio assessment was piloted during the 2011-12 school year. Fine arts teachers from the legacy Memphis, Tennessee, City Schools system, led by Fine Arts co-coordinator Dr. Davison, developed the model. Data were collected from the pilot phase and submitted for approval to the Tennessee State Board of Education in 2012. It was approved during that summer as an option for the student growth component of the TEAM evaluation for fine arts teachers. Three districts implemented the model during the 2012-13

school year. In the spring of 2013, fine arts teachers were able to use the scores from this portfolio assessment for their individual growth scores on the TEAM evaluation. It is now provided as an option for any fine arts teacher in the state of Tennessee (TEAM-TN, n.d.).

The Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model requires the fine arts teacher to submit four evidence collections that represent the growth of either groups of students or individuals. These may be audio or video files, documents or images of student work. At least two of the evidence collections must focus on individual students that represent three learning levels (emerging, proficient and advanced) and document the growth of each of these students in the same performance task. Ensembles or groups of students may be utilized for one of the evidence collections. According to the Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model Guidebook (2017-18), “teachers should collect student work artifacts from at least two points in time that are the best suited to demonstrating the proficiency level of standard(s) included in the collection” (p. 3). The submission also includes a teacher narrative that elaborates on the student work provided. Fine arts teachers are asked to tag the student evidence provided so the evaluators are able to determine the salient portions of the student work that represent the performance level of the individual students or groups.

Evidence collections are uploaded to an online platform throughout the school year until April 15. Teachers self-score their submissions, ranking them on a scale from one to five based on the amount of growth. A level one score indicates no growth and a level five score indicates three or more levels of student growth. Once all of the evidence collections have been uploaded, “they are distributed to trained, certified peer reviewers for additional scoring” (Fine Arts Students Growth Portfolio Model Guidebook, p. 6). Trained scorers evaluate the portfolio submissions, assigning each evidence collection a score from one to five. These scores are

compared to the teacher's self-score. If there is a difference of more than one level, the portfolio submission is sent to an executive reviewer who determines the final score. The scores derived from this consensus scoring methodology are used to provide data for the student growth portion of the TEAM evaluation.

Teacher Work Samples

Teacher Work Samples (TWS) began with the Renaissance Partnerships for Improving Teacher Quality, a Title II funded program that began in 1999 and continued until 2005. This consortium, composed of ten universities, used the TWS model, described below, as a performance assessment for candidates in their teacher preparation programs.

Seven teaching processes were included in the TWS Assessment. In the first section, teacher candidates provided contextual factors that described the community, school, and district as well as a description of the students included in the instruction. The second section consisted of learning goals that included national, state, and local objectives that were appropriate for the students selected. The assessment plan made up the third section. Teacher candidates provided pre- and post-assessments as well as the formative assessments used throughout the unit. In the fourth section, teacher candidates reflected on the results of the pre-assessment from the previous section. Using this information, they provided an overview of the instruction unit, detailing activities and instructional strategies as well as the use of technology. In section five, teacher candidates described adaptations made during the instructional time frame. Analysis of student learning was the focus of the sixth section that consisted of three levels of data analysis. Reflection comprised the final section of the TWS (Henning & Robinson, 2004). Teacher candidates identified their grade level, choosing among early childhood (birth to grade three), elementary (grades K -6), middle school (grades 5 – 8), secondary (grades 6-12) or a multiple

level option. There were 27 certification categories listed that included music as one of the licensure areas (Emporia State University website, 2005).

Studies concerning the TWS model have looked at various aspects of the assessment including validity (Denner, Salzman & Harris, 2002; Denner, Norman, Salzman, & Pankratz, 2003; Keese & Brown, 2003), its effect on early field experiences (Henning, DeBruin-Parecki, Hawbaker, Nielson, Joram, & Gabriele, 2005), the use of literacy strategies by social studies teacher candidates (Lenski & Thieman), benchmarking completed by a panel of raters (Salzman, Denner, Bangert & Harris, 2001), and the inclusion of general studies objectives as part of the TWS (Benton, Powell, DeLine, Sautter, Talbut, Bratberg & Cwick, 2012). In general, the TWS model was found to be a valid assessment of pre-service teaching using quantitative measures such as surveys (Henning et al., 2005; Keese & Brown, 2013) and inter-rater reliability utilizing analytic and holistic scoring (Denner, et al., 2002; Salzman et al., 2001). One qualitative study used document analysis to determine the literacy strategies used by social studies teacher candidates. Findings indicated that, although teacher candidates used multiple levels of literacy strategies, “Classes with higher levels of poverty and racial and linguistic diversity were taught lower-level strategies, and students in higher SES schools were taught higher-level strategies” (Lenski & Thieman, 2013, p. 77). The implications of this study do not denigrate the TWS model, itself, but indicate that more focus during teacher training should be placed on using multiple levels of literacy strategies on all students in any given situation.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) began their work in 1987 by developing paradigms to identify accomplished teaching and to create an assessment that identified teachers who met these standards. Out of this work came National Board

Certification©, a teacher performance assessment consisting of three written commentaries and an assessment center computer-based test. There are currently twenty-five certificate areas that cover sixteen content areas including music. According to the Certificates, Standards, and Instructions table, candidates must choose between two student developmental levels for nine of these content areas: (a) early and middle childhood (EMC) for students ages 3-12 or (b) early adolescence through young adulthood (EAYA) for students ages 11-18+. Music applicants must also specify a concentration in either instrumental music (band or orchestra) or vocal music/general music.

According to the NBPTS website (2016), the National Board Certification assessment contains four components: (1) Content Knowledge, (2) Differentiation in Instruction, (3) Teaching Practice and Learning Environment and (4) Effective and Reflective Practitioner. For components 2 – 4, candidates must submit a one-page description of their classroom and school (referred to as the Contextual Information Sheet) and two classroom layout forms that provide diagrams of the physical layout of the instructional setting. Components 2, 3 and 4 require written commentaries and components two and three require video submissions.

The first component, Content Knowledge, involves completing a computer-based assessment at a testing center. The first part of this evaluation consists of approximately 45 selected-response questions. For music candidates, these items focus on music theory and music history, curriculum and instructional strategies, specialized skills and knowledge, specific instrumental/vocal techniques and repertoire, connections to disciplines other than music, and world music (Sample Items and Scoring Rubrics, p. 1). The second part of the assessment consists of three constructed response exercises that address diagnostic skills, instructional strategies and music composition (p. 2).

According to the NBPTS's Portfolio Instructions and Scoring Rubric for Component 2 (2014), Differentiation in Instruction requires each teacher applicant to construct a multi-lesson teaching unit and describe it in a one-page overview. The student learning during this unit is explained in a written commentary of not more than twelve pages addressing four categories: (1) Instructional Context, (2) Planning and Implementing Instruction, (3) Assessment and (4) Reflection (p. 6). Specific prompts give the candidate the opportunity to describe, analyze and evaluate how the lessons in the unit of instruction promote student learning of the objectives. Additional contextual information provides a clear picture of the student group targeted in this segment. The candidate also submits two short video segments of this same group of students, representing two different points in the unit.

Requirements for Component 3, Teaching Practice and Learning Environment, also include the submission of two videos and written commentaries. The focus of this submission is instruction, student engagement and learning environment. The candidate discusses his/her pedagogical decision-making. The rubrics indicate that the applicant should provide high-quality music instruction and exhibit good musicianship. The instruction should also meet all students' needs and foster good musicianship among the group.

The two 10–15 minute videos must represent two different lessons and they cannot be the same lessons submitted in Component 2. These videos should show how the candidates plan instruction and how they choose materials for the learning segments. Evidence of good teaching, a positive learning environment and student engagement should be evident in the videos. Candidates submit an Instructional Planning and Materials document of no more than three pages and an Instructional Planning Form of no more than one page as well as a written

commentary of no more than four pages for each video. Candidates reflect on the lessons in terms of successful attainment of objectives and implications for future lessons.

The NBPTS Component 4: Portfolio Instructions and Scoring Rubric (2016) explains requirements and scoring for Component 4, Effective and Reflective Practitioner (EMC & EAYA). For the assessment portion of the portfolio, the candidate chooses one group of students. The candidate must show evidence of knowledge of students and the use of this information when designing both formative and summative assessments.

The second part of Component 4 is Participation in Professional Learning Communities (p. 5). Even though this also involves a targeted group of students, it does not have to be the same group of students as in the previous section. In fact, examples can be from up to two previous years. The candidate completes and submits two separate forms. The Description of Professional Learning Need Form (p. 9) identifies a need based on what you learned about your students. This could be for the candidate or other colleagues. The Description of Student Need Form (p. 5) identifies needs for a group of students or a specific population. The candidate demonstrates collaboration with people in the school, community or a professional organization to meet these needs. The candidate's role could be as advocate, collaborator or leader.

All portfolio entries are submitted through an electronic portfolio system (ePortfolio) provided by Pearson Virtual University Enterprises (VUE) (NBPTS website, 2015). Assessors, chosen and trained by Pearson, score the constructed responses for Component 1 and all of the items in Components 2, 3 and 4 based on a 12-point scale.

According to the Compensation Technical Working Group (2011-2012), multiple studies have been conducted dealing with National Board Certified Teachers (NBCTs). These include

national, regional and local studies that used various methods of analyzing data obtained through experimental and quasi-experimental study designs. Research subjects included NBCTs, teachers who attempted the assessment and failed, and teachers who chose not to apply for National Board Certification. Research areas included the relationship between NBCTs and student achievement, equity and distribution of NBCTs, and professional development and leadership roles related to certification.

Studies that concerned the effects of NBCTs on teacher effectiveness & student achievement produced mixed results. Harris, Ingle & Rutledge (2014) compared value-added scores with Principal evaluation scores. The results of this study indicated that each of these assessments identified different teachers as effective. The Washington State Institute of Public Policy conducted a meta-analysis of research about NBCTs, finding that “a teacher with NBPTS-certification can boost student test scores from 0 to .06 standard deviation units per year; best estimate = .02 standard deviations” (Pennucci, 2011, Slide 14). Cantrell (2008) reported that when NBCTs were compared with non-certified teachers, the NBCTs were found to be more effective teachers. Some studies found that NBCT’s students scored higher on achievement tests, especially among minority students (Cavalluzzo, 2004; Goldhaber, Perry & Anthony, 2004; Vandervoort, Amrein-Beardsley & Berliner, 2004). Cowan & Goldhaber (2015) compared teacher value-added and NBPTS assessments finding that NBCTs in Washington State were more effective than non-certified teachers. However, “not all studies have found a consistent link between NBCT status and greater gains in student learning” (Plecki, Elfers, John & Finster, 2010, p.43). Sanders, Ashton and Wright (2005) found “mixed or statistically non-significant results” (p. 2-3).

Another category of research concerned the equity and distribution of NBCTs. Several studies have identified that most NBCT candidates are from schools with high student achievement and low poverty (Goldhaber, Perry & Anthony, 2004; Koppich, Humphrey & Hough, 2007). Kassner (2012) found there were more NBCTs in districts that provided funding, often resulting in fewer NBCTs in low income schools. Simpkins (2011) studied the impact of monetary bonuses for NBCTs. The findings indicated that bonuses do not impact the number of NBCTs in high poverty schools but has increased the total number of NBCTs overall in Washington State.

The third category of studies dealt with professional development and leadership roles as it related to NBPTS. Loeb, Elfers, Plecki, Ford, & Knapp (2006) reported that many NBCTs take on leadership positions in their schools or districts. The Compensation Technical Working Group (2011-2012) stated that some researchers have also addressed the question as to whether the very process of becoming National Board Certified provides professional development and improves teachers. Several researchers (Cavaluzzo, 2004; Lustick & Sykes, 2006) have found positive impacts of NBCTs on student outcomes. “The positive effect has been attributed to what teachers learn through the process of becoming certified as measured against professional teaching standards, as well as teacher learning that can occur in cohort based extended learning communities” (p. 3). Hall (2012) conducted a qualitative research project in the form of a case study that looked at NBCTs in East Tennessee who taught 4th and 5th grade. The results of this case study indicated that the National Board Certification process had a “positive impact...on their teaching practices” (p. 116).

Overall, studies about National Board Certification indicated that it had a positive effect on student achievement as well as professional development and leadership roles of the certified

teachers. Studies also looked at the distribution of NBCTs. The studies indicated that bonuses often increased the number of NBCTs in a school district or state, and also that fewer NBCTs were found in lower income schools.

Performance Assessment for California Teachers

California Senate Bill 2042, passed in 1998, required teacher candidates to pass a “state-approved multiple measure teaching performance assessment with demonstrated validity and reliability to receive an initial license in CA” (Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity, 2015). Unhappy with the state-provided performance assessment designed for use with all grade levels and subject areas, a consortium of twelve California colleges and universities created the Performance Assessment for California Teachers or PACT (Pecheone & Chung, 2006). The original coalition, formed in 2001, was comprised of two California State Universities, Stanford University, Mills College and all campuses of the University of California system. The PACT used the NBPTS portfolio as a model for the development of this performance assessment (Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Wei, 2010). The PACT, in use since the 2002-2003 school year, currently assesses 17 credential areas (some were elementary and secondary) that include music. Teacher candidates who graduated at the end of the 2008-2009 school year were the first class required to pass the PACT in order to receive California teacher certification.

The PACT used multiple data sources including lessons plans, artifacts, student work samples, video segments and reflection commentaries as evidence of teaching effectiveness. A “Teaching Event” (TE) occurs toward the end of the student teaching experience and requires a unit plan made up of three to five hours of teaching, usually accomplished during one week. The Music TE consists of five tasks: (1) Context for Learning, (2) Planning Instruction and

Assessment, (3) Instructing Students and Supporting Learning, (4) Assessing Student Learning, and (5) Reflecting on Teaching and Learning.

The PACT is student-focused; all students, including English Language Learners and students with Individual Education Profiles (IEPs), should be able to meet the learning objectives. The “Music Teaching Event Candidate Handbook” (PACT, 2014-2015) provides instructions on how to complete the performance assessment process. The first task consists of providing a “Context for Learning” in which the teacher candidate describes the setting of the learning segment as well as information about the students involved in the instruction. Due to the high percentage of Hispanic students in the California public schools, teacher candidates provide the number of students featured in their Teaching Event who were English learners, redesignated English learners and proficient English speakers. Redesignated English learners are those students who are not native English speakers but have met the district criteria for moving to Fluent English Proficient status. Candidates must also identify the number of students who have Individual Educational Profiles and 504 accommodations. In the Context for Learning Commentary, applicants provide a description of the school, including special requirements or expectations from the school district such as curriculum guides or required textbooks. The students’ academic and social development is described, including information about the students’ families and community.

For the second task, centered on planning and assessment, teacher candidates describe how they used student’s prior knowledge during planning. Lesson plans must include both formative and summative assessments. The lesson plan format includes a central focus, academic content standards, English Language Development (ELD) standards, learning objectives and instructional materials. Teacher candidates must also write a commentary for this task.

Task 3, Instructing Students and Supporting Learning, requires the teacher candidate to provide one or two video clips of their instruction that cannot be more than 20 minutes total in length. These video clips show that students were actively engaging in learning specific musical skills, learning strategies used in performing, creating, analyzing, describing or understanding music. In the instruction commentary, teacher candidates describe routines as well as what happened immediately before and after the video clip(s). The video clips should show examples of strategies for the whole class and individuals or sections as well as both formative and summative assessments. Language supports, defined in the Performing Arts Assessment Handbook as “the scaffolds, representations, and pedagogical strategies teachers provide to help learners understand, use, and practice the concepts and language they need to learn within disciplines” (p. 47), must also be included in the video clips.

Assessing student learning is the focus of the fourth task. The teacher candidate provides audio/video recordings of student performances of a musical work that focuses on either three individuals, three sections/ensembles or a whole class in an elementary music setting. An evaluative criteria or rubric is constructed that could include “responses to nonverbal conducting gestures, error detection, technical proficiency on instrument or voice, pitch control and tone production, and expressive dimensions of music-making” (PACT Handbook, 2016, p. 14). The assessment commentary includes a discussion of standards/objectives, evaluative criteria, an analysis of student learning, examples of the teacher’s feedback as well as next steps for instruction.

Reflection is an important part of the PACT. Teacher candidates completed daily reflections during the teaching event in Task 2, analyzing the effectiveness of their teaching strategies both for the whole class and for individual students. The reflective commentary

included a description of what the teacher candidate learned from teaching this learning segment, citing relevant research or theory as well as the opportunity to discuss what could be done differently if this same lesson was repeated. Music was added as an assessment area during the pilot year of 2004-2005. The PACT was formally approved by the state of California for use as a valid teacher performance assessment in 2007 (SCALE, 2015).

Pecheone and Chung (2006) used content validity measures when discussing validity of the PACT. The California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) were compared with the tasks included in the PACT. Also, a panel of teacher educator experts judged the authenticity of the tasks based on their professional experiences and judgment. In general, both of the content validity measures found a strong relationship between the TPE standards and the TE tasks. Pecheone and Chung (2006) also conducted reliability studies during the first two years of implementation, determining that the level of agreement between scores assigned by local college instructors were commensurate with scores assigned by outside adjudicators.

The edTPA

After the success of the PACT in the state of California, the Teacher Performance Assessment Consortium (TPAC) was formed in 2008. It consisted of The Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE), the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). Teams of higher education representatives and state departments of education from 20 states joined these organizations. CCSSO's Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) developed the Model Core Teaching Standards adopted by 38 states. When Pearson came on board as an administrative partner in 2012, CCSSO withdrew from the group (DeMink-Carthew, Hyles, & Valli, 2016).

Developed by professors and researchers at Stanford University in response to the growing popularity of performance-based assessments for educators, the edTPA is modeled after the PACT (Darling-Hammond, 2010). A portfolio assessment, the edTPA consists of three Tasks: Task 1 - Planning for Instruction and Assessment; Task 2 - Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning; Task 3 - Assessing Student Learning. The teacher candidate is required to provide a written commentary for each task. For a music education teacher candidate, each of the three tasks includes five rubrics that address specific aspects of the task for a total of fifteen rubrics, each worth five points, equaling seventy-five points total for the portfolio. Scores range from one to five - a one representing a novice who is not ready to teach and a five representing a highly accomplished beginner.

Task 1 requires the teacher candidates to choose one class to focus on during the edTPA assessment. They complete a Context for Learning in which the teacher candidate describes the school (rural, urban or suburban) as well as the specific composition of the selected class. Teacher candidates must identify students with an IEP as well as students with special needs such as English as a Second Language Learners and students with 504 designations such as Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). This task consists of three to five lesson plans, called the learning segment. A language function such as *create, perform, identify, improvise* or *respond* is chosen for the central focus that carries throughout the lesson plans. Additional language demands must also be included. These include *vocabulary and/or symbols* and either *syntax* or *discourse*. A response to the writing prompts required for Task 1 must be included (SCALE, 2015).

In Task 2, the teacher candidates must choose two ten-minute video clips of their learning segments that show positive interactions in the classroom as well as active student engagement.

In addition, the video evidence should show how the candidate deepens students' learning by evoking "student performances and/or responses" that show that the students can apply the information in the lesson. The last commentary prompt asks the teacher candidate to reflect on the lesson and identify any changes to make if this lesson was taught again. As part of this, candidates are asked to talk about the whole class as well as specific learners in the class and strategies that could have been used to help students with special needs (SCALE, 2015).

Task 3 concerns assessment. The teacher candidate chooses one assessment from the learning segment. The candidate must identify specific objectives and evaluation criteria such as rubrics must be included in the commentary. Data from the assessment are collected and analyzed, specifying student learning for three targeted individuals as well as the class as a whole. Student work samples are submitted for the three targeted students. Evidence of feedback must include strengths and needs as well as how each student will be supported to "further their learning related to learning objectives, either within the learning segment or at a later time" (SCALE, 2015, p. 30).

Task 3 must also include Evidence of Language Understanding and Use. Three possible sources for this evidence are video clips from Task 2, an additional five-minute video or annotations written on the student work samples. These artifacts should show concrete examples of the language function defined in Task 1 as well as the music vocabulary or musical symbols that were used during instruction. Evidence of the students' use of syntax or discourse were also included.

The following figure illustrates the development of the edTPA, showing its basis in NBPTS and the PACT. As this review of literature showed, teacher evaluation has evolved over time. Precursors could also include TWS and even the work of Marzano and Danielson,

According to SCALE, however, the following pyramid represents the development of the edTPA.



Figure 1: Development of the edTPA

There are similarities and differences between these three TPAs. A table is provided for a comparison of the NBPTS, PACT and the edTPA (see Appendix C). Comparisons are drawn based on the following aspects of the three assessments: components, written commentaries, scoring and cost/target populations.

Institutions of higher education have conducted studies about the adoption of the edTPA as a requirement for their teacher preparation programs (Burns, Henry, & Lindauer, 2015; DeMink-Carthew, Hyles, & Valli, 2016; Denton, 2013; Lin, 2015; Peck, Gallucci & Sloan, 2010; Pinter, Winter & Watson, 2016). These studies have ranged in scope from studying faculty engagement in the edTPA process to various ways to support candidates throughout the undergraduate experience, culminating in the edTPA as a benchmark assessment. Though some

research related to music and the edTPA exists, scant research concerns the relationship between the edTPA and music education (Baumgartner & Council, 2015; Greene, 2015; Meuwissen & Choppin, 2015; Parkes & Powell, 2015; Snyder, 2014).

Scoring/External Scorers

The edTPA seeks to create quantifiable scores to identify teacher candidates that are ready to teach. SCALE, the AACTE and Pearson are having a profound influence on the evaluation of teacher candidates throughout the United States. They appear to regard educational evaluation:

as if its production process could be readily broken down into a set of fixed, measurable and assessable procedures which admit the title of “good (or even best) practice”, or as if its output should be predictable, standardisable and quantifiable. (Hartley, 1995, p. 419)

Some music trainers questioned the validity of the edTPA in terms of measuring the candidates’ effectiveness, especially in an ensemble setting. Content knowledge and context are more important in an ensemble setting according to Parkes and Powell (2015). They stated that “the edTPA cannot measure what it claims to measure in the performing arts” (p. 110). Because they defined teaching as a dynamic process, it was difficult to measure the learning that takes place in a music classroom with a standardized approach to evaluation. Their study suggested that more research is needed about the complexities of music teaching and the best way to evaluate this sometimes messy learning situation. Maranzano (2000) advocated the use of more inclusive evaluation models to address the “complex decision-making process that a music teacher focuses upon in the act of conducting a musical rehearsal...” (p. 268).

One of the criticisms directed at the implementation of the edTPA concerned the use of external scorers contracted and paid by the publishing company Pearson (Cochran-Smith, Piazza,

& Power, 2012). Madeloni and Gorlewski (2013) criticized Pearson because it reduced teaching to a number determined by external judges who scored the portfolio. The AACTE and SCALE have published a rebuttal of these criticisms by publishing an “edTPA MYTHS and FACTS” page on their website. They debunk the idea that Pearson “owns and is in control of the assessment design” (SCALE, 2016). They assert that SCALE “is solely responsible for developing all edTPA handbooks, rubrics, scoring training . . . and support resources for candidates and programs” (Website, 2016).

Academic Language

According to Snyder (2014), music students had difficulty understanding the academic language portion of the edTPA. He looked at the edTPA scores for music teacher candidates in the fall of 2013 and the spring of 2014 before the edTPA was consequential at his university. He noted that, instead of engaging students in discussion or discourse about music using the vocabulary of music, candidates often just called on students to define the terms used in the lesson in order to address the inclusion of discourse in the lesson. The concept of syntax was identified as being very problematic, with Snyder going so far as to say that “nobody seems to know what syntax means in a musical context. The definition of syntax is ‘conventions for organizing symbols’. For those of us in the music teaching profession, this can include the governing principles of reading music (i.e., rests, notes) and musical staff according to the test designers and evaluators” (p. 3).

Impact on Coursework

The edTPA will have an impact on teaching at the college level because of its implementation as a credentialing device for teachers (Denton, 2013). One of his criticisms was that university professors were not allowed to view the training materials provided by Pearson or

substantially edit their students' entries (p. 23). SCALE asserts that faculty were "encouraged and expected to provide formative support to candidates" (SCALE, 2016). The only thing they were not allowed to do is directly edit the reflections or choose the videos for each candidate.

According to Pinter, et al. (2016), all faculty must "buy in", not just the residency faculty. The stakeholders of the edTPA include the education professors as well as the content faculty such as professors who teach music theory, music history and other core music courses. Teacher candidates need to be able to use specific vocabulary for the edTPA and this vocabulary should be included in required coursework before residency so that candidates are familiar with the terminology. Candidates should also receive training in assessment, reflection, and working with diverse learners.

Baumgartner & Council (2015) looked at music teaching seminars by utilizing a cross-sectional survey of music faculty members who were in charge of a seminar class. Even though most teacher preparation programs surveyed implemented some form of portfolio assessment, "some instructors mentioned the desire to 'eliminate the edTPA' and similar portfolio-type teacher evaluation projects" (p. 67). These instructors felt that working on portfolio assessments was not the main purpose of the seminar. Therefore, common activities in the seminar class did not align with what the professors perceived as the purpose of these classes.

Impact on Clinical Practice

Greene (2015) and Meuwissen & Choppin (2015) studied the role of cooperating teachers in the edTPA process. Using the qualitative approach of narrative inquiry, Greene's study put forth different views of the edTPA through the stories of cooperating teachers working with music teacher education candidates. Most of the cooperating teachers in the study did not know much about the edTPA at the beginning of their residency experiences. The high school music

teacher mentors received material from the university but did not have time to read it. According to the researcher who was also a residency supervisor, “Of all the tensions we had shared during the year, the edTPA proved to be the one that bumped the hardest against our narrative authority as cooperating teachers” (p. 286). Meuwissen & Choppin (2015) also addressed the tension experienced by both the teacher candidate and the cooperating teachers. Utilizing a sequential mixed-methods approach, Meuwissen & Choppin (2015) asked teacher candidates to complete a 40-item survey and participate in a semi-structured interview. Although this qualitative research project was not targeted at music education pre-service teachers, out of the 24 candidates included in the research, four were in music education. One of the comments from a music teaching candidate talked about the fact that he and his cooperating teacher did not understand the language in the handbook.

Meuwissen & Choppin (2015) discussed the challenge of presenting the edTPA video-recorded lessons in sequence. One music candidate had to “feign continuity” (p. 15) due to the absence of one of her target students. Scheduling the edTPA video segments was an issue for some cooperating teachers, especially in ensemble classes. Parkes and Powell (2015) observed that the edTPA had to be scheduled in between performance preparations, making it really difficult for the cooperating teachers who felt they had to give up rehearsal time so that the candidates could complete the required videos.

The edTPA requirement seemed to narrow the focus of lesson planning during the student teaching experience. Parkes and Powell (2015) discussed the edTPA in general as a high-stakes evaluation for pre-service teachers. Their experience with the edTPA included the

observation that music teacher candidates were “simply answering the edTPA prompts and then planning their lessons around the prompts. Again, this leads the profession away from authentic lesson planning, which should be student-centered” (p. 109).

Summary of Teacher Evaluation

Changes in teacher evaluation are the result of ESEA and the subsequent legislation passed to update the original mandate. We have looked at the history of education evaluation including formative versus summative evaluations and specific evaluation frameworks such as Marzano’s *Causal Teacher Evaluation Model* and Danielson’s *Framework for Teaching*. TPEs were examined including TEAM, The Fine Arts Portfolio for Student Growth in the Arts, TWS, NBPTS, PACT and the edTPA. Research concerning the edTPA has shown that there is criticism of the use of external scorers, questions about the validity of the assessment, complaints about the loss of rehearsal time, difficulties with the video process, negative effects on the lesson planning process and difficulties in understanding the language used in the K-12 Performing Arts Handbook. As we shall see in the next section, many of these evaluation processes can be characterized as mechanized, rationalized, bureaucratized, and alienating when considered in the context of arts based education.

Sociology Framework

According to Weber (1958/2012), a bureaucratized society can create an “iron cage” of rationality that constricts both the worker and the consumer. Ritzer’s work on rationalization is grounded in the work of Weber, whose “related work on bureaucracies has been the cornerstone of the sociology of organizations from its inception” (Ritzer, 1975, p. 628). Weber saw the ultimate result of bureaucratization as confining the worker to an “iron cage” of rationality. Weber defined this entrapment in a bureaucracy as a cage that denies an individual’s basic

humanity (Ritzer, 2008a). Weber approved of the efficiency created by bureaucracy, but “he abhorred the mechanization of life it produced” (Ritzer, 1975, p. 633).

Ritzer’s McDonaldization

Whether creating an “iron cage” or a “rubber cage”, Weber’s concept of rationalization has had an impact on the study of organizations. Ritzer (2008a) used the metaphor of the fast food restaurant, specifically McDonald’s, to frame his observations regarding the rationalization of society as a process. According to Ritzer, “McDonalds has succeeded because it offers customers, workers, and managers efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control” (Ritzer, 2008a, p. 13).

A rational society emphasizes finding the best means to achieve an end product. Ritzer refers to this as *efficiency* (Ritzer, 2008). Many families now turn to fast food restaurants to provide meals because that is the quickest way to feed a family when both parents are working. This doesn’t mean that the family is eating the most nutritious food possible, but it is one of the most efficient ways to achieve the goal of providing dinner. Another aspect of the fast food industry is the role of the worker According to Ritzer (2008), “workers in McDonaldized systems function efficiently by following steps in a predesigned process. (p. 13).

People in a rational society do not want surprises, they want *predictability*. They expect products will be similar when entering certain settings such as a fast food restaurant.

McDonalds’ patrons expect the cheeseburgers in Memphis to taste like the cheeseburgers in Houston or New York. According to Ritzer (2008), workers in McDonaldized systems, “follow corporate rules as well as the dictates of their managers. In many cases, what they do, and even what they say, is highly predictable.”

Calculability, in a rational society, can be described as the perception that quantity is more important than quality. McDonalds describes it's Extra Value Meal on its website stating, "You value good food just as much as you value a good price. Thanks to our delicious meal bundles, you can have both" (McDonalds.com. 2018). According to Ritzer (1995), in a McDonaldized society, evaluators of educational products seek to "develop a series of quantifiable measures that it takes as surrogates for quality" (p. 375).

According to Ritzer (1983), rational systems are oriented toward *control* over various uncertainties in life, especially social interactions with other people. This can be seen in the policies at McDonalds' restaurants that control the employees by training them to deal with preparing the food and waiting on the customers in specific ways. This highly proscribed approach harkens back to Ford's automobile assembly line.

McDonaldization impacts many different sectors of society. Gamble (2010) referred to the retail industry in China as providing *McJobs*. In a discussion of the McDonaldization of political and social interactions, Turner (2010) used the term *McCitizens* to describe a more globalized citizenship. Monaghan (2007) discussed slimming clubs in England using McDonaldization as a framework, calling the idealized physical form *McBodies*. Slimming clubs offered efficient and rationalized means to lose weight but the men's "bodies, however, could not be standardized like the Big Mac" (p. 89). The latter is an example of an unintended irrational consequence of what appears to be a rational way to lose weight.

The Irrationality of Rationality

Rational systems can lead to irrational or negative consequences that represent the opposite of rationality – "inefficiency, unpredictability, incalculability, and loss of control" (Ritzer, 2008a, p. 141). Rational systems are often dehumanizing, taking away the autonomy of

the individual and creating what Weber called “the iron cage” of rationality. Rationalization can also lead to disenchantment where the worker no longer finds joy in doing the job because it is so restrictive (Ritzer, 2008a).

As can be expected, Ritzer’s dimensions of McDonaldization have been applied to the food industry. Cliquet and Streed, (2007) looked at concept uniformity in limited-service restaurant chains. They compared McDonalds to Great Harvest, a company where the franchiser has freedom to do what he wants. McDonalds has developed a rigid system based on their core components resulting in the irrational consequence that the system must be monitored frequently to function well. Great Harvest differs from the McDonald’s model:

Great Harvest allows different interpretations and manifestation of this experience but its core values are very strong. The sense of pride for a job well done and respect for the individual, owners, employers, customers is the common denominator among franchises: a concept to analyze further in regard to the current fast-food industry.

(p. 15).

An anathema to the McDonaldized restaurant industry is represented by the work of Holley and Wright (2010). Their sociological look at rib joints viewed them as a backlash to the modernization of the food industry. The proprietors of these establishments are often individualists who are only concerned with the quality of the product. The patrons were identified as “rubber cagers...who are looking for an alternative to the ho-hum routine of the week and not content with certain features of the fast-food eateries” (p. 51).

The McDonaldization framework has also been used to study such disparate topics as agriculture (Knight, 2010), cruise ships (Weaver, 2005), drug care (Kemmesies, 2002), crime and the criminal justice system (Robinson, 2010), religion (Drane, 2010; James, 2010), weight

loss (Monaghan, 2007), and even the sex industry (Hausebeck & Brents, 2002). The rationalized systems in each of these studies resulted in irrational consequences

Robinson (2010) asserted that the crime and criminal justice systems of the United States have been McDonaldized. Even though more efficiency, predictability and control from the police force and the court system would seem to be better, United States citizens are “less sure of receiving justice from their justice system” (p. 100). Hausbeck and Brents (2002) used the four dimensions of McDonaldization to describe the sex industry. At first, this seems counterintuitive, but they cited specific ways that the sex industry is becoming rationalized such as standardization of services at legal brothels in Nevada. What should be an escape from the rationalized “iron cage” of everyday life can be dehumanizing for the both the clients and the workers. Weaver (2005) found a similar effect in the cruise industry. People wanted to escape the iron cage of their routine, but they expected efficiently run cruise ships with predictable food and entertainment.

Even the family has been studied from the viewpoint of McDonaldization. Woolridge and Stanley-Stevens (2016) found that all four dimensions of McDonaldization were present in 66 households studied. Irrational consequences were also discovered, resulting “from an over-bureaucratization of simple procedures or a measure of cognitive dissonance between means and ends. Thus, any system which uses the McDonaldization model, including the family, will exhibit certain characteristics that emerge as irrational” (p. 24). Raley (2010) determined that the family could be perceived as moving away from McDonaldization because it is no longer the nuclear family of the past. However, encroaching technology such as television and cell phones are eroding quality family time creating irrational consequences in the new technology age.

The studies cited above represent the application of the sociological framework of McDonaldization to various aspects of society. We will now look at education from the viewpoint of Ritzer's four dimensions.

McDonaldization of Education

A bureaucracy as defined by Weber (1958/2012) describes the organizational structure of many institutions. According to his definition, a bureaucracy contains specific jurisdictional areas, an established hierarchy and general rules established by the officials and followed by the departments beneath. In a typical college or university, there is a president or chancellor who is over various departments. Each department has a chairperson who directs the professors in their department. Some sort of state-wide policy group oversees these entities. In the state of Tennessee, this was the TBR until the spring of 2016.

The process of bureaucratization and rationalization in education can be documented in descriptions of education in the early twentieth century. Taylor, in 1911, published *The Principles of Scientific Management*, which focused on the management of factory workers using scientific principles. John Franklin Bobbitt appropriated the concept of scientific management from Taylor and applied it to public education in the United States (Au, 2011). Drawing on the factory metaphor, the students were the raw materials, the teachers were the workers, and administrators were the managers. School was the assembly line where the process of education took place. In the conclusion to his article, Au (2011) stated that "the standardization of US teaching due to high-stakes testing is connected to issues of control over classroom practices, with teachers' power being increasingly usurped through both policy and curricular structure" (p. 38). This application of Taylorism to education supports the idea that rationalization as a paradigm has been driving the construction of American education policy for

well over a century. Based on these observations, we will now turn our attention to the application of McDonaldization to the topic of education.

If we examine Ritzer's four dimensions of McDonaldization, we can identify applications of these aspects of rationalization in the field of education. Ritzer's discussion of the McDonaldization of Society included the university as "another rationalized institution" (Hayes & Wynyard, 2002, p. 10), mirroring Taylor's Fordist views of education. The framework of McDonaldization has been used to study educational systems in Great Britain (Parker & Jary, 1995; Prichard & Willmott, 1997; Wilkinson, 2006), Scotland (Hartley, 1995), Indonesia (Rizqi, 2016) and the United States (Roach & Frank, 2007; Howes, Graham & Freidman, 2009). Just like the studies concerning different aspects of society in general, these educationally focused studies and commentaries identify irrational consequences of the McDonaldization of education. For example, Howes, Graham and Freidman (2009), in their study of science education in an elementary school, state, "Ritzer's image of McDonaldization may neglect the more positive features of Weber's *rationalization*--..." (p. 128). However, the results of their study indicated that people are intelligent enough to transform Weber's "iron cage" into "pliable rubber, thereby creating meaningful experiences within larger rationalized structures" (p 129). The following section relates each of Ritzer's four dimension of McDonaldization (efficiency, calculability, predictability and control) to the field of education.

Efficiency

The word "efficient" is defined as "productive without waste" (Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary, n.d.). Universities were modeled after successful industries in the early twentieth century, thereby exhibiting the qualities of an efficient rationalized system of production modeled after the Ford automobile factories. According to Mwachofi (2002), this

rationality clogs up higher education by utilizing delivery systems that are perceived as efficient but may not be effective.

A rational society emphasizes finding the best means to achieve an end product (Ritzer, 2008a). Many families now turn to fast food restaurants to provide meals because that was the quickest way to feed a family when both parents were working. This doesn't mean that the family is eating the most nutritious food possible, but it is one of the most efficient ways to achieve the goal of providing dinner. Hartley (1995) stated that "implicit in the notion of efficiency, therefore, is the optimization of resources, but this in turn implies that the product itself is definable, precisely, without ambiguity, for only then can the 'best practice' or treatment be specified" (p. 411).

Roach and Frank (2007) identified large-scale assessments as a very efficient way to gather information about many students in a "cost-effective manner" (pp. 15-16). Therefore, some policy-makers viewed standardized evaluations as a positive tool. SCALE and Pearson agreed that a standardized model is the most efficient and reliable way to assess teaching (SCALE, 2015). The Society for Music Teacher Educators' (SMTE) statement on Preservice Teacher Education (2016) argues that, "the edTPA limits the evaluation of music teaching readiness to essentially a writing test and 2-3 short video clips" (p. 3). Au (2016) also questioned the format of the test, suggesting that thirty pages of writing is more "a test of writing" than "a test of teaching" (p. 2). SCALE declared that the edTPA is not just a test of writing, but encompasses multiple forms of measurement such as video clips, lesson plans, student work samples and instructional materials to determine if a candidate is ready to teach (SCALE, 2016).

Calculability

To calculate something usually means to view it from a mathematical perspective. In education, this can be evidenced by taking the subjective evaluation of teaching quality and rendering it more objective by assigning numeric scores based on a diagnostic assessment system. Hartley (1995) stated that this practice has “a judgmental, norm-referenced and competitive purpose, setting institutions in a competitive relationship to one another” (p. 416).

How can the quality of a teacher be determined? In a McDonaldized society, evaluators seek to “develop a series of quantifiable measures that it takes as surrogates for quality” (Ritzer, 1975, p. 375). One criticism of the edTPA is that it turns a teaching event into a quantifiable score. Scores for each of the 15 rubrics result in a possible score of 75 with five possible points for each rubric. Critics of this scoring scheme posit that this reduces the candidates’ teaching experience to a number, thereby devaluing “the uncertainties of teaching” (Madeloni & Gorlewski, 2013).

The TBR required schools with teacher education programs to use a passing score on the edTPA as a degree requirement for its teacher candidates. The state of Tennessee will require the edTPA for teacher licensure throughout the state beginning in January of 2019. The developers of the edTPA are currently working with teacher education programs in 40 states to implement the edTPA either for graduation requirements or for licensure. There is still some push back from organizations such as SMTE. In their position paper, they stated “the edTPA presents the same problems as high-stakes standardized tests do for P-12 students. Standardized assessment rubrics tend to be reductive, ignoring much of the complexity necessary to fully evaluate teacher performance in the diverse and highly contextual settings in which music teachers work” (p. 3).

Some employers view calculability as a positive attribute of standardized assessment. Brown (2001), in a study about the social sources of credentialism, viewed the standardization of degrees as an aid for potential recruiters so they can expect certain attributes from an employee if they have achieved certain credentials from a qualified institution. Employers did not question the legitimacy of the degree or the competence of the graduate if the program adhered to established criteria that legitimize the degree. Viewed from this standpoint, the edTPA is seen as a way to legitimize a student's teaching credentials so that employers can assume with some confidence that this graduate will be ready to teach on the first day of their employment. An assessment, such as the edTPA, ensured that the teacher candidate who received a passing score on this standardized test had a numerical grade that can be compared mathematically to other teacher candidates with edTPA scores.

Predictability

According to Ritzer (2008), workers in McDonaldized systems, "follow corporate rules as well as the dictates of their managers. In many cases, what they do, and even what they say, is highly predictable" (p.15). In an attempt to make the outcome of teacher training more predictable, SCALE promoted a standardized assessment instrument for teacher education programs. An example of predictability is "the perceived need for common standards of assessment and of a common academic unit of currency" (Hartley, 1995, p. 418). This would result in the standardization of institutions of higher education across Scotland. Hartley (1995) went on to describe the application of Ritzer's dimension of predictability as *product standardization* in higher education. He gave as an example the fact that the government in Scotland put into place a system of examinations for higher education. This resulted in the

perception within the university system and outside of the university system that the credentials conferred by various universities were the same.

Some see predictability as a positive attribute when applied to standardized assessments. If the edTPA is utilized across the United States, then administrators can expect new teachers who passed this benchmark assessment to possess the same capabilities. Roach and Frank (2007) determined that a standardized accountability system is expected to result in more consistency across curriculums and teaching approaches in various schools and communities just as workers in McDonaldized systems exhibit predictable behaviors in McDonald's restaurants (Ritzer, 2008b). Hartley (1995) referred to this as "product standardization" in education (p. 417). Au (2016) addressed the standardization of the edTPA by relating it to one student's difficulty in planning. This teacher candidate reported that they had to constantly consult the handbook to ensure they were "following the script". Au stated, "In the process, many of my students felt they couldn't demonstrate what they were capable of and who they were as teachers" (p. 3).

Control

One of the ways that Hartley (1995) critiques this domain is by examining the addition of technology into higher education. This could result in courses taught through technology instead of by a teacher in a classroom. Hartley (1990) related this development to Ford's assembly line approach where "hands, not 'heads' did the work" (p. 412).

Reagan, Schram, McCurdy, Chang and Evans (2016) discussed the influence of political policy on the development of teacher assessment. A reaction to the "problem of teacher education", the edTPA is becoming further removed from local influence, even though it was developed by educators, for educators. Pearson Education, an external private corporation, determined who scores the portfolios, how these scorers were trained, and provides the platform

for submitting the assessment. Pearson represents the beginnings of substituting nonhuman technology for human evaluators such as residency supervisors and cooperating teachers.

Another issue of control is the observation that the edTPA is taking over the clinical practice seminar experience for the senior education majors who work in the field. In an auto-ethnography of her experiences as one of the first of her class to complete the edTPA, Chiu (2014) described the process as “painful” (p. 28). She believed that student teaching should be about working in the classroom, not spending seminar time on learning how to complete this assessment. While finding a few benefits, she stated that “the negatives of edTPA outweigh these positives for one main reason: all of these positives can be taught and practiced outside of the context of edTPA” (p. 28). Cooperating teachers also voiced their unhappiness with the process. Some felt that it was taking too much time away from actually focusing on lesson plans for the classroom experience. One cooperating teacher stated, “our student teaching seminars increasingly emphasize the test's logistics, choosing the right kind of video segment for the test, choosing the right kind of unit for the test, (and) making sure everyone is using the same language as the test” (Au, 2016, p. 2).

Summary of McDonaldization

Ritzer's four domains of McDonaldization, efficiency calculability, predictably and control, are viewed as both positive and negative attributes of standardized assessment such as the edTPA. Pearson, SCALE, and the AACTE are impacting the evaluation of teacher candidates throughout the United States. If viewed from a negative viewpoint, they appear to regard educational evaluation as easily quantifiable due to the predictability of a standardized process and product (Hartley, 1995). Taking the control of pre-service teacher evaluation away from the university supervisors and cooperating teachers and giving it to a large corporation is a move

from the human to (almost) nonhuman technology. The use of quantifiable scores to identify certified teachers aligns with the McDonaldization of education. Some stakeholders view the reliability of a standardized assessment as a positive outcome of the edTPA, resulting in efficiency in terms of providing a national assessment for the teaching profession.

Summary

This literature review examined the evolution of teacher evaluation, concentrating specifically on the development of teacher performance assessments. Containing common elements, the development of the edTPA was based on previous work with Teacher Work Samples, National Board Certification© and the Performance Assessment for California Teachers. Research and commentaries about the implementation of the edTPA included both positive and negative responses.

Examining these findings through the lens of Ritzer's sociological theory provided insight into the responses of the edTPA's stakeholders. McDonaldization can be read in both the university system in general, and the edTPA specifically. We will look at the lived experiences of those who have implemented the edTPA in Chapter Four. In order to accomplish this task, I will first need to discuss the research methods.

Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the methodology utilized in this study. The purpose statement and research questions will be restated from Chapter One as well as a brief review of the literature that is pertinent to the methodology. This chapter will also discuss the methods employed in this study, including participant selection and qualifications. It will conclude with a discussion of the analysis process and the format for the representation of the data.

As stated in Chapter One, the purpose of this study is to explore the lived experiences of music teacher trainers in institutions of higher education while preparing pre-service music education students for the edTPA. This research endeavors to answer the following questions:

1. What are the experiences of the music education teacher trainers in Tennessee with the edTPA?
2. Does the framework of McDonaldization assist in understanding Tennessee's music education teacher trainers' discourse regarding their experiences with the edTPA?

Methodology

According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), methodology is defined as “a way of thinking about and studying social reality” (p. 3). This study used constructivist grounded theory based on the work Glaser and Strauss as refined by Charmaz. Grounded theory is defined as “theory that was derived from data, systematically gathered and analyzed through the research process” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 12). Grounded theory seeks to bridge the gap between quantitative and qualitative approaches by analyzing the data in a systematic and rigorous manner. Intensive interviewing allows the subjects to share in-depth experiences related to the research topic. The

researcher begins coding as soon as data is collected, not waiting until all of the data is assembled. Strauss and Corbin (1998) define coding as “the analytic processes through which data are fractured, conceptualized, and integrated to form theory” (p. 3). Constructivist Grounded Theory is grounded in the data that is collected. In other words, coding is “quantifying qualitative data” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 11). Coding leads to a description of the story that the data tells. At this stage of the process, the researcher does not step back and interpret the events or seek to “explain why certain events occurred and not others” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 25).

The next step in the process is conceptual ordering defined as “the **organization of data** into discrete categories (and sometimes ratings) according to their **properties and dimensions and then using description to elucidate those categories**” [boldface in original] (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 19). Conceptual ordering is a “precursor to theorizing” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 20). The theory that is constructed from grounded theory “enables users to explain and predict events, thereby providing guides to action” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 25).

I chose this method because constructivist grounded theory provides the researcher the opportunity to discover meaning in the data (Marvasti, 2004). Using constructivist grounded theory, the researcher starts “with experiences they wish to explore (Charmaz, 2014, p. 1166). There is scant research on the experiences of music education professors or students and the implementation of the edTPA (Barrett, 2011; Baumgartner & Council, 2017; Cangro, 2014; Elpus, 2015; Greene, 2015; Parkes & Powell, 2015). Examining the impact of the implementation of the edTPA in music education teacher preparation programs in Tennessee provides a chance for music educators to share experiences, ideas and advice about the implementation of the edTPA.

The utilization of intensive interviewing of multiple music teacher trainers provided rich data for coding purposes. One way that a researcher creates distance from a topic is to acquire “multiple viewpoints of an event, that is, to attempt to determine how the various actors in a situation view it” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 44). The researcher’s job is to listen to the subjects in order to ascertain what their experiences were like and how they explained and interpreted their actions. It is also the researcher’s task to try and make analytic sense out of these descriptions and other interview data. According to Charmaz (2014), “the research process will bring surprises, spark ideas, and hone your analytic skills. Grounded theory gives you focus and flexibility’ (p. 3).

The History of Constructivist Grounded Theory

Grounded theory arose as a result of the “tensions between qualitative and quantitative research in sociology in the United States in the early 1960s” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 5). Glaser and Strauss published their seminal work, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research* in 1967, providing “a powerful argument that legitimized qualitative research as a credible – and rigorous – methodological approach in its own right rather than simply as a precursor for developing quantitative instruments” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 8). Both sociologists, Strauss was a professor and a qualitative researcher at the University of Chicago, and Glaser was a quantitative researcher and a graduate of Columbia University. Their strategies for analyzing data and the idea of developing theories from this analysis were developed “from research grounded in qualitative data rather than deducing testable hypotheses from existing theories” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 6).

Strauss co-authored with Corbin in the 1990’s, approaching grounded theory as a form of verification of the data. The first two editions of *Basics of Qualitative Research* (1990, 1998),

avored “applying additional technical procedures rather than emphasizing emergent theoretical categories and the comparative methods that distinguished earlier grounded theory strategies” (Charmaz, 2014, p.11). A more positivistic approach, it nevertheless assisted grounded theory in gaining increasing acceptance and, due to its flexibility, was often used by quantitative researchers who adopted a mixed-methods approach (Charmaz, 2014).

Charmaz, a student of Anselm and Strauss, continued their work but moved it toward a more constructivist perspective. Constructivist grounded theory recognizes that the researcher is not just a neutral observer, but brings their own perspectives which they must examine in terms of how they shape the analysis (Charmaz, 2014). The constructivist “position aligns well with social constructivists whose influences include Lev Vygotsky (1962) and Yvonna Lincoln (2013), who thus stress social contexts, interaction, sharing viewpoints, and interpretive understandings” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 14).

I was sensitized to my subject’s responses based on my own experiences and by drawing on Ritzer’s (2008) theory of the McDonaldization of Society as put forth in Chapter Two. Ritzer identified four dimensions of the effect that the fast food industry has had on society that he calls McDonaldization - efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control. I used these four themes for initial coding as sensitizing concepts meaning that these four dimensions were used as a “working tool for analysis” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 86).

Methods

Strauss and Corbin (1998) define methods as “a set of procedures and techniques for gathering and analyzing data” (p. 3). Many grounded theorists use intensive interviewing to provide the source of data for their qualitative research (Charmaz, 2014). This type of interviewing allows the subjects to share their perspectives or their lived experiences with the

subject matter. The researcher's job is to guide the conversation, not to take part in a dialogue with the participant. (Charmaz, 2014). The interview protocol for the proposed study (see Appendix D) consisted of open-ended questions that required in-depth, first-hand experiences of participants who were actively involved in the research topic. The objective of this questioning technique was to obtain detailed responses, focusing "on understanding the research participant's perspective, meanings, and experience" (Charmaz, 2014, p. 56).

The research procedures were conducted utilizing the BlueJeans online video meetings platform that can connect from a computer or mobile device. Respondents were asked to schedule one hour for the interview, including time to choose a pseudonym and ask any questions before the recording began. All interviews were recorded using the BlueJeans platform. The recordings are being kept in the cloud storage system provided by BlueJeans separate from the cover sheet containing the demographic information. When the project has been completed, the recordings will be stored in a password protected file for five years from the publication date in keeping with the policy of the American Psychological Association (APA Publication Manual, 2010). Either I or a reputable transcription service made transcriptions of each recording. These were stored in a password protected file on a Toshiba Satellite P55W-C PC laptop computer. The transcriptions were kept in a password protected file for five years after the date of publication. The participants in this study remained anonymous, meaning that no one, not even members of the research team, knows who provided the information in the interviews.

Since the sample size was small, the information from each interview was combined with data obtained from other participants in the study. None of the participants were personally identified in the written materials. Research participants chose a pseudonym before the interview began. Every effort was made during the reporting of data to talk about the participants in a

general way so as to not to re-identify information that was dis-identified for the Institutional Review Board. Each participant signed a consent form (see Appendix E) before the interview began. Each individual could have stopped at any time during the interview or chosen not to answer specific questions without any repercussions. There were no costs associated with participating in the study and no payment for participation in the study.

Trustworthiness and Ethics

I passed Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) modules pertaining to students conducting no more than minimal research. This research met the requirements of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and permission was granted from the researcher's institution of higher learning to conduct this research. I did whatever I reasonably could to make sure that no harm would come to the participants during the course of the study. The participants benefited from the study by sharing their perspectives and experiences with the edTPA (Marshall & Rossman, 2016).

Since the sample size was small, every effort was made to protect the anonymity of the participants. I followed the ethical principles as set forth in the Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research. Guidelines from this report were part of the CITI training. The contents of "this policy provides protections for human subjects as mandated by applicable laws, regulations, and standards of local, state and federal government agencies concerning the protection of human subjects, including the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)" (<https://umwa.memphis.edu/umpolicies/UM1742.htm>).

Participants

The subjects were selected by purposive sampling from two sources. The first source was participants identified by their former association with the Tennessee Board of Regents system that included six 4-year universities in Tennessee. These universities were mandated to use the edTPA as part of their teacher education programs. An initial recruitment e-mail was sent out to 25 music education professors at these universities. Many of these university personnel were in attendance at an annual conference hosted by the Tennessee Music Education Association on April 5-8, 2017, located in Nashville, Tennessee. I presented an overview of the proposed study at the Higher Education Caucus during this conference and elicited some initial agreement from possible participants for their willingness to take part in the interviews. The second source was snowball sampling. Those interviewed were asked if they knew of other music educators in higher education who might be willing to participate in the study, adding two participants to the final total of respondents.

The participants were over the age of 18 and identified as music education professors, fine arts administrators, adjunct faculty, residency supervisors or graduate students/teaching assistants that have been involved in coaching pre-service teachers through the edTPA process in the state of Tennessee. Their years of experience ranged from just beginning their second year to 28 years as music educators. Each of the participants possessed at least a master's degree. One participant held a Masters of Fine Arts and one participant had attained 30 hours past her master's degree. Another has completed the coursework for a PhD, but had not completed her dissertation at the time of the interview. For the doctoral level, five held PhDs, two held EdDs and one participant held a DMA. The participants were willing to discuss their experiences regarding the edTPA. Presumably, all participants were free from physical, mental, cognitive, or

emotional limitations that might have impacted their involvement in this study. No vulnerable populations were used as study participants.

The number of participants recruited for this study was 12, consisting of seven women and five men. Although this might be considered a relatively small sample size, Glaser and Stern state that “small samples and limited data do not pose problems because grounded theory methods aim to develop conceptual categories and thus data collection is directed to illuminate properties of a category and relations between categories” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 33). Because the research questions related to “local practice” in the field of music education, “a small number of interviews may be enough” (2014, p. 106). Each participant chose a mutually agreed upon pseudonym at the beginning of the interview process to protect their anonymity.

Timetable

Permission to conduct the research was granted by the Institutional Review Board in March, 2017. Initial contact was made with some potential participants at the Tennessee Music Association Professional Development Conference, April 5-8, in Nashville, Tennessee. The dissertation proposal was submitted to the dissertation committee in August and data collection began at the end of August. After approval of the dissertation, a recruitment e-mail was sent to the identified participants. As they responded, an interview time was arranged. Data was gathered as soon as permission was granted and data collection continued until the end of October. According to Charmaz (2014), “through coding, we raise analytic questions about our data from the very beginning of data collection” (p. 4). In keeping with the methodology of grounded theory, coding began as soon as data collection started. I also began writing memos about the codes. Those included comparisons between the data and other ideas that arose during the initial coding phase (Charmaz, 2014).

I transcribed the first three interviews soon after they were conducted. A reputable transcription service was provided by the Sociology Department for the rest of the interviews. Focused coding was undertaken when all data had been gathered.

Analysis/Implicit Interpretation

Ritzer's (2008) four dimensions of the McDonaldization of Society (efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control) served as sensitizing concepts during the initial coding phase of this research. Initial coding involved a close reading of the data, and remaining open to other possible themes. In grounded theory, however, the researcher is allowed to bring her prior experiences and skills to the coding process by using sensitizing concepts – as long as they are “provisional, comparative and grounded in the data” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 117). I also employed *in vivo* coding, defined as “codes that researchers adopt directly from the data, such as telling statements they discover in the interviews, documents, and the everyday language used in a studied site” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 343). This approach to coding allowed the researcher to pay attention to the language used during the interviews, providing “symbolic markers of participants’ speech and meanings” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 134). The qualitative methodologist on the dissertation committee served as an intercoder and monitored the reliability of the codes. The researcher reviewed and refined the codes as needed throughout the coding process.

Representation

The representation of the data follows a traditional format. Quotations from the interviews are included along with interpretation of the data, based on themes discovered during the coding process. As the process progressed, I found original but creditable ways to present the data in order to increase the “resonance, usefulness, and the subsequent value of the contribution” (Charmaz, 2014, p. 338). Chapter Four presents the themes which emerged from

the data regarding McDonaldization. Chapter Five seeks to provide implications and applications of the research findings. Charmaz (2016) characterizes the writing process as follows:

Our written works derive from aesthetic principles and rhetorical devices – in addition to theoretical statements and scientific rationales. The act of writing is intuitive, inventive, and interpretive, not merely a reporting of acts and facts, or, in the case of grounded theory, causes, conditions, categories, and consequences – or an outline of processes that depict resolving a main concern (p. 338).

Summary

This chapter identified the methodology chosen for this research project as constructivist grounded theory as set forth by Glaser, Strauss and Charmaz. The primary method of gathering data was intensive interviewing. Participants were selected through purposive sampling and every effort was made to insure anonymity. Analysis of the data was accomplished through coding using Ritzer's four dimensions of McDonaldization as sensitizing concepts during the initial coding phase. Reliability was established through the use of an intercoder. The representation of the data follows the traditional format of utilizing pertinent quotations from the interviews as well as analysis of the data using the precepts of grounded theory.

Chapter 4: Data

Introduction

In this chapter, I will discuss the Tennessee music education teacher trainers' experiences with the edTPA, using their discourse to describe these experiences. I will provide the reader an overview of the sociology framework used for coding purposes, which includes a review of Ritzer's four dimensions of McDonaldization and how these dimensions relate to the findings of this study. In the first section, I will show how my research subjects discussed the concept of efficiency, first in rational terms, then in irrational terms. In section two, I will show how my research subjects made use of the concept of calculability, first in rational terms, then in irrational terms. In section three, I will share the respondents' discourse about the rationality and irrationality of the dimension of predictability. The final section will address the respondents' discourse and experiences with the dimension of control, citing both rational and irrational consequences.

Coding began after the first interview was completed and transcribed. Ritzer's (2008) four dimensions of the McDonaldization of Society (efficiency, calculability, predictability and control) served as sensitizing concepts during initial coding and functioned as overarching coding categories throughout the coding process. During coding, subcategories of lived experiences were discovered under each of Ritzer's four dimensions of McDonaldization. Furthermore, the research participants described both positive and negative dimensions of the edTPA. The positive outcomes were framed as rational and the negative consequences were framed as irrational. A description of Weber's formal rationality and the resulting irrationality of rationality are set forth in Chapter Two.

Sociological Framework

Ritzer (2008) based his ideas about the McDonaldization of society on the works of Max Weber, a turn-of-the-century sociologist from Germany. Weber's formal rationality is described as "the search by people for the optimum means to a given end [that] is shaped by rules, regulations, and larger social structures" (Ritzer, 2008, p. 25). In this system, the individual makes decisions based on a formalized set of rules developed by someone outside of the individual that dictates the optimal way to achieve a task. Ritzer (2008) extended this formal rationality to encompass the influence exerted by the McDonald's fast food business as a paradigm for efficiency, calculability, predictability and control.

The power exerted by a bureaucracy leads to the rationalization of almost any undertaking, resulting in the breaking down of a job into many smaller tasks. These smaller tasks are then also rationalized and one most efficient method is determined for completing each sub-task. At this point, other methods that were not as efficient are discarded. Thus, the rationalization (or McDonaldization) is complete with the following outcome:

The result is an efficient, logical sequence of methods that can be completed the same way every time to produce the desired outcome. The outcome is *predictable*. All aspects of the process are easily *controlled*. Additionally, quantity (or *calculability*) becomes the measurement of good performance (McDonaldization, n.d. p. 1).

The studies that were cited in Chapter Two using McDonaldization as their framework discovered that many rational processes result in irrational consequences. The literature suggested that this might be true for the respondents in this study. Both rational and irrational consequences of the edTPA as evidenced by the respondents' discourse will be discussed in the following sections.

Why use McDonaldization to frame the data obtained during the interview process? In informal talks with teacher trainers across the state of Tennessee, some of the same ideas kept surfacing. The recurrent theme was ambivalence toward the edTPA representing Weber's idea of rational and irrational. For example, teacher trainers liked the idea of being able to have their certification transfer from state to state - that was a good thing. It was a rational thing. But, overall, the edTPA was just too much work and caused teacher candidates to burn out. McDonaldization to me was a way to explain this rational/irrational dichotomy and the teacher trainers' discourse fell into Ritzer's dimensions.

The edTPA process can be described in terms of Weber's formal rationality. Each of the three tasks is broken down into proscribed smaller tasks. The teacher candidates must follow the procedures in the handbook that have been developed for them by SCALE and mandated by the College of Education at their university. Therefore, Ritzer's four dimensions of the McDonaldization of Society, (efficiency, calculability, predictability and control), served as overarching coding categories for this research. Both rational (positive) and irrational (negative) outcomes were identified by the research participants.

Overall, five out of the 12 research participants stated that the edTPA was a positive experience for their teacher candidates. Affirmative observations included the idea that the edTPA aided the teacher candidates in becoming practitioners that are more reflective about their teaching. Clark observed the following:

It is transformative for the students. As they go through it, they are actually becoming more reflective. They're becoming more intentional in their practices. Yeah, I think intentional is a good word because they're starting to consider the reasons behind the actions that they choose or the activities that they choose to have for their students.

Therefore, from that perspective, I think it's a really good tool to make us more intentional practitioners.

Research participants stated that the edTPA process aided the teacher candidates in their ability to plan and assess their teaching. Diane observed that, "This is helping our students think more deeply, be more rigorous about their teaching, their assessing and just kind of putting it all together. It's forcing them to put it all together in one package." She also said that this process enabled the teacher candidates to see that the planning, teaching and assessment are "all tied together." Ramona extended this thinking by stating that "I think, in general, a lot of our students have a lot of trouble with the process of planning, assessing, revising your next work and so this forces them to do that so I think that's a good thing." In terms of planning, Ishmael stated that the edTPA "forces them to write down and put down what it is they really are thinking when they're making their choices."

Another rational aspect of the edTPA identified by respondents was its relationship to real-world experiences such as teacher evaluation. According to Ramona, the edTPA prepared teacher candidates for the types of evaluation they will encounter when they become licensed educators. Ramona goes on to say, "I think it helps our students to be ready for real-life teaching and if they can get through residency, get that done and survive everything they have to do in residency, that first year of teaching will be a whole lot easier for them cause they will already have had evaluation."

One of the general irrational or negative consequences of the edTPA as noted by several respondents was the inability of the teacher candidates to enjoy their residency experience. Diane identified diminishment of joy as a challenge and called it an "impediment to good teaching." Diane added, "I'm not seeing a lot of joy in our teacher candidates. I don't see any joy in the

first placement. I'll just be real honest. First placement of residency two is an absolute nightmare.” Leigh agreed with Diane, extending this lack of joy to their future as teachers by saying, “I think one thing though, the students see the amount of time and effort they put into this and I think they can think, ‘Oh my God! Am I going to have to do all this through everything I do in teaching?’”

Seven of the music education teacher trainers saw both positive and negative outcomes. Diane summed up her view of the edTPA by stating:

I still have some mixed emotions about overall edTPA. I think it could be better, I think it could be good. I don't think it's completely Satan, but I'm more on the dark side just because of everything the students have on their plates. That's the biggest reason.

The next four sections discuss specific dimensions of McDonaldization, focusing on the rational and irrational consequences of the edTPA as experienced by the research participants. Each section begins with a brief summary of the specified dimension of McDonaldization and then continues with the discourse expressed during the interview process addressing each category. The sub-categories were discovered during the coding process in the language the respondents used to describe their lived experiences related to the over-arching categories based on the Ritzer's four dimensions of McDonaldization.

Efficiency

Efficiency has been defined previously as the best way to achieve an end product. The workers in a McDonaldized society “function efficiently by following the steps in a predesigned process” (Ritzer, 2008, p. 13). It is true that efficiency, itself, is not a bad thing. Many organizations and workplaces search for the most efficient way to complete a job, harkening back to the assembly line approach of Ford and the scientific management ideas of Taylor. The

distinction “is that in a McDonaldized society, efficiency is thrust upon a person, so instead of choosing your own methods of efficiency, you are forced to accept the efficiency of the surrounding institutions” (McDonaldization.com).

The federal government, although it did not specifically mandate the use of the edTPA, initiated the move toward standardized teacher evaluation systems due to the passage of legislation such as NCLB and ESEA. The TBR mandated that the colleges and universities under its jurisdiction implement the edTPA for their teacher candidates. The College of Education at these universities in turn, expected the other departments under their jurisdiction, such as music education, to adhere to their policies regarding the implementation of the edTPA. In these ways, the surrounding institutions determined what was most efficient, even though some members of these institutions might not consider these mandates efficient for either the teacher trainers or the students (McDonaldization.com). One of the respondents summed it up as follows:

And so this thing came out of California and it had the sexiness appeal with Stanford University and Pearson attached to it and here we are finding ... our teacher candidates being told, if you are going to be licensed to teach in the state of Tennessee, this is what you'll have to do. (Diane)

Handbooks designated for various educational fields were provided by SCALE. The K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook applies to music, dance and theatre. Some respondents viewed the Handbook as efficient, offering guidance for the teacher candidates. Other respondents viewed the Handbook as inefficient, providing an “iron cage” that restricted creativity and created stress for the teacher candidates.

K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook

The K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook is a 54-page document provided for fine arts teacher candidates by SCALE. The use of the K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook aligns with Ritzer's (2008) concept of efficiency because the teacher candidates are asked to follow "steps in a predesigned process" (p. 13). Teacher candidates are provided instructions for "What do I Need to Think About?, What Do I need to Do?, What Do I Need to Write?" for each of the three tasks included in the handbook. Specific rubrics tell the teacher candidates what the scorers look for in each of the submissions. Diane viewed this aspect of the handbook as helpful, telling her teacher candidates, "Read this rubric. It's like writing a grant. Just follow [the rubric]. What are they telling you to tell us about? What are they asking about? Just spell it out...." The fact that a guide was provided for fine arts teacher candidates was seen as a positive attribute. Evelyn was grateful that the education department provided handbooks for each of the disciplines. Annie agreed, saying, "It's nice when you have a handbook that's specific to your discipline and so that makes you feel kind of good."

The three tasks set forth in the handbook are Task 1: Planning, Task 2: Instruction, and Task 3: Assessment. Several respondents saw these tasks as providing beneficial experiences for their teacher candidates. Ishmael included a Task 1 assignment in her methods courses as a final project because the requirements asked students to "think about things that they need to think about." Clark liked the assessment task, acknowledging that it provided an impetus for measuring the individual student's "honest progression towards an objective".

Clark stated that it felt to him like the handbook "was a document or certification process that was created for general education and then they tried to pigeonhole it into a music program. At times, it can seem like a lot of it doesn't really apply to a music teacher, at least that's the

feedback I get from my students.” In addition, Annie and Clark both expressed frustration when dealing with the Performing Arts Assessment Handbook because it included music, dance and theatre. Diane described the performing arts assessment handbook as “overwhelming“, both for her and the teacher candidates. In her opinion, the teacher candidates are unlikely to read the entire document.

Four of the respondents expressed an issue with having their students write the Context for Learning. Davis and Clark added discussions during their methods classes about the Context for Learning, seeking to improve their college music students’ ability to describe an educational setting so “they can better understand the students that they are going to be interacting with.” Clark had the music education students use this information in their woodwinds and brass methods classes when they went out into the schools for a field experience near the end of these classes. He has now embedded writing a Context for Learning into the methods classes’ syllabi. Annie suggested that teacher candidates should research the arts opportunities that are available to the students in their residency placements. She identified this as a “key piece”, saying “some schools are in close proximity to some of our cultural institutions and some of them are close and never go and that’s a big opportunity.” Whether or not the students have access and are taking part in arts activities outside of their school would have an impact on prior knowledge considerations during the teacher candidates’ planning.

Academic Language

Ten out of the twelve respondents mentioned the *academic language* included in the edTPA. The definitions of the following terms in italics are defined in a glossary at the end of the K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook on pages 46 to 51. In Planning Task 1, teacher candidates select a key *language function* and must identify specific *language supports* tied to

this verb. Additional language demands including *vocabulary*, *syntax* and *discourse* must be included in the lesson plans. Attention returns to the *language demands* in Assessment Task 3. Rubric 14 addresses the candidates' evidence that students are able to use the *language function* as well as the *vocabulary* and either *syntax* or *discourse*. Even though the specific language for each field may not be the same, the terms that specify the language requirements for each field are consistent across the handbooks. According to Annie, through the use of the language embedded in the edTPA, teacher candidates encounter a more real-world experience. She compared it to being an arts teacher in a school where "you're not going to have as many peers with your background and you also might have an administrator from a different background. So it's just good that they're hearing similar language from people from a different discipline." Davis acknowledged that once a teacher trainer makes the connection for the teacher candidates between what the concept has been called in their methods classes and what the edTPA calls it, the language demands begin to make sense. Ramona reached the conclusion that "It's saying the same things in a different dress." For instance, the *learning segment* used to be called the *unit and lesson plan*. Davis agreed, stating, "A lot of it is learning the terminology because it's a matter of - they call it this, but once you realize that this is actually something else that we already typically do, you go, 'Oh okay. That makes sense.'"

Annie saw value in the academic language requirements of the edTPA, stating, "If we are not using the language of our discipline then what's the point of what we are teaching?" In her opinion, it is important for the teacher candidates to move beyond merely conducting rehearsals and presenting performances to teaching their students what is distinctive about the arts and what the arts teach that other disciplines do not. Annie also suggested that academic language should be scaffolded using Bloom's Taxonomy, giving the students the tools with which they could

build their knowledge base. In her words, “You have to build knowledge and skill before you apply, analyze, and create anything.” Annie described her approach to understanding academic language as follows:

The biggest thing that we do though in our classes is unpack academic language to really get them to think about...., “When you look at standard, what’s the academic language in that standard? How do you write a central focus statement and what’s the academic language that’s present there?...How are you making sure your students aren’t just doing it but how do you see it? How do you hear it?”

Annie also, however, identified academic language in the edTPA as one of the biggest hurdles to the teacher candidates’ understanding of the requirements of the edTPA. She compared it to the lyrics of the song, “Let’s Call the Whole Thing Off” when she says, “There was a lot that was lost in translation, you know. We usually say unit plan, they say learning segment – ‘tomato /tomahto.’” Annie goes on to say that, it is important to define the language used in the Arts especially when the same terms are used in a general education classroom with different definitions. In her opinion,” we've got to get our students beyond just doing the Arts activities... and really unpacking (the language).” Annie and Chris agreed that often the issue is that the academic language gets “lost in translation” because musicians spend a lot of time on vocabulary which, for musicians, is symbols on the page as well as musical terms. Diane includes academic language in her methods classes, stating:

So academic language is doable, we do take a lot of time in methods classes to train for it, to practice it, and [describe] what does this look like. Let’s write some procedures for a lesson plan in which we focus on academic language and how that looks in our lesson. So we do get the kids to do that.

Some teacher trainers had difficulty explaining the terms *syntax* and *discourse* for their music students. Clark admitted that, “trying to put words to what those are in a music context is difficult I found. Even differentiating between those two, as an instructor, I have a hard time putting into words a difference between those two in a music context specifically.” Diane also acknowledged that the term *syntax* sometimes caused an issue. David does not “find it worth our time to be talking about syntax and discourse and academic language.... I'd much rather be talking to them about sequencing and... sound-to-sight pedagogy and student agency and those sorts of things plus music fundamentals....” in his music techniques class.

Diane defined syntax as a “fancy word” that includes “rhythmic notation or notating on the staff....” She acknowledged that most of her teacher candidates understood the term *syntax* once they learned that it “is usually the go-to academic language for our music people....” The difficulty comes, in her opinion, when teacher candidates choose a specific music symbol or symbols on which to base their learning segment, but they don't place the symbol(s) in a musical context. The lesson must refer back to the central focus and “its' got to be contextualized around what's the big picture....”

Test of writing

Even though edTPA is marketed as a test of teaching, some teacher trainers viewed it as more a test of writing. Several respondents reported that their teacher candidates believed that the edTPA required too much writing. It is true that teacher candidates are required to write commentaries for each of the tasks in the K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook. Task 1 allows up to nine pages of commentary. Task 2 allows up to six pages of commentary. Task 3 permits up to ten pages of commentary. In Annie's view, the planning and writing of the learning segments allows teacher candidates to dig deeply into the lesson plans, “so it's not a mile wide

and an inch deep.” She suggested that the teacher candidates should view each rubric as isolating one skill, reinforcing why this skill is important and how this skill will be used in the future.

Clark’s students complained about the amount of writing required. He said, “I heard it from at least one student last year and another student this year saying, ‘What's the point behind having to write so much’, because it's writing intensive and both of those students last semester and then now are not strong writers.” Leigh agreed that the test was based heavily on the students’ writing abilities and, even though some students might be really good teachers, she feared that their writing abilities could create a bias resulting in a lower score.

Video recording

For Task 2, teacher candidates must provide two video clips (“each no more than 10 minutes in length, but not less than 3 minutes combined”). Clark liked the videotaping component in general because, in his experience, it lets the teacher candidates know what they are doing well and maybe what they're not doing well. He did, however, find the mandate of one continuous clip very restrictive for the teacher candidates. In his opinion, requiring one continuous clip “forces the student to really kind of manipulate the system so that they are hitting every single thing in that little clip as opposed to ‘here’s an example of me doing this’, and then later in the lesson ‘here’s an example of me doing this’.” Davis found the use of video segments limiting, stating that it would be difficult for an external scorer to evaluate the fitness of a teacher based on video clips.

Building the plane as they were flying it.

One of the questions posed during the interview process dealt with the training that teacher trainers received as part of their introduction to the edTPA. Many of the respondents felt that the training was either non-existent or insufficient. The lack of training may have been a result of the fact that music education departments were mandated to adopt the edTPA. Many teacher trainers were not prepared for the new system of teacher candidate evaluation. In Ramona's university, the residents in the first semester of the edTPA's implementation told her that, "Oh, we are doing this." It was a total surprise to Ramona as the residency supervisor. Diane's situation was similar in that the College of Education mandated the use of the edTPA "in one fell swoop" for all teachers involved in education.

During the coding process, several research participants voiced the opinion that they were learning about the edTPA along with the teacher candidates due to the suddenness of the adoption. Annie referred to this unintended consequence of mandating the edTPA without sufficient training as "building the plane as they were flying it." Clark's first semester as a residency supervisor was during Residency 1. During this time, teacher candidates were required to complete a mock edTPA. He felt that he "was learning alongside" the teacher candidates. Davis acknowledged that "I'm also getting used to it too because it's a matter of kind of learning what the rules are about and how that's done. So I'm having to get up to speed on how to guide them in that." These responses are all examples of Annie's frustration of building the plane as they were flying it, indicating a lack of training provided for the teacher trainers.

Ishmael identified the need for training each of the participants in the edTPA process. Ishmael did not attend local scoring training until after her first year of supervising teacher candidates through the edTPA process. She acknowledged that this training would have been

very helpful if she could have attended it at the outset, stating that “everything would have made so much more sense.” Leigh agreed with Ishmael and identified the most helpful part of the local scoring training was looking at real examples of artifacts and then going through the process of actually scoring them using the rubrics for each task. When teacher trainers were asked about the training they did receive, the focus was on how to assist their teacher candidates in attaining a passing score instead of what the edTPA defines as good teaching and how will these skills and knowledge help teacher candidates become competent teachers. With that being said, Pearson still offered the most beneficial training received by the respondents.

Several of the respondents chose to go through official scorer training provided by Pearson. Even after becoming a certified scorer, Diane still had reservations about the process. She voiced her perceptions as follows:

I’m still satisfied that anytime, even if you are a certified scorer, scoring those things are still highly subjective. Even with rubrics that have been spelled out very specifically, you are still your own person and we got a brain and we have set ideas and perceptions that we are bringing to the table and I have a bar in my mind for what a good teacher should look like, sound like, move like, all of that. We all have those perceptions and there is no rubric in the entire world that’s going to remove that.

Calculability

Calculability deals with the quantization of processes and products, assigning a numerical value to each of the parts of the production process (Ritzer, 2008). Ritzer related one aspect of calculability in education to the reduction of a high school student’s four years to one “single number, the grade point average” (p. 84). Even though teacher candidates are not identified as a Level 5 or Level 4 teacher candidate if they obtained scores of 4 or 5 on each rubric, a passing

score on the edTPA does imply that they received at least a score of 3 on most of the rubrics. There are 15 rubrics included in the K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook that are scored from one to five points each. Therefore, a perfect score on the edTPA for a music candidate would be 75. Minimum scores required by teacher education programs in Tennessee for passing the edTPA range from 37 to 42.

One rational application of assigning a score to the edTPA is that a passing score on the edTPA is viewed as an indicator by principals that the teacher candidate is ready to assume the duties of a certified teacher, even during the first year of employment. It is possible that principals would give hiring preference to an applicant who passed the edTPA over another applicant with similar background who did not take the edTPA. Universities view the credentialism of a standardized assessment as a recruitment tool for aspiring educators.

There are some irrational consequences of assigning a numerical score that represents the teacher candidates' ability to plan, teach and assess students. Diane's concern was about making the scoring as objective as possible. In her opinion, the rubrics are not sufficient to take something as subjective as a teacher candidate's teaching and creating a quantifiable score from it. Steven agreed stating, "I have lots of fears about turning something as subjective and active as the teaching profession into a standardized test." Clark felt that sometimes this sort of assessment, when applied to the arts, can be stifling. He described his own experience as follows:

My mind is pretty analytical, but I have been touched by music and I have been changed. I know better who I am because of music. And so being able to quantify that feeling and those experiences I think are fruitless...I think we as music teachers have to find a way to hold those two things in tension. Yes, we are measuring quantitatively students' progress reports, objectives and measurable skills...but we can't ever lose sight of the

aesthetic beauty and the knowledge about ourselves that we get from participating in a music program.

According to some respondents, focusing on a numerical score creates stress for the teacher candidates and shifts the emphasis from learning how to teach to getting a good grade. According to Patsy, the teacher candidates are “racing around trying to do everything that's on the rubric so they could get good scores.” Clark was frustrated by the lack of feedback that teacher candidates received when their edTPA scores were reported. He acknowledged that it would be time-consuming and possibly difficult for the scorers to provide individual feedback to the teacher candidates, but he felt that the number score was insufficient. From his viewpoint as a teacher trainer,

I think, if the goal of the edTPA is to create reflective practitioners, then students should be reflecting on their scores and not just be able to get a number and read the qualifiers and the rubric. But to actually have, “Here’s what I read. Here’s why I gave you this score. Here’s how you could have improved.” I think that would create a more reflective document in a more reflective process.

Qualifying scores

Another aspect related to the calculability of the edTPA that became evident during coding was the determination of a qualifying score, referred to by the respondents as a cut score, that ranges in Tennessee from 37 to 42. The rational aspect of using a cut or qualifying score is that it creates parity between university teacher education programs. Some universities adopted a lower cut score when the edTPA was introduced, but have been raising the cut score each year of the program. Diane questioned increasing the cut score over time. Her argument was, “We’ve kind of not only introduced this demanding rigor that is the edTPA for these undergraduates, but

now we're raising the bar consistently over time for how well we expect them to perform on those 15 rubrics.” According to David, “I think the idea of having a variable cut score undercuts their arguments about the validity of the assessment.” David also suggested that raising the qualifying scores was not evidence that teacher candidates are magically going to get better at the assessment, but that the institutions will get better at teaching the various aspects of the edTPA. Leigh voiced a concern about the standardization of qualifying scores across the state of Tennessee. The university where she teaches has already established a qualifying score of 42. What will happen to the universities whose qualifying scores are lower? Will they be forced to raise their qualifying score to 42 to qualify their graduating teacher candidates for licensure?

External scorers

Research participants voiced their opinions about the use of external scorers to grade the edTPA submissions. Some respondents observed rational consequences of utilizing external scorers. Steven said, “There is value in it and there's a lot of value in having outside observers tell you what's good and bad.” David agreed with Steven, saying that he liked “the fact that people from all of the country are looking at our students’ work.”

Other respondents identified irrational consequences of the external scoring process. As previously stated, Pearson trained four of the respondents in this study as external scorers. David viewed the certification that he received from Pearson as problematic. He was concerned that the scores he gave on the practice portfolios utilized during the scoring training represented too much leeway in the scoring process. He stated,

I was **under** their official score by the exact tolerance and the score that **I** would have given that student for that mock portfolio would not have quite qualified as a cut score in

any state. And the score that they would have assigned would have qualified them for every state. It was that different.

Annie described the fear some teacher trainers felt by saying, “You think you're confident that your students are doing good work, but they are sending it off to somebody else and we're like, we hope you agree.” David goes so far as to say, “I would like to see the elimination of these external reviews.” His viewpoint was that the teacher trainers at the University are experienced educators who should be able to evaluate their own teacher candidates. The university system is “undercut if we're going to say at the end of this we're going to export the evaluation process [to external scorers] and say your students are good enough or not good enough based on a few video clips and their writing ability.” Davis agreed and was concerned that the evaluation of the teacher candidates was limited because the external evaluators only look at video segments uploaded by each teacher candidate in order to evaluate this person's fitness to be a teacher. Putting herself in the teacher candidates' place, Diane believed that teacher candidates are trying to figure out what the external evaluator is looking for. She was concerned that she would be a really tough scorer and another scorer might be more lenient, describing her as “sweet Susie over there who's going to just take pity on the poor soul who is about to graduate and wants to get a license.” Leigh stated that the students would be better served by having their residency supervisors be a part of the evaluation process. Clark agreed and said, “Yeah, so it's still kind of a mystery to me because they upload all these documents, they press submit, and it goes out into the world and the scorer somewhere, I assume with a musical background, is then reading and judging and using the rubrics to create a score.” Concerns voiced by the research participants about calculability revolved around the debate over whether or not teaching can be quantified, determination of qualifying scores, and the use of

external scorers. Most of the discourse revolved around unintended negative consequences of assigning a numerical score that seeks to quantify the teacher candidates' clinical practice.

Predictability

One of the characteristics of McDonaldization is predictability, illustrated earlier by the analogy that burgers can be the same in Memphis as they are in New York City. According to Hartley (1995), one aspect of predictability in education is the product standardization that is becoming evident in higher education. The creation of common standards of credentialing and the mandating of standardized assessments are evidence of this dimension of the McDonaldization of the higher education system.

Some of the research participants viewed product standardization as a positive consequence of SCALE's development of the edTPA citing comparisons with current evaluation systems for in-service teachers, specifically the Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model and TEAM. Patsy agreed that there needs to be a National Standard that would assure that each university would be held to the same standard of teacher preparation throughout the state but she wasn't convinced that the edTPA was the answer.

Tennessee evaluation models

According to some music education teacher trainers, teacher candidates are prepared when they actually get a job in Tennessee because they have already been through a portfolio assessment process. Ramona stated that, "Our students who have done it and then had to go through their first year portfolios or whatever, say it's much easier to do those portfolios because they've had the edTPA. They're saying that the evaluation process in the public schools is easier than the edTPA." Davis acknowledged that the edTPA prepared teacher candidates for evaluation as in-service teachers. He described the value of the edTPA process by saying, "if

they've already done these things, they're not going to sweat teacher evaluations to the same extent, not after they've been through all of this." David concurred, stating,

[P]eople who think positively about it [the edTPA] tend to frame it as an experience that students will then be able to apply in other settings either in terms of, so for instance, if they are in a state where there is a fine arts portfolio teacher evaluation, "Oh. If they can do this portfolio then they'll be set up to do that portfolio."

Ramona also saw the edTPA as a good preparation for the evaluation system utilized to evaluate practicing teachers. She compared the edTPA process to TEAM, the current evaluation process for in-service teachers, stating, "Students have to do what they will have to do when they are teachers. It seems to be a reasonable approach. You have to plan lessons. You have to assess your students. You have to figure out how it went and do something different if necessary."

National Board Certification

One of the precursors of the edTPA was National Board Certification. Davis realized that the edTPA was based on this model and remarked that "if you can do this [the edTPA] then you know National Board Teacher's Certification wouldn't really be a big problem." Diane also saw parallels between the edTPA and National Board Certification, but she perceived it as a negative correlation, observing that,

They are struggling. Even our brightest students are struggling with edTPA because it's hard. It is hard. It is National Board Certification. It really is. When you look at the rubrics and you look at what's being demanded of you as a teacher, it is almost exactly like National Board Certification which we don't even let people do until...they have been teaching at least...five years.

Annie wondered what the implications of the parallels between these two assessments might be, saying, “I also wonder that once that teacher [candidate] enters the profession, are we going to start seeing more National Board Certified arts educators because of this?...I don’t know.”

Licensure

One of the advantages touted by SCALE and Pearson to adopting the edTPA was the fact that 18 states are either requiring the edTPA or considering requiring the edTPA for teacher licensure. Some respondents reported that passing the edTPA helped teacher candidates get teaching jobs in other states. Annie related that a state nearby had already adopted the edTPA before the state of Tennessee, so Annie’s university implemented the edTPA before it was mandated so that their students could get jobs in a neighboring state. This was a strategic move on the part of this Tennessee University to ensure that graduating teacher candidates would be “competitive in their field”. Davis stated, “In fact, one of the student teachers got hired for a job out west and the edTPA, I think, was a big selling point in addition to just everything he brought himself.”

Some music departments are afraid that when something new comes along, they will actually be at the end of the line or on the chopping block according to Annie. One of the things that Annie liked about the edTPA was that it can cross state lines. She goes on to say, “So if you get licensure here and you go to another edTPA state, you’re not going to have much difficulty with your licensure transferring over.” Evelyn recognized that the former TBR schools will be ahead of the other music education programs in the state when the edTPA becomes consequential for licensure in 2019.

Standardization

Philosophically, having a common, standardized assessment for all pre-service teachers appears to be a move toward making the teaching profession a more respected profession. After all, lawyers must pass the bar exam in order to become lawyers. Research participants saw product standardization as having both rational and irrational consequences. Key words discovered during the coding process included *licensure*, *portfolio*, *outside the box*, and *TEAM*. As previously stated, the edTPA can assist a teacher candidate in getting a job outside the state of Tennessee because it is a nationally recognized assessment. The edTPA, since it is a teacher performance assessment, can prepare pre-service teachers for evaluation when they become in-service teachers. Some respondents fear, however, that the edTPA can restrict creativity because of the teacher candidates' interpretation of the rubrics, creating fear of teaching "outside the box".

According to the respondents in this study, standardization was identified as a major roadblock to preparing qualified teachers. Stephen was concerned that the edTPA does not do a good job of creating a whole picture of the teacher candidates and that placing so much emphasis on this type of assessment was not fair to the students. David thought that the reason that Tennessee adopted the edTPA was just to keep "up with the Joneses (and) that we want the latest, greatest fans of how we're going to evaluate." Leigh was concerned that teacher trainers are building constructs that just focus on the edTPA and that this feels constricting. If teacher candidates have to conform to the edTPA model or its definition of good teaching, then teacher candidates will continue to do things that have always been done in the classroom. One of the things that often happened during a teacher candidate's work with their cooperating teacher is that the teacher candidate brought new ideas from their methods classes. Leigh's fear was that

the edTPA kept these teacher candidates from using new teaching models, so it caused her to have mixed feelings about the edTPA. Leigh goes on to say that the former model used for teacher training was freer because students did not feel so constricted in terms of what their lesson plans had to have to match the rubrics for the edTPA. She says the students would say, “I don't want to do anything really outside the box because maybe it won't jive with what the evaluator who reviews my portfolio sees as a model for good teaching.”

Control

One of the aspects of Weber's iron cage is the increasing control that a bureaucracy exerts on society, constricting its workers and creating a mechanized way of living. Some respondents viewed the adoption of the edTPA as a way to achieve parity with general education teacher candidates, creating a common language where all teaching fields could meet. Other research participants saw the edTPA as restrictive, giving control of the clinical practice aspect of teacher training to the universities' College of Education and to the edTPA process itself.

In a McDonaldized Society, a bureaucracy exerts control over the workers or institutions underneath it. As previously stated, the TBR mandated that the colleges and universities under its jurisdiction would utilize the edTPA as a capstone evaluation for teacher candidates. The teacher trainers interviewed for this study stated that this decision required that the edTPA would be utilized in the music education department as well. The College of Education, however, was responsible for the implementation in the majority of the colleges and universities in this study.

At Steven's university, the first year of implementation was a pilot phase and was not a requirement until the second year. At David's university, the first year of the edTPA was a requirement “that had a lot of leeway built into it in terms of there was a cut score, but it was initially very low and if you did not make the cut score, you could do in-house remediation

without sending things back in to get re-scored.” Chris’s approach to the edTPA was to ensure that the students at his university we're still learning the music content and how “to be very effective teachers and what they do on the edTPA is just an outgrowth of that.” Annie stated, “I think it's all about how people react. I think the more that we can help people be proactive about it rather than reactive I think that's going to be the biggest indicator.” David did not believe that teacher trainers were actively undermining the edTPA or trying to “figure out how to make it implode”, but he did acknowledge that some of the push back represented “people taking a stand on issues of academic freedom and of their own expertise and authority”.

Parity with general education

Annie and Davis agreed that the edTPA assisted in building a bridge between the general education department and the music education department. Chris stated,

For years, as music educators we have fought for our rightful place as a real subject in the schools and all of the “real subjects” in the schools have to prove that there is growth in their classrooms and that the students are learning. Now, here we are. We’re being treated like real subjects in schools. That’s the way I view it. We got what we asked for. So now let’s step up to the plate and let’s do this thing very well.

David covered education topics in his music methods classes that assisted his teacher candidates in making connections between the instruction they received in the education department classes and the performing arts. He focused on:

the kinds of evidence they need to be gathering and also giving them a lot of strategies to be ready to hit the ground running in their final semester, particularly in terms of choosing the kind of class they want to work with, considering schedule considerations and a variety of other things.

Including aspects of the edTPA in undergraduate coursework is one way respondents sought to aid the teacher candidates in accomplishing the edTPA tasks during their clinical placement.

Annie is hopeful that the increasing inclusion of edTPA's tasks and language demands in the courses leading up to the residency experience will have a positive result on teacher candidates, even going so far as to say, "I'm anticipating the students next semester are going to be bored in professional seminar....The big thing is that they're entering it a lot more confident which is really exciting. "

One of the consequences related to control that was viewed as negative by the respondents in this study was the decrease in control that teacher trainers feel they have over their teacher candidates and especially the seminar experience. Chris stated that the edTPA is "still a very new change of culture. People are still afraid of it and it still monopolizes our time more than we wish it would." Annie would like to focus more on topics related specifically to practical novice teacher questions during Seminar such as,

You've got your job - what kind of questions should you ask? How do you build your network in your community? How do you start building your curriculum? How do you setup a classroom? You don't have budget for supplies, what do you do? What is professional development?

Diane's reaction was perhaps a little harsher. She stated that "for the University, you know, it's almost like we've adopted a stance of resigned support." David agreed but believed that his university still has some control over the teacher training process. He was afraid, however, that once the edTPA is required for licensure, their jurisdiction over the process would be subsumed by the state.

State/federal

The TBR, even though it no longer has jurisdiction over the universities in Tennessee, was responsible for the initial adoption of the edTPA in response to RTTT mandates regarding strengthening teacher training. Diane said, “There was not a grandmothering in, a grandfathering in. It was if you are going to graduate from this university with any kind of degree in education, starting now, this is what we are doing.” Ishmael described the mandate as resulting in panic for the music education department. Although the TBR no longer had jurisdiction over universities in the state of Tennessee, Patsy stated, “They told us that edTPA would be required for student teachers several years ago. They said it was because we were a Board of Regent’s school. Therefore, it was going to be required.” Diane concurred that “it was forced upon us.” Evelyn had a similar experience, stating that “The edTPA was introduced to me and simultaneously the music department through way of the College of Education. That’s how we first heard about that because it was going to go into place as a graduation requirement and student completion requirement for all student teachers on campus.” Diane described it as “the tail is always wagging the dog instead of the dog going and then experiencing something and then reacting by waving its tail.”

David was concerned with the devaluing of the teacher trainers in the state of Tennessee. He stated that:

If we are teacher educators who are ourselves credentialed and then we are part of an institution that is accredited to prepare teachers then, you know, let us do it... you're both devaluing our accreditation and credentialing and you're taking away the little power we had over the system anyway.

Pearson/SCALE

Several respondents found the scoring training provided by Pearson very beneficial. Diane, a certified scorer, found the practice of actually scoring portfolios the most helpful practice. Both Ishmael and Leigh attended a one-day workshop led by a certified edTPA scorer focused on what is referred to as “local scoring”. This is defined as an option that some colleges and universities selected in the early days of the adoption of the edTPA that allowed the education department to score the portfolios of their own teacher candidates. Now, for the most part, submissions are sent off to Pearson to be scored by external scorers who are trained by Pearson. The workshop facilitator discussed the group’s scores and then provided the “official” score from Pearson. Leigh described the advantage to this approach by stating, “That’s the way I learned is seeing an example and then deconstructing it. Taking out the pieces...[that] were evaluated as good or not. I guess being able to disaggregate it that way...[has] been very helpful to me.” Evelyn agreed that this process worked very well for her also, even though she experienced it by going through the official Pearson scorer training. She admitted that she went through the certification process, not to serve as a national scorer, “but to actually go through the process and understand the process so that I could provide the best guidance for our music education students.” The other respondents that became certified scorers echoed her sentiment, with only one of them actually going on to score portfolios for Pearson.

Some teacher trainers surveyed for this research believed that Pearson is exercising a lot of power through the administration of the edTPA. Even though it appears from her interview that she did not perceive this viewpoint as politically correct, Annie says, “Go Pearson! They have found a way to make a lot of money on this.” Out of the four respondents who actually went through the scorer’s training offered by Pearson, only one of these professors actually went

on to score edTPA submissions for Pearson. Diane was troubled by the fact that the edTPA submission was due so early in the semester of residency attributing this to the fact that Pearson needed the artifacts submitted by that time frame so that Pearson could get the scores back to the institution of higher education so the students can graduate on time. It was difficult, however, for her teacher candidates to immediately start work on the edTPA when they first got to their placements at the beginning of the semester.

College of Education

In Davis's university, the fine arts department actually was the first to adopt the edTPA as a capstone assessment, lending credibility to the fine arts department in the eyes of the College of Education because the teacher candidates in the arts have done well on the edTPA. Valuable as a bridge building tool, the edTPA has helped the fine arts department "to have a closer relationship with that crucial licensure part of the degree." Chris acknowledged that the education department drives "the decisions and they make the big decisions, [but] they don't do that without our input."

Most of the universities in this study have added a Residency 1 clinical placement semester to their teacher training programs. For some, this was a direct result of the adoption of the edTPA. For others, it was done to meet the increasing requirements for graduation as well as obtaining a teaching license. David met with the residency committee in the College of Education to ensure that the needs of the music education teacher candidates were being met and to address "those issues and help them with giving them a sense of where our students are and what their needs are." At David's university, "They at least plan a learning segment and then, hopefully, tape one and then in our seminars, at least with me, we also then go through pretty heavily both the instructional and assessment commentaries."

One of the components of Residency 1 at some universities is a mock edTPA assignment, providing teacher candidates the opportunity to become familiar with the requirements of the “real” edTPA submission. Although seen as good practice, Chris noted that, when the mock edTPA was introduced during Residency 1, “they get stressed out about it because they just hear edTPA... We try to emphasize that this is just the training- the mock edTPA, you’re just learning how to do it- so calm down and learn how to do it.” The mock edTPA, overall is perceived as helpful in preparing the teacher candidates for the edTPA submission required in Residency 2.

At Diane’s university, Residency1 is housed in the College of Education. She strongly suggested that the music education department oversee Residency 1 because the music education teacher candidates at her university are not placed in music classes. The ideal scheduling she suggested was that the music students should be placed “for six hours for...two days a week in a music placement full-time... [with] one mentor teacher in a music setting...”

Davis observed that, “in most universities, the divide between the school of education and the arts department is pretty wide.” Clark acknowledged that there are some tensions between the College of Education and the music education department and that these issues are difficult to discuss. One of the most common crossovers was the utilization of a common lesson plan format. Ramona stated that they use the College of Education lesson plan because that is a format that will be required when the teacher candidates submit their edTPA. Leigh used a modified version of the College of Education's template in her Foundations class and also in her Elementary Methods class in order to help prepare the music education students for the requirements in their residency and for the edTPA submission. Annie's college has also adopted the School of Education lesson plan format and embedded it in the classes that she teaches.

The lesson plan template provided by the College of Education was described by Steven as “horrible”, Annie as “boxy”, and Chris as “a monster”. Steven stated that “it’s very difficult to use for...an ensemble lesson plan which has multi-lesson parts like warm ups and sight reading and then rehearsal.” Chris would prefer a simpler lesson plan template – the template used at his university is seven pages long. He described his introduction of the lesson plan template to the teacher candidates as follows:

And what I tell them is that if you are in front of a real classroom, you are not going to have time to look through a seven page lesson plan to find what you need to find. So, this is unrealistic to expect that you are going to use this as a teacher. But in the meantime, here it is.

The template frustrated Ramona also, and she said, “I am getting ready to ask someone from the college of ed. to help us all understand the blocks on the form cause some of them I don’t even know what they’re asking.”

Even though the College of Education and the department of music education are two separate departments, most of the music education teacher trainers interviewed wanted to keep the bridge between the College of Education and the School of Music. There was, however, some tension between these two departments. Ishmael described it as “active drama” and maybe even “hostility”. Even though complaints were not overt, according to Ishmael, teacher trainers said things like, “Oh yeah. The Ed Department wants that” or “that’s not really my field” or “I don’t understand” or “I don’t want to do that.” Diane kept the bridge between the College of Education and the Music Education Department so that the music education students will be able to get certification. She goes on to say, “so we have to play ball for the benefit of our students

but we...kind of adopt this eye rolling mentality of ‘Oh, they're going to make us do this now. Oh, they're going to make us do this now.’”

In most cases addressed in this study, the College of Education provided training for all of the subject areas that offered teacher licensure. Diane observed that, with

all those content areas that are in the same room together at the same time, you can't go real deep into what that training looks like because it's so different for a performing arts person than it is [for] an early childhood person or an elementary person, or even a math or science person....It just can't go into depth because our area contents are so diverse.

The College of Education at Diane's university provided a full-time faculty certified trainer also, but, according to Diane, “when it gets down to the nitty-gritty of what our performing arts people need, it's specifically music, in this case. She's no help and she readily admits, ‘I'm no help.’”

As previously stated, the College of Education and the music education department work together to train the music education teacher candidates. It is often the case that teacher candidates take general education classes such as philosophy of education and assessment in the College of Education and music methods classes in the music department. Another issue of control discovered during the coding process was related to coursework. At Diane's university, the College of Education tried very hard to prepare all teacher candidates, but Diane identified gaps in the coursework. She attributed these gaps to the lack of “arts people that are teaching those classes and they don't – they can't speak to our teacher candidates and give them ideas that they need as future music teachers.” Chris agreed with Diane, stating that, “those education units can kind of fight for more time in the College of Education to teach the students that content.”

One effect of the edTPA requirement, according to Chris, is that the music education department

needs more time to teach about learning theorists such as “Jerome Bruner [and]...Lev Vygotsky in the context of music.”

According to Diane, the College of Education in her university controls 18 hours of the music education degree program. She felt that her hands were tied because, “it's seemingly every year something new that's being crammed down our throats.” For Diane, the music department tried to move the assessment and the classroom management classes from the education department and put them in the music department but the music department was unsuccessful. Diane states, “so that got nowhere because ultimately it comes down to territory. We're going to protect our turf. And we're going to keep our faculty and generate our credit hours so we can get more money funneled into our department.”

To satisfy the requirements for higher level rubrics in the edTPA, teacher candidates must cite pertinent research. Diane was disappointed in the responses of many of the teacher candidates. It appeared to her that they were citing “surface level” research, perhaps using Google to find articles that related to their learning segment. There did not seem to be a carry-over from the classes that taught “about Elliot and Reimer and Maxine Greene and all these people. We're not even really talking about Jerome Bruner and some of these educational psychologists.” Diane was frustrated that teacher candidates appeared unable to relate what they were teaching during the clinical placement to relevant research.

At Leigh's university, the music education department has recently taken over the Residency program from the College of Education. She voiced the concern that the College of Education is monitoring the pass rate and she feels that “there's some pressure being exerted on us to be successful and I would rather empower successful future teachers rather than empower students that are going to pass the edTPA.”

Mandates issued by the College of Education sometimes created tension between the music education faculty and other music professors. Ishmael assumed the voice of the non-music education faculty saying,

Then you have the music ed people who've got their little tentacles into everybody's pie and nobody likes them....[W]e, because we want to be liked, we'll be like, "It's not me! It's the ed department." So...[the music professors say], "We hate the music ed people because they're making us do this stuff and we don't like it. *It's not what my professor at Julliard used to do.*" (spoken dramatically)

In summary, there are both positive and negative facets of the relationship between the College of Education and the music education department. The College of Education is responsible for licensure as well as some of the required general education courses. Some music departments would like more control over courses such as assessment so that class content could be targeted specifically at music education majors. There appears to be a general lack of communication between these two entities in some universities, resulting in conflict and misunderstandings.

Music education

Ramona acknowledged that utilizing the edTPA "does require us to prepare our students differently, but I don't think that's a bad thing." According to Chris, the music education courses at his university have not changed as a result of the adoption of the edTPA. They have, however, "become more purposeful in what they do." As a result of the implementation of the edTPA, respondents acknowledged that many universities are using a backwards design approach to embed aspects of the edTPA into undergraduate music education coursework. Annie described the course content as leading up to a higher stakes assessment than previously, resulting in a

rethinking of the design of the methodology courses. Clark agreed that the edTPA will have an impact on methods classes, saying:

I think that it will impact it...to the same degree that we take it seriously. If this is going to be the defining measure of our student's success and also their certification, then it absolutely has to trickle down into the rest of our classes. And that means not just those of us that are familiar with edTPA because we teach it, but we need to be embedding that language and preparing them from the beginning so that they can be familiar with the concepts and the process of writing this huge document. And they can be familiar with that so it's not as much of a shock when they get there.

Steven complained that preparing for the edTPA took up too much time in the methods classes already, saying "I think that's really the impact is that we're sacrificing things that I think we need to be teaching just to teach them how to record themselves in a 15-minute video, which I really don't like." Diane agreed, complaining that the College of Education at her university was requiring instructional time during methods classes to prepare teacher candidates for the edTPA when she was already having difficulty finding time for the music content that the candidates would need to know as future teachers. In her previous experience with teacher candidates, Leigh preferred to give the students "the tools to be good educators" instead of worrying about preparing them for the edTPA.

Teaching to the test

One of the phrases that was discovered in five of the interview transcriptions was *teaching to the test*, another unintended consequence of the edTPA. Steven said, "I hate to say teaching to the test but we kind of do. We kind of teach what's going to be on the edTPA, what they have to do to make this video, what's expected of them." Chris questioned whether or not

the practice of including a mock edTPA project as part of the semester before residency could be considered cheating or teaching to the test. Annie was in a colleague's class who teaches one of the required classes in education that everyone has to take before their residency. This professor and Annie were talking about the edTPA, "And he just said we're just teaching to the test."

Patsy, in her role as residency supervisor, recalled that some of the cooperating teachers felt that their students were having to teach to the test when they did their learning segments. Clark summed it up succinctly, stating that "It feels like we're trying to manipulate our teaching in order to pass the test as opposed to really being a tool that is impactful and useful preparing them for teacher evaluations as future teachers and really being a measure of what they do as teachers in the future."

Burn out/too much work

The terms *stress*, *burn out* or *too much work* were utilized by 75% of the respondents to describe the pressure experienced by the teacher candidates while completing the edTPA. The addition of more work to an already daunting work load associated with the residency experience was identified as an irrational consequence of completing the edTPA. Ishmael said, "So my feelings about the edTPA were pretty negative like, 'This is so much work,' was my big feeling. For me and for the students and I still think it's a lot of work especially for the students but also for me as a supervisor." David observed that the teacher candidates face burn out before they graduate as evidenced by the following remarks that he attributed to his teacher candidates:

Oh! I'm being evaluated to death. I am going to have to do this portfolio thing.

This is not what I thought teaching was going to be.

I'm going to finish this degree but then I'm not applying for jobs this summer.

This is not the field for me I'd rather find a different path.

Chris suggested that he would like to “find a way to minimize this thing [the edTPA] so that it feels like it’s just more of a natural outgrowth of what I do as a teacher.”

There is also the danger that teacher candidates will not pass the edTPA according to Leigh. She identified the edTPA as just another test that music education students must pass in order to graduate and receive their teacher license. In her experience, there are already students enrolled in the music education program who face difficulties passing the Praxis exams and the edTPA could be seen as just another barrier to licensure. Some of these students have “left the music education program to go to general studies and get to teaching through a different path.” She posits that difficulty with passing standardized assessments might affect racial minority students disproportionately, but she has not seen evidence of this effect with the students she has mentored through the edTPA process.

Residency 2, for those schools that have two semesters of clinical practice, is when the edTPA submission is required. Diane observed that the teacher candidates needed a longer period of time to get to know the students and begin writing the Context for Learning, but she acknowledged “there’s just no time.” Most Residency 2 placements are scheduled to begin in January. David identified inclement weather and illness as two of the issues related to that time of year. He was concerned about the teacher candidates placed in elementary schools, describing the challenge as follows:

If you’re in a school that sees that one class once every seven school days, you are already counting, to get a three day learning segment, you are already...doing your edTPA across three weeks. Any disruption from ice, snow, flu or your own health or a field trip or surprise benchmark testing or anything else could completely throw that off.

One source of stress noted by research participants was the amount of work generated by the dual requirements of the edTPA and the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM). The College of Education required the edTPA for graduation and the responsibility for training the teacher candidates was handled mostly by the teacher trainers. Since the TEAM is utilized for evaluating in-service teachers in Tennessee, the observation forms used by the residency supervisors and cooperating teachers are based on the TEAM rubrics, not the edTPA rubrics. According to David, this created stress for the teacher candidates due to the number of required observations. At his university,

Between the university supervisor and the mentor teachers, our students get evaluated on the TEAM rubric nine times over the course of the semester....they also have summative evaluations completed by both the university supervisor and their mentor teacher at both the mid-semester and end-semester points so they end up with...13 total evaluations using that rubric [TEAM] but they're still doing edTPA on top of that.

Diane concurred with David, saying, "That's overwhelming for me as a teacher educator with a doctorate, much less a twenty-two year old who has never taught a child in his life."

Davis echoed this tension between the requirements for the clinical placement that were mostly focused on the TEAM rubrics and the requirements for completing and uploading the edTPA submissions. According to David, this pressure resulted in burn-out, even before the teacher candidates became practicing teachers. He attributed a negative view of teaching during the first year to TEAM, the evaluation system currently in place in Tennessee. In his opinion, "if they can make it through this, then all those other onerous things that they'll have when they're in-service teachers won't feel so bad. So, if we put them through hell now, the rest of it's just, maybe you know, purgatory."

Summary

Chapter 4 sought to answer the research questions:

1. What are the experiences of the music education teacher trainers in Tennessee with the edTPA?
2. Does the framework of McDonaldization assist in understanding Tennessee's music education teacher trainers' discourse regarding their experiences with the edTPA?

The information in this chapter was organized around the four dimensions of McDonaldization as set forth by Ritzer (2008), based on the previous work by Weber. Within each of these four dimensions, respondents identified consequences of the edTPA that were both rational and irrational. Music education teacher trainers shared their experiences with the edTPA. Their discourse was shared throughout the chapter, using their own words to convey their lived experiences with this assessment.

Efficient aspects included the availability of the K-12 Performing Arts Handbook, recognizing the importance of using academic language in the learning segment, and requiring teacher candidates to video-record lessons in order to evaluate their own performance. Inefficient consequences included not having a specific handbook for music education, having many of the language demands get lost in translation, becoming a test of writing instead a test of teaching, and lack of training resulting in the teacher trainer learning about the edTPA at the same time as the teacher candidates (building the plane while they were flying it).

Calculability was perceived to have a positive impact on teacher candidates' marketability and its impact on the perception of music education as a legitimate field of education. The use of external scorers was viewed as both positive and negative. Discussion about qualifying scores centered on the desire to establish consistent norms.

Predictability was seen as the most rational result of the edTPA due to parallels with other evaluation tools used in Tennessee, specifically the Portfolio for Student Growth in the Arts and the TEAM, preparing teacher candidates for evaluation in the real teaching world. Confidence gained by passing the edTPA could also result in more NBCTs. Reciprocal licensure among states was seen as a positive result of requiring the edTPA for licensure. Many of the respondents in general questioned the advisability of using standardized assessments in general to evaluate music education teacher candidates.

Control was perceived as the biggest issue. Most respondent accepted the fact that federal and state mandates required some form of evaluation. Parity with general education was cited as a positive factor even though some tension between the music department and the College of Education were discussed. Negative consequences included the necessity of allocating time in both seminar and methods classes to focus on the requirements for the edTPA, causing stress and burn out in the teacher candidates, losing control of coursework and clinical practice experiences, the necessity of teaching to the test and the lack of training received by all stakeholders.

Chapter Five will seek to draw conclusions and discuss the implications of this research. The movement toward more McDonaldization will be discussed as well as opportunities to move away from McDonaldization. It is hoped that the implications of this study will assist music education teacher trainers in providing support for their teacher candidates as they complete their edTPA submissions.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

In this chapter, I will summarize the results and strive to elucidate the implications of the McDonaldization of the edTPA. Using the lived experiences of the teacher trainers as well as the advice they offered during their interviews, I will endeavor to provide practical applications of this research. Hopefully, this information will be generalizable to music education teacher trainers outside of Tennessee who are using the edTPA as part of their music education degree requirements.

Summary of Results

Research Question 1

The first research question addressed the experiences of the music education teacher trainers in Tennessee with the edTPA. Out of 12 respondents, two were for continuing the use of this portfolio assessment as a capstone project for their teacher candidates, two wished that Tennessee would rescind the mandate requiring the edTPA for teacher licensure, and the other eight saw both positive and negative aspects. Even the two respondents who perceived the mandate of using the edTPA as positive offered suggestions for improvements.

All of the interviews included discussions about the K-12 Performing Arts Handbook. Seen mostly as a helpful tool, especially since there was a handbook specifically for the performing arts, it was variously described as *helpful* and *overwhelming*. Ten of the respondents addressed the challenge of the language demands, citing the inclusion of *academic language* including the use of music vocabulary as the easiest demand to meet while *syntax* and *discourse* were the most confusing. Two respondents used the term *lost in translation* to identify the disconnect between the teacher candidates' undergraduate coursework and the language used in the edTPA handbook. Four respondents noted the teacher candidates' struggles to write the

Context for Learning. Some respondents criticized the amount of writing required for the commentaries, alluding to the edTPA as a *test of writing* instead a test of teaching. One respondent suggested that there were too many rubrics included in the edTPA.

There was general discussion about whether or not teaching could be reduced to a numerical score. The variations in qualifying scores among universities were cited as problematic. Some respondents viewed external scorers as rating the teacher candidates based on an incomplete picture of their teaching abilities, while others saw external scorers as providing a positive outside perspective. Some respondents wanted to return to the previous model where teacher candidates were rated by their residency supervisors and cooperating teachers.

Six of the respondents compared the edTPA with the Tennessee Portfolio for Student Growth in the Arts. In general, the edTPA was seen as valuable practice for completing a portfolio assessment that would assist pre-service teacher candidates when they attained teaching jobs, especially in the state of Tennessee. The overlap of the requirements for these two portfolio assessments was seen as an opportunity for the cooperating teachers to develop an understanding of the edTPA, giving them more confidence in assisting the teacher candidate assigned to them.

Nine of the music teacher trainers discussed the impact of the edTPA on the Seminar class required by all of the programs in the study. Overall, it was felt that the edTPA took up too much time during these once a week classes. Most of the respondents would rather have spent time discussing classroom management and addressing specific methodology questions than discussing video recording strategies and unpacking the edTPA rubrics. Many felt that the edTPA also shifted the focus of the clinical placement from learning how to be a good teacher to passing the assessment.

Nine of the respondents directly addressed the teacher candidates' stress with the other three referring to it indirectly. One of the respondents said that the amount of work was *ridiculous*, another called it a *burden* and most agreed that it was just *too much work*. The fear of some of the respondents was that this overwhelming task would deter some teacher candidates from even wanting to teach citing *burn out* as a possible consequence.

The lack of training experienced by many of the respondents resulted in what one respondent called *building the plane while they were flying it*. Respondents felt they were learning about the edTPA along with the teacher candidates during the first years of implementation. Most respondents agreed that more training for all stakeholders (teacher trainers, residency supervisors and cooperating teachers) was needed and a Pearson-trained music educator would provide the most helpful training.

Research Question 2

The second research question sought to determine if McDonaldization functioned as a framework for understanding the Tennessee music education teacher trainers' discourses regarding their experiences with the edTPA. Based on Weber's theory that a bureaucracy was the most efficient way to control workers and processes, Ritzer extended Weber's ideas by using the metaphor of McDonalds to represent the "iron cage" of rationality purported by Weber. As previously stated, all respondents identified both rational (positive) and irrational (negative) aspects of the edTPA. During the coding process, all research participants' responses echoed Ritzer's four dimensions of the McDonaldization of Society - efficiency, calculability, predictability and control. The discourse related to efficiency, completing a task by following a predesigned process, mostly centered on the K-12 Performing Arts Assessment Handbook. Concerns with calculability, reducing a process or product to a numerical value, focused on the

scoring process. Predictability, mostly centered on product standardization, focused on issues of licensure and the use of standardized assessments. Experiences related to control, often resulting in confining workers to an iron cage of rationality, focused on state and federal mandates for teacher evaluation, the control of the scoring process by Pearson/SCALE, the music education departments' relationship with the universities' College of Education and the impact of the edTPA on coursework and the teacher candidates' clinical practice.

McDonaldization Applied to the edTPA

The edTPA appears at the outset to be a rational outcome of the current trend in teacher evaluation. Higher education accepts the fact that incoming freshmen are required to meet qualifying scores on the SAT or ACT in order to enroll. Passing grades on these assessments are seen as indicators that the incoming student will be successful in higher education. From this viewpoint, achieving a qualifying score on the edTPA can be seen as an indicator that the teacher candidate will be successful as a teacher, representing a rational approach to teacher training. However, rational systems can result in irrational consequences. One irrational consequence of the edTPA, a high stakes assessment, is stress and burn out for the teacher candidates.

The next section will discuss Ritzer's four dimensions of McDonaldization as they relate to the results of this study, the results of other research pertaining to the edTPA and the data obtained by other researchers using the framework of McDonaldization to understand rationalized systems. The four dimensions will be used to categorize the results.

Efficiency

As previously discussed, efficiency has been defined as the most reliable way to complete a task or to create a product. In order for teacher candidates to function efficiently, an assessment handbook was provided by SCALE for the fine arts teacher candidates, setting forth a blueprint

for completing the three tasks required by the edTPA. This current handbook was based on handbooks provided for teachers attempting National Board Certification and teachers being evaluated using the framework of the PACT.

Although respondents found the K-12 Performing Arts Handbook helpful as a guide, the language demands were problematic, supporting the findings of Snyder (2014) and Meuwissen & Choppin, (2015). The use of unfamiliar terms such as *syntax* and *discourse* resulted in the irrational consequence that the teacher candidates, the teacher trainers and the cooperating teachers did not understand the language and therefore had difficulty creating lesson plans that included these concepts. Pinter, et al. (2016) reached the same conclusion as some of the respondents in this study, recommending that the specific vocabulary used in the edTPA handbook should be included in pre-requisite coursework. Another option would be to petition Pearson/SCALE to substitute more common educational terms for *discourse* and *syntax*. If the edTPA is concerned with the use of academic language and defines this as the “language of the discipline”, shouldn’t the language of the edTPA be taken from education? It appears that the terms *discourse* and *syntax* come from the field of linguistics. If these terms could come from terminology that is typically used in education courses, then all stakeholders would benefit.

Calculability

In a McDonaldized system, processes and products are often represented by a numerical value. Some respondents in this study questioned whether or not teaching could be quantified, or reduced to a number score. Madeloni (2013) criticized the edTPA by stating that it devalued teaching in general because it strove to reduce the teacher candidates’ residency experiences to a number, a characteristic of the calculability dimension of Ritzer’s McDonaldized society. Can teaching behaviors be equated to a numerical score? The bigger question, perhaps, is **should**

numerical scores be utilized? SMTE stated that a numerical score ignores the complexity of the music educator's teaching environment. Parkes and Powell (2015) and Maranzano (2000) suggested that music educators need a more inclusive evaluation model that measures the types of behaviors included in an ensemble setting, for instance, because it is a very complex and specialized learning context.

Predictability

The research participants, overall, perceived the dimension of predictability, the standardization of products and processes, as the most rational of the four dimensions of McDonaldization. In agreement with Roach and Frank (2007), respondents viewed the edTPA as a move to more consistency within the training programs within the state and parity between states that require the edTPA for licensure creating a more predictable pool of teacher candidates. Denton (2013) saw the edTPA as providing a more standardized credentialing device for teachers. The fact that other states recognized the edTPA as a requirement for licensure was seen as a positive attribute. Two respondents in this study related stories about teacher candidates getting jobs in neighboring states as well as other states.

There has been some push back against the use of standardized assessments for teachers as described by Hartley (1995). Au (2016) complained that his students felt constricted by the 15 rubrics used for scoring purposes in the edTPA, relating to the concerns of some of the respondents in this study who noted that their teacher candidates were afraid to teach "out of the box".

Parallels were drawn between the requirements for the edTPA and the Tennessee Portfolio for Student Growth in the Arts by seven of the research participants. Cooperating teachers often viewed the edTPA as a portfolio assessment similar to what they had to prepare,

citing the video component as the most obvious common feature. Although there is no research currently that deals with the Tennessee Portfolio for Student Growth in the Arts due to its recent adoption, Darling-Hammond (2010) identifies Teacher Performance Assessments as an effective tool for teacher evaluation.

Control

One aspect of McDonaldization is the control that a bureaucracy exerts over the workers or institutions that it oversees. The bureaucracy, without input from the workers, often mandates this control. Reagan, Schram, McCurdy, Chang and Evans (2016) asserted that political policy had an influence on the development of teacher assessment. Harkening back to “A Nation at Risk” in 1983, the federal government has assumed more and more oversight through legislation such as ESEA (1965) and its reauthorizations: NCLB (2001), ARRA (2009), and ESSA (2015). In Tennessee, the state increased their oversight of public education when Race To The Top (RTTT) grants resulted in changes to the state’s teacher evaluation system, bringing about the creation of the TEAM. The federal government passed down mandates to the states, who passed them on to the colleges and universities.

Many of the music education teacher trainers in this study felt that the training they received was either insufficient or targeted mainly at general education teacher trainers. Several respondents in this study felt they were learning about the edTPA alongside their teacher candidates. This prompted three of the respondents to undergo the official scorer training provided by Pearson. Practice scoring was viewed as the most helpful aspect of the formal training as well as local training provided by Pearson. One of the criticisms that Denton (2013) leveled against the edTPA process was that teacher trainers were not allowed to review the training material provided by Pearson to their official external scorers. The biggest gap in

training as identified by the respondents was the lack of training for cooperating teachers. Greene (2015) and Meuwissen & Choppin (2015) reported that the cooperating teachers in their studies had little knowledge of the edTPA. Co-teaching workshops, one aspect of training that relates to the edTPA, are provided by some universities for cooperating teachers.

The Marzano Causal Teacher Evaluation Model and the Danielson Model provide useful, formative feedback for teachers. One of the criticisms of the edTPA scoring process is that the feedback from the external scorers is very limited, almost non-existent, and not very helpful. The reality appears to be that the edTPA is a summative assessment, not a formative assessment. Based on the definitions provided in chapter two, summative assessments are completed during specific points in the school year and provide a snapshot of the teacher's effectiveness and skills. It is, therefore, left up to the residency supervisors and cooperating teachers to provide formative feedback for the teacher candidates that will assist them in improving their teaching abilities.

Another issue identified by the respondents was the control that the College of Education has over coursework and clinical practice. Prior research identified issues with the edTPA and the clinical practice portion of the teacher candidates' training (Au, 2016; Baumgartner & Council, 2015; Chiu, 2014). The respondents in this study identified changes in their seminar classes as well as the actual teacher candidates' clinical practice, identified as "Residency 1" and "Residency 2". Residency 1 most often occurred in the fall semester and consisted of an average of two days that the teacher candidates were placed in a classroom with a cooperating teacher. During Residency 2, usually in the spring semester, teacher candidates spent every day in a classroom with their cooperating teacher.

Nine of the research participants complained that preparing for the edTPA was "taking over" their seminar classes. Baumgartner & Council (2015) reached the same conclusions,

echoing the research participants' observation that it changed the content of the seminar class. From the teacher candidates' viewpoint, Chiu (2014) stated that the negative aspects of the edTPA were greater than the positive aspects and that she did not enjoy the process. Cooperating teachers, according to Au (2016), voiced similar concerns, viewing the edTPA as adding an unnecessary burden to the clinical experience. This is supported by the research of Cliquet and Streed (2007) who compared the McDonald's restaurant paradigm to the management system used by another restaurant chain, Great Harvest. It was found that the control exerted by the rigid system used by McDonalds resulted in a great deal of oversight from the management. The autonomy of Great Harvest's management system allowed its franchises to maintain strong core values while providing stakeholders with a sense of pride and respect for accomplishing the tasks in their own way.

Are We Lovin' It?: Implications of McDonaldization on Music Education

If we accept the fact that music education teacher training is becoming McDonaldized, then there are three options available for the future. We can continue this trend and make the field of music education even more efficient, calculable, predictable and hand over even more control to Pearson and SCALE. The music teacher trainers in Tennessee could develop training materials such as PowerPoint presentations specifically targeted at music teacher candidates that could be used throughout the state. Lesson plan templates that reflect successful completion of the edTPA submission process could be provided for each subsection of music education – elementary, choral and instrumental. The language demands could be systematically introduced in methods classes. The mock edTPA could be limited to specific language functions such as create, reproduced from models from previous students who received high scores. It might even be possible to create high-scoring portfolio entries that do not contain any active music making.

Students could talk about music or write music but never perform music. A completely McDonaldized process could result in passing scores for the teacher candidates and an uncomplicated process for the teacher trainers and the cooperating teachers.

Another option is to lobby the state of Tennessee for removal of the edTPA as a requirement for licensure and return to the localized system that was in place before the edTPA. In this scenario, each college/university would determine what constitutes good teaching, developing a system to determine the fitness of a candidate to teach based mostly on observation. The residency supervisor and the cooperating teacher would assess the teacher candidate and decide whether or not the teacher candidate should graduate and receive a teacher license.

The third possibility is a hybridization of these two alternatives, taking the positive aspects of each and developing a system that is beneficial for all stakeholders. Each university could decide what aspects of each option suited their particular situation. In this way, each music education department could keep its identity and still produce teacher candidates who meet the qualifying score for the edTPA. The following discussion offers some suggestions that provide options for this hybridization.

Implications for Music Teacher Trainers

Results from this study could be useful in guiding music teacher trainers in preparing their music education students for success on the edTPA. As one respondent in this study advocated, teacher trainers might consider working backwards to prepare for this capstone assessment. For instance, music education professors might review the various components of the edTPA that could be introduced gradually to students throughout the four-year music course sequences.

How do music education teacher trainers go about embedding features of the edTPA in the music methods classes? One respondent's advice moves the process away from McDonaldization toward a more personalized and communicative approach. Overall, it seems music teacher trainers could place more emphasis on the edTPA's language demands as well as including parts of the tasks in methods classes. It would be the job of the music education faculty to supply the non-music education faculty with the vocabulary and other knowledge that relates specifically to the edTPA assessment because they do not possess the background in music education. It could be very helpful for the music education teacher candidates if music professors and music education teacher trainers could increase their involvement in the language that is used throughout the edTPA, especially in Task 1. This would allow teachers of university classes to give concrete examples of the language requirements. Pinter, et al. (2016) reached the same conclusion, stating that all music content faculty should utilize the vocabulary from the edTPA handbooks so that teacher candidates would be familiar with the terminology before their residency experiences.

A move toward more McDonaldization is agreeing on music-specific applications of the various terms used for the language demands in the K-12 Performing Arts Handbook. Appendix F provides an alternative glossary for music education teacher candidates. The definitions are taken from the research participants' interviews and personal experience. Examples of the application of these terms to music-specific lessons such as ensemble rehearsals are provided. For example, the most perplexing terms for music education teacher candidates appeared to be *discourse* and *syntax*. Two of the respondents offered clarification for the term *discourse*. For one it was the way that musicians talk about their work. The other facet of discourse could involve "philosophical debates' about various music genres, for instance, leading a discussion

about popular music or a discussion about the historical/cultural aspect of music. Discussions could also center on self or peer evaluation lessons in a learning segment. One respondent in this study called syntax a “fancy word” that merely describes the written language of music. The example in the glossary concerns defining the function of a quarter note in 2/4 time and 2/2 time. The student’s response to this query represents the music teacher candidates’ application of syntax in a learning segment.

To prepare teacher candidates for the video recording portion of the edTPA, it would be helpful to include it in the methods classes leading up to the clinical practice. Students enrolled in methods class could video record their practice lessons in real class situations and reflect on their teaching by reviewing the footage and analyzing the effectiveness of the instruction. For an even more McDonaldized version, the teacher trainer could provide a template that asks specific questions about the video, relating specifically to the types of activities required in Task 2 of the edTPA such as respect, rapport and students engagement.

Implications for the College of Education

Who has the most control over the teacher training process? The music education department relies on the College of Education to grant licensure for all teacher candidates in Tennessee. Therefore, it behooves the music department to establish a good working relationship with the College of Education.

The College of Education provided the lesson plan template utilized by the music education departments in this study, ostensibly to make it easier on the teacher candidates. According to one respondent, the resulting lesson plans were seven pages long. Some respondents found the lesson plan template cumbersome for music education teacher candidates. It appeared that most teacher trainers assumed that this was the template required by Pearson for

the edTPA submission. Pearson and SCALE do not require any specific lesson plan format.

According to *Making Good Choices* (edTPA, n.d.):

Lesson Plans should contain the following:

- Relevant state-adopted, national, or other local standards used within your teaching context
- Learning objectives associated with the standards
- Formal and informal assessments
- Instructional and learning tasks
- Instructional resources and materials

The information provided by Pearson/SCALE could allow the music education departments to create their own lesson plan format that would be utilized in music education methods classes and residency placements. Each music education department could decide if they wanted to add a place to cite research/theory or use terms such as *Central Focus* and *Assessment Evidence*.

Choosing one focus of the lesson appeared to be problematic for ensemble classroom settings where the teacher candidate is rehearsing multiple pieces of music. This might be a way to allow some flexibility in planning for a band, orchestra or choir rehearsal, A decision would have to be made about whether or not the lesson plan template corresponds more with the edTPA or with the TEAM. To that end, Appendix G contains a simplified lesson plan format that could be used or adapted for use in music education classrooms.

Many education degree programs require coursework on assessment. Respondents in this study revealed their College of Education typically required their music education students to take an assessment course offered by their college even though one music education department was successful in moving the assessment class to the music department. Because general

education teachers are more likely to use paper and pencil tests than music teachers, it would be helpful for the teacher candidates if they had specific instruction in authentic, embedded music assessments. This could be accomplished by having the assessment class co-taught by someone from the College of Education and the music education department, or move the entire assessment class to the music department.

Implications for Clinical Placements and Seminar

Teacher candidates are placed in classrooms with experienced music educators during the clinical placement phase. Residency supervisors, either from the music department or the College of Education, mentor the teacher candidates or observe their teaching. The formal observation form usually comes from the College of Education and focuses on the TEAM rubrics. Music education teacher candidates struggle to “check all of the boxes” on the observation form because it appears to be geared toward a general education classroom and is not based on the edTPA rubrics. In order to make the observation tool more applicable to the music education teacher candidates, we could take the things that are in common between the TEAM rubrics and the edTPA rubrics and develop an observation tool that focuses on the common elements of these two assessment models. This would be in keeping with the recommendations of Maranzano (2000) and Parkes and Powell (2015), who noted that the music classroom is different than a general education classroom, calling for a modified observation tool.

Even though offering a mock edTPA during Residency 1 was viewed by some as teaching to the test, the overall response to this project was positive. It allowed the teacher candidates to become familiar with the terminology in the K-12 Performing Arts Handbook as well as practice the video recording component. There appears to be a fine line between teaching

to the test and providing classwork that prepares the teacher candidates for the edTPA.

Residency seminar instructors might consider the benefit of implementing a mock edTPA with their residents in order to better prepare their students for the edTPA.

Adjustments to the Handbook

The research participants offered advice for using and improving the K-12 Performing Arts Handbook. One suggestion was the development of a handbook specifically targeted at music education teacher candidates. There is a precedent for this request. PACT provides a “Music teaching event candidate handbook” that specifically targets music educators. Friedrichs and McGraw (2009) developed this single subject handbook designed specifically for secondary music teachers. Both arts educators, Friedrichs was a former director of the School of Music and Dance and Associate Professor of Music Education at the University of San Diego and McGraw was a former chair of the department of music education at the University of Southern California. PACT provides access to the Music Teaching Event Candidate Handbook on their website (PACT, 2016). They do, however, restrict its usage, requiring anyone who wants to use PACT products to request permission from the PACT Director at SCALE. Perhaps music education teacher trainers in Tennessee could seek approval for use of the PACT handbook as a resource. There is, for example, a clear explanation of the expectations for video recording an ensemble that corresponds with the rubrics in Task 2 of the edTPA. The teacher trainers could share these salient excerpts with the teacher candidates. Perhaps a digital format could be provided for the teacher candidates that would take the guesswork out of the video process. This would move the process toward more McDonaldization, but could result in more efficiency and less stress.

Another suggestion was the development of a “companion guide” that is much shorter than the current handbook. It would contain only practical information such as directions for writing the Central Focus and information about the language component. The rubrics would be presented in such a way that the teacher candidates could clearly understand how the scoring process works. Creating this companion guide could be a topic of discussion at the higher education caucus at the Tennessee Music Education Association in-service conference. If music education teacher trainers wanted more control, they could develop their own edited version of the K-12 Performing Arts Handbook.

If Pearson does not agree to create a completely new handbook specifically targeted toward music education, then an annotated version of the current handbook offering practical definitions for some of the unfamiliar terms as well as ways to complete portions of the edTPA based on music education teacher trainers’ experience could be developed. It would also indicate which portions of the handbook need the most attention and which ones are not as important. An annotated handbook could be created for all Tennessee music education teacher trainers, either by one individual or a committee.

One respondent suggested that 15 rubrics was too many. The number of rubrics for the edTPA have already been reduced from the initial PACT assessment. Originally, the PACT contained five tasks instead of the current three. SCALE stated that the edTPA document is a work in progress and some changes have been made since it was first introduced.

One of the topics respondents discussed revolved around the edTPA rubrics and the TEAM rubrics. In Tennessee, most school districts use the TEAM rubrics to evaluate in-service teachers during classroom observations. There are three domains for edTPA rubrics (Planning, Instruction and Assessment) and four domains for TEAM rubrics (Instruction, Planning,

Environment and Professionalism). Comparing the TEAM rubrics with the edTPA rubrics, Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands is not addressed at all in TEAM. Rubric 3 relates more easily to “Teacher Knowledge of Students” in the Instruction section of TEAM. “Rubric 6: “Engaging Students in Learning” relates to Student Work in the Planning domain of TEAM. Perhaps these two rubrics could be combined or shifted in order to better align with TEAM. Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness and Rubric 11: Analysis of Students Learning relate closely to the “Use of Data” rubrics found in TEAM’s Professionalism Rubric. Perhaps the edTPA could combine these two rubrics so the teacher candidates do not feel they are repeating the same answers in their commentaries. The edTPA Rubrics 12 and 13 deal with feedback. These two rubrics could be combined into one rubric under “Academic Feedback” that would better match TEAM and, again, reduce the amount of writing for the Teacher Candidates.

Rubric 14: Analyzing Student’s Language Use and Performing Arts Learning, asks the teacher candidate to explain and provide examples of the use of the language function for the learning segment (most often perform, create, respond, or connect), music vocabulary/symbols, and either syntax or discourse. Two separate TEAM rubrics actually cover the demands of this rubric: Questioning and Teacher Content Knowledge. The latter TEAM rubric encourages the teacher candidate to use subject-specific strategies to teach the lesson. These could include the students’ use of music vocabulary or symbols. Teacher candidates could use higher order questions to meet the requirement of including discourse in the learning segment by asking students higher level questions about peer and self-evaluation as well as asking students to make connections between what they are learning and historical/cultural significance or relationships to their own lives. These problematic terms could be presented using either social language

terms, education terms or music terminology. Recognizing the application of these terms as they relate to the TEAM rubric could de-mystify them for teacher candidates (and teacher trainers).

The following table uses the edTPA rubrics in the order they are presented in the K-12 Performing Arts Handbook and compares their content with the rubrics found in the TEAM model. Sometimes, the domain names are the same and sometimes a similar concept is found in two different domains. Music education teacher trainers and residency supervisors could use this comparison chart to determine the rubrics that are shared between these two evaluation systems. An observation instrument could be created for the music education teacher candidate that reflects this overlap and assists the teacher candidate in focusing on aspects of good teaching as identified by both of these TPAs.

Table 1

Comparison of Rubrics for the edTPA and TEAM

edTPA		TEAM	
Rubric		Rubric	
Task 1: Planning			
1	Planning for Developing Student Knowledge and Skills in the Performing Arts	Planning	Instructional Plans
2	Planning to Support Varied Students learning Needs	Planning	Instructional Plans
3	Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	Instruction	Teacher Knowledge of Students
4	Identifying and Supporting Language Demands		

Table 1 (Continued)

Comparison of Rubrics for the edTPA and TEAM

edTPA		TEAM	
Rubric		Rubric	
5	Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	Planning	Assessment
Task 2: Instruction			
6	Learning Environment	Instruction Environment Environment	Motivating Students Environment Respectful Culture
7	Engaging Students in Learning	Instruction Planning	Activities and Materials Student Work
8	Deepening Student Learning	Instruction Instruction	Questioning Academic Feedback
9	Subject-Specific Pedagogy	Instruction Instruction	Presenting Instructional Content Teacher Content Knowledge
10	Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	Professionalism	Use of Data
Task 3: Assessment			
11	Analysis of Students Learning	Professionalism	Use of Data
12	Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	Instruction	Academic Feedback
13	Student Understanding and Use of Feedback	Instruction	Academic Feedback
14	Analyzing Students' Language Use and Performing Arts Learning	Instruction Instruction	Questioning Teacher Content Knowledge
15	Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	Planning	Assessment

Implications for the Field of Music Education

Whether or not the field of music education moves toward more McDonaldization, moves away from this trend, or finds some hybrid form that reduces the stress level of the teacher candidates and gives the music education teacher trainers more control over the process, the edTPA is changing the field of music education. Some possible good news is that the respondents in this study who have been in education a long time predict that another assessment instrument will supplant the edTPA in the not-to-distant future. In the meantime, music education teacher trainers need to make difficult decisions about coursework, residencies and clinical placement assignments and evaluation tools. The edTPA could have a negative effect on the number of students desiring to enter the field of music education.

Attrition in music education programs

Three of the respondents postulated that the edTPA could result in fewer incoming students in higher education choosing to major in music education. Freshmen hear horror stories from the seniors about the stress related to the edTPA submission. Respondents reported that the teacher candidates wanted to teach music because it meant something special to them and they did not want to be constantly assessed, especially with instruments that don't allow them to teach creatively.

Some respondents even postulated that emphasis on evaluation could have an impact on long-term teacher retention. Teacher candidates going through the edTPA hear their cooperating teachers talk about the Portfolio for Student Growth in the Arts and decide that they don't want to submit a portfolio assessment each year of their teaching career. If the edTPA is based on National Board Certification and that assessment is geared toward experienced teachers, then asking inexperienced teacher candidates to meet similar expectations may be too much to ask.

Implications for Pearson/SCALE

Many of the respondents seem to believe that Pearson has too much control over the edTPA process. Even though both the NBPTS and the Portfolio for Student Growth in the Arts used external scorers, this handing over the control of assigning a numerical value to the teacher candidates' performance is seen as moving toward more McDonaldization. It is interesting to observe that three of the respondents in this study went through the official scorer training provided by Pearson but only one went on to actually score edTPA portfolios. Perhaps Pearson could make available on their website a list of all trained scorers by subject, including their degrees, years of experience in both K-12 and higher education, and certifications held such as NBCT. This might alleviate some of the anxiety created by not knowing who is grading the edTPA submissions.

It is evident from these research participants that some kind of scoring training is very helpful for music education teacher trainers. Scorer training should be offered for teacher trainers, residency supervisors and cooperating teachers. Pearson could provide this training, either in the form of local scorer training or official scorer training. Members of the music education department who are official edTPA scorers could provide the most beneficial training for any or all of these groups.

According to many of the teacher trainer interviews for this study, the partnership between the cooperating teacher and the teacher candidate is one of the most important aspects of the residency experience. The biggest barrier to training the cooperating teachers as identified by the research subjects was time. It is difficult to get the cooperating teachers to come to campus in order to receive training. Most cooperating teachers have enough responsibilities connected with their teaching jobs that they do not have time to attend training outside of the

school day. Many of the in-service music teachers have after school rehearsals, concerts, musical theater productions and other ensemble commitments that fill up their schedules. It is important to foster a sense of partnership between the cooperating teacher and the teacher candidate that emphasizes the sharing of new approaches, allowing both participants to learn from each other. Several respondents suggested encouraging cooperating teachers to receive training and reward them with a stipend or professional development hours.

Some of the cooperating teachers referred to in this study saw parallels between the edTPA and the Tennessee Portfolio for Student Growth in the Arts. Since both are portfolio assessments and the cooperating teachers in several districts across Tennessee are required to complete a portfolio, perhaps local colleges and universities could offer training for teacher candidates and teachers in the district concerning portfolio assessment in general. Tips could be shared for video recording lessons, assessment strategies specifically tailored for music classes and ensembles and ways to collect and report data from these assessments. In this way, the cooperating teachers would understand more about the edTPA process and would feel more comfortable guiding the teacher candidates through the process.

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) provides a brochure on their website titled “Collaborating to Promote Effective Instruction” (AACTE, 2016). A graphic is provided that shows an overview of the three tasks with a brief description of the process. Under the heading “What You Can Expect”, cooperating teachers are given a summary of their responsibilities and information about the completing the required video recordings. Another graphic is supplied that lists “Acceptable Supports’ and Unacceptable Supports”. The final page provides information about becoming an edTPA scorer. This brochure could be useful as an introduction to the edTPA for any cooperating teacher.

Limitations of Study

This study is limited by several factors. As noted in Chapter 3, the sample size for this study consisted of 12 respondents. An attempt was made to recruit all of the music education teacher trainers at the six universities mandated by the TBR to utilize the edTPA in the fall of 2009. An initial recruitment e-mail was sent out to 26 possible respondents with only 10 agreeing to participate. Two more respondents were obtained through snowball sampling. One of the original TBR schools was not represented in the sample. Seven of the respondents were female and 5 were male. Although the sample was representative of males and females, all participants were White. It is possible teacher trainers of other races may have different opinions of and experiences with the edTPA.

Future Research

With the edTPA becoming consequential for many teacher education programs as well as teacher licensure in 18 states, more research needs to be done. Possibilities for future research concerning the edTPA could fall into several categories. The first would be a continuation of this research, using McDonaldization to frame the experiences of music education teacher candidates, residency supervisors, cooperating teachers, non-music education university/college music faculty, and/or music education teacher trainers in other states. Using the same qualitative design, semi-structured interviews could be conducted examining the lived experiences of each of these categories of stakeholders. The viewpoints of these groups could provide valuable discussion among all stakeholders. Each group could share its insights and suggestions for implementation and improvement as we move forward with the edTPA as a consequential portfolio assessment for teacher licensure.

Another category of research could address the lived experiences of the teacher candidates. It would be interesting to find out if they felt better prepared to teach than teacher candidates who do not complete the edTPA process. One respondent suggested a longitudinal study that tracks the teacher candidates for several years who completed the edTPA, inquiring about the impact that the specific tasks had on their actual in-service teaching. Future research could mirror the research done on Teacher Work Samples and National Board Certification, focusing on the impact that an edTPA certified teacher has on the students they teach as an in-service teacher.

Another possible topic for research would concern the edTPA assessment itself. Is it feasible to create a handbook designed specifically for music education teacher candidates? Research could be designed to determine what music education teacher trainers would like to see in such a document. Could this research be expanded to include the development of a state-wide evaluation system targeted at music educators that would supplant the TEAM?

Summary

Since the edTPA will be required for Tennessee teacher licensure in January, 2019, the music education teacher trainers accept the fact that it will be a part of their music education programs for, at least, the foreseeable future. The respondents found rational aspects of the edTPA that represented efficiency, calculability, predictability and control. They also found irrational consequences of the edTPA that were inefficient, non-calculable, unpredictable and evidenced a loss of control. The research participants did, however, offer advice as to how to make the best of the current situation. In their discourse about the K-12 Fine Arts Assessment Handbook, music education teacher trainers suggested the Handbook could be more efficient if a document was provided specifically for music teacher candidates or if an annotated version of

the handbook or a companion guide to the current handbook was created. Under the dimension of calculability, scoring training was recommended for teacher trainers, residency supervisors and cooperating teachers provided by a Pearson-trained scorer with a music education background. The predictability of the edTPA was seen as a positive factor in the job market. It will also prepare the teacher candidates for evaluation once they are hired as teachers. Another positive outcome could be an increase in National Board Certified music teachers. The control issues seemed to create the most tension. Music education departments should strive to maintain a mutually respectful relationship between themselves and the College of Education in their universities. A true partnership would be beneficial to both the teacher candidates and the teacher trainers by strengthening coursework and the clinical practice part of the process.

It is hoped that the results of this study will be transferable to music teacher education programs in the state of Tennessee. The respondents in this study offered various perspectives on the implementation of the edTPA. The results of this study found that there are mixed emotions related to the edTPA. The field of music teacher education must continue to grapple with the potential effects, both positive and negative, associated with the edTPA. It is my hope that we not lose sight of our most important priority which is to prepare highly effective music educators and not just highly effective test-takers.

References

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (n.d.). *Teachers who support teacher candidates*. Retrieved from https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/res_get.php?fid=1619&ref=edtpa.
- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American psychological association* (Sixth ed.). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Au, W. (2013). What's a nice test like you doing in a place like this? *Rethinking Schools*. Retrieved from http://www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/27_04/27_04_au.shtml.
- Barrett, J. R. (2011). Intersections of practice, research, and policy in music teacher education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 20, 105. doi:10.1177/1057083710395500
- Baumgartner, C. M. & Council, K. H. (2017). Music Student Teaching Seminars: An examination of current practices across the United States. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 35, 62-69. doi: 10.1177/8755123315615183
- Behney, J. (2016). Perceived influence of cooperating teachers on edTPA performance. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49, 271-286. doi: 10.1111/flan.12199
- Benton, J. E., Powell, D., DeLine, M. A., Sautter, A., Talbut, M., Bratberg, W. & Cwick, S. (2012). The teacher work sample: A professional culminating activity that integrates general studies objectives. *The Journal of General Education*, 61(4), 369-387. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/jgeneeduc.61.4.0369> doi: 141.225.112.53
- Breiset, L. (n.d.). Academic language and ELLs: What teachers need to know ¡*Colorín colorado!* Retrieved from <http://www.colorincolorado.org/article/academic-language-and-ells-what-teachers-need-know>

- Brown, D. K. (2001). The social sources of educational credentialism: Status cultures, labor markets, and organizations. *Sociology of Education*, 74, 19-34. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2673251>
- Bryman, Al. & Beardsworth (2006). Is qualitative research becoming McDonaldized? *Methodological Innovations Online*. 1(10), 3-13). doi: 10.4256/mio.2006.0002
- Burns, B., Henry, J. & Lindauer, J. (2015) Working together to foster candidate success on the edTPA. *Journal of Inquiry & Action in Education*, 6(2), 18-37. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.buffalostate.edu/jiae/vol6/iss2/2/>
- Cangro, R. M. (2014). Measuring music education: music education assessment in Illinois. *Music Educators Journal*, 100(3), 20-21.
- Cantrell, S., Fullerton, J., Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2008). *National board certification and teacher effectiveness: Evidence from a random assignment experiment* (NBER working paper 14608). National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w14608.pdf>
- Cavaluzzo, L. (November 2004). *Is national board certification an effective signal of teacher quality?* (Report No. 11204) Alexandria, VA: The CNA Corporation. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED485515.pdf>
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=v_GGAwAAQBAJ&pg=GBS.PR2
- Chiu, S, (2014). edTPA: An assessment that reduces the quality of teacher education. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL and Applied Linguistics*, 14(1), 28-30.

- Cochran-Smith, M., Piazza, P. & Power, C. (2012). The politics of accountability: Assessing teacher education in the United States. *The Educational Forum*, 77:1, 6-27, doi: 10.1080/00131725.2013.739015
- Compensation Technical Working Group. (2011-2012). *National Board Certification Research Brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/Compensation/pubdocs/NBCTRResearchbrief.pdf>
- Cowan, J. & Goldhaber, D. (2015). *National board certification and teacher effectiveness: Evidence from Washington* (CEDR Working Paper 2015-3). Retrieved from Center for Education Data & Research website: <http://www.CEDR.us/publications.html>
- Cliquet, G., & Streed, O. (2007). Concept uniformity in limited-service restaurant chains: Case studies. *Paper presented at the Third International Conference on Economics and Management of Network, Rotterdam*.
- Danielson, C. (2008). *The handbook for enhancing professional practice: Using the framework for teaching in your school*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Danielson, C. (2001). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Danielson, C., & McGreal, T. L. (2000). *Teacher evaluation to enhance professional practice*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Evaluating teacher effectiveness: How teacher performance assessments can measure and improve teaching. Retrieved from www.americanprogress.org ED535859

- Darling-Hammond, L., Newton, S., and Wei, R.C. (2010). Evaluating teacher education outcomes: A study of the Stanford teacher education programme [sic]. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36, 369-388. doi: 10.1080/02607476/2010.513844
- Davison, D. & Fisher, R. A. (in press). Music Teacher Evaluation and the Determination of Student Growth in Music in American Schools. In T. Brophy (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Assessment Policy and Practice in Music Education* (Part 5, Chapter 38). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- DeMink-Carthew, J., Hyles, M. E. & Valli, L. (2016). Redesigning teacher evaluation in the context of multiple reform initiatives. In D. Polly (Ed.), *Evaluating teacher education programs through performance-based assessment*. (pp. 1-17). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Denner, P. R., Salzman, S. A., & Harris, L. B. (2002, February). *Teacher work sample assessment: An accountability method that moves beyond teacher testing to the impact of teacher performance on student learning*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New York, NY.
- Denner, P. R., Norman, A. D., Salzman, S. A., Pankratz, R. S. & Evans, C. S. (2003, February). *Connecting teaching performance to student achievement: A generalizability and validity study of the Renaissance teacher work sample assessment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Jacksonville, FL.
- Denton, D. (2013). Responding to edTPA: Transforming practice or applying shortcuts? *AILACTE Journal. The Journal of the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges of Teacher Education*, 10, 19-36.

- Drane, J. (2010). From creeds to burgers: Religious control, spiritual search, and the future of the world. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *McDonaldization: The reader* (pp. 222-232). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Dworkin, G. A. (2005) The No Child Left Behind act: Accountability, high-stakes testing, and roles for sociologists. *Sociology of Education*, 78, 165–182.
- edTPA (n.d.). *State policy map*. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy>
- edTPA (n.d.). *Making good choices*. Retrieved from <http://www.edtpa.com/Content/Docs/edTPAMGC.pdf>
- efficient. (n.d.). In Merriam-Webster's online dictionary (11th ed.). Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/efficient>
- Elpus, K. (2015). Music teacher licensure candidates in the United States: A demographic profile and analysis of licensure examination scores. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 63, 314-335. doi: 10.1177/0022429415602470
- Gamble, J. (2010). Multinational retailers in China. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *McDonaldization: The reader* (pp. 172-190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Gardner, D. P. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education.
- Gillis, B. P., Song, G. & Lim, W. (2014, October). Preparing teacher candidates to address academic language for the edTPA: A collaborative teacher educator's self study. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Georgia Educational Research Association Conference 19, Augusta, GA. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/gera/2014/2104/19>

- Goldhaber, D., & Anthony, E. (2004). *Can teacher quality be effectively assessed?* Seattle, WA: Center on Reinventing Public Education, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington. Retrieved from http://www.crpe.org/workingpapers/pdf/NBPTSquality_report.pdf
- Goldhaber, D., Perry, D. & Anthony, E., (2004). The national board for professional teaching standards (NBPTS) process: Who applies and what factors are associated with NBPTS certification? *Educational evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26, pp. 259-280 Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699508>
- Greene, J. L. R. (2015). *Looking big at cooperating teachers in music education: examining narrative authority within a knowledge community* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3708120)
- Hall, A. (2012). National board certification: The impact on teaching practices of three elementary teachers (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Electronic Theses and Dissertations (Paper No. 1467)
- Harris, D. N., Ingle, W. K., & Rutledge, S. A. (2014). How teacher evaluation methods matter for accountability: A comparative analysis of teacher effectiveness ratings by principals and teacher value-added measures. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51, 73-112. doi: 10.3102/0002831213517130
- Hartley, D. (1990). Tests, tasks and Taylorism: A Model T approach to the management of education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 5, 67-76.
- Hartley, D. (1995). The 'McDonaldization' of higher education: Food for thought? *Oxford Review of Education*, 21, 409-423. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1050719>.

- Hausbeck, K. & Brents, B. G. (2002). McDonaldization of the sex industries? In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *McDonaldization: The reader* (pp. 102-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Hayes, D. & Wynyard, R. (2002). *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*. Wesport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Henning, J. E. and Robinson, V. (2004). The teacher work sample: Implementing standards-based performance assessment. *The Teacher Educator*, 39, 231–248.
- Henning, J. E., DeBruin-Parecki, A., Hawbaker, B. W., Nielson, C. P., Joram, E. & Gabriele, A. J. (2005). The teacher work sample: A tool for scaffolding and assessing preservice teachers; early field experiences. *The Teacher Educator*, 40(3), 188-207. doi: 10.1080/08878730509555360
- Holley, P. D. & Wright, Jr., D. E. (2010). A sociology of rib joints. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *McDonaldization: The reader* (pp. 47-53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Howes, Graham & Friedman (2009). Between McDonaldization and Gardening Pedagogy: How Teachers Negotiate Science Education in Action. *Green Theory & Praxis: The Journal of Ecopedagogy*, 5(1), 126-152. doi: 10.3903/gtp.2009.1.10
- James, J. D. (2010). McDonaldisation [sic], Masala McGospel and Om Economics: Televangelism in contemporary India. New Delhi: Sage Publication Pvt. Ltd.
- Jordan, A. W., & Hawley, T. (2016). By the elite, for the vulnerable: The edTPA, academic oppression, and the battle to define good teaching. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from <http://www.tcrecord.org> ID Number: 19461
- Karen, D. (2005). No child left behind? Sociology ignored! *Sociology of Education*, 78(4), 165-169.

- Kassner, L. D. (2012). *The distribution of national board certified teachers in Virginia* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ETDs: Virginia Tech electronic theses and dissertations. (etd-04062012-143338)
- Keese, N. & Brown, T. (2003, August). *Student teacher input and teacher work sample as part of a teacher education unit accountability system*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Santa Fe, NM.
- Kemmesies, U. E. (2002). What do hamburgers and drug care have in common: Some unorthodox remarks on the McDonaldization and rationality of drug care. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 32, 689-708. Retrieved from jod.sagepub.com on September 16, 2016.
- Kilpatrick, L. W. (2016). *The experiences of university faculty expected to implement edTPA within a teacher preparation program* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2391&context=doctoral>
- Knight, A. J. (2010). Supersizing farms: The McDonaldization of agriculture. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *McDonaldization: The reader* (pp. 192-204). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Koppich, J.E., Humphrey, D.C. & Hough, H.J. (2006) Making use of what teachers know and can do: Policy, practice, and national board certification. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 15(7). Retrieved from <http://www.redalyc.org/html/2750/275020546007/>
- Learning Sciences: Marzano Center (2012). *Marzano causal teacher evaluation model*. Prepared for the Oklahoma State Department of education. Blairsville, PA: Learning Sciences International.
- Lenski, S. J. & Thieman, G. Y. (2013). What work samples reveal about secondary pre-service social studies teachers' use of literacy strategies. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 40(1), 63-79. Retrieved from

http://link.galegroup.com.ezproxy.memphis.edu/apps/doc/A411196939/AONE?u=tel_s_tsla&sid=AONE&xid=96b97fe6

- Lin, S. (2015). *Learning through Action: Teacher Candidates and Performance Assessments* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from digital.lib.washington.edu. (0250E_14424.pdf)
- Loeb, H., Elfers, A., Plecki, M. Ford, B. & Knapp, M. (October 2006) *National Board Certified Teachers in Washington State: Impact on Professional Practice and Leadership Opportunities*. Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession. Tacoma. , WA.
- Lustick, D. & Sykes, G. (2006) National Board Certification as professional development: What are teachers learning? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 14(5) 1-43. Retrieved from <http://www.redalyc.org/html/2750/275020543005/>
- Madeloni, B., & Gorlewski, J. (2013). Wrong answer to the wrong question. *Rethinking Schools*, 27(4), 16-21.
- Maranzano, C. (2000). Music teacher performance evaluation: A call for more inclusive models. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 14, 267—274.
- Marzano, R. J. & Toth, M. (2013). *Teacher evaluation that makes a difference: A new model for teacher growth and student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD
- Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Marvasti, A. B. (2004). *Qualitative research in sociology: An introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McDonaldization (n.d.). *What is McDonaldization?* Retrieved from <http://mcdonaldization.com/whatisit.shtml>

- McGreal, T. L. (1983). *Successful Teacher Evaluation*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McLendon, M. K., Hearn, J. C., & Deaton, R. (2006). Called to account: Analyzing the origins and spread of state performance-accountability policies for higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 28*, 1-24.
- Meuwissen, K. W. and Choppin, J. M. (2015). Preservice teachers' adaptations to tensions associated with the edTPA during its early implementation in New York and Washington states. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23*(103), doi.10.14507/epaa.v23.2078
- Monaghan, L. F. (2007). McDonaldizing men's bodies? Slimming, associated (ir)rationalities and resistances. *Body & Society, 13*(2), 67-93. doi: 10.1177/1357034X07077776
- Morris, C. & Reed, M. (2010). From Burgers to biodiversity? The McDonaldization of on-farm nature conservation in the UK. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *McDonaldization: The reader* (pp. 207-220). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Mwachofi, Ngure wa (2002). Does rationality gum up the educational system? In D. Hayes & R. Wynyard (Eds.), *The McDonaldization of higher education* (pp.190 -199). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2014). *Component 1: Content knowledge sample items and scoring rubrics*. Retrieved from http://boardcertifiedteachers.org/sites/default/files/EMC_Music_Component1.pdf
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2014). *Component 2: Differentiation in instruction portfolio instructions and scoring rubric*. Retrieved from http://boardcertifiedteachers.org/sites/default/files/EAYA_Music_Component2.pdf

- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2016). *Component 3: Teaching practice and learning environment portfolio instructions and scoring rubric*. Retrieved from http://boardcertifiedteachers.org/sites/default/files/EMC_Music_Component3.pdf
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2016). *Component 4: Effective and Reflective Practitioner portfolio instructions and scoring rubric (pilot test)*. Retrieved from http://boardcertifiedteachers.org/sites/default/files/EMC_Music_Component4.pdf
- National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (n.d.). National core arts standards. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalartsstandards.org/content/creating-music>
- Performance Assessment for California Teachers (n.d.). *Supporting Documents for candidates: Music*. Retrieved from http://pactpa.org/_main/hub.php?pageName=Teaching_Event_Handbooks.
- Parker, M. & Jary, D. (1995). The McUniversity: Organization, management and academic subjectivity. *Organization*, 2(2), 319-338. doi: 10.1177/135050849522013
- Parkes, K. A., & Powell, S. R. (2015). Is the edTPA the Right Choice for Evaluating Teacher Readiness?. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 116(2), 103-113. doi: 10.1080/10632913.2014.944964.
- Pecheone, R. L., & Chung, R. R. (2006). Evidence in teacher education: the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(1), 22-36. doi: 10.1177/0022487105284045
- Peck, C. A., Gallucci, D., and Sloan, T. (2010). Negotiating implementation of high-stakes performance assessment policies in teacher education: from compliance to inquiry. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61, 451-463. doi: 10.1177/0022487109354520

- Peck, Singer-Gabella, Sloan & Lin (2014). Driving blind: Why we need standardized performance assessment in teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 8(1), 8-30. doi:10.3776/joci.2014.v8n1p8-30
- Pennucci, A. (2011, September). *Teacher Compensation: Preliminary Summary of Research on Teacher Degrees and Experience*. PowerPoint presented at the meeting of the Washington State Institute of Public Policy. Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/compensation/pubdocs/WSIPPresearch.pdf>
- Performance Assessment for California Teachers (2014-2015). Music teaching event candidate handbook. Retrieved from http://www.pacttpa.org/_main/hub.php?pageName=Home.
- Peterson, K. D., Wahlquist, C., Bone, K., Thompson, J., & Chatterton, K. (2001). Using more data sources to evaluate teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 58(5), 40-43.
- Pinter, H. H., Winter, K. K. and Watson, M. K. (2016). How to thrive in the changing landscape of teacher education: Planning for implementation of performance-based assessments. In D. Polly (Ed.), *Evaluating teacher Education Programs through Performance-based assessments* (pp. 18-33). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Plecki, M., Elfers, A., John, E. & Finster, M. (June 2010) *Study of the Incentive Program for Washington's National Board Certified Teachers*. The Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington and the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession. Seattle, WA.
- Polly, D. (Ed.). (2016). *Evaluating teacher education programs through performance-based assessments*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Prichard, C. & Willmott, H. (1997). Just how managed is the McUniversity? *Organization* 18(2), 287-316. doi: 10.1177/017084069701800205

- Raley, S. (2002). McDonaldization and the family. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *McDonaldization: The reader* (pp. 138-148). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Reagan, E. M., Schram, T., McCurdy, K. Chang, T-H., & Evans, C. M. (2016). Politics of policy: Assessing the implementation, impact, and evolution of the performance assessment for California teachers (PACT) and edTPA. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24 (9). doi:10.14507/epaa.v24.2176
- Ritzer, G. (1975). Professionalization, bureaucratization and rationalization: The views of Max Weber. *Social Forces* 53(4), 627-634. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/53.4.627>.
- Ritzer, G. (2008a). *The McDonaldization of society* (5th ed.). Los Angeles: Pine Forge Press.
- Ritzer, G. (2008b). Varieties of neo-Marxian theory. In *Modern Sociological Theory* (pp. 139 – 191). Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Ritzer, G. (Ed.). (2010). *McDonaldization: The reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rizqi, A. R. A. (2016). McUniversity: The Rationalization on Higher Education. *Proceedings of the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University Annual Conference, Bangkok, Thailand, 121-128*. Retrieved from http://arts.tu.ac.th/Proceedings/proceedings_all%201.pdf#page=126
- Roach, A. T. & Frank, J. L. (2007). Large-scale assessment, rationality, and scientific management: The case of No Child Left Behind. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 23, 7-25.
- Robelen, E. W. (2005). 40 years after ESEA, federal role in schools is broader than ever. *Education Week*, 24(31), 1, 42[sic].

- Robinson, M. B. (2010). McDonaldization of America's police, courts, and corrections. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *McDonaldization: The reader* (pp. 85-100). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Salzman, S. A., Denner, P. R., Bangert, A. W. & Harris, L. B. (2001, March). *Connecting teacher performance to the learning of all students: Ethical dimensions of shared responsibility*. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Dallas, TX.
- Sanders, W., Ashton, J. & Wright, S.P. (2005). *Comparison of the effects of NBPTS certified teachers with other teachers on the rate of student academic progress*. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED491846.pdf>
- Shinkfield, A. J. and Stufflebeam, D. (1995). *Teacher evaluation: guide to effective practice*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Simpkins, J. (March 2011) What does Washington State get for its investment in bonuses for board certified teachers? *Center on Reinventing Public Education*. University of Washington. Seattle, WA. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED517748.pdf>
- Snyder, D. (2014). How have music student teachers done on the edTPA so far? From the *Selected Works of David W. Snyder*. Retrieved from <http://wprks.bepress.com/dshyder/5/>
- Society for Music Teacher Education (n.d.). *Statement on High Stakes Evaluation in Pre-service Music Teacher Education*. Retrieved from http://smte.us/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/SMTE_Statement_on_Preservice_TE.pdf
- Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (2014). Performance assessment for

- California teachers (PACT). Retrieved October 14, 2016, from <https://scale.stanford.edu/teaching/pact>
- Strauss, A. and J. Corbin (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tennessee Department of Education (2017). *Fine Arts Student Growth Portfolio Model Guidebook*. Retrieved from http://team-tn.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/2017-18-Fine-Arts-Portfolio-Guidebook-for-Administrators-and-Teachers_Final.pdf
- Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model – Tennessee (n.d.). *Resources for fine arts*. Retrieved from <http://team-tn.cloudapp.net/non-tested-grades-subjects/fine-arts/>.
- Turner, B. S. (2010). Risk, coolness, and irony in contemporary politics. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *McDonaldization: The reader* (pp. 229-232). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) (2016, May). *Laws & guidance/elementary & secondary education: ESEA flexibility*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/esea-flexibility/index.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) (2009, November). *Race to the Top Program Executive Summary*. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf>
- Vandevoort, L. G., Amrein-Beardsley, A., & Berliner, D. C. (2004). National board certified teachers and their students' achievement. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 12(46), 1-117. doi: 10.14507/epaa.v12n46.2004
- Weaver, A. (2005). The McDonaldization thesis and cruise tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(2), 346-366. doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2004.07.005

- Weber, M. (2012). Bureaucracy. In M. Godwyn & J. H. Gittel (Eds.), *Sociology of organizations: Structures and relationships* (pp. 79-83). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wilkinson, G. (2006). McSchools for McWorld? Mediating global pressures with a McDonaldizing education policy response. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(1), 81-98. doi: 10.1080/03057640500491088
- Woolridge, J. P. & Stanley-Stevens, L. (2016). McDonaldization in households. *Review of Social Sciences*, 1(7), 21-31. Retrieved from <http://socialsciencejournal.org>

Appendix A

IRB Approval

IRB #: PRO-FY2017-404

Title: Music Education Teachers' Experiences with the Education Teacher Performance Assessment

Creation Date: 2-24-2017

End Date: 3-17-2018

Status: **Approved**

Principal Investigator: Ellen Koziel

Review Board: University of Memphis Full Board

Sponsor:

Study History

Submission Type	Initial	Review Type	Expedited	Decision	Approved
-----------------	---------	-------------	-----------	----------	-----------------

Key Study Contacts

Member	Ellen Koziel	Role	Principal Investigator	Contact	ekoziel@memphis.edu
--------	--------------	------	------------------------	---------	---------------------

Member	Ryan Fisher	Role	Co-Principal Investigator	Contact	rfisher3@memphis.edu
--------	-------------	------	---------------------------	---------	----------------------

Member	Ellen Koziel	Role	Primary Contact	Contact	ekoziel@memphis.edu
--------	--------------	------	-----------------	---------	---------------------

Appendix B

Recruitment E-Mail

From: Ellen Koziel

Subject: Music Education Teachers' Experiences with the Education Teacher Performance Assessment

I am writing to let you know about an opportunity to participate in a research study about university music education teacher trainers' experiences with the Education Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA). Ellen Koziel, a PhD candidate in music education at the University of Memphis, is serving as the principal investigator. Dr. Ryan Fisher is serving as her advisor. This study will help to determine the effects of the edTPA on music education programs throughout the state of Tennessee.

We are contacting you for this study because you are currently a music education professor in the state of Tennessee who is connected with the Education Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) in some way. You will be asked to answer questions about your experiences with the edTPA. This interview will take approximately one hour of your time. It is possible that a follow-up interview will be needed in order to complete the research. This will probably be in the form of a telephone interview. You may benefit from this study by becoming aware of commonalities between the experiences of university music educators involved with training preservice music teachers throughout the state of Tennessee. The field of music teacher education will benefit from this study as more information is obtained on the implementation of the edTPA as it specifically relates to music education.

If you would like additional information about this study, please call Ellen Koziel at 901-619-6593. If you are interested in participating, please respond to this email and we will set up an interview time.

Thank you,

Appendix C

Comparison of NBPTS, PACT and the edTPA

Table 2

Comparison of Components

NBPTS	PACT	edTPA
4 TASKS	5 TASKS	3 TASKS
1 Assessment Center Computer-Based Test 3 Written Commentaries	3 Written Commentaries Context for Learning Reflecting on Teaching and Learning	3 Written Commentaries (Includes Context for Learning)

Table 3

Comparison of Written Commentaries

NBPTS	PACT	edTPA
Component 2: Differentiation in Instruction	Task 2: Planning Instruction and Assessment	Task 1: Planning for Instruction
Component 3: Teaching Practice and Learning Environment	Task 3: Instructing Students and Supporting Learning	Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning
Component 4: Effective and Reflective Practitioner	Task 4: Assessing Student Learning	Task 3: Assessing Student Learning

Table 4

Comparison of Scoring

NBPTS	PACT	edTPA
External (ePortfolio System)	Internal (faculty/supervisors)	External (Pearson VUE)

Table 4: Comparison of Cost/Targeted Populations

NBPTS	PACT	edTPA
\$475 per component	Set by each university	\$300 total
Designed for experienced teachers – must have taught for three years	Pre-service teachers	Pre-service teachers
Can result in a stipend – set by each district or state	Can also be used for teacher licensure	Can also be used for teacher licensure

Comparison of the Three Teacher Performance Assessments

- All three contain:
 - Context for Learning
 - Lesson plans
 - Video artifacts
 - Written commentaries
 - Assessment artifacts (student work samples)
 - Reflection
- All three use similar commentaries:
 - Planning
 - Implementation
 - Assessment and Reflection

Appendix D

Interview Protocol

1. How was the edTPA introduced to you or to your music department?
 - a. What was your involvement in the induction phase?
 - b. What training did you receive and from whom?
 - c. What did you think worked really well regarding your training?
 - d. What did you think didn't work so well regarding your training?
 - e. What is the nature of your involvement with the edTPA now?
 - f. Has the nature of your involvement changed over time? In what ways?
 - g. What is the relationship between the music department and the department of education at your university in regards to the edTPA?
 2. What was the music teacher education program like before the edTPA was required? What did you like about it? What didn't you like about it?
 3. Has the edTPA had an impact on the music teacher education program at your school? If so, why? If not, why not?
 4. How do you expect the edTPA will impact the future of your music education department's teacher education program?
 5. What are your attitudes/opinions about edTPA? Do you like edTPA? Can you tell me a story where you think it worked really well? Do you dislike edTPA? Can you tell me a story about it not working so well?
 6. If the interviewee likes edTPA, ask, "What do you think is the difference between you and those who don't like edTPA?" If the interviewee dislikes edTPA ask, "What do you think is the difference between you and those who like edTPA?"
 7. Overall, if you were put in charge, what would you change, if anything, about the edTPA process?
 8. There are stories around about people having issues with "buying in" to the edTPA process. Have you heard stories like these? (If so, "Why do you think that is the case? Or What do you attribute that to?")
 9. Were there any questions you were expecting me to ask regarding this topic, that I did not ask? What were they? (Ask them to answer the question).
 10. What kinds of questions do you think should have been included in this study? (Ask them to answer their question).
- "Thank you for your participation in this study."

Appendix E



Institutional Review Board

315 Administration Bldg.
Memphis, TN 38152-3370
Office: 901.678.2705
Fax: 901.678.2199

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

MUSIC EDUCATION TEACHERS' EXPERIENCES WITH THE EDUCATION TEACHER PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

WHY ARE YOU BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

You are being invited to take part in a research study about the impact of edTPA on teacher music education programs in the state of Tennessee. You are being invited to take part in this research study because your university was a member of the Tennessee Board of Regents and, therefore, adopted the Ready2Teach model that includes the use of edTPA as an evaluation tool in your program. If you volunteer to take part in this study, you will be one of about twenty people to do so.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

The person in charge of this study is Ellen B. Koziel of the University of Memphis department of music education. Dr. Ryan Fisher is guiding her in this research. There may be other people on the research team assisting at different times during the study.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

By doing this study, we hope to learn about the impact of the edTPA on the music teacher education programs in the state of Tennessee.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY YOU SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

There are no reasons why you should not take part in this study.

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

The research procedures will be conducted at the Tennessee Music Education Association Professional Development Conference from April 5-8 at the Opryland Hotel in Nashville. If

these dates and/or location do not work for any participants, the interview will take place either by phone or face-to-face at the university where the participant is employed. You will need to come to the designated room at the Opryland Hotel one time during the study. This visit will take about one hour. The total amount of time you will be asked to volunteer for this study is one hour over the next five months.

WHAT WILL YOU BE ASKED TO DO?

Participants will have the choice to participate in either a face-to-face interview or a telephone interview. Participants that elect to participate in the telephone interview should within the researcher's realize that it is not ability to control the privacy within your physical location during the phone interview. No identifying information will be taken from the participant. Participants will work with the Investigator to create a pseudonym, which will serve as the only identifier for each participant. With the participant's permission, interviews will be recorded, but no identifying questions, such as name or phone numbers, will be requested.

Participants that elect to participate in face-to-face interviews will have a choice of setting. An attempt will be made to conduct the interviews during the Tennessee Music Education Association's Professional Development Conference April 5-8 at the Opryland Hotel in Nashville Tennessee. Subsequent interviews will take place at a location in the interviewee's school when at all possible. If, however, you do not feel comfortable participating on campus, the researcher is willing to meet you at a mutually agreed upon location.

All interviews will be audio taped. The recordings will be kept in a password protected file separate from the cover sheet with the demographic information. When the project has been completed, all recordings will be destroyed. Transcriptions will be made by the researcher for each recording. The transcriptions will be kept in a password protected file until the end of the project, at which point they will be destroyed.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?

To the best of our knowledge, the things you will be doing have no more risk of harm than you would experience in everyday life. You may find some questions we ask you to be upsetting or stressful. If so, we can tell you about some people who may be able to help you with these feelings.

In addition to the risks listed above, you may experience a previously unknown risk or side effect.

WILL YOU BENEFIT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

There is no guarantee that you will get any benefit from taking part in this study. However, it will give you an opportunity to discuss your experiences with the edTPA. Your experiences may help others navigate the implementation of this performance assessment in their own music departments. Your willingness to take part, however, may, in the future, help society as a whole better understand this research topic.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?

If you decide to take part in the study, it should be because you really want to volunteer. You will not lose any benefits or rights you would normally have if you choose not to volunteer. You can stop at any time during the study and still keep the benefits and rights you had before volunteering.

IF YOU DON'T WANT TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE OTHER CHOICES?

If you do not want to be in the study, there are no other choices except not to take part in the study.

WHAT WILL IT COST YOU TO PARTICIPATE?

There are no costs associated with taking part in the study.

WILL YOU RECEIVE ANY REWARDS FOR TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?

You will not receive any rewards or payment for taking part in the study.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT YOU GIVE?

We will make every effort to keep private all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law. Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered. You will not be personally identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your name and other identifying information private.

The recordings will be stored in a password protected file for five years, at which time they will be destroyed. Transcripts will be made for each recording, however; only a pseudonym will be used. Any identifying information that might come up during the interview, such as a school name or address will be replaced with a broad description. An example is instead of the University of Memphis, something along the lines of a "large urban institution of higher education" will be substituted.

This study is anonymous. That means that no one, not even members of the research team, will know that the information you give came from you.

CAN YOUR TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY?

If you decide to take part in the study, you still have the right to decide at any time that you no longer want to continue. You will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study.

The individuals conducting the study may need to withdraw you from the study. This may occur if you are not able to follow the directions they give you, if they find that your being in the study is more risk than benefit to you, or if the agency funding the study decides to stop the study early for a variety of scientific reasons.

WHAT IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS, SUGGESTIONS, CONCERNS, OR COMPLAINTS?

Before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind now. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you can contact the investigator, Ellen Koziel at ekoziel@memphis.edu or her adviser Dr. Ryan Fisher at rfisher3@memphis.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the Institutional Review Board staff at the University of Memphis at 901-678-2705. We will give you a signed copy of this consent form to take with you.

What happens to my privacy if I am interviewed?

The principal investigator (Ellen Koziel) and two faculty advisors (Dr. Ryan Fisher and Dr. Carol Rambo) will be the only ones allowed to access any recordings of the interviews and transcripts. All identifiers will be omitted from any publications, reports, or documents. Only the pseudonym may be used. All written documents and electronic information related to this research will remain secure, and only accessible to the researcher and her advisers.

Signature of person agreeing to take part in the study

Date

Printed name of person agreeing to take part in the study

Name of [authorized] person obtaining informed consent

Date

Appendix F

K-12 Performing Arts Glossary for Music Education Teacher Candidates

Academic language: The formal “language of school... [that] is used in textbooks, essays, assignments, class presentations, and assessments.” (Breiseth, para. 11) This is in contrast to social language, or the informal language that students use with their friends.

- **Language demands:** Musical terms or other vocabulary that students need to understand a learning segment. For example, in a choral ensemble rehearsal, if the conductor says, “Start on page 2, third score, second measure”, the student must understand how to find page 2, how to find the third score or system and then locate the second measure. The student must know the definitions of “score” and “measure”. In addition, the student must be able to find his/her part in the score, determine their starting pitch, and be able to interpret the conductor’s signal to start singing. Each of these skills and terms must be taught before the conductor’s directions can be followed. These are the *language demands* for this segment of the choral rehearsal.
- **Language functions:** Must be verbs. Relate to National Core Arts Standards (Annie). Verbs include: **Creating** (“Conceiving and developing new artistic ideas and work”): Anchor Standards #1, #2 and #3; **Performing** (“Realizing artistic ideas and work through interpretation and presentation”): Anchor Standards #4, #5, and #6; **Responding** (“Understanding and evaluating how the arts convey meaning”): Anchor Standards #7, #8 and #9; **Connecting** (“Relating artistic ideas and work with personal meaning and external context”): Anchor Standards #10 and #11.

- **Vocabulary:** “But as a musician, vocabulary means the symbols on the page. It means the quarter note, the half note, the fermata. All of that is vocabulary. We have to teach the student what that symbol means, how to interpret it, how to read fluently using it- all of that.” (Chris)
- **Discourse:** “How do people in their discipline talk about their work? I think it’s a really good question, but I think how we are labeling it is a little tricky” (Annie). “Discourse is more of the philosophical debates you’re going to have with this or that. So, whether or not popular music is good or should be used in the traditional classroom. That’s an issue of discourse” (Chris).
- **Syntax:** “It’s just a fancy word and [teacher candidates] have to come to the realization of, so, that can be rhythmic notation or notating on the staff or whatever can be syntax for whatever we’re doing.” (Diane) “With syntax, sometimes music is even at an advantage with syntax because we’re thinking about that symbolic way to communicate language and in music it’s a symbolic language....” (Diane) “And what I tell our students...is syntax is how you use this thing in context. So what does a quarter note mean in 2/4 time versus 2/2 time? So there is your syntax.” (Chris).
- **Language supports:** “The academic language I would scaffold it around Bloom because the way I look at it is if you’re scaffolding your instruction around Bloom knowing that just scaffolding your curriculum you can’t effectively create anything if you don’t know what you are creating with. You have to build knowledge and skill before you apply, analyze, and create anything.” (Annie)

Appendix G

Lesson Plan Form

Teacher Candidate _____ Date _____

Grade or Class: _____ Lesson # _____ Date: _____

Central Focus:

District, State, or National Standard(s):

Learning Objective(s):

Instructional Resources and Materials:

Warm-up/Lesson Opener:

Instructional and Learning Tasks:

Closure:

Informal and/or Formal Assessment(s):