Music Informance as Embodied Service Learning

By Mary Ann Doyle, Gwen Hotchkiss, Marie Noel, Ann Huss, & Rebecca Holmes

Introduction

Many universities and PK-12 schools have embraced the challenge of developing new models for collaborative partnerships in the preparation and professional development of teachers (Shelley & Washburn 2000). Evidence suggests that collaborative partnerships are sustainable only when access to and distribution of influence is equitably shared among stakeholders, so much so that even competing interests may be understood in the larger conceptual framework as contributing in different ways to shared benefits (Zlotkowski 1997).

How does this evidence challenge social foundation faculty in particular ways? Do some questions deserve special attention, i.e., what kinds of experiences are likely to benefit preservice teachers' understanding of collaborative partnerships? To what de-

Mary Ann Doyle is director of the undergraduate education programs and Gwen Hotchkiss is a professor of music education, both at Loyola University, Marie Noel is a professional development coordinator at Banneker School, and Ann Huss and Rebecca Holmes are both graduates of Loyola University, all in New Orleans, Louisiana.

gree should students be involved in the decision-making processes regarding field experiences, learning communities, and service-learning opportunities within collaborative partnerships? Shall we assume that leadership skills may be different in a world where collaboration is valued more than representational leadership? If so, how do we provide appropriate support for the development of such talents? And, what might we learn from preservice teachers' enthusiasm for and resistance to greater participation in shared decision-making and community involvement?

The authors employ these questions as an interpretive framework for the evaluation of a collaborative project envisioned and implemented for the most part by preservice teachers, with support and encouragement from a team of peers, school administrators and university faculty housed in different colleges within a small, private, liberal-arts university.

Background

In the summer of 1998, a fifth grade teacher new to a neighborhood school near our university requested support for her students in whatever ways the university's teacher preparation program could provide. The school, identified in this essay as B. Pearl, is located within walking distance of the university and was accessible by streetcar from residential areas at some distance along two main boulevards. The school serves an urban and poor neighborhood community in which 86% of the families identify themselves as African-American, 10% identify themselves as white, and 4% identify themselves as Asian-American. Instruction is provided for nearly 300 children from kindergarten through eighth grade. Hearing impaired students make up as much as 20% of the school population, with profoundly deaf students among the preschool population.

The physical plant was in disrepair at the time of the teacher's request, and instructional resources for students with regular and exceptional needs had been in short supply from the district for more than a decade. Characterized as a low-performing school with most families living at or below the poverty level, the school is situated in the historically Black neighborhood known in former times as the Black Pearl Community. Within walking distance of this school and the two universities in the neighborhood are six other schools that enroll students in the same age range on the basis of particular and discriminating criteria. These schools attract students with strong academic records and maintain the quality of their enrollment by enforcing strict performance standards. As magnet schools, parochial and independent schools, and a Montessori school, these schools offer alternatives for students who perform at or above average. In many ways, the students who demonstrate academic readiness at preschool age are removed from the pool of students who will attend B. Pearl. After the preschool level, students may secure enrollment in one of the alternative schools by demonstrating a level of academic achievement in accordance with the continuing discriminating criteria. Therefore,

students who demonstrate the lowest levels of academic readiness and achievement remain at B. Pearl from preschool through eighth grade.

With fiscal, parental, and a variety of other forms of resources in short supply, the students and teachers at B. Pearl face daunting obstacles in their efforts to demonstrate that every child can learn. The invitation to cooperate with the school community presented difficult challenges for our relatively small teacher preparation program, but it was accepted. The partnership between the university and B. Pearl began with the placement of social foundation students in the class of the fifth grade teacher who had asked for support.

Experiencing Social Foundations

Students in the social foundation course at the university are often in their first education course. It is common for the class to include students from the first through the fifth year of university studies. Some students arrive at university with clear intentions to pursue teacher preparation and are placed in the foundation course in their first semester. Others decide in the last semester of their fourth year to explore teaching interests. This mix of students usually constitutes the foundation class as a very heterogeneous community.

A service-learning component of the foundation class requires students to contribute in any number of ways to schools or community centers in the greater New Orleans area. Students demonstrate a remarkable commitment to service-learning and provide evidence of their involvement in a variety of ways. Many describe the benefits of their experience in terms of how much they learned from it. Students from urban K-12 experiences learn about suburban, private, and independent schools just as students from those backgrounds learn about well and poorly resourced urban schools. They learn about themselves and one another too, as well as about this region and its very diverse cultures.

The foundation class provides an educational focus to what students describe in their admissions documents as a call to service (Coles 1996). At the start of the fall 1998 semester however, students were encouraged to consider spending at least some of their ten service hours in the school where the fifth grade teacher had asked for our support. Students in the class that fall and those enrolled over the following three semesters accepted the invitation and participated by observing, reading, tutoring, assisting the teacher, volunteering in the after-school program and working with parents and students in an after-school computer lab.

Over the next three semesters, evidence of our cooperative relationship increased. A student teacher completed his practicum in the fifth grade class with the teacher who had first requested our support. The professional development coordinator of the school, Marie Noel, organized a system of matching university students with B. Pearl teachers who shared similar interests or needs. The education coordinator for the Amistad Research Center, Nikki Wilson, who was an alumnus

of an undergraduate English and a graduate education program, designed and implemented an Afro-Caribbean Dance curriculum in eight area schools. She included B. Pearl in her selection and employed foundation students in her work. Student evaluations at the end of each semester enthusiastically advocated a continuation of the cooperation between the university and the school, with some suggestions for greater structure and other suggestions for providing less structure.

Spring 2000

During the spring semester of 2000, the university publicly renewed its commitment to service learning and to those practices that develop learning communities within the university (Zlotkowski 2000; Checkoway 2000). In the College of Arts and Sciences, learning community courses and student cohorts were established for several disciplines. The education foundation course was not reconfigured as an official learning community course, but it met the criteria the university was employing for these newly envisioned courses. Since there were no elective courses in the preservice teacher programs, students often found themselves enrolled with the same peers from course to course within the program sequence. Service learning components provided opportunities for students to engage in the community beyond the classroom, and share their reflections with one another within the context of particular courses. However, there was one way in which the education foundation class brought together several different preservice teacher cohorts.

Elementary education majors made up one cohort; music education majors made up a second; and, secondary education minors made up a third. Each program placed the foundation course in a different place in the course sequence, i.e., in the first year for elementary majors, the second year for secondary minors, and the third year for music education majors who took music education foundation courses in their first two years. Music education students enroll in a five-year undergraduate program. Non-education students were allowed to enroll in the course also, since the class qualified as an elective for some other programs of study in the College of Arts and Sciences.

The class of spring 2000 included 12 very talented music education students who had shared a cohort experience in their program already for several years. Most of the other 20 students in the class had had minimal contact with one another prior to this semester and were at the start of their cohort experiences. The difference between the music education cohort's shared experience and the rest of the class proved to be of greater significance than anyone anticipated.

When invited to contribute in some systematic way to the school in our neighborhood, one music education student assessed the talents and teaching skills of her cohort peers and proposed that they could do more than serve the school community as individuals serving in field experiences. Ann Huss proposed that the

music education cohort conduct a needs assessment of the school's music education program and then design and implement an extension of the program. She had surveyed her music peers before presenting the idea to the class and had secured their support and commitment. Most agreed readily that their two and one half years of music methods classes provided them with a different kind of call to service than might be experienced by students who had not yet had methods courses in their programs.

During the first weeks of the semester students began their service work at B. Pearl School. With the school's resources in short supply and tensions high in relation to newly imposed high stakes testing, foundation students entered classrooms where children and adults were often feeling overwhelmed by the challenges of the impending assessments. We worked to establish systematic support of the school community, inviting the school's professional development coordinator and the education coordinator from the Amistad Center into our class for discussion, planning, and assessment activities. We reviewed the history of the university-school relationship and determined that we had developed a viable cooperative relationship. However, when the music cohort began to act as a body, questions emerged about the difference between a cooperative relationship and a collaborative partnership between the university and the school.

Through the Body of Music

When Ann presented her findings and her proposal for the music service project during the fourth week of class, she provided a clear rationale for why the cohort could and should work closely with Marie Noel, the professional development coordinator for B. Pearl School. With the support of their university music education advisor, Gwen Hotchkiss, the music student cohort and Marie Noel could offer an intensive six-weeks, Saturday Music Program to the school community. Ann noted that the weekday instructional time at the school was already compromised in some ways by the district's insistence that teachers and students prepare for high stakes tests in certain ways. As much one-on-one tutoring as could be arranged was already scheduled at the school.

The school's arts programs were in a greatly reduced state and research evidence suggested that the arts enhance academic performance (Cesarone 1999; Woody 1998). Also, the music education students were constrained during the regular school week by schedules that kept them in their practice sessions throughout mornings and afternoons. It was a common adage that at any given moment music education students were either in class or in practice sessions. Hotchkiss had helped Ann Huss conduct a thorough needs assessment of the school's music program and the findings suggested B. Pearl would be an excellent choice for a Saturday music program. With the music students enthusiastically enlisted in the idea, and the support of Hotchkiss, Noel, and the foundation instructor, Doyle, the principal of

the school, Joe Ridolfo, agreed to open the school building on Saturdays and lend his support to the project also.

A second music education student, Rebecca Holmes, agreed to serve as a co-coordinator for the project, and with that agreement, the project began to take shape. Huss and Holmes envisioned a collaborative project that engaged all of the stakeholders in significant ways, from the creation of a shared vision to the implementation of that vision in the particularities of the project. The vision for the Saturday music program combined the best and most powerful components of the music methods courses with an abiding sense of commitment to school community and its youngest members. It was decided that the children at the school would be provided opportunities to see, hear, touch, and even play as feasible, the full range of instruments that the College of Music had at its disposal. With two-hour programs over five Saturdays, school and university students would work in groups with one another and the different families of musical instruments. A rigorous but enjoyable music education program would be provided for B. Pearl's students who were willing and able to attend Saturday sessions. The sixth Saturday was planned as a school community informance, during which students would perform for the school community while engaging the community in its own opportunity for music informance.

When Huss and Holmes presented a description of the project to the class, a mixture of enthusiasm, disbelief, skepticism, and amazement characterized the class's response. The project was much more comprehensive than any service project created in any previous foundation class. Some university students expressed concerns that it was too grand to be accomplished. Some expressed the conclusion that the project made perfect sense in light of the group's collective talents. It was not clear how the music education program would affect the other members of the foundation class. As the instructor, Doyle agreed to serve as an advisor and participant outside of class time. She invited the music education cohort to keep the class informed of their progress.

Music as Embodied Experience

In some ways neither the foundation instructor nor the other members of the class were able to envision the music education program as the music education students were able to do. This music cohort shared a common vision and understanding of music and music education that relied upon embodied meanings. Even students who described themselves as music lovers seemed to occupy an experiential space outside the shared understandings of the music students. For several weeks the music students met late in the evenings after very long, full days, in order to collaborate on the design and implementation of their project. The foundation instructor attended a few meetings but observed the evidence from the start that the cohort had a deep and abiding understanding of what they hoped to accomplish.

They negotiated, disagreed, compromised, crafted lesson plans, revised, and sought help when needed. They were undaunted by others' concerns about discipline issues; the music curriculum would take care of discipline issues. They were confident about their abilities to produce appropriate and effective curriculum experiences, even though they found it necessary to create music lessons that would respect the talents and interests of a very diverse student body, in terms of age, dis/ability, and degree of experience with music education. They created a curriculum that provided opportunities for students to enter into, play within, explore, share, and reflect upon music as an embodied experience. They designed ways for the B. Pearl students to create music over the course of the five weeks and in one grand finale production. The plan designed the movement of students through four different music lessons each Saturday, with smaller teams of the music cohort planning the lessons for the instrument families for which they had some expertise. As the music cohort worked on their plans and their implementation, they shared their reflections with the class.

From the start of the project, the music cohort developed a stronger sense of cohort identity in the foundation class than others. The music cohort developed the habit of sitting together during class and they often arrived a little early or stayed a little late in order to share the lesson plans they were working on or distribute copies of songs they were composing. Some non-music students volunteered to help the music cohort early in the process. Others raised the question of whether the project was an appropriate one for a class in which 20 students shared little understanding of music education while 12 others experienced complete immersion in the subject. A few students suggested that if the music students chose to contribute so much of their time to the local school, there was no reason why the rest of the class had to hear reports of their efforts or their progress. One student, Eleanor, protested insistently, claiming that it was not evident to her why the music program had been allowed to develop after the semester had begun. She insisted that these things "should be planned ahead of time," because they "threatened to take control of the class away from the instructor" (Classnotes 2000). Although Eleanor was alone in her objection, she raised important issues about the way consensual decision-making was understood and employed in the class.

What did each of us mean when we affirmed our commitment to service-learning and to the organization of the class as a learning community? Is participation in a collaborative project between education programs and local schools inherently better for teacher candidates than the more traditional relationships that often characterize beginning field experiences? Did Eleanor have a right to expect, and even demand, that the music education project be treated as an extra-curricular venture that had relevance only for the more experienced education cohorts? What can we learn from Eleanor's resistance, since what she resisted was not the collaborative project itself, but the inclusion of the project as a significant, though unplanned, part of the foundation course?

Huss, Holmes, and Doyle responded to Eleanor's challenge by opening the project up for wider participation from others in the class. Everyone was formally invited to participate as much or as little as they chose. The music cohort welcomed the support of their classmates and created opportunities for peer contributions in ways that did not require music education skills. It became evident that much help would be needed in order to provide for students with special needs, particularly the hearing impaired children. It would be necessary for people to be with the students as they arrived at the school, as they waited for the sessions to begin, as the refreshments were served, and as they waited for someone to pick them up at the end of the day. Documentation of the project was needed and peers were invited to take photographs, manage supplies, and identify sponsors for the children's costumes, stage props, and T-shirts for the Swingin' Saturday staff. Since refreshments were served each week, provisions, setups and cleanups were necessary.

The music students could not simultaneously set up their instruments and their lessons and accompany the children from room to room in the building. By electing to participate in the music education program, non-music educators gained invaluable field experiences in the arts. Weekday experiences provided the greatest opportunities for individual and small group instruction in discipline specific areas, but the Saturday program provided opportunities for working with children in an arts-specific arena. And, with more students from the class participating, greater involvement could be designed for the B. Pearl students in the original animal opera that was composed collaboratively for the Finale Saturday Informance. More hands to share the work meant more children could be provided individual assistance with their drawings, songs, animal dances, costumes, and language arts skills, since reading, writing, speaking and listening skills were a necessary part of the Saturday music program.

Embodied Field Work

It became evident by the fourth of the six planned Saturdays that the Finale Animal Opera program would require enormous effort in order to meet its objectives. Students from the school were so enthusiastic that each week friends of theirs from other schools showed up at B. Pearl wanting to participate. Many more sixth, seventh, and eighth grade students attended than had been anticipated. Marie Noel set the standard that allowed students from other schools to attend as long as they were actively engaging in the music program. She assumed the responsibility as well for refusing entrance to some students and for dismissing those who did not participate appropriately.

Usually there were 60 students in attendance, from ages four through 15. Some foundation class members could not meet on weekends but contributed by creating stage props and costumes, or donating refreshments. Even the music students found it difficult to continue to meet in the evenings to prepare their music lessons and

practice. This difficulty presented a challenge and an opportunity for the class. We could contribute class time to the extended cohort and conduct the discussions in the open arena of the class or we could provide some class time for the extended cohort to meet apart from the rest of the class. The decision was made by Doyle to keep the cohort's collaboration within the public arena of the class whenever possible, even though Eleanor continued to object.

Most students wanted to invest in the project and believed the class time was the best and most appropriate arena within which we could transform our interest in learning how schools work into a collaboration effort to make one school community richer in myriad ways. We negotiated differences in our perspectives and shared decisions about how to proceed. Students were still required to complete their readings, journal and essay responses, and be prepared to discuss them in accordance with the assignment schedule on the syllabus. There were class sessions however, when students submitted their assignments without having had the opportunity to discuss the positions they had taken in response to the primary text, Joel Spring's *The American School: 1642-2000*. Also, Doyle made the decision to substitute field experience journal entries for responses to selected readings from the second text listed on the syllabus. Several chapters from Ford and Ayers' *City Kids/City Teachers* were required reading that spring. For those students who increased their service hours above the ten already required for the course, journal entries were accepted as meeting the second text requirement. Again, Eleanor interpreted this revision as inappropriate. Her resistance to revisions did not persuade others to her position. However, late in the semester, several students acknowledged Eleanor's opposition by presenting what they thought would be 'her objection' to decisions we made during class sessions when she was absent. This tug-of-war seemed at times to be just that: a play of resistance, persuasion, and personal force.

The public nature of our decision-making accommodated many different talents, interests, and perspectives, and allowed for the resistance, cooperation, and collaboration that characterized the class that semester. However, the traditional notion about who should be in control of the class had to be balanced against emergent opportunities for students to shape and authorize their own learning experiences and commitments. The music project presented a contested public arena within which stakeholders could practice democratic decision-making and a public discourse made urgent by a common cause. Fraser (1997) describes this reclamation of public spheres as an urgent matter for everyone concerned with democratic practice. The project's advisors could see little merit in denying class time to those who were practicing the very arts of critical engagement about which our readings led us to consider and reflect upon (Spring 2000).

In many ways, the discussions about the Saturday program led to increasing interest in and understanding of the evaluation component of curriculum work. We considered the many different ways that foundation students were contributing to

the school community and tried to evaluate our efforts and their effects. In terms of course requirements, the field component of the course was described as providing opportunities for the students to observe and participate in educational settings as a means of exploring the student's interest in teacher preparation. The music project met and exceeded this objective. If each of the 32 students had contributed their ten hours of service, 320 hours of service would have been contributed to the B. Pearl School community. In contrast to that sum, 15 students each contributed more than 100 hours, and another ten contributed more than 25 hours each. No one contributed fewer than ten. Additionally, seven music students who were not enrolled in the foundation class brought their instruments to the school and performed for and with the students just because their peers asked them to do so.

How should we evaluate such a project? Is it sufficient to note that all foundations students met the objective for their service-learning requirement? What did we learn from our own experiences that paralleled or challenged what we learned from our readings of Spring's text? And, were the leadership and collaboration skills developed during the semester envisioned, employed, and evaluated in terms of their long-term efficacy or only in relation to the immediate needs of this one semester's project?

The Finale Informance

The Swingin' Saturdays Finale Event, an Original Animal Opera, was scheduled to take place three weeks from the end of the university semester. Designed as an informance, that is, a music performance presented with audience participation, the informance provided engaging opportunities for every student and adult who had participated in the program. The stage in the school's common room, also used as the cafeteria, was fully transformed into a jungle with large, brightly painted trees, flowering plants, and animal paths. Several music students installed multiple color stage lights, a sound system, accent lights, and an audio-video recording system to capture the Informance as it was performed. For this event, all of the music cohort students had worked long hourse for several weeks. Nine members of the class worked with the music students to prepare the stage, the costumes, the brochures, the refreshments, and the school community for this event. As the hour for the Informance approached however, it became evident that fewer parents and grandparents were going to attend than had been suggested by the enthusiastic reports of B. Pearl's students.

The four elders who had attended each Saturday with their nieces, nephews, and grandchildren had arrived early and were seated in the audience, where chairs had been arranged for 75 people. Five other adults from the school community arrived a few minutes before the Opera began. Overall, the Informance was everything its imaginative co-creators had hoped it would be. The B. Pearl students had been asked to identify their most and least favorite animals, treats, heroes, classes, clothing, and

a host of other things. The music students had included these responses into songs the children performed in costume as a favorite animal. The cameras recorded. The elders were drawn into the opera as participants, both on stage and in the seating arena. Children remembered and forgot their lines and their songs and their stage entrance and exit cues, just as children do in elementary school performances all over the world. The Finale was grand, as even the principal allowed himself to be seated on stage with a cello and its bow placed in his care. He announced that he had never touched a cello before that day and then played a few, long, slow notes, drawing the bow across the strings with everyone listening and watching in delight.

A quick assessment of the day's events allowed participants to report their initial responses. The university students were very proud of the Pearl students and their performances. Everyone else reported amazement at the quality of the students' participation. It was evident that the university students were disappointed in the turn-out of the school community adults, and that the elders who were present were accustomed to having people both appreciate their attendance and show disappointment in how few in number they were. As a class we had read about national patterns for involvement/non-involvement of community members in poor, urban, school communities. All the reading had not dissuaded these teacher candidates from hoping for more. Even teachers from the school who had been enthusiastic throughout the semester did not attend the Finale. Those in attendance encouraged the university students to appreciate the long-term effects of their efforts which were hidden from them at that moment.

To the university teacher candidates, however, this phenomenon of parental absence produced the sting of rejection. When they were reminded about those aspects of the program that were valuable and worth celebrating, including the involvement of the elders who attended week after week throughout the semester, disappointment was tempered. When we reviewed the decisions we had made along the way, we credited ourselves with having made many efforts to draw the parents into the project. As we did this however, we cast the net of our assessment efforts only as far as we had envisioned the partnership between the university and the school. Within the parameters that we had established and assumed to be sufficient, we had demonstrated our determination to engage the adult community of the school.

Assessing Self-Organizing, Collaborative Partnerships

In many ways, social foundation faculty have often occupied a privileged position in relation to the assignment of students to observe, participate, and reflect upon their experiences in local schools. Field experiences for the foundation course are often designed to provide opportunities for initial, exploratory relationships between preservice teachers and schools. Content methods faculty are often constrained by the number of available and official cooperating teachers in particular grade levels and content areas in local schools. Also, when content

methods students are in schools, the preservice teacher must demonstrate competence in content and age-appropriate pedagogy in order to remain in the program. There is often little opportunity for exploration. How foundation faculty envision opportunities for preservice teachers to explore school settings, disciplines, and age-groups remains variable. Some preservice teachers are encouraged to use the opportunity to investigate their own tentative interest in teaching while others are encouraged to use it to gain experience regarding a field to which they are already committed.

When a university emphasizes service as an important part of the development of the whole person, as our university does, we might expect that students would have opportunities to explore an interest in a service oriented field, such as teaching. However, the foundation course may still represent one of the earlier course opportunities students may have, and the questions about envisioning and evaluating the field component remain difficult. Research evidence suggests that field experience variability may remain characteristic of foundation courses without diminishing the value of those experiences, as long as there is an articulated, shared vision and an assessment/evaluation framework employed as part of that vision (Hargreaves 1997). This vision and framework must be applied not just to each course, but to the body of relationships that make up the teacher preparation and professional development programs (Earl and LeMahieu 1997). That body of relationships includes university and PK-12 school personnel who collaborate with one another in the preparation of teachers.

The music cohort generated a climate of hopeful anticipation about their project and made that state available for others to enter into and transform in light of their own contributions. Doyle has observed that at the individual and collective levels, members of this class shared a greater sense of efficacy than most other foundation class communities. That sense of efficacy produced hopeful resourcefulness among students most engaged in the project. Each challenge was met with calm, thoughtful consideration. That quality has been described as one of the most significant and desirable in an age of school change (Fullan 1997). However, since the vision we shared was only as large as the project at hand, we overlooked those many ways in which every viable project between a university and a school ought to be an expression of a larger vision and partnership. Our project may have been organic, and other similar and different projects may develop in foundation classes in the future, but without our embedding this and similar projects in something greater than itself, it remained just that: a project.

Near the end of the semester, a team of students, faculty, and administrators from the university and B. Pearl School began the process of identifying a larger vision for our collaborative partnership. We identified funding sources that could offer several years of grant support for continuation of the music education program. Huss and Holmes were hired through grant funds as student staff members to work closely with Hotchkiss in the development of an expanded and more sustainable music

education program. A planning process was begun to develop and implement a more holistic, shared vision that would give direction and continued life to the university-school relationships that service learning would continue to make possible. We recognized that Eleanor's criticism pointed to our lack of a comprehensive plan. No response to an immediate opportunity could be as strong as one we might make within the context of a shared vision and well-considered opportunities to make our projects self-sustaining.

As a result of the music education project evaluation, the university and B. Pearl recognized our mutual need for a shared and collaborative partnership. We had made progress toward that end, and members from both the university and the school contributed to a developing planning process. The partnership enjoyed increasing support at the university and the school. Then, in the fall of 2000, B. Pearl's principal had to take an unexpected medical leave. The assignment of a first-year principal to that position revealed just how vulnerable the partnership was to unexpected changes. At the same time that the new principal was assigned, the district instituted a new policy requiring that all university students undergo a criminal records check in order to volunteer in local schools. The regulation requiring the records check was implemented before the sheriff's department was able to establish an efficient operating system. The first round of criminal checks took 12 weeks to be processed.

Students seeking service-learning opportunities in local schools found their way into the very schools that made access for able students more available. These magnet, private, and independent schools benefited from the years of experience their principals brought to their communities. At B. Pearl, where the new principal struggled to create a new network of relations with the central office staff, there was provided neither an alternative nor an expedient dispensation of the process. The school with the greatest need was made inaccessible to university support. Had there been a more comprehensive vision and structure in place for the relationship between the university and the school, continuation of the service-learning project may have been preserved without diminishing the discretionary power of the new principal, who sought to follow the rules 'by the book' during her first year of administrative appointment.

Traditionally, university teacher preparation programs have adjusted to disruptive changes in university-school relationships by searching out different schools, teachers, or communities with which to cooperate. The loss of momentum and shared history may have been grieved, but it was often regarded as beyond the control of the university. The vision for collaborative partnerships created in recent years represents a different set of expectations and criteria, however, and to that we turn.

Planning for Sustainability

In light of our inability to keep the music program alive into its second year, we realized a different kind of merit to the criticism brought by Eleanor. She objected

to the emergent nature of the project and wanted exercised those controls that would make possible the determination of any project's merit, based on the evidence of its relatedness to a set of clearly articulated objectives. In one way, Eleanor's criticism seemed to underestimate the potential for value of any emergent project within the context of any given course. In another way, Eleanor's criticism could be understood as having very little to do with whether or not a project, emergent or otherwise, might be worth pursuing. Her objections direct our attention to the absence of a well-considered conceptual framework within which university-school collaborations may be evaluated in light of a sustainable partnership with articulated goals and objectives. This is how the merit of a project may best be determined (Hargreaves 1997). Without this shared vision, sustainable reforms will remain illusive and unlikely.

Although it may be too soon for many universities and PK-12 schools to claim success in their efforts to establish collaborative partnership councils in the preparation of teachers, it is evident that we must move in that direction with creative determination. What has become evident also is the degree to which some of us who are committed to collaborative teacher preparation may need professional development in order to proceed with skill. As Adelman and Walking-Eagle (1997) explain, teachers who invest energies in reform programs only to produce less than desirable results often are among those who are most predisposed to despair and cynicism (92-109). If we simply require more service-learning hours from preservice teachers and greater effort from faculty at universities and schools, without constructing the kind of sustainable partnerships within which these efforts may be shared, evaluated, and transformed, we are likely to find ourselves losing rather than gaining ground on reform issues.

The many different partners involved in the Saturday music education program described in this essay, worked diligently to identify their own assumptions, listen to different perspectives, and secure support and active participation from both the university and the school communities. We assumed that support and equitable participation among the stakeholders would secure a viable future for the collaborative project. That assumptive worldview underestimated the kinds of effects that small changes could produce. Essentially, we failed to imagine how our own limited understanding of our partnership created problems for our project and its viability. It is likely that many disappointments and unexpected outcomes will be produced by efforts to re-envision the ways universities and school districts collaborate in the preparation of teachers. We may be served well to remember that the evaluations that are necessary for assessing the efficacy of our efforts are also necessary for assessing the efficacy of our vision and our network of relationships. That may represent a more difficult set of tasks than we currently understand.

References

Adelman, N., & K. P. Walking-Eagle. (1997). Teachers, time, and school reform. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *Rethinking educational change with heart and mind* (pp. 92-110). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cesarone, B. (1999). Benefits of art and music education. *Childhood education*, 76 (1), 52-53.

Checkoway, B. (2000). Public service: Our new mission. *Academe* 86 (4), 24-28.

Coles, R. (1993). *The call of service: A witness to idealism*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Earl, L., & P. LeMahieu. (1997). Rethinking assessment and accountability. In A. Hargreaves (Ed*.), Rethinking educational change with heart and mind* (pp. 149-168). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Fullan, M. (1997). Emotion and hope: Constructive concepts for complex times. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *Rethinking educational changes with heart and mind* (pp. 216-233). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hargreaves, A. (1997). Rethinking educational change: Going deeper and wider in the quest for success. In A Hargreaves (Ed*.), Rethinking educational change with heart and mind* (pp. 1-26). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Shelley, A., & S. Washburn. (2000). Our NCATE report card: A partnership for excellence. *Educational Forum*, 64 (2), 156-164.

Spring, J. (2000). *The American school: 1642-2000*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Woody, R. (1998). Music education in young adults. *Middle School Journal*, 29 (5), 41-47.

Zlotkowski, E. (1998). A service learning approach to faculty development. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 73, 81-89.

Zlotkowski, E. (1997). Service-learning and the process of academic renewal. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, 2 (1), 80-87.