

PROCEEDINGS
The 89th Annual Meeting
2013

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 21

Reston, Virginia 20190

Telephone: (703) 437-0700; Facsimile: (703) 437-6312

Web Address: www.arts-accredit.org

E-mail: info@arts-accredit.org

© 2014

ISSN Number 0190-6615

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
11250 ROGER BACON DRIVE, SUITE 21, RESTON, VA 20190

All rights reserved including the right to reproduce this
book or parts thereof in any form.

CONTENTS

Preface	v
Keynote Address	
The Work of Music	
<i>Samuel Hope</i>	1
Teaching I: Overview of National and State P-12 Developments	
Learning, Music, and Values: Behaving as a Profession Within the Politics of Teacher Education Standards	
<i>David E. Myers</i>	9
Teaching III: Local Decision-Making for P-12 Music Teacher Preparation Programs	
<i>Sharon Davis Gratto, Michael R. Sitton, Charles G. “Skip” Snead</i>	17
Management III: Health and Safety for Music Students and Faculty	
A Musician’s Guide to Anxiety	
<i>Bonnie E. Robson</i>	27
Teaching IV: Preparing Students to Teach in and Prepare for Existing, New, and Future Pedagogical Environments	
<i>Aimé Sposato</i>	35
Management IV: Copyright and Intellectual Property	
<i>Dwayne K. Buttler, John Raso, Tammy Ravas, Serona Elton</i>	41
Meeting of Region Seven: The Tenure and Promotion Process	
Dealing With Tenure and Promotion at a Changing (Teaching to Research) University	
<i>Harry E. Price</i>	43
The Plenary Sessions	
Minutes of the Plenary Sessions	
<i>Catherine Jarjisian</i>	51
Greetings From the European Association of Conservatoires (AEC)	
<i>Martin Prchal</i>	54
Report of the President	
<i>Mark Wait</i>	57
Report of the Executive Director	
<i>Samuel Hope</i>	64
Oral Report of the Executive Director	
<i>Samuel Hope</i>	68

Reports of the Regions.....	73
Report of the Committee on Ethics <i>David P. Robbins</i>	84
Actions of the Accrediting Commissions	87
NASM Officers, Board, Commissions, Committees, and Staff 2013	90

PREFACE

The Eighty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music was held November 22-26, 2013, at the Westin Diplomat Resort, Hollywood, Florida. This volume is a partial record of various papers delivered at that meeting, as well as the official record of reports given and business transacted at the two plenary sessions.

Papers published herein have been edited for consistency of formatting but otherwise appear largely as the authors presented them at the meeting.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

THE WORK OF MUSIC

SAMUEL HOPE

Mr. Hope presented the following keynote address on the occasion of his final NASM Annual Meeting as Executive Director, following 38 years of service.

Introduction

In 1949 American author William Faulkner was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. His acceptance speech in Stockholm on December 10, 1950, remains famous to this day. It began as follows: “I feel that this award was not made to me as a man, but to my work – a life’s work in the agony and sweat of the human spirit, not for glory and least of all for profit, but to create out of the materials of the human spirit something which did not exist before.”

The work of music is what we all do, individually, in our institutions, and collectively in NASM. We do the work of music in many other settings as well, as do our thousands of professional colleagues in all aspects of our field. Over the next 50 hours or so, all of us are going to be engaged in the work of music as we address the various topics scheduled for this meeting, topics that name and annotate major issues of importance to music in higher education and therefore to music as a whole.

We face conditions that provide opportunities, issues that provide challenges, and developments that are deeply frustrating. We also face ideas and situations that gnaw and scrape against what we believe in our minds and souls to be right. Whatever we face, the work of music is our center. It remains our way through, our transcending instrumentality, our guide, our anchor, our greatest positive, our bridge to the world of spirit and light.

There are hundreds of musicians in the audience. Individually and collectively we have a thorough knowledge of the work of music. No matter how gifted we are, we understand the connection between incessant, dedicated work and achievement. We know in our souls what Faulkner means when he talks about “agony and sweat.”

The work of music makes possible everything else that music is and does. It always has, and it always will. Nothing can replace it. The work of music is a gift that we have received, and it produces the gifts of music that we give to others. It is in receiving and giving these gifts that we reach the deepest regions of the human spirit, what we often call “the power of music.” This power, in its highest manifestations, produces that glorious wrenching move from this world to another, one that floods us with intimations of infinity and connects the human spirit to eternity.

As this meeting proceeds, and the opportunities and challenges of our time are discussed, it is crucial that the work of music remain our first and most basic reference point.

Let us interact as we always do, remembering that the work of music is a tapestry where every thread is important, every musician, every institution, every student, everyone involved in the work of music in every specialization is important. Every thread in the tapestry must be as strong as possible. We are here to pool our resources in thought toward action, to help every institution

and its administrators, faculty, and students to be as strong as possible – not “for glory...[or] for profit, but to create out of materials of the human spirit something which did not exist before.”

Context

Each of us does the work of music in a context. We share national and international contexts, but each of us also works in a unique local context. Each of our contexts is dynamic with many interactions among what changes and what does not. So is the work of music. Most of the people in this room have responsibilities to manage the relationship between what changes and what does not in ways that advance the work of music in their institution and beyond. It is under the aegis of this responsibility that each of us faces and resolves specific questions of leadership and management, teaching, evaluation and assessment, frameworks, future directions, building projects, and all the other issues that are on the agenda for this meeting.

Contextual conditions are complex and full of detail, but they are created and sustained in large part by foundational ideas and by relationships and collisions of foundational ideas.

For example, take proposals, realities, and extant trajectories regarding operational systems and governance. In any instance, ask yourself the extent to which the basic underlying idea is freedom or control. Of course, both must be present, but in any situation, what idea dominates, what is the proportion? To what extent and in what ways are authority and responsibility distributed? How compatible are the freedom and control proportions with the specific nature of the issue, problem, or task at hand?

We all know three things: (1) questions of freedom and control are extremely complicated, a basic subject of human interaction, and sources of disagreement and conflict at every level; (2) deep and bitter divisions now roil the American context over questions of freedom and control; and (3) once left primarily to govern itself, higher education has become an increasingly visible freedom-versus-control battlefield in the larger cultural and political war.

In education, the forces supporting the idea of centralized control have been advancing since the mid-1980s. These forces created a rhetoric of permanent accusation. Their control acquisition trajectory began with outcomes and then proceeded to assessment, accountability, and accounting. If left alone, it is poised to advance fully to the already visible next stages of curriculum standardization, centralized federal control, bureaucratic enforcement, and a new educational economy driven by crony assessmentism and justified by the rhetoric of transparency. These are all just ideas shaped toward certain objectives, but the operational results of their advancement surround us every day.

No wonder many of you come to this meeting bearing concerns about rising bureaucratization and top-down standardization that are slowly eroding conditions enabling you and your faculty, your colleagues in other disciplines, and your upper administration to decide what is right for your particular students, institution, time, and place.

Thankfully, there are signs that more and more individuals throughout higher education are beginning to see the strategic nature of the trajectory, not just its individual tactical elements. The endgame is becoming clearer. More are beginning to see that the idea of centralized control is harnessed to a goal they oppose. This goal is to turn higher education from a sensitive, nuanced, institutionally administered instrument for advanced individual development in matters of disciplinary content and integration to a centralized, highly regulated, technical utility fulfilled primarily by roboticized means. One clear manifestation of this effort is the highly funded public

relations attempt to move the purpose of higher education from civilization building in all its artistic, humanistic, and scientific richness, to the salary of the first job.

In *Troilus and Cressida*, Shakespeare has Ulysses speak about what happens when societies lose their balance and sense of proportion about questions of power and control: “Then everything includes itself in power, / Power into will, will into appetite; / And appetite, an universal wolf, / So doubly seconded with will and power, / Must make perforce an universal prey, / And at last, eat up itself.” We may have to listen to the wolf howl. We may be coerced to feed it, but we don’t have to let it dwell within us.

In great contrast to all these troubling conditions, we have the freedom and independence ideas behind the enormous historic achievement of American higher education, including the achievements of music in higher education. We can see what happens when we do the opposite of what many are proposing we do now. In an overall sense, advancements in capacity, capability, and results have been spectacular over the last century.

Our challenge is to manage in the present and evolving context in ways that preserve conditions that advance these capabilities, capacities, and results, and keep the work of music in higher education moving forward with all of its creative force.

Transcendence for the work of music is our responsibility, our challenge, and our joy. Today, I want to explore with you one conceptual approach to fulfilling this responsibility.

To get started, let us each create an imaginary table. Let us place upon it sets of big ideas in relationship and collision. Let us place upon our table the first set containing freedom and control. I will ask you to put other idea sets on the table as we connect the work of music, contextual realities, and the concept of big ideas to several topic areas that we will begin to consider in depth immediately following this session.

Leadership and Management

Leadership and management are vast topics. Let us look at just two contrasting big ideas.

Think for a moment about the differences in the way a farmer works and the way a factory manager works. Both the farmer and the factory manager are interested in results. Successful farmers and factory managers have to be knowledgeable and technically proficient at what they do. Both use the benefits of science, applicable technologies, and analytical knowledge and skills. But there is one major difference. The factory manager is operating a highly engineered technological system; the farmer is nurturing a dynamic, organic system.

In the factory, as long as raw materials arrive and the machines work as they are designed to, identical product will roll off the assembly line. Manufacturing will occur. Local knowledge does not matter.

The farmer is at the mercy of constantly changing weather, and other variables. Livestock farmers are responsible for individual animals that do not post schedules for getting lost or sick or having their young. Each farm is different. If the farmer makes thousands of good case- and time-specific decisions as conditions change, cultivation will occur in the present, and conditions for future cultivation will be protected. Local knowledge is essential.

Many of the challenges that we face today can be traced to policy preferences for the manufacturing idea as the governing education policy generator. The idea of education as a cultivation enterprise is deeply discounted. Those interested in centralizing power naturally gravitate toward the factory model with its illusions of predictability and portability, its single yes-or-no answers, its numbers-dominated accountability structure, and its claims of scientificness. Subjects and ways of working that are incompatible with the factory model are marginalized. The STEM movement is Exhibit A.

But cultivation as idea and process is a transcending reality in the world, an idea deeply embedded in the work of music. If repressed where it is the appropriate approach, failure is usually right around the corner.

Let us now return to our imaginary table and add a set of ideas containing manufacturing and cultivation to the set containing control and freedom.

Teaching

The contrast between the idea of teaching as manufacturing and teaching as cultivation is abundantly clear, especially to musicians.

The manufacturing mindset has placed the world of P-12 education under terrible stress for over three decades, some would say for over a century. There is a parade of panaceas each of which lasts about 3 years. These conditions are deeply troubling far beyond their inconveniences, costs, and dysfunctions. When factory model after factory model does not work, the answer is always a newer and more elaborate factory with improved theory, better machines, newer technologies, and more publicity assuring success in advance. The factory model itself is not questioned.

Our colleagues doing the work of music in music education face difficult decisions about how they will proceed to protect the study of music under the many difficult conditions that these views of teaching continue to create, especially as they are translated into ever-changing policies and requirements that divert attention from teaching content. At this meeting there will be several sessions that address these very questions in terms of both national and local contexts, with a particular focus on music teacher preparation.

The manufacturing ideal also informs a variety of commercial and political forces interested in turning as much of higher education as possible into one big education factory.

Returning to our imaginary table, and continuing to think about transcendence, let us add a third ideas set, puzzles and mysteries, to those containing manufacturing and cultivation, and freedom and control. It is often said that puzzles have specific solutions, but mysteries have answers that expand and deepen the mystery as more is learned. The factory solves a specific puzzle. The farm is a place of mystery.

Which big idea – puzzle or mystery – best characterizes the nature and pursuit of teaching?

Evaluation and Assessment

It is one thing to believe, as we all do, that assessment is a critically important part of educational efforts where the center is subject-matter content. It is quite another to believe that assessment trumps content, that content only matters in relationship to assessment procedures, processes, and results. Consistent with the control, manufacturing, and puzzle views of education, we have all seen assessment being morphed from something that is applied by those cultivating specific

disciplines, habits of mind, and specific individual students in specific institutions to something mechanistic, standardized, and centralized.

This brings us to the secular religion of assessmentism. Our president will say more about assessmentism tomorrow, but for our purpose today, let me observe that assessmentism is a cult that sees assessment as the purpose of education, lives by permanent accusation, accepts no questioning, refuses to negotiate, and thrives on the fiction that the student has little responsibility for educational results. Challenged, the assessmentist will accuse you of not wanting to be accountable or transparent. Usually the assessmentist is neither. Assessmentism is pernicious not only in terms of its effects on policies regarding individual student testing, but in terms of its narrowing influences on other more holistic types of academic evaluation, such as institutional accreditation.

I know many of you are concerned about this issue. Here is one reason why.

Each of you is able to assess in music based on knowledge of what the thing you are assessing is and what it does and how it works, and what is necessary to do that thing at a professional level in various specializations of the field. Assessmentism refuses to accept the kind of content-based expertise, experience, and intuition you possess. Its default operating position is procedure. Assessment consistent with the natures of specific fields and their content no longer counts.

Methodologies of collecting and reporting assessment become the most important thing. Success is gained by pretending that assessment is a puzzle, not a mystery; following the required standardized, often content-poor process; producing the right symbols of compliance; and never, ever saying that the emperor has few or no clothes, or that the process is a waste of time and resources.

As musicians, we and our colleagues and students are focused on assessment and evaluation in all their richness and service to learning and artistry. But in the world of ideas, we recoil from assessmentism, seeing it as incompatible with the way that music works, and with the work of music.

Continuing to think about transcendence, let us place on our imaginary table a fourth idea set containing two types of problems: problems with single answers and problems with multiple answers. In assessmentism, all evaluation is considered in terms of single-metric answers: a graduation rate, a ranking, a test score, a starting salary, and so forth. We are told that big data is going to give us more sophisticated single-metric answers to improve educational engineering. Better factories are on the way. In music-centered assessment, there are multiple answers, complex answers, and plenty of mysteries. Assessment serves cultivation and the pursuit of other mysteries where answers produce more questions in infinite series.

Frameworks

NASM's position on assessment is consistent with a big idea called "frameworks." In this meeting, our sessions with this title consider several content and procedural frameworks that the association has developed to work with curricula and curriculum development.

The framework idea generated many founding principles of the American experiment. Based on consent of the governed, it fosters keeping laws, rules, and regulations focused on large-scale threshold necessities. The framework concept is consistent with policies supporting conditions for creativity. It is consistent with placing decision-making responsibility primarily at local and

individual levels. It works extremely well in situations where cultivation is the reality, the goal, and the operational objective.

The framework concept is an engine of diversity. It deals with assessment in a larger context. It is also consistent with the way the arts work, where certain fundamentals are the basis for creations of infinite variety. Think common practice harmony or sonata form. It is also the basis for great teaching and scholarship. It recognizes multiple good solutions and encompasses the realities of multiple dynamic environments. It nurtures conditions that support experimentation, innovation, and change. The framework approach is an approach based on concepts of ordered liberty. It respects the fact that expert knowledge and capability are distributed throughout a society. The framework approach has been a central idea in all four arts accrediting organizations.

As we know, there is a contrasting approach. This approach replaces the concept of ordered liberty under frameworks with the concept of ever-escalating regulation: the big idea is that the more detailed rules we have, the better things will be.

In policy, when the regulatory approach advances, the framework approach is eclipsed, and down the line, local control and creativity are diminished.

Let us place on our imaginary table a fifth ideas set containing distributed expertise – many people know what’s best for their own work and situation – and centralized expertise – a few know best for all work, situations, and people. Distributed expertise is central to the framework idea; centralized expertise is central to the regulatory idea.

Change

To a great extent, every NASM meeting and every session is about change. During these meetings, there will be several opportunities to continue the Association’s multiyear discussion of local creativity and change with regard to the undergraduate curriculum. We will also be working with issues of student health, copyright and intellectual property, and multidisciplinary curricula – all important areas of change.

As we all know, the work of music is infused with change. Through the creative work of artists, scholars, and teachers and other music professionals, newness and change produce interest and excitement. Individual passion for exploration and creation produces a continuity of exploration and creation. This continuity inspires, energizes, and animates the spirit of the field.

In our society today, we hear “Change or die” repeated endlessly, as though all change is good. But clearly all change is not good. “Change and die” is just as real, but we don’t hear much about that possibility in advance. We also hear that everything is changing, a statement that is almost never true. Too often, we hear that those who question change, either generically or specifically, are deeply flawed. These either/or approaches are too simplistic and petulant. The work of music demands a more sophisticated approach.

Let us return to our imaginary table and place upon it a sixth set of ideas: change as destroyer and change as contributor. The first view sees change as replacing what is. It tends to devalue past achievements. The second view sees change as adding to, influencing, and entering into a dialogue with what is and what has been. It encompasses change in larger continuities. It recognizes the presence of transcendent conditions, achievements, values, and mechanisms.

Conclusion

Let us return now to our imaginary table and look at all six sets of contrasting big ideas we have placed there.

The first set was control and freedom, followed by manufacturing and cultivation, then puzzles and mysteries, then single-answer problems and multiple-answer problems, then centralized expertise and distributed expertise, and finally change as destroyer and change as contributor.

As I continue, please remember that these are not contrasts between good and bad ideas, but rather different ideas in relationship and, at times, in collision.

Our administrative challenge is twofold: First, to understand the priorities and interactions among these contrasting big ideas in the specific contexts and decision-making situations we face, and second, to use those understandings to compose specific plans, actions, and responses according to the nature of the task at hand, remembering that whether large or small, the most basic task for each of us is to make and preserve the best possible conditions for the work of music. All this is easy to say, but hard to do.

As I have said twice, I know that many of you are troubled about what you see happening. Perhaps here is why.

The general educational context in which most of us are working seems more dominated at present by an ideational environment that seeks control, sees education as a factory, regards every problem as a puzzle, poses and addresses only single-answer problems, seems fixated on centralized expertise, and pursues change as a destroyer of all that is past.

The nature of music and the nature of the work of music produce and thrive in an ideational environment dominated by freedom, cultivation, mysteries, multiple-answer problems, distributed expertise, and change as contributor.

A conflict at the most fundamental conceptual level is obvious. Policies and operational patterns shaped primarily by ideas in the first list are pressuring us musicians to be less than we are, to narrow what we are and do, to narrow the concept of our field and its purpose, to narrow the range of our spirits. These pressures produce that gnawing and scraping feeling that something is fundamentally wrong. It is, because all around us we can see myopic pursuit of the ideas in the first list that begins with control attacking the credibility and operational realizations of ideas in the second list that begins with freedom. This is not only troubling and inconvenient to us; it is dangerous to our society.

Transcendence for the work of music is our responsibility, our challenge, and our joy. So what do we do? What about our transcendence responsibility in such conditions? How do we keep from being harmed by the wolf of power and will while it is devouring itself? What is the one conceptual tool to work on transcendence I promised to describe a few minutes ago?

When we analyze the ideas on our imaginary table – alone, in relationship, or in conflict – we discover something important. The ideas dominating the work of music – freedom, cultivation, mysteries, multiple-answer problems, distributed expertise, and change as contributor – are bigger, broader, and more inclusive than the dominating ideas presently shaping so much of our environment – control, manufacturing, puzzles, single-answer problems, centralized expertise, and change as a destroyer of all that is past.

In other words, our dominating ideas can and do contain the current set of dominating ideas as a part of a larger whole. The reverse is hardly true. For example, control agendas seek to remove freedom. Freedom agendas seek to find a workable relationship with control.

When we understand this distinction, we have the basis for enfolding the many incompatible ideas and conditions we face into larger constructs compatible with music and the work of music, and also compatible with the larger realities of life and the pursuit of civilization. This enfolding is worth doing even if conditions only allow us to do it in our minds.

Our field itself is full of wonderful examples of how this enfolding works, and how practical it is.

In music, control serves freedom rather than reducing it. Freedom encompasses control and ennobles it. The technical and mechanistic enable and serve creativity. Puzzles and their solutions are parts of larger mysteries. Questions with single answers are elements in questions with multiple answers. Authority contributes to distributed expertise, and change adds value.

Laid out in this way, we can see that the work of music not only describes what we do, it also gives us principles and lessons about ways to think and what to do.

It tells us to maintain a strategic vision and a conceptual approach to serving our field that takes situations dominated by ideas of control, manufacturing, puzzles, single-answer problems, centralized expertise, and change as destroyer; and manages them all toward the ideas and glorious results of cultivation, mysteries, multiple-answer problems, reliance on distributed expertise, and change as continuity.

Such a strategic conceptual vision for the work of music builds conditions for transcendence. In fact, it is what musicians have done for centuries as the nature of their field led their hearts. It is what you are doing. I have only presented one of many structures to describe a natural inclination.

Following this inclination and becoming more conscious of what encompasses what can help us lead our minds and hearts in ways that keep our colleagues, our students, and ourselves on a broad fertile field where cultivation is both priority and necessity, a fertile field that supports creativity in music, a fertile field that continues to expand, that yields surprise and wonder, that links us to mystery and to infinity and to eternity.

A field where as we plow, sow, reap, rejoice, and give thanks we can, in Kierkegaard's words, not only know the truth, but be the truth. A field where we can join Faulkner. We can know the work of music and be the truth of music – “a life's work in the agony and sweat of the human spirit, not for glory and least of all for profit, but to create out of the materials of the human spirit something which did not exist before.”

TEACHING I: OVERVIEW OF NATIONAL AND STATE P-12 DEVELOPMENTS

LEARNING, MUSIC, AND VALUES: BEHAVING AS A PROFESSION WITHIN THE POLITICS OF TEACHER EDUCATION STANDARDS

DAVID E. MYERS
University of Minnesota

In 1958, the *Paris Review* published an interview of Ernest Hemingway conducted by George Plimpton. Plimpton was probing Hemingway's ideas about good writing, to which Hemingway responded: "*The most essential gift for a good writer is a built-in, shockproof, [crap] detector.*"

At the national convention of the National Council of Teachers of English in 1969, New York University professor Neil Postman, co-author with Charles Weingartner of *Teaching as a Subversive Activity* (1969), picked up on Hemingway's quote. "*Each person's crap-detector,*" Postman said, "*is embedded in their value system; . . . you must help students become aware of their values. After all, Vice President, Spiro Agnew, or his writers, know as much about semantics as anyone in this room. What he is lacking has very little to do with technique, and almost everything to do with values*" (<http://criticalsnips.wordpress.com/2007/07/22/neil-postman-bullshit-and-the-art-of-crap-detection/>).

Joel Podolny, former dean of the Yale School of Management, professor at Harvard and Stanford, and most recently dean and vice president of Apple University, wrote in 2009 on the *Harvard Business Review* blog that business schools have largely ignored the teaching of values and ethics in favor of technical knowledge and skills. An *occupation*, Podolny argues, earns the right to be a *profession* when it incorporates ideals such as *servicing the greater good*. According to Podolny, education moves toward being a profession when it requires students to ask, "*How do I want to change the world for the better?*" and provides them with the skills, tools, and values to do so in a responsible manner.

Today, there is incessant rhetoric in education about what students and instructors need to know and be able to do and, importantly, how to assess what they know and are able to do. However, the larger and more essential question, which is rarely raised, is WHY students and teachers need to know and be able to do the things that multiple sets of national, state, and local standards indicate they should. The values underlying standards remain largely elusive, often couched in vague language about becoming global citizens or competing favorably in the world market place. The rhetoric is often ambitious, as in the annual report of the recently formed Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, 2013). CAEP advertises keywords such as quality assurance; continuous improvement; transformation and innovation; evidence and inquiry; and transparency. These words sound like important qualities, and yet, as Brigitta queried Maria in *The Sound of Music*, "does it mean anything?"

A perusal of standards documents reveals that most standards convey information about what students and teachers need to know and be able to do *in school*. If one accepts the premise that meeting school-based standards is the equivalent of schools' responsibility for equipping people to live well beyond school, then perhaps this schools-based orientation makes sense. But if one chooses to interrogate whether the measurable, and therefore relatively technical, specifications of school-based learning are consistently relevant to the values issues raised by

Hemingway, Postman, and Podolny, then one has to ask whether the standards-centered approach to improving schools and teacher education is sufficient for meaningful change and the assurance of quality.

The National Core Arts Standards are the arts' answer to the Bill Gates- funded project in academics called Common Core State Standards. There is much to applaud in the guidance these standards offer, especially to novice music teachers. But it would be a stretch to argue that these new standards rise to the better-world criterion Joel Podolny cites for a profession. According to the *Conceptual Framework for Arts Learning* (National Coalition for Core Arts Standards, 2013), "The . . . Standards are designed to serve an eminently practical purpose – to improve the teaching and learning of the arts *in America's schools*" (italics added). Though the document cites the importance of artistic literacy for citizens, nowhere do we read *why* artistic literacy is an important goal for our citizens.

A philosophical section of the arts standards conceptual framework mentions the role of the arts in the human condition and indicates that the standards include creativity, innovation, critical thinking, and collaboration, but there is no explicit delineation of the relationships between the standards and these philosophical perspectives. The question for our crap detectors is thus not *whether* the arts are valuable to individuals and society—anyone who is aware of the pervasive place of the arts in society knows the arts require no defense; rather, the central question is whether the arts content and processes we teach *in school* are directly relevant and offer pathways to values of the arts in society. On this matter, I agree with Stanford Professor Emeritus Elliot Eisner, who has asserted that the most important forms of learning are the ones students need to apply *outside* the schoolroom walls (2002). In too much of our advocacy work, we conflate the arts, which are endemic in society, with arts education, which is clearly *not* endemic in society, as though they are one in the same. This lack of precision in language neglects questions of quality and relevance in arts education and disguises the need for a thoroughgoing assessment of exactly *why* arts education is important and how we might best argue for it.

In 1984, John Goodlad published his national research findings indicating a disconnect between the intrinsic values teachers named for arts learning and what his team observed in arts classrooms. In classrooms, transcendent values of the arts took a remote second place to technical skills and performance achievement. "Students in music classes," he wrote, "spent an inordinate amount of class time on rehearsals for performance at the upcoming football game or some other event. . . . Arts classes did not fulfill the individual expression and creativity claimed in arts learning rhetoric. Rather, they were governed by the characteristics of being in "school" – following rules, finding the right answers, and using lower cognitive processes" (pp. 218-220).

Things have certainly changed in the thirty years since Goodlad's book. Composition and improvisation have become important topics of discussion and, to some extent, are now included in public school and collegiate curricula; we have deepened our understanding of the relationships between music and other areas of study, and technology is playing a far greater and, sometimes, positive role in music learning and teaching. Some of this progress is likely attributable to the 1994 standards in arts education.

However, in a 2006 doctoral study, Melissa Arasi discovered that ten years after graduation, graduates of a high school choral program that was acclaimed as a model by professional peers and university choral educators recalled that competitions and social events were the program's primary values. They retained little in the way of musical knowledge or skill, were not engaged actively in music pursuits, and identified benefits of choir participation almost exclusively in terms limited to their years in high school. Another study by Snead (2010), found that high school students considered "school music" to be divorced from the richness of their music engagement and learning experiences outside of school. As one of our most eminent music educators, Allen Britton, suggested decades ago, "...music education . . .has. . . always operated at a . . .distance from the well-springs of American musical life, both popular and artistic. Music

education has [created] a world of its own with its own people, music, and thought patterns” (Lang, 1961, p. 215).

The dichotomy between school music and real-world music experience illustrates one challenge of endeavoring to codify and assess music teaching. Are we willing to ask ourselves how many high school graduates will participate in large-group performance under a conductor’s baton vs. those who will seek to make music informally with friends and family? For how many will sight-reading be essential vs. singing and playing by ear? How many will seek to make music on a harmonic instrument vs. one that can play only a single melody line? How many will wish for an understanding of how music works as organized sound in a diverse array of music contexts and cultures vs. knowing the conventions of common practice Western idioms? How many will have sufficient music self-efficacy to pursue continued learning as adults?

Another challenge is that our field unflinchingly perpetuates a longstanding program structure that services on average fewer than 20 percent of high school students. It emphasizes conducted ensembles over small group and personal music making and assumes a menu of traditionally named classes and performances, as opposed to encouraging a variety of flexible program options through which students may enlarge capacities for lifelong learning and participation.

The well-intentioned National Core Arts Standards speak of lifelong goals. However these goals are framed within a traditional school music context, *i.e.*, by grade level for general music from kindergarten through eighth grade, and by traditional performing ensembles in middle and high school, with the usual nod to guitar class, composition and theory class, and emerging ensembles such as mariachi, jazz, and rock. Why, in today’s global and diverse society, do the standards indicate that traditional organizations of uniformly attired, repertoire-based, conducted bands, orchestras, and choirs prevail over the opportunity to establish multi-faceted ensembles rich with combinations of strings, winds, percussion, ethnic instruments, voices, and ability levels? In such ensembles, improvisation might be the core and students would collaboratively create expressive performances through perceptive listening, responding, elaborating, transposing, and musical decision-making. Why are big bands still the core of most school jazz programs, rather than jazz ensembles for anyone who wants to understand jazz through performance – oboists, vocalists, tubaists, bassoonists, and others?

Values-based programs, *i.e.*, those where teachers are concerned with making the world a better place, might seek to provide distinctively situated learning experiences that vary across different community and school contexts. Authentically described outcomes across programs and contexts might well be similar, embracing learning that derives from music writ-large as it is experienced in society. However, programs would be distinctive from place to place. Moreover, programs so conceived would encompass a wide variety of skill levels without sacrificing essential musicianship, and thus be available to *all* students. Approaching standards from this perspective would derive from the work of Jerome Bruner, Lev Vygotsky, and Paulo Friere, and would emphasize a spiral approach to concept and skill development rather than the limiting one-size-fits-all assumptions of identified grade levels and course titles.

Our culpability as music educators is that we have forsaken our longstanding mantra, “Music for every [person]; every [person] for music.” We have perpetuated a music education structure that can never be considered truly core, organized our collegiate methods courses to fit that structure rather than challenge it, told our future teachers that thinking *inside* this box is the only way they’ll get jobs, and ignored the structure’s implicit lack of relevance to the historic, vibrant role and place of music in the greater good of every known community and society in recorded history.

The complexities we face are not trivial. Standardized outcomes achieved through routinized teaching in order to compare and rank students, teachers, and schools and publish in the local papers which schools are doing well and which aren’t is inherently antithetical to the dynamic nature of art and artistic process. Moreover, the arts, by virtue of their content and

forms of thinking, ought to offer a counterbalance to this runaway train. Effective teachers don't merely accommodate variables, they embrace and use them to enliven teaching and learning. They imagine possibilities, take risks that may or may not work, create an aesthetic ambience for learning, function as co-learners with students, and instill these same sorts of attributes in others.. As Brazilian philosopher Paulo Friere notes, "The teacher is of course an artist, but being an artist does not mean that he or she can make the profile, can shape the students. What the educator does in teaching is to make it possible for the students to become themselves" (Bell, Gaventa, & Peters, 1990). In the preface to his 1950 masterpiece, *The Art of Teaching*, Columbia University professor Gilbert Highet wrote, "*Teaching is not like inducing a chemical reaction; it is much more like painting a picture or making a piece of music . . . You must throw your heart into it, you must realize that it cannot all be done by formulas, or you will spoil your work, and your pupils, and yourself*" (viii). Here, then, is where we must unabashedly equip our students with shockproof crap detectors. They must work within a system, but they must also understand the appropriate and often limiting place of standards relative to their professional higher calling to the greater good of lifespan engagement with and in music. In the mode of Postman and Weingartner's *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, they must be willing to take a stand for values. And those of us who teach teachers must instill arts-generated risk-taking in them, so that they will stand for values in the midst of technical-based standards and outcomes.

Recently, Bill Gates has begun investing in education and is making the rounds of talk shows telling the country what needs to change. Whether Gates's interests are altruistic or agenda driven is being debated, but his money is supporting initiatives that may become catalytic, for better or for worse.

I've already mentioned the Common Core State Standards, to which some now refer as the Common Core Gates Standards. Another of Gate's projects of interest, though it does not include arts education, is the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) (<http://www.metproject.org/>). MET incorporates multiple assessment measures, including state tests and other measures of student achievement, classroom observations, assessments of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, student surveys of classroom environments, and teacher perceptions of working conditions to analyze the factors contributing to effectiveness in classrooms. Those of us acquainted with research methods know that multiple sources of data frequently increase validity, assuming that the data sources themselves are valid. Should this study trigger a more circumspect approach to teacher evaluation it would be an important positive development, and perhaps more consistent with arts teaching and learning than current measures, such as Praxis II, the pre-professional licensure exam still being used in a number of states.

Praxis II, now thankfully on the decline as an assessment of teacher effectiveness, offers an example of how assessment too frequently succumbs to manipulative strategies. Praxis II includes a music test, which like all of Praxis is supported by an array of commercial "how to" aids designed to help students actually pass the test. Obviously, the education industry has banked on the premise that Praxis II is more about figuring out the test than having one's real knowledge assessed. Consider, for example, this practice-test Praxis II item:

Prior to learning about meter, elementary students should be able to demonstrate their understanding of

- (A) weak and strong beats
- (B) syncopation
- (C) subdivision of the beat
- (D) tempo markings

The item includes no reasonable foils, so for the test-taker it's a mere process of elimination to determine the answer. The problem with the item is that meter is a label for what one may perceive through listening, moving, and feeling. The real issue is readiness for application of the term to the concept. The item implies an incremental and sequential absolute

that is at odds both with how music works and with the holistic nature of musical perception and cognition.

Praxis II is used less and less in view of the recent development of the edTPA (<http://edtpa.aacte.org/>), originated at Stanford and now administered for a hefty fee to students by the Pearson Company. edTPA claims to be an authentic, student-centered, multiple measure assessment of teaching that is designed to be educative and predictive of effective teaching and student learning and is related to the Common Core State Standards and InTASC standards (see below). edTPA evaluates student teachers' competence in planning, instruction, assessment of learning, analysis of teaching, and use of academic language. It requires work samples, lesson plans, goals and objectives, commentaries, and brief videos of teaching, all of which are assessed according to an elaborate series of rubrics that comprise a dense array of teaching process criteria. The test is subject specific, and, in the case of the performing arts, provides a framework for content expectations from the now-familiar language of create, perform, and respond from the 1994 National Arts Standards. This means, of course, that edTPA will soon be outdated if the new core arts standards are adopted, which will provide opportunity for considerable money-making as the assessment is revised. Close scrutiny reveals that the edTPA criteria as explicated in the rubrics deal only minimally with issues of artistic quality and are far more heavily focused on teaching process. Like so many arts standards, matters of content quality appear to be assumed as a given when, as we have seen in Goodlad's and other studies, values-based content and authentic artistic process in the arts may be the biggest challenge for arts educators.

edTPA was designed by some brilliant and progressive minds, and subject specialists have been working to define and refine subject-specific issues. Nevertheless important crap-detecting questions must be raised about this new system, such as: 1) in a semester of student teaching, a music teacher is expected to move incrementally from observation to teaching segments to full classes, which may not occur until the last few weeks – how does this assessment accommodate this priority concern?; 2) learning to teach is a developmental process tied to an understanding of the cognitive and psycho-social development of college-age student teachers – where is the evidence of this consideration?; 3) there is no guarantee that mentor teachers in schools themselves satisfy the criteria articulated in the rubrics – how does this potentially affect a student teacher's performance on the edTPA?; 4) a music student teacher could be seeing hundreds of students a week, let alone trying to figure out how many have certain learning qualities that may differentiate them from others – is edTPA the best model in such situations?; 5) like many other assessments, this one is all about school – nothing indicates any larger values issues with regard to outcomes – why not?

The instructions for completing the edTPA portfolio are contained in a 50-page manual dense with text. Making licensure dependent on this documentation, which in the case of music teachers will inevitably require manipulating the process so that the realities of music student teaching do not compromise one's score, severely diminishes opportunity for holistic assessment of *growth* in knowledge and skill during the student teaching experience. Assessments of student teachers' work should assess growth in readiness for classroom practice, not institute yet another measure that encourages students to contrive situations to meet a measure's stipulations. edTPA might work if our universities and public schools collaborated in a sensible system of teacher induction in which first-year teachers were closely mentored and given reduced teaching loads so that the development of high-level teaching and its assessment could be judged over the course of a full year. Such assessments would be incentivized by appropriate salaries, and focused on documentation that arises organically from actual classroom practice instead of an imposed snapshot of three to five lesson plans that are assumed to represent the student teacher's overall level of understanding and application. But such approaches remain anathema to notions of the state-corporate complex, which assumes that education can be improved by the imposition of increasingly irrelevant assessment practices for student and practicing teachers.

The Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) (http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Programs/Interstate_Teacher_Assessment_Consortium_%28InTASC%29.html) is a consortium of state education agencies and national education organizations within the Council of Chief State School Officers that is seeking to reform teacher education, licensing, and professional development. The consortium has recently released model core teaching standards and learning progressions, which outline what all teachers across all content and grade levels should know and be able to do to be effective in today's learning contexts. These standards claim to "articulate what effective teaching and learning looks like in a transformed public education system" (p. 3). The standards are intended to serve as a resource to education agencies and teacher education programs. However, the standards are not categorized by subject area, thus content is again not addressed, and their focus is on generic teaching process.

A new development in accreditation of teacher preparation programs, as opposed to standards for teacher certification or assessment, is the merger of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the Teacher Education Accreditation Consortium (TEAC). The new body is known as CAEP – Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. CAEP has established a Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting "charged with transforming the preparation of educators by creating a rigorous system of accreditation that demands excellence and produces educators who increase student learning" (<http://caepnet.org/caep-accreditation-standards/commission/>).

Increasing the amounts of data from teacher education programs is considered paramount, and CAEP notes the potential for collaborative work with the Gates-funded Measures of Effective Teaching project, state data systems, and teacher preparation portfolio assessments, *e.g.*, the edTPA. Acknowledging increasing financial constraints on both pre-collegiate and higher education, CAEP nevertheless proposes to gather data *annually* from its programs, including impact on P-12 learning and development, indicators of teaching effectiveness, results of employer surveys, including retention and employment milestones, and results of preparation program completer surveys. Additional data will include graduation rates, ability of program completers to satisfy licensing requirements, employment rates in the fields for which they prepared, and student loan default rates and other consumer information. The Commission recommends that CAEP identify levels and significant amounts of change in any of these indicators that would prompt further examination by the CAEP Accreditation Council's *Annual Monitoring Committee* (italics added). Outcomes could include: (1) requirement for follow-up in future years, (2) adverse action that could include revocation of accreditation status or (3) recognition of eligibility for a higher level of accreditation.

Anyone who has been through NCATE reviews and may have endeavored to operationalize the national agreement between NASM and NCATE should be able to see that this increased level of data reporting on an annual basis and the sort of watchdog mentality implied do not bode well for music teacher education. The irony of such increased reporting at a time of acknowledged financial constraints raises significant questions as to academic freedom, the expertise of professional teacher educators, the expenditure for additional staff as opposed to student-centered expense, and the increasingly restrictive policies of an accrediting agency. As so often happens, extra staff may be required simply to administer the local data-gathering work, meanwhile compromising the focus of teacher educators on assuring the much-needed values of education in society. Conformance to a political and, in all likelihood, commercially sustained quagmire of tasks irrelevant to the core values of teacher education will, as it has historically, show no real impact on teacher performance and thus, having consumed millions of dollars and millions of hours of time and energy, will give way to yet another politically motivated procedure.

In the midst of the often confusing plethora of information and expectations arising from the state-federal-commercial-philanthropic complex claiming school improvement as a goal, one

of the best things we can do for our musician-teacher students is to assure that they have shockproof crap detectors, otherwise known as the ability to discern what counts and what doesn't; to be critical, in the best sense of the word, about expectations and assumptions imposed on their work; and to instill the personal fortitude to work within a system while advocating for values-based change. As sociologist William Bruce Cameron once wrote (1963), "not everything that can be counted counts, and not everything that counts can be counted" (p. 13).

Frequently, on Saturday mornings, Marin Alsop, music director of the Baltimore Symphony, talks with Scott Simon on NPR's Weekend Edition Saturday about music. Recently, Marin was discussing a particular moment in Britten's *War Requiem* based around a tritone. Here's a paraphrase of what she said: "Now you don't really need to know this is a tritone, but everyone feels it when it happens." A moment later, Scott Simon opined that music isn't necessarily always about calmness and beauty, but sometimes it keeps us on the edge of our seats with tension. And that, you see, is what every human being knows intuitively – that music embodies the complete range of human feeling and emotion in ways that transcend method and technique. This feelingful experience is, of course, what creates a need and desire to know – the question of *why* music feels and sounds the way it does and how we, in the mode of philosopher Christopher Small, become co-musicians and co-constructors of meaning in the musical experience. Participatory culture is not simply about learning technically how to create, perform, and respond to music; it is about embodied meaning and how we all share collaboratively and concurrently in that meaning. And that is why we *must* engage our crap detectors when we look at things like grade-level based and course-based standards that limit music understanding and skill to segmented parts that too often do not accumulate to the whole of what music and music learning are actually about. And it is why we need to challenge systems of teacher certification and program accreditation that thwart, rather than encourage, innovation and creativity.

Elliot Eisner's 1995 observation on the standards movement was that "successful efforts at school reform will entail a substantially deeper analysis of schools and their relationships to communities and teachers than has thus far been undertaken." (p. 2). I would add that it will require a substantially deeper analysis of music and its relationship to communities and society than has thus far been undertaken. When Eisner lectured to the Dewey Society in 2002, he said, "Our world is not one that submits to single correct answers to questions or clear cut solutions to problems. We need to be able not only to envision fresh options, we need to have **feel** for the situations in which they appear. . . .the forms of thinking the arts stimulate and develop are far more appropriate for the real world we live in than the tidy right angled boxes we employ in the name of school improvement."

Those of us who teach future teachers at any level, including those who will themselves become teacher educators, owe it to our students, our art, and our society to teach in ways that empower values-based contexts for decision-making, and that assure teachers who are themselves musically enlivened and passionate about the magnificent humanizing power of our art form. We simply cannot allow the appearance of high-quality teaching through endless documentation to turn the profound joy of teaching music into the drudgery of meaningless busywork.

As musicians, we supposedly make qualitative judgments, we elaborate on ideas, we create new expressions, we interrogate existing expressions, we deal with multiple avenues of problem-solving, we develop empathy. The applications of these values are not necessarily always for a greater good, as history makes clear. Nevertheless, our calling, as professionals, is to assure that they *do* lead to a greater good. If we can keep our heads while all around us are losing theirs, we can see standards as a contributing but not defining element of our work.

A few years ago, Henry Fogel proposed this challenge in his address to NASM, and I close with it: ". . . the question is "are we preparing our students to go forward in this world and help to shape the America of the 21st Century? If we are going to build an America that is something more than faster computers, bigger buildings, more productive factories, and certainly

about something other than more devastating wars and conflicts, then we cannot exist in a self-made plastic bubble, unaware of, and unwilling to change the society in which we live.”

References

- Arasi, M. (2007). Adult reflections on a high school choral music program: Perceptions of meaning and lifelong influence. Ph.D. Dissertation: Georgia State University.
- Bell, B., Gaventa, J., & Peters, J. (Eds.) (1990). *We Make the Road by Walking: Conversations on Education and Social Change by Myles Horton and Paul Freire*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Britton, A.P. (1961). Music education: An American specialty. In *One Hundred Years of Music in America*, P.H. Lang (Ed.). (211-229). New York: G. Schirmer.
- Cameron, W.B. (1963). *Informal sociology: A casual introduction to sociological thinking*. New York: Random House.
- Council for the Accreditation of Educators Preparation. (2013, June). *First CAEP Annual Report to the Public*. Author. http://caepnet.files.wordpress.com/2013/05/annualreport_final.pdf
- Eisner, E.W. (1995). Standards for American schools: Help or hindrance, *Phi Delta Kappan* 76(10), 758-760.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). The kind of schools we need. *Phi Delta Kappan* , 83 (8) 576-583.
- Eisner, E.W. (2002). What can education learn from the arts about the practice of education. http://www.infed.org/biblio/eisner_arts_and_the_practice_of_education.htm John
- Fogel, H. (2009, November). Speech for the national meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music, San Diego, CA
- Goodlad, J.(1984). *A place called school*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Highet, G. (1950). *The art of teaching*. New York: Random House.
- National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (2013). *National Core Arts Standards: A Conceptual Framework for Arts Learning*. <http://nccas.wikispaces.com/Conceptual+Framework>
- Plimpton, G. (1958). The Art of Fiction, No. 21. *The Paris Review*. <http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/4825/the-art-of-fiction-no-21-ernest-hemingw>
- Podolny, J. (2009, June). The buck stops (and starts) at business Schools. *Harvard Business Review*. <http://hbr.org/2009/06/the-buck-stops-and-starts-at-business-school/ar/1>
- Snead, T. E. (2010). Dichotomous musical worlds: Interactions between the musical lives of adolescents and school music-learning culture. Ph.D. Dissertation. Georgia State University.

TEACHING III: LOCAL DECISION-MAKING FOR P-12 MUSIC TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

SHARON DAVIS GRATTO
University of Dayton

MICHAEL R. SITTON
The Crane School of Music

CHARLES G. "SKIP" SNEAD
University of Alabama

I. Sharon Davis Gratto

After preparing for this panel presentation and listening earlier to the two related sessions before this one, I have decided that everyone would benefit from having a glossary of state and national abbreviations and acronyms related to music teacher education. This would be especially helpful for music education faculty who move to a position in a different state and work on music student teacher preparation with faculty in education units that are new to them. I also think it would be advisable to recommend that all of our Ohio graduates look for music teaching positions in the southern part of the United States, where jobs seem to be more plentiful than in Ohio and in many other parts of the country.

In the state of Ohio, changes and developments in music teacher education have resulted in a confusing and challenging situation for faculty, students, and PK-12 teachers. In its role as the primary broker for the new Teacher Performance Assessment program (edTPA), Pearson Education, Inc., in my opinion, has joined the Educational Testing Service in the great education financial racket by instituting increased time and expense for college students who are already financially strapped from large tuition and room and board costs. edTPA has joined other 'innovations' and changes that impact teacher education, including revised Ohio state teaching standards and the 2014 iteration of the 1994 national standards in the arts. These developments have resulted in teachers who have insufficient time to meet their own new requirements for evaluation, much less the challenges of being cooperating teachers for student interns who must follow the directives of the edTPA. Student teacher interns, furthermore, are no longer being evaluated using the Praxis 2 examination but are taking instead a new multi-age computer-based multiple choice pedagogy assessment test of professional knowledge, along with an assessment test of music content knowledge. Furthermore, Ohio offers an alternative resident educator license for teacher certification outside the traditional higher education teacher education program that can result in unequal competition for available teacher openings.

Prior to 2004, teachers in Ohio were required to have a Master's degree for the second renewal of their state teaching license. On page 32 of the 2004 update of the Ohio Department of Education booklet "Teacher Education and Licensure Standards," one sentence changed this degree requirement: "The second renewal of the professional teacher license shall require the completion of a Master's degree **OR** thirty semester hours of graduate credit in classroom teaching and/or an area of licensure." This meant that teachers could earn much-less-expensive continuing education units and that school districts did not need to support Master's degree course work or to pay larger salaries to teachers with Master's degrees.

This change in degree requirements resulted in the gradual but steady enrollment decline in music education Master's degree programs at universities in Ohio. In response, some schools are making an effort to follow in the footsteps of Kent State University by offering their degree programs on-line for a national rather than a regional audience. On-line degree programs, however, require additional training for faculty and funding and marketing staff support. It can also be anticipated that if fewer music teachers are earning Master's degrees, fewer will be moving forward to doctoral programs and subsequent teaching positions to prepare the next generation of music educators. This comes at a time when many senior faculty in the profession are retiring. It is likely that at least in Ohio the cycle of generating qualified future music teachers for higher education positions will be interrupted.

Supply and demand for music education faculty and students is related directly to other national and state trends. In the next few years, the number of high school graduates is expected to be in decline, with a resulting increase in the competition to recruit music education majors to undergraduate degree programs. Diversity among students and faculty in this field has been and will continue to be a problem because of the low income expected for program graduates, as opposed to income generated following graduation from other degree programs. Ohio also ties school bond levies to property tax rates, and tax levies often do not pass in school districts where residents do not want to pay higher taxes.

In the region around Dayton, OH, for example, failed levies have resulted in massive cuts to arts and physical education programs in districts where public school education otherwise has been strong. What may remain of some of these programs is decreased quality of arts education, including the loss of curriculum continuity across all grade levels, PK-12. One glimmer of hope is evident in the University of Dayton's New Horizons Band Program. These 'over age 50' instrumentalists have connected with a middle school band program, sharing both rehearsal time and concert performances as the multi-age players sit side-by-side and work together. This shared arrangement is one way senior citizens who vote can observe first-hand the importance of school music programs.

Since none of the problems described here are going away until the next cycle of educational reforms takes place, the only solution is to be pro-active in our responses and to model ways for our students to cope, both long-term and after they begin to teach school music. Here are some specific ideas:

- 1. Update music teacher preparation course content to include 21st Century skills**

This will require a clear understanding of what those skills are and a willingness to prepare students beyond traditional large ensemble training to conduct bands, orchestras, and choirs. Music teacher programs can no longer prepare students to work with the 10% of the population that usually participates in music programs after seventh grade. The undergraduate music education curriculum needs hefty doses of creative music making, including composition and improvisation that is not just for members of the jazz band and composition majors.

Diversity education that includes world music instruction in ensembles and courses is another critical component of today's music teacher education programs, as is a thorough knowledge of music technology. A broad education will prepare current undergraduates for multiple teaching situations that are available in the job market and for internal position changes that may suddenly occur in school districts where they are working.

- 2. Provide music education students with stronger preparation in curriculum development**

We work well with our students to help them understand and teach to the national and state arts standards and to help them develop skills for teaching. We cannot forget, however, the missing link between the two – curriculum development - and

we must make time to inform our undergraduates in this area as well as in the other two.

3. Advise music education seniors to apply for a wider variety of teaching positions

Graduates of Ohio music teacher education programs tend to have their hearts set on teaching in school districts near home. The reality of the challenging Ohio job market suggests, however, that students expand their geographic horizons as they begin their position searches. Not only should they apply for jobs in a broader array of geographic locations, but also they should consider a variety of types of schools where they might teach, including parochial, independent, international, Department of Defense Dependent Schools, charter, magnet, urban, rural, and community music schools. Both faculty and students should explore and know well where music teacher openings are and gather information about the financial and political health of the school districts in which the positions are located.

4. Guide music education students throughout their four-year degree programs to develop public relations, marketing, and entrepreneurship skills

Graduates need a thorough understanding of arts advocacy and program promotion. They need to be able to enter a school district prepared to gather supporters for their music program who can be as strong advocates as the marching band parent boosters.

5. Model civic awareness and responsibility

Faculty must demonstrate to their students who are going to be the music teachers of the future the importance of paying attention to current events and local politics, especially as these events impact arts education. An awareness of local educational issues and the work of the school board are critically important, as is knowledge of the health and well being of the state arts council and local arts organizations. Students need examples for encouragement to assume their civic responsibilities. Faculty should demonstrate, for example, the importance of voting in every election, no matter how small or unimportant each seems. Students must learn that a single vote really can make a difference.

6. Impress upon students the importance of continuing to make music after they graduate and have begun to teach

From singing in a volunteer church choir to free-lance performance work, music teachers need to continue to make music after graduation. Music making can contribute to quality of life and general well being and can be the source of additional income. The ‘performing’ music teacher can also be a role model for students, and shared performance experiences can inform and enrich music lesson content. Children can benefit from knowing that their music teachers enjoy performing and are continuing to do so outside of class.

In summary, higher education faculty who are preparing students to teach in today’s and tomorrow’s PK-12 school settings need to take an active role in the education process by modeling certain behaviors for their students, by taking advantage of opportunities to get out into the PK-12 classroom environment themselves, and, either electronically or in person, by visiting some of their graduates on the job. Faculty need to come together to share and learn from each other about current issues, trends, and concerns in education and to be active in professional organizations such as the Society for Music Teacher Education. Faculty must assume a leadership role to diversify students and other faculty who enter the music education profession and to ensure that diverse content and diversity issues are fully integrated into the undergraduate music education curriculum.

Administrators whose specialty is music education will need to be more diligent about remaining up-to-date with the PK-12 classroom and the students who are being prepared to teach

in that environment. Local units cannot put their heads in the sand until the current cycle of teacher education directives goes away. They must meet these issues directly, both now and in the future.

II. Michael R. Sitton

Local responses to changes affecting teacher preparation will always be shaped by factors in particular local landscapes. To that end, let me describe some of the factors particular to the landscape for The Crane School of Music, located in Potsdam, New York, a small town in a largely rural area near the Canadian border, and offer some of our experiences as something of a current case study.

The State University of New York at Potsdam, of which The Crane School is one of three academic units, is a regional campus within a strongly centralized state university system. As a large school of music with a long history and a primary mission in music education, we have a strong and very extensive network of music teacher alumni throughout the state of New York. In our small town/rural environment, we do not have sufficient local capacity to place the forty to fifty student teachers we send out each semester, so we employ regional student teacher supervisors in six locations throughout New York, in a variety of settings (urban, suburban, small town/rural), who are themselves retired music teachers with significant teaching experience. The School of Music largely has ownership of its teacher training program, though we have strong and positive engagement with SUNY Potsdam's School of Education and Professional Studies, and collaborate with that unit and its Dean on NCATE accreditation matters, as well as broader engagement with the local, regional, and state public education community,

Changes in teacher education for New York implemented during the past few years, or in the process of being implemented, have led to a range of impacts on our students, our curriculum, and clinical aspects of our program.

Students have seen impact in the time, effort, and pressure imposed by new evaluation requirements in the initial certification process, as well as financial costs directly tied to those requirements. Other changes impacting students have included new teacher education program entrance requirements and a changing employment landscape brought about by funding pressures on public school systems.

Our curriculum has been impacted by new, externally imposed required courses and by the faculty load devoted to those courses, as well as faculty time required to prepare students for other aspects of new certification requirements, as they are embedded in already-existing courses. Newly required courses have squeezed out other courses and/or course options open to students, due to externally-imposed limits on degree credit hours.

Clinical aspects of the program been impacted, or potentially may be impacted, by the willingness of public schools and sponsor teachers to accept student teacher placements, as well as willingness to permit student observation hours, as these schools and teachers face pressures of their own from new teacher and school-level evaluation requirements.

Specific recent changes in New York State initial certification requirements impacting our program have included a freestanding three-credit course in special education for all students (which we have implemented as a Music in Special Education course so as to make its content most useful to our graduates, though this now requires most of a full-time faculty member's load); a freestanding three-credit course in Literacy, which has resulted in the virtual elimination of elective courses from the program; mandated compliance with a new Dignity for All Students Act, which is still in progress but will be either folded into existing courses or implemented as special workshop training; and a 100-hour requirement for documented clinical observation prior to student teaching, which requires half of a faculty member's load to assist students, liaise effectively with local schools, and certify observation hours in the manner required by the state.

The State University of New York has imposed a number of new requirements or policies directly or indirectly affecting teacher education, including a cap of 126 credit hours on all baccalaureate degrees; a “seamless transfer” initiative within the system, which has placed pressures on the general education program and lessened some local control on acceptance of lower-level courses in the curriculum; severe funding cuts over the past six years, which have resulted in restrictions on various budgets including budgets for adjunct instruction, where some of our specialized, and required, courses are taught; and pending imposition of statewide GPA and test score requirements for entry into all teacher education programs.

At the curricular level, this has meant for the Crane music education program that we have been compelled to reduce credits (and therefore content) in secondary tech courses; to eliminate a general music methods course; to eliminate the option of an upper-level music education elective; to eliminate six elective credits in liberal arts courses (due to displacement by the required Literacy and Special Education courses noted earlier); and to increase credits in a School Health class in order to accommodate mandated curricular content on child protection. By listing these impacts, we do not argue with the merit of any of the new requirements; nevertheless, each imposes choices that must be made affecting other parts of the curriculum.

Students seeking initial teaching certification as they graduate from our baccalaureate program must pass a series of tests and evaluations, a roster which has undergone considerable change recently. The direct cost to each student completing these tests, including required fingerprinting, now totals around \$1,000, a cost borne by students above and beyond tuition and fees charged by our institution. These tests include the EAS (Educating All Students) test; the ALST (Academic Literacy Skills Test), which we require Crane students to complete with our Sophomore Evaluation process for all music education majors; the CST (Content Specialty Test), whose anticipated revision in the music area we are anxiously awaiting; and the edTPA (Education Teachers Performance Assessment), a commercially outsourced test including a video teaching demonstration component, required of all candidates graduating as of spring 2014 and later.

Other impacts on our program have included the implementation in New York public schools of the APPR (Annual Professional Performance Review) as a requirement for individual evaluation of public school teachers, which, as noted earlier, we perceive as having an emerging impact on the willingness of schools and teachers to accept student teachers and observers. The concern has been that having student teachers may negatively impact evaluation results for teachers or even for schools and systems, so that it becomes increasingly tempting to decline to participate in clinical programs. To date, we continue to be able to place student teachers and provide observation sites, but we are concerned for the future.

We are awaiting the announcement of new music/arts standards for the Common Core, which will doubtless impact aspects of our teacher preparation in our content area.

While our long history of requiring student self-analysis through video as a teaching technique in teacher preparation courses has, we feel, prepared our students better than some others for the edTPA, we remain concerned with the rapid implementation of the edTPA in New York State. Questions remain, for example, about options open to students who are unsuccessful in a first attempt at the edTPA, who must submit new video examples for a re-take, when they are no longer in a student teaching environment where they can easily secure such examples.

Among the local strategies which have helped The Crane School thus far in its engagement with new and changing requirements are our strong and positive ties to the School of Education and Professional Studies, and, through it, to local and regional public schools as well as to the New York State Department of Education and to all of the State University of New York schools of education, whose deans meet regularly.

A particularly useful local vehicle is the SUNY Potsdam Teacher Education Advisory Committee, which includes college administrators, faculty from all teacher education programs, including Crane’s, and an array of local/regional superintendents, principals, and BOCES (Board

of Cooperative Educational Services) representatives. This group meets regularly to share information, review changes, and engage in positive conversation.

Our extensive network of teacher alumni has been invaluable in continuing to assist with student teacher placement and job placement. This network is also valuable in the sphere of influence, since a number of alumni are well-placed in terms of statewide advocacy for teacher education and public education policy. The network of student teacher supervisors described earlier, in six locations across New York State, positively cultivates strong ties to the local schools in each of those areas, which also provides significant benefit to us and to our students.

Doubtless, local experiences vary greatly for institutions whose profiles are significantly different from ours, and whose locations have strikingly different characteristics. The success that we have had to date in navigating the difficult waters of rapid significant change in teacher education, as evidenced by our continued ability to place large numbers of student teachers and to guide graduates quickly toward full-time employment in the field, has much to do with our positive engagement with a number of important constituencies, including our college's School of Education, the local, regional, and state public education communities, and our own network of alumni educators. Regardless of local and institutional circumstances, it is clear that positive engagement with such groups is key to the success of any unit preparing teacher candidates in the current environment.

III. Charles G. Snead

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity today to speak on a subject that is central to the success of every aspect of our discipline for generations to come. Music education, the training of future generations to participate in, or at the very least appreciate, what we do is paramount in the ongoing evolution of music as a cultural influence.

As I focused carefully on the charge for this session with the questions that were provided, I came to realize that the question itself outlines the problem, and to some degree becomes the problem. A diverse range of individual perspectives will form the basis of reaction to the question, and by direct parallel, reaction to the problem. My interpretation of the wording and the context of the questions presented for this session led me to assume that we were searching for the solution to a 'problem.' But, after careful analysis I would propose an additional question: is this a problem or is it an opportunity?

How one sees this issue relative to the specifics involved in the question of 'problem or opportunity' will be highly individualized based on geographical region, local experience, and their associations with individuals in positions of power and influence (locally, regionally, and nationally). An example of how a single person in a strong position of influence can drive this conversation in a variety of convoluted directions would be Margaret Spellings and her tenure as Secretary of Education. On the more localized level, influences by governors, mayors, boards of education and other individuals in positions of influence will dictate a myriad of local circumstances.

These questions have manifested at every identifiable level, local, regional, and national, as an organized reaction to pressures that have been building for decades (at least since the 1970s). Politicians and educators, across disciplines, have shown warranted and growing concerns about the quality of our educational system and our place relative to the rest of the world. Through the evolution of those concerns a variety of perspectives about our strengths and weaknesses have come and gone, which we might define as 'the noise of education reform.' Without a doubt this 'noise' has proved to be a moving target and was described by one of the seasoned educators in my region as a 'pendulum'; constantly moving, and soon to move in an alternate direction. We've all experienced increased pressures that were initiated in the first few years of this millennium. We were faced with increasing expectations to justify our level of quality and product; with product being defined as 'music education students'. These were

pressures that could not be ignored as increasingly, federal and state levels of support became directly tied to ‘effective production’.

New systems and approaches were established which have affected all of us and the manner in which we do business. These external pressures regarding the justification of our product required effective measurement. As a result, quantifiable, score based systems became the norm. This led to an unbalanced focus on quantitative assessments of teaching effectiveness as opposed to sufficient qualitative assessments of expertise in the discipline. As music education programs have responded and evolved relative to local, regional, and national pressures the most successful programs have sought and struck the appropriate balance in teaching effectiveness and expertise in the discipline. Even in the face of this, we have experienced continued political, social, and cultural attempts to quantify what is ‘good teaching’.

In response to these trends and demands, our music education programs have shown an increasing degree of bifurcation in recent decades. We must be as effective as possible at producing both teachers and musicians. The model must be, ‘musicians who are good teachers; and teachers who are good musicians’. This resurrects what has been an age-old question relative to this discussion. In what order do these words come and on which should the greater priorities be placed: ‘music’ and “education”? Both of these words are tremendously important and must be integral components of the student’s educational and preparatory process. Much of the situation that has generated the problem (regardless of one’s perception of the problem) relates to the following:

- On the musical side of the ledger, students have continued to be trained in a very traditional, experiential model. Although tried-and-true and arguably, quite effective, it is also somewhat stagnant and antiquated. It is an easy and vulnerable target within our current environment because our system of musical preparation provides excellent experience and background, but very little in the way of quantifiable assessment and almost nothing that is consistent with any combination of facts leading to effective licensure or justification consistent with state, regional, or federal guidelines. Simply stated, performers do not require a license. There is no politically mandated standard to which someone must perform, in order to perform.
- In contrast, our development of future teachers (on the education side of the ledger) has been more nimble, requiring greater change, flexibility, and assessment of current trends. This is developed out of necessity, driven by federal and state requirements. Music education programs have faced and been forced to respond to increasing degrees of federal and state level requirements. These requirements must be specifically addressed on an individual basis, which is assessed by state licensure. Teachers do require a license. There is a politically mandated standard to which someone must perform (teach), in order to teach (perform). This has driven the required flexibility in our music education programs as the politically mandated standard has been, and remains, in a constant state of evolution.
- In summation, training within the traditional model (musical model) does not imply and certainly does not guarantee or assess required levels of success. Teacher education programs on the other hand require, assess, and regularly measure specific benchmarks and levels of success.

As we compare the two sides of this ledger, comparing the validity and success rates of both, analyzing the complementary nature that they have for each other, we begin to outline the potential opportunity in this situation, as opposed to the perceived problem.

Both the short-term and long-term analysis and resolution of this situation require that it should not be viewed as a ‘problem requiring a reaction’. We, within the profession would be better off to take a proactive stance to the situation, seeing it as ‘an opportunity for improvement’

as opposed to a ‘problem that needs to be fixed or eliminated’. The perceived ‘problem’ is not going to go away. At the very best, it will continue to evolve. It will be increasingly important that we evolve with it establishing a proactive position in the process.

As I specifically address the answers to the questions posed for this session, I synthesized that the answers to the first, second, and third questions share a very similar and focused answer.

1. How do we filter the noise of education reform, review conditions and prospects as objectively as possible and create a realistic local approach?
2. Given the circumstances in each case what decisions can we make or advocate that minimize risk, meet challenges, and take advantage of opportunities to advance our music teacher preparation capabilities?
3. How do we create our way forward?

This should be 100% focused on, centered towards, and responsive to the needs of the students, defining these needs as ‘what will make them successful music educators’. In most cases, those who choose at any point to leave the profession will make that decision because of classroom management issues, not the knowledge of music. If we remain sensitive to what they are being required to do in order to achieve success in ‘their’ generation, our path will become clear relative to the experiences that we must provide and requirements that must be present within our curricula and specific courses. As articulated earlier, the ‘noise of education reform’ will be perceived differently in different geographical regions, political environments, and individual circumstances. The one thing we can guarantee from experience is that the “noise” will be fluid and ever-changing. Those who will ultimately succeed will be those who establish and maintain a proactive position. That is clearly and ultimately my interpretation of the nature of this discussion.

4. Based on where we are and what we have determined that we need to do, how do we advocate our position, how do we convince those that need to be convinced that our position is valuable and meritorious?

Widely accepted and increasingly popular national statistics support the most obvious strengths that we all know. 1) Schools with strong creative and experiential programs have better attendance; 2) students involved in creative programs do much better in their schoolwork; recent data indicates that standardized achievement tests reflect this trend as well.

And, for clarification: I am not putting forth the argument that the creative arts, or music specifically ‘make you smarter’. I am pointing out the obvious and measurable parallel that creative and experiential programs, specifically music, improve the human condition, thereby increasing productivity on the part of individuals and groups.

We need to continue to aggressively champion the importance of music and other forms of creative activity and its relevance to the success of students in all disciplines. Simply stated, what we teach IS as important as science and math. Therefore, we need to educate our students preparing them to make the case that music is equally relevant to science and math. One of my colleagues observed that, even in our current culture of score based achievement and testing we would be better off if there had been a music/arts test established. If that were the case, then appropriate attention would be placed on the scoring and relevant placements. As further research is done, which is one of the most important responsibilities of our generation, statistics and documentable facts will further support this cause. The arts in general and in this case, music specifically, is at the core of our cultural identity.

This is directly relevant to the final question:

5. Once we know our situation and needs well, how do we find allies and partners for mutual assistance?

We must train and equip our students to become strong advocates. In addition to educating our students and equipping them to become strong and effective advocates for both themselves, their students and their programs, we need to educate parents, administrators, and communities. I accept that this is a well-known mission, but an integral part of the education that we provide to our students must better equip them to deal with this essential component in their future professional development. There must be an increased understanding that while without question, science, math, and technology are important and integral components of success for future students in all disciplines, they do not supersede or take a more important place than the arts.

Creative expression, manifested through artistic expression, defines our culture and who we are; relative to the education of our society, nothing could be argued as “more” important. Fundamental elements of science, mathematics and to a large degree technology know or recognize no cultural distinction. $2+2 = 4$, in any language, in any country. The elements of the periodic table and their combinations are the same regardless of the language in which they are interpreted.

The expressive and experiential arts, in this case specifically music, are what define, portray, and contextualize the human condition. An understanding of this fact and an effective knowledge base in the arts, both theoretical and functional, should and (I hope) will become an increasingly better understood and integral component of all forms of education.

This is a message that could not be more appropriate or more pertinent for parents, politicians, and community leaders of all kinds. A diverse range of surveys, statistics and reports over the past two decades has sought to quantify the anecdotal evidence that creative people are more successful in any chosen discipline, with reasonable degrees of success. They make better business leaders, doctors, engineers, accountants, and so on. I would direct you to the work of Sir Ken Robinson, Dr. Charles Kim, or Daniel Pink, for further reinforcement.

Much of what has precipitated the question posed for this session was born in the public schools and followed a “trickle up” path. We can facilitate our work for the future far more aggressively and successfully on our own campuses. As we continue to educate administrators in higher education, deans of colleges, program directors, and department chairs of other divisions about the integral nature of the arts and its relationship to success in their disciplines, we further our own cause. If their students in colleges of engineering, nursing, business, and every other discipline learn and understand the necessity of the arts and its importance in our society/culture, then over time we will certainly experience a ‘trickle down’ (essentially reverse) effect of trends that have so dramatically affected our role in the educational process.

By understanding the benefits to each individual student directly, and the ultimate benefits to our community as a whole, both short-term and long-term, our educational leaders and those who support them will evolve their understanding of the importance of what we do. As we perpetuate and refine our message, our relationship to the ‘pressures’ and our perceptions of the ‘problem’ will change. Over time, the ‘noise of education reform’ will sound less like ‘noise’ and hopefully, at some point, more like the ‘music of education reform’.

MANAGEMENT III: HEALTH AND SAFETY FOR MUSIC STUDENTS AND FACULTY

A MUSICIAN'S GUIDE TO ANXIETY

BONNIE E. ROBSON, M.D., D.C.P, D.PSYCHE.
Pivot Sports Medicine, Toronto, Canada

Why do musicians need to know about anxiety? All musicians experience anxiety, nervousness and anticipatory arousal at some time. They need to understand how pre-performance jitters, performance anxiety and anxiety disorders differ. They need to know how to control performance anxiety to enhance their presentation, and when and what to do about more serious signs. A performer's training should include learning how to manage this stress to the musician's advantage. Every performer faces the challenge of learning how to regulate his or her physical and emotional energy to perform consistently in the peak performance zone.

What are the chances of being affected? Social phobia, which includes Performance Anxiety, affects 15 million American adults beginning in childhood or early adulthood.¹ The definitive 1988 study of 2,212 symphony orchestra musicians found that 24% reported performance anxiety that interfered with their playing. 16% said the problem was severe. Performance anxiety was the most commonly reported medical symptom in the survey.² Nagel reports that at least half of all performing artists regardless of age, gender, talent or experience report problems associated with performance anxiety.³ Miller and Chesky studied college music students, of whom 83.1% reported experiencing performance anxiety.⁴ In another study of college musicians, nearly 50% reported anxiety.⁵

What is Anxiety? Anxiety can be considered a normal, natural and healthy response to life's challenges and or threats. It differs from fear, as fear is the reaction to an identifiable external threat from a source or object outside of the individual. Fear leads to the fight/flight response to avoid the danger. This response involves the sympathetic nervous system. Anxiety is an interior cognitive reaction to an anticipated future event or situation that does not exist or is unlikely to exist. It is characterized by worry and pessimism.

Anxiety can have Somatic or Cognitive components. Most people recognize the somatic components or the physiological symptoms that accompany heightened arousal, such as having butterflies in the stomach. Cognitive anxiety includes thoughts and related images of risk or danger, worry about the future, and catastrophic thinking.

Linda Brennan, American Academy of Dramatic Arts, speaking at a Performing Arts Medicine Association regional meeting at Chapman University, August 2013 recounts Jimmy's experience. Jimmy is a 48-year-old actor/vocal musician in international theatre, TV and film. "I think I am a good actor but my stage fright is terrible. It is just Hell. Pure Hell! It is like going to the guillotine. Before I go onstage, it is this red chaos that goes straight to my stomach. And I have so many negative thoughts going round and round in my head that I try to fight. But you have to go onstage, you don't have a choice. My career could have been better if I did not have this Hell."⁶ The symptoms don't stop with the end of the performance. Pablo Casals observed that when he went to bed after a concert he saw the performance like a nightmare: "I go through the whole thing in my mind and I see again with perfect exactitude everything that went off the rails and I go through every single note. I cannot get to sleep until I have made this examination exacting and painful."⁷ Again, Miller and Chesky found that for all performance conditions cognitive anxiety was higher than somatic anxiety. Higher cognitive anxiety scores were associated with

low self-confidence. Changes in cognitive or somatic intensity were also associated with whether the anxiety was perceived as facilitative or debilitating.⁴

Anxiety State or Trait There is also the distinction between State and Trait Anxiety. State Anxiety is a transitory emotional state characterized by heightened tension and apprehension. Trait anxiety refers to the relatively stable individual differences in anxiety tendencies. Individuals with high trait anxiety feel chronically worried or apprehensive and perform worse than those with low trait anxiety in circumstances that involve evaluation. They are the worrywarts.⁸

Are performance anxiety and stage fright different? Kate Hays quotes Mark Twain: “The brain is a wonderful thing. It starts working the minute you are born and never stops until you get up to speak in public” (Page 101). She describes stage fright as the debilitating form of Performance Anxiety, as stage fright involves a sense of catastrophe.⁹ Kenny and Ackerman agree that performance anxiety occurs on a continuum of severity from everyday stress inherent in performance occupation to more debilitating symptoms of stage fright.¹⁰ Steptoe suggested that Music Performance Anxiety (MPA) was different from stage fright that happens to other performers appearing before a large audience, as MPA can occur in intimate settings such as auditions. Stage fright is sudden in onset, and MPA can come on gradually over days and weeks preceding the event. MPA has four components: 1) affect or feeling; 2) cognitions (or loss of concentration, memory failure, misreading the score); 3) behaviors (failures of technique, and loss of posture, tremors and trembling); and 4) physiological reactions (disturbances in breath control, salivation, heart rate, GI function and hormonal imbalances (cortisol, epinephrine)).¹¹ Nagel uses performance anxiety in a psychoanalytic perspective, “the state involves as internal conflict between the need to display one’s artistry publicly and the concurrent fear of proving inadequate and suffering public humiliation and rejection.” It does seem that performance anxiety is the correct term if the state involves an internal conflict, as the cognitive component is definitely an internal dialogue.

What is the difference between Anxiety and Perfectionism? Since successful musicians tend to be perfectionistic and part of perfectionism is attention to detail and worry, which are characteristics of anxiety disorders, we need to differentiate between anxiety and perfectionism. Otherwise we may attribute the symptoms to an anxiety disorder when they are actually manifestations of their personality characteristics. Lynda Mainwaring defines perfectionism as setting excessively high performance standards in conjunction with a tendency to make overly critical self-evaluations. Perfectionists set and hold unrealistic standards for themselves and others.¹³ Toby Diamond describes how perfectionism is often linked to performance anxiety. She says, “The disorder involves too much focus on the self or ‘I’ and an excessive concern with how one is being perceived.” The three types of perfectionism are: 1) an inward response or self-oriented perfectionism, in which the individual can never match up to the ideal; 2) other-oriented perfectionism, which means high expectation of others and being critical of others; and 3) socially prescribed perfectionism, which involves the belief that socially imposed standards from the outside world are excessively high. The first is more typical of the dancer, and is the constricted self-doubting person with low self-confidence. The second type is more afraid of losing control. But the two can overlap and have much in common, which results in these individuals having a type of perfectionism that is very low in adaptability and coping skills and easily thrown off when things don’t go according to plan.¹⁴ Dianna Kenny says, “Perfectionism, although not extensively studied in the performing arts, appears to be both an etiological and maintaining factor in anxious performance. One of the reasons for this is that the performing arts are exacting disciplines. Perfectionism taken to the extremes can be debilitating. For example, Barbara Streisand gave up live performance for 27 years after she forgot the words to a song in a concert in Central Park in 1967.”¹⁵

What are the symptoms of Anxiety? The following symptoms of anxiety may be experienced for a short period of time. It is only when these are prolonged, severe and disruptive that a musician may need to consider if he or she has a more serious disorder.

- Racing pulse, heart palpitations and chest pains.
- Shortness of breath, panting, dry mouth
- Blushing and mottled skin.
- Appetite disturbances, nausea and vomiting
- Trembling, shaking, muscle tension and muscle aches
- Dizziness
- Hot-flashes, sweating or chills, clammy hands
- Difficulties with sleep
- Difficulty concentrating
- Social isolation
- Obsessions, compulsions

What are the various Types of Anxiety Related Disorders?

I. The Phobic Group

- a) Panic Disorder with or without agoraphobia. Agoraphobia is when a person avoids certain situations fearing a panic attack may take place.
- b) Social Phobia
- c) Specific Phobias, e.g. Spiders, Reptiles, Flying

II. The Worrying Group

- a) Generalized Anxiety Disorder

III. Trauma and Stress Related

IV. Obsessive Compulsive Disorder

- V. Anxiety Disorder Due to General Medical Conditions, e.g. injury, post-concussion syndrome, hyperthyroidism, pheochromocytoma, stimulants, cardiac disease

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders #5 is published by the American Psychiatric Association and provides diagnostic criteria for psychiatric disorders. Of the Anxiety Disorders, the one most interesting to musicians is Social anxiety Disorder or Social Phobia, which has the requirement that the psychiatrist specify if the disorder is **Performance only**, i.e., if the fear is restricted to speaking or performing in public. Social Phobia is, as the DSM-V notes, frequently associated with behavioural, cardiovascular and neuroendocrine activation and can manifest itself in a variety of physical discomforts.

It is important to rule out Anxiety disorders due to General Medical Conditions, such as Hyperthyroidism, temporal lobe epilepsy, endocrine dysfunction, pheochromocytoma, caffeine abuse, other stimulants, cardiac disease and injury. There is a positive linear relationship between anxiety and pain. So for the injured musician, reducing anxiety reduces pain and speeds recovery.¹⁶

What causes anxiety? Anxiety disorders are not the fault of the person experiencing them. Research shows that these disorders are most likely a combination of biological and psychological factors. Miller and Chesky established that for college students, anxiety is multidimensional; that is, more than one factor contributed.⁴

Biological/Physiological. Genetic factors are likely part of the etiology, as anxiety symptoms tend to run in families. One form of anxiety, obsessive-compulsive disorder, can result from toxins created by a virus infection. (PANDAS, meaning Pediatric Autoimmune Neurological Disorder Antecedent Streptococcal). Physiologically, with anxiety there are changes in brain chemicals called neurotransmitters and alterations in certain areas of the brain. When stressed, the body produces norepinephrine (noradrenaline) and epinephrine (adrenaline) that attaches to adrenergic sites and so produces the physiological response typical of the anxiety state. The Flight/Fight response is really a response of the sympathetic nervous system. Sympathetic activation produces some of all the physical symptoms that we just examined. The CNS interprets these symptoms as anxiety, and reinforces it with further sympathetic stimulation that in turn increases epinephrine and norepinephrine, cortisol, and heart rate. Cortisol or hydrocortisone is a steroid hormone or glucocorticoid produced in the adrenal glands. The adrenal glands sit on top of the kidneys. Small increases in cortisol heighten memory function, increase immunity; lower sensitivity to pain. However, prolonged increase in cortisol levels due to chronic stress can result in suppression of thyroid function, increased blood pressure, blood sugar imbalance, and decrease in muscle tissue and body density. Fredrikson and Gunnarsson found that epinephrine, norepinephrine, cortisol, heart rate, and subjective ratings of distress increase from private to public performance. Life-threatening events or acute stress can actually lead to changes in the brain.¹⁷

Psychological Causes. Psychological factors include the ways musicians learn to think about certain situations or cues, the fears they associate with things, and the amount of control they believe they have over events or situations. Some childhood experiences also shape the way the adult deals with anxiety. Attachment theory is one explanation. Attachment refers to the type of bond between the parent and the child: if securely attached, the musician is more able to regulate anxiety, to explore the world, to take risks; if insecure or ambivalent then the musician is at risk for anxiety and depressed. Eric Plaut suggests that artists are inherently vulnerable both physically and mentally. He suggests that as young children they may experience their uniqueness as a loss of parental love that can be recapitulated in the applause of the audience.¹⁸ Similarly, DeNelsky approaches causation from a developmental point of view. He says: 1) Much early reinforcement for outstanding performance; 2) Performance becomes a major base for self-esteem; 3) Increased competition as older with fewer and fewer rewards; 4) After the performance the student may get notes from adjudicator or teacher. These notes can be critical or viewed as such; 5) The musician develops a belief in perfection as a goal; 6) The musician over-thinks, and what was automatic behaviour becomes de-automatized and the musician obsesses about negative outcomes; 8) Performance anxiety develops; and 9) A positive feedback loop is established.¹⁹

Theories of Performance Anxiety and Stage Fright, The Yerkes-Dodson U. The Yerkes-Dodson Law (the inverted U principle has been available since 1908) explains the relationship between Arousal and Performance Anxiety. Arousal enhances performance up to a point, beyond which it causes deterioration. The law further states that deterioration occurs more quickly when the task to be performed is complex or under-learned.²⁰ The U hypothesis has been expanded to include the concepts of state and trait anxiety. In addition, Mary Wolfe has a model that incorporates an X-axis that varies from arousal/intensity to nervousness/apprehension and a Y-axis with confidence/competence as opposed to self-conscious/distractibility.²¹ Plaut notes that unconscious guilt occurs when a musician is injured, and he thinks that unconscious guilt can lead to experiencing the injury as a form of punishment. A patient of mine was rendered unconscious by a pile of logs that fell off the stage into the pit. As they were taking her out strapped to a backboard she remembers vaguely muttering, "But I don't understand. I played the overture so well." Plaut further hypothesizes that performance anxiety is not about playing well or being

perfect, but the unconscious wish to fail and still be loved. If a performance is “slightly” flawed and not perfect, and the audience still adores you, this satisfies both the conscious wish to do well and be recognized, and the unconscious wish to be liked despite your flaws is also fulfilled.¹⁸

How to Manage Performance Anxiety?

- 1. General Physical Health.** Musicians need to maintain peak conditioning by cross-training with both aerobic and non-aerobic exercise. This is best assessed by preseason port-hire screening similar to that required of all college and professional athletes and a recent initiative in Australia for musicians. (see the Musicians Wellness Program, Case Western Reserve)
- 2. Nutritional Health.** Certain foods are said to exaggerate symptoms of anxiety, such as peppermint, chocolate, nuts and the cabbages. Certain foods are thought to be calming such as barley, applesauce, bananas, carrots, squash and potatoes. On tour it is recommended that musicians carry cooked or peeled fruit and vegetables, which are said to increase muscle glycogen. Fats are to be avoided on the day of a special performance, as fats require more oxygen to metabolize and take longer to digest. Thus the energy is in the GI system, not in the muscle system. Increasing fibre over the months before a special tour and increasing water may alleviate stomach and bowel upset but is best done under supervision of a registered dietician.
- 3. Medications.** Antianxiety medications, including high potency benzodiazepines, can be useful to combat anxiety in musicians who are experiencing severe symptoms. They have few side effects other than initial drowsiness, but because people get used to them they may need higher and higher doses to get the same effect. These medications are generally prescribed for short periods of time. However, in individuals who have panic attacks these medications can be prescribed for a year without harm. Clonazepam (klonopin/Rivotril) is used for Social Phobia and Lorazepam (Ativan) for panic, and Alprazolam (Xanax) for both panic and Generalized Anxiety Disorder, GAD. An azapirone, called Buspar or Buspirone is a newer anti-anxiety medication for GAD and must be taken consistently for two weeks before any noticeable effect. Similar antidepressants are also effective for anxiety, but may take 4-6 weeks to see their maximum effect. SSRIs, or serotonin reuptake inhibitors, alter the level of the neurotransmitter Serotonin in the brain, which like other neurotransmitters helps brain cells communicate with one another.

Beta-blocker use was the major shocker of the 1988 ICSOM study. 27% of musicians with anxiety used beta-blockers prior to performance, 19% used the drug on a daily basis and 70% of these were self-medicating without a prescription or medical supervision.² Beta-blockers are very effective at reducing the somatic symptoms of anxiety. They are so effective that 13% of cardiologists attending an international conference reported using B-blockers themselves prior to delivering formal presentations.²² James et al did a study of oxyprenolol. Twenty-four musicians took the medication 90 minutes prior to the performance. Thirteen reported that their subjective anxiety decreased and as evaluated by two independent judges their performance improved.²³ B-blockers prevent the binding of neurotransmitters such as noradrenaline to their receptors in the heart, lungs, arteries, and inhibit the stimulatory effects of the sympathetic nervous system. There are two kinds of receptors; B1 that affects the heart, and B2 that affects peripheral circulation and bronchi. So propranolol/Inderal, a B-blocker, is frequently used to decrease heart rate and to increase saliva. Although it has been shown that B-blockers reduce muscle power in high intensity exercise, there is adequate cardiac output for moderate exercise. In the 1988 study, musicians who were using B-blockers under medical supervision reported beneficial effects twice as frequently as those who were using medication without medical supervision (92% vs 46%).² Side effects are not troubling, but fatigue, nightmares, hallucinations, and exacerbation of existing depression have been reported. As B-blockers are contraindicated for people with some heart conditions, asthma, diabetes and Raynaud’s syndrome, the need for medical supervision is

obvious. So B-blockers are best used well before a crucial performance and in combination with CBT and reciprocal inhibition to reduce cognitive anxiety. The musician feels in control and performs well. Cognitively the musician now knows it is possible to control anxiety, and with gradual reductions in dosage the musician can perform with a minimal dose or none at all because of the positive conditioning. The medication just takes away the somatic symptoms and not the debilitating cognitive ones, but the musician has learned now to overcome these.

4. **Sleep.** It is essential that musicians avoid fatigue and get sufficient sleep to prevent mistakes and fatigue-related injury. If the musician suffers from insomnia he or she may require further consultation with a health professional.
5. **Breathing Training.** Learning different types of breathing techniques and choosing the type best suited for the individual can help reduce anxiety, especially when used with Progressive Muscle Relaxation. Somatic symptoms are controlled and while focus is on the breathing, the Cognitive Anxiety is somewhat lessened.
6. **Cognitive Behavior Therapy.** CBT involves identification of anxiety-producing thoughts and evaluates their validity, and then takes small manageable steps to face situations that produce anxiety through gradual exposure. CBT is a type of psychotherapy that attempts to change the thoughts and behavior that are fundamental to maintaining the anxiety disorders. The therapist assumes the role of a guide or coach for the patient, helping the individual understand the symptoms. It is disappointing that only 25% of the ICSOM musicians suffering from stage fright used psychological counselling.²
7. **Education about anxiety and Psychological Skills Training.** PST, especially in the areas of goal setting and positive self-talk, reduces anxiety.
8. **Mind Calming Activities.** Meditation Yoga²⁴ and other movement training such as Feldenkrais, Alexander Technique, and Gyrokinesis have been used very successfully alone or in combination with other treatments. The special technique, EMDR—Eye movement Desensitization and Reprocessing—is very effective in the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder.²⁵ Neurofeedback using brain waves has also been effective.
9. **Developing other outlets and social supports.** Musicians are so focused on music that they often do not have time for other pursuits. Even though we offer them voluntary lectures on wellness, they are reluctant to leave their practice rooms to attend social events. But if they can find an activity that they can focus on and feel a sense of satisfaction in pursuing this can be very stabilizing. Having a social support network has been shown to reduce performance anxiety.⁵
10. **Stress Management.** Performers need to prepare for a special event in every way possible. By anticipating what might go wrong, performers are more able to remain in control even when the unexpected happens. They actively minimize stresses and anticipate interruptions. Practicing in an environment that approximates the actual performance space helps condition the performer to the “live” event. Musicians need to remember that before an important event, coaches and teachers can be nervous too and can be hypercritical. Last minute coaching is to be avoided. Musicians must learn not to be pressured into performing when injured. Imagery training helps the musician visualize all the intricacies of the performance and anticipate how he or she will handle any problems.

References

1. www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/anxietydisorder (July 31, 2013)

2. Fishbein, M., Middlestat, S.E., Ottati V., Straus, S., Ellis A: *Med Probl Perf Art* 1988: 3(1); 1-12.
3. Nagel, J.J., Stage fright in musicians, A psychodynamic perspective. *Bull Menninnger Clin.* 1993; 57: 492-503.
4. Miller, S.R., Chesky, K., The multidimensional anxiety theory. *Med Probl Perf Art* 2004: 19(1); 12-20.
5. Schneider, E., Chesky, K., Social Support and Performance Anxiety of College Music Students. *Med Probl Perf Art* 2011; 26(3) 157-165.
6. Brennan, L., "Demon in the Wings," Stage Fright in the Actor. Paper presented at Healthy Approaches in the Training of Performing Artists, Chapman University with PAMA, August 2013.
7. Ostwald, P., Psychodynamics of Musicians: The Relationship of Performers to Their Musical Instruments. *Med Probl Perf Art* 1992: 7(4) 110-116.
8. Spielberger, C.D., Anxiety as an emotional state. In C.D. Spielberger (ed) *Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research.* Pages 23-49, New York, NY. 1973.
9. Hays, K., Performance Anxiety. In Kate F. Hays (ed): *Performance Psychology in Action.* 2008. American Psychology Association, Washington. DC, Page 104.
10. Kenny, D., Ackerman, B., Optimizing physical and psychological health in performing musicians. In S. Hallam, M.I. Cross, M. Thaut (eds): *Oxford Handbook of Music Psychology.* Pages 39.0-400. Oxford UK, Oxford Press.
11. Steptoe, A., Negative emotions in music making: the problems of performance anxiety. In P.N. Juslin & J.A. Slobada (eds): *Music and Emotion: Theory and Research.* 2001, Oxford University Press. Oxford UK. Pages 291-307.
12. Nagel, J.J., Stage fright in musicians, A psychodynamic perspective. *Bull Menninnger Clin.* 1993; 57: 492-503.
13. Mainwaring, L., Working with Perfection. In Kate F. Hays (ed): *Performance Psychology in Action* 2009. American Psychology Association, Washington DC.
14. Diamond, T., Perfectionism, Obsession and dance. 2007, Paper presented at IADMS Annual Meeting, Canberra, Australia.
15. Kenny, D., *The Psychology of Music Performance Anxiety.* 2011. Oxford University, New York. Page 10.
16. Wristen, B.G., Fountain, S.E., *Med Probl Perf Art* 2013, 28(3):152.
17. Fredrikeson, M., Gunnarsson, R., Psychobiology of Stage Fright; the effect of public performance on neuroendocrine, cardiovascular and subjective reactions. *Biological Psychology*, 1992; 33(1):51-61.
18. Plaut, E., Psychotherapy of Performance Anxiety. *Med Probl Perf Art.* 1988:3:113-118.
19. DeNelsky, G.Y., Performance Anxiety: A Special Challenge for the Performing Artist. Paper presented at the Fifth Annual Symposium, Medical Problems of Musicians and Dancers. 1987.
20. Yerkes-Dodson principle, in G.D. Wilson, *Psychology of Performing Artists.* Whurr, 2002: 211.

21. Wolfe, M.L., Relationship between dimensions of musical performance anxiety and behavioral strategies. *Med Probl Perf Art* 1990;5(4):139-145.
22. Harris, D.A., Using B-blockers to Control Stage Fright: A Dancer's Dilemma. *Med Probl Perf Art* 2001; 16(2):72-79.
23. James, I.M., Griffith, D.N.W., Pearson, R.M., Effect of oxyprenolol on stage fright in musicians. *Lancet ii* 1977; 952-954.
24. Stern, J.R.S., Khalsa, S.B., Hofman, S.G., *Med Probl Perf Art* 2012: 27(3)123-128.
25. Shapiro, F.: *Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing : Basic principles, protocols and procedures (2nd ed.)* 2001: New York, Guilford Press.

TEACHING IV: PREPARING STUDENTS TO TEACH IN AND PREPARE FOR EXISTING, NEW, AND FUTURE PEDAGOGICAL ENVIRONMENTS

AIMÉ SPOSATO
Shenandoah University

Academic leaders within arts disciplines have asked the same question for decades, “How do we better prepare our graduate students for the current demands of the college teaching profession?” More specifically, “How do college administrators provide graduate students with the training necessary to be effective classroom teachers?” Graduate students enrolled in music programs across the United States will step into their first college teaching position following completion of their degree. *Are they prepared?* When faculty and key leadership look for the exemplary teacher preparation models within their own institution, they naturally gravitate towards Music Education programs. These programs include a well-balanced combination of foundational coursework and performance experiences designed to foster and develop skills as musicians and teachers, and to prepare students for successful careers in teaching. The foundation of the curriculum is rooted in teaching philosophies and is divided into three parts, academic, foundational, and methodologies.

Undergraduate pre-professional degree programs such as Music Therapy and Music Production or Recording Technology are preparing students to enter the workforce following the internship experience. Students in Music Therapy programs also experience clinical foundations, methodology coursework, and field experience, which prepare the young music therapist to enter the clinical setting upon graduation. Students enrolled in Recording Technology programs receive hands-on experience recording recitals and concerts throughout their four-year education preparing them to step directly into an internship experience. Yet, students enrolled in undergraduate performance degree programs receive minimal introductory coursework in classroom teaching techniques. The assumption is that if a performance student desires a teaching career or wishes to explore teacher preparation opportunities, then further education will be required by enrolling in a graduate pedagogy program. Although beneficial for in-depth study and analysis of pedagogical concepts, these programs typically focus on preparation of the applied teacher, not the classroom teacher. Entry-level faculty positions often involve faculty assignments such as fundamentals courses in music history or music theory, instrumental methods courses, and class piano or class voice. So, how does the graduate student enrolled in a performance degree program receive classroom-teaching experience?

Academic leaders of music institutions are cognizant of the conundrum they face during each recruitment cycle: the need to attract highly skilled performers to their graduate programs outweighs the amount of scholarship funds available to support these talented young performing artists. As savvy entrepreneurs, these same graduate applicants are already seasoned “contract negotiators” and skillfully consider their offers holding out for a teaching assistantship that covers tuition *and* a stipend. The latter, often times, “clinches the deal”. It is only natural that these skilled musicians are attracted to increasingly competitive teaching assistantships, especially during this period of financial recovery following the economic downturn in the United States.

New teaching assistants arrive on our campuses in late August, many of whom have never taught

in a classroom setting. In many cases, they will not have the opportunity to meet with a mentor before walking into the first class. Most teaching assistantship assignments involve serving as an assistant in a large undergraduate course, leading discussion sections, grading papers and exams, teaching introduction to musicianship coursework, or music theory fundamentals courses. Other teaching assistants may assist directors of the choral or instrumental ensembles, or teach applied lessons. Regardless of the assignment, teaching assistants require close supervision and a mentor who is willing to help them navigate through the responsibilities expected of any college-level instructor.

Preparing graduate students in performance degree programs for a career in academia is a low priority in graduate education in the 21st century. Academic institutions provide minimal classroom pedagogy courses to prepare the young performing artist who may have an interest in further strengthening their craft while establishing a pedagogical framework to secure a teaching position upon graduation. Courses such as *Methodology of Teaching in the College Classroom*, *Introduction to College Teaching*, or perhaps, *An Introduction to Academic Teaching* are absent from most curricular offerings throughout the United States.

The apparent need for creative classroom pedagogy coursework or a teaching certificate program influenced an extensive online research. Anthony T. Grafton and James Grossman state that “*Graduate programs should prepare students for an array of positions outside of the academy... (they) should open many doors, therefore, we need to broaden the curriculum.*” (Grafton and Grossman, Jan. 2012, Chronicle of Higher Education). Using the field experience model provided in Music Education degrees, graduate students in newly designed curricula could experience faculty-supervised student teaching, observation, or internship opportunities. The development of partnerships within the broader community may lead to internal and external mentoring relationships for the group of students who do not engage in pedagogical coursework as a curricular requirement. The observation of, and collaboration with, a master teacher would inspire the performing artist and future college-level teacher. We are all too familiar with the phrase “*think outside the box*”. Well, it may be time for us to become creative and “*teach outside the box*”.

An increasing number of colleges and universities are requiring the submission of teaching portfolios as part of the application process for prospective faculty. Therefore, unless a graduate student was awarded a teaching assistantship during their academic career, how would this emerging teacher with a doctoral degree in any program, other than education and pedagogy, receive relevant training and classroom teaching experience? Graduate students are concerned about acquiring that first job and want to understand what it takes to land the perfect position. Focusing on further developing and honing their craft, the young performing artist often is unable to envision the need to secure a teaching position to sustain gainful employment. Once they enter the academic arena, often times by happenstance, they experience the feeling of inadequacies in the classroom and frustration with the daily routine of teaching. Young professors often seek out advice of senior faculty members, but it is often too late. Teaching philosophies and methodologies should have been introduced during their graduate education. Returning to the original question, “How do we better prepare our graduate students for the current demands of the college teaching profession?” If the student were buying a house, the ideal recommendation would be to focus on “location, location, location.” In this case, the more appropriate response to the question would simply be to “teach, teach, teach.” As with most trades, the craft of effective pedagogy is one that is best developed in the context of hands-on training. Students will begin to synthesize the skills they experienced as a student *in the classroom* and apply them by assuming the leadership role *in front of a class*.

Academic leaders have the responsibility to equip students with the intellectual, professional, and musical tools needed to succeed in a rapidly changing educational environment. The students must be prepared to meet the typical academic challenges that all faculty members face on a daily basis and remain confident that they themselves can step into our shoes as the leaders of the next generation of teachers. In his article “A Philosophy of Teaching”, Rob Jenkins states:

“Teaching is performance art. Great teachers may be born, but good teachers are made. The ability to become a great teacher...The very best teachers are those who have the gift and have worked hard over many years to further develop it—although we often overlook the hard work because they make being a great teacher look so easy. Just as with any other skill, the key to becoming a good teacher is to want to become one.” (Jenkins, 2011, Sept. 20 ed., Chronicle of Higher Education)

Quite often academic leaders search for models *inside* and *outside* of the academy to build on best practices and proven success stories. Aware of the confinements of the limited resources available to enhance music program at the undergraduate and graduate levels, the need to identify a successful model of a supplemental teacher preparation program was evident. This nationwide deficiency in our graduate education programs may require a creative approach. The following types of programs may enhance our already rigorous graduate degree programs:

- *Program for Excellence in Classroom Instruction* - instructional support services for Graduate Teaching Assistants and all graduate students. Periodic extracurricular sessions on teaching-related topics. Students would receive a certificate upon completion of the program;
- *Coffee and Tea Hour with Teaching Workshops* – one-year program of weekly workshops on teaching strategies. Students would receive a certificate upon completion of the program;
- *Teaching and Learning Program* - focusing on teacher preparation for classroom instruction. Graduate students collaborate with faculty mentors who assist in developing good teaching techniques for careers in the academy, one-year program, students receive a certificate upon completion of the program; and
- *Teaching Preparation Course* - graduate students would enroll in a one-semester course to learn how to prepare and deliver lectures, design and implement syllabi, develop and grading techniques.

Several educational organizations have partnered with the business sector to direct grants toward the creation of teacher preparation programs in both private and public institutions. Opportunities for graduate teaching assistants to study in a mentor-student teaching atmosphere while experiencing faculty responsibilities, is essential in graduate education. Recognizing this missing component in most graduate curricula, administrators from various institutions went outside of the academy for financial support to fund their teacher-training programs. An example of offering the merging of higher education with corporate America resulted in the formation of *The Teagle Foundation*. Walter C. Teagle envisioned the *Foundation* as a national leader and an agent for change in higher education. Focusing on 21st century teacher preparation, the *Foundation* funded initiatives to include distinct professional preparation experiences. Programs provide students with:

- An introduction to digital teaching methods, communication technologies and

- assessment;
- The ability to identify engaged learning objectives;
- The tools to evaluate how various teaching philosophies impact learning;
- A series of workshops and seminars in which they engage with faculty on learning concrete strategies for teaching; and
- A series of faculty led discussions that equip graduate students, 21st century teachers, with knowledge of various learning styles.

Another example of a successful partnership emerged in 1993 when *The Pew Charitable Trusts* (<http://www.pewtrusts.org/default.aspx>) assisted with the underwriting of the *Preparing Future Faculty* program (<http://www.preparing-faculty.org/>). This unique program provides masters and doctoral students with opportunities to observe and experience classroom teaching at a variety of academic institutions with varying missions, diverse student bodies, and different faculty expectations.

Centers for Faculty Teaching and Learning are forming on campuses throughout the United States in reaction to a nationwide awareness of the lack of resource and support programs available for our teaching faculty. Teachers in private or public institutions throughout the country agree that general teaching methodologies are an asset to a graduate education, but the need for the quintessential teacher-training programs within music institutions are an ongoing challenge. Administrators are encouraged to explore a *Certificate in Higher Education Teaching*, designed to include workshops, seminars, and the observation of dynamic faculty. Collaborative mentor-student discussions should cover topics such as grading, creative teaching strategies, classroom management, understanding expectations and responsibilities of a college faculty member, and discovering new technological approaches to education. Through careful and purposeful faculty mentorship, teaching assistants would be expected to develop a teaching portfolio and philosophy as an outcome of professional development exercises. Effective graduate education should provide regular opportunities for emerging teachers to observe high quality teaching and to receive constructive and well-informed feedback.

Academic leaders are often charged with increasing enrollment, program prioritization, and assessment initiatives; therefore, teacher preparation programs appear as an attractive graduate recruitment strategy. Institutions of higher education are responsible for providing graduate students with excellent pre-professional programs that should introduce the *art of teaching*. Graduate students should adopt the philosophy of a craftsman. They must be passionate about what they are doing; learn their craft under the intense supervision of expert faculty mentors and through daily hands-on experience. We have the ability to shape the next generation of arts leaders.

Notes

Walter C. Teagle (1878-1962) was the president and chairman of the board of Standard Oil Company in New Jersey, now Exxon Mobil Corporation. More information available at <http://www.teaglefoundation.org/>.

Preparing Future Faculty has since partnered with the Council of Graduate Schools and the Association of American Colleges and Universities. More information available at <http://www.preparing-faculty.org/>.

The Pew Charitable Trusts is an independent nonprofit, global research and public policy organization, still operated as an independent, non-partisan, non-governmental organization

dedicated to serving the public. More information available at <http://www.pewtrusts.org/default.aspx>.

References

Aristotle. *Poetics*. Trans. S. H. Butcher. *The Internet Classics Archive*. Web Atomic and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 13 Sept. 2007. Web. 4 Nov. 2008. Available at <http://classics.mit.edu/>.

Benton, T. H. *Five "Virtues" of Successful Graduate Students*. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 5 Sept. 2003. Available at <http://chronicle.com/article/The-5-Virtues-of-Successful/50>.

Grafton, A. and Grossman, J. *OK, Let's Teach Graduate Students Differently. But How?* *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 8 Jan. 2012. Available at <http://chronicle.com/article/OK-Lets-Teach-Graduate/130218/>.

Jenkins, R. *Philosophy of Teaching*. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 20 Sept. 2011. Available at <http://chronicle.com/article/A-Philosophy-of-Teaching/129060>.

MANAGEMENT IV: COPYRIGHT AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

DWAYNE K. BUTTLER
University of Louisville

JOHN RASO
Harry Fox Agency

TAMMY RAVAS
University of Montana

SERONA ELTON
University of Miami

Copyright and Intellectual Property – Suggested Resources

- Music Library Association, *Copyright for Music Librarians* website, available at <http://copyright.musiclibraryassoc.org/>
- The Harry Fox Agency (HFA)/MENC/MTNA/MPA Songfile page, available at <http://www.harryfox.com/public/educator/index.html>
- *The Teacher's Guide to Music, Media, and Copyright Law*, by James Frankel (available at booksellers including Amazon and Barnes and Noble).
- National Association for Music Education – Copyright Center website page, available at <http://musiced.nafme.org/resources/copyright-center/>
- *Best Practices in the Fair Use of Copyrighted Materials in Music Scholarship*, written by an Ad Hoc committee of the American Musicological Society Council, available at http://www.ams-net.org/AMS_Fair_Use_Statement.pdf
- *Copyright Essentials for Librarians and Educators*, by Kenneth C. Crews (available at booksellers including Amazon and Barnes and Noble). Note, chapter 15, *Music and Copyright* by Dwayne K. Buttler
- “Musical Arrangements and Copyright Law” by Serona Elton, for *Southwestern Musician*, the official publication of the TMEA)
(link found at <http://www.eltonentertainment.com/#!/articles/c10p7>)
- “Understanding Music Copyright – A Guide for Music Educators” by Serona Elton, for the *Florida Music Director Journal*
(link found at <http://www.eltonentertainment.com/#!/articles/c10p7>)
- ProQuest’s copyright guide, *Copyright Law and Graduate Research: New Media, New Rights, and Your New Dissertation* by Dr. Kenneth D. Crews, available at <http://www.umi.com/en-US/products/dissertations/copyright/>
- The University of Pittsburgh website for Graduate Students, available at <http://www.pitt.edu/~graduate/etd/copyright.html>

- University of Michigan's *A Graduate Student's Guide to Copyright: Open Access, Fair Use, and Permissions*, available at <http://www.lib.umich.edu/files/services/copyright/Dissertations.pdf>
- Virginia Tech's *Copyright Information for Authors, Researchers, and Scholars*, available at <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/copyright/cprtetd.html>

MEETING OF REGION 7: THE TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCESS: EVALUATION AND MENTORING OF PRE-TENURE FACULTY

DEALING WITH TENURE AND PROMOTION AT A CHANGING (TEACHING TO RESEARCH) UNIVERSITY

HARRY E. PRICE
Kennesaw State University

This paper deals with reviews of retention, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure at institutions that appear to be changing their focus to include more creative activities or scholarship. We are talking about faculty assessments that affect teachers in the music studios, theory, composition, history, education, therapy, business, technology, etc. It affects all permanent teachers in any music program.

Of course, one question is, why do we even have tenure and what is it? This is actually an important question currently, since overall college leaders' (typically Presidents) beliefs are that <25% prefer tenure while 69% prefer that a majority of faculty work under long-term or annual contracts. As we break this down, among private four-year institutions, 40% expressed a preference for faculty with long-term contracts and 30% favored tenure. At four-year public institutions, 50% of the presidents preferred tenured faculty while 36% preferred professors on long-term contracts. So, even the long-standing use of tenure appears to be a bit of a larger issue today.

Tenure and promotion regulations were established in the 1940s. There has been a rate of decline in tenured positions for the past 20 years. In fields other than music, data indicate that currently fewer than 50% of faculty members are granted tenure. This reduction appears to be continuing. While not dramatic, one research university is suggesting a span of ten years before a colleague is considered for tenure and promotion.

Who are the people we are discussing? Truthfully, this is a matter of concern for all colleagues. The non-tenure track faculty is growing at a rate that is nine times that of our tenure track colleagues, in some institutions. They are protected to some extent, but not in the same manner as people on tenure tracks. Fill-in or long-term colleagues can address these non-tenure positions, and they may become the majority at some universities in the not too distant future.

There is no question that faculty members want to be successful. However, people who are on a tenure track may end up with increased managerial skills in some aspects of their work. As there is an increase in the number of colleagues on long-term or annual contracts, the many expectations regarding management of academic programs will increase for tenured or tenure track colleagues. Consequently, they will also be given the demands of supervising other teachers, in addition to programs.

Workload is an issue for all colleagues. As members of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective **teachers**. There are differences between doctorate and non-doctorate universities. At doctorate institutions, **research and other creative** activities tend to be stronger than other types of colleges and universities. Indeed, non-doctoral institutions indicate teaching is more important than research. But, there has been a shift to increasing

research expectations across all types of universities; with some already indicating a desire for more research from successful faculty.

At many places, the faculty load is equivalent to 12 hours. Teaching, supervising, and mentoring of students, or something similar is supported by all institutions, but universities are adding other expectations. Something similar to professional service is appreciated everywhere. Research and creative activity is an expectation at many institutions, but not all. Administration and leadership is an area typically used by administrators, and since 1990, the area of scholarship of teaching and learning has started to become a larger issue. Boyer (1990) suggested that,

Faculty, as scholars, are also learners ... While well prepared lectures surely have a place, teaching, at its best, means not only transmitting knowledge, but transforming and extending it as well. Through reading, through classroom discussion, and surely through comments and questions posed by students, professors themselves will be pushed in creative new directions. (24)

This approach is a more comprehensive model that has four areas: **discovery, integration, application, and teaching**. “Discovery” is information that adds to the knowledge base. Then “integration” relates the discoveries across disciplines. With “application,” the intent is to use knowledge for the benefit of society and apply the information to consequential issues. The final area in Boyer’s approach is what one might call the main goal of being a professor, “teaching.” It is here that we effect the transfer of knowledge to students: learning. This area focuses on the vision, design, interactions, outcomes and analyses necessary for teaching.

The Boyer Model for professional activity has a number of steps that are critical, if they are to be considered, when evaluating colleagues’ works. It has a *process* that requires a high level of expertise in a discipline or methodology, which in our case is music or the transfer of musical information. In so doing, we must have clear objectives that are conducted with strong goals, an understandably stated problem, and adequate preparation.

When all of this is done, the work must be submitted to a *review*, by a panel of the candidate’s peers, for assessment of both the process and product (results), to determine if the work is meritorious and significant. Among the things being reviewed is whether this effort will have an *impact*. That is, whether it has significant results beyond the individual context. Does it break new ground and can be replicated or be further elaborated upon.

Given that the work is assessed as having an impact, it is appropriately documented and *disseminated*. This reporting should include a reflective component that addresses the significance of the work, the process that was followed, and the outcomes of the research or creative activity, inquiry, or activity. In other words, this is expected of all activities in music fields, whether our colleagues are theorists, performers, educators, historians, ensemble directors, or administrators.

Scholarship may be in any of Boyer’s categories: *discovery, integration, application, teaching, or engagement* (service). Professors should plan their class activities so that they seek outcome data regarding student learning with revisions that are deliberately and systematically assessed. In other words, researchers and creative artists transform their work into presentations where the work is formally shared with others, exhibits the use of appropriate and rigorous methods, which is subject to informed critique and review.

Boyer’s ideas allow for added areas of scholarship. With good documentation of scholarly service, they describe the role of faculty members in their activities, how they use their expertise, and clearly demonstrate the outcomes or impacts of these service activities. In truth, we are talking about the scholarship of discipline specific forms of engagement, service, and creative activity.

Of course, we have different types of colleges and universities in this country. They can be apportioned in many ways. One division is publicly versus privately funded institutions;

currently, many publicly funded larger institutions are receiving support in such a reduced manner that they need to consider themselves as almost private. We also have differently defined institutions such as research; regional, master's or comprehensive; liberal arts, state, teaching or professional colleges; or two-year institutions. The demands at these different places vary, depending on the focus.

Fortunately, Mark Schell from Asbury University (private university in Wilmore, KY), Pamela S. Wurgler from Murray State University (Murray, KY), and Randal Rushing from University of Memphis (Memphis, TN) were willing to discuss how issues regarding items such as tenure and retention are handled at their universities.

It was fairly clear as to how Dr. Schell's smaller institution (total of approximately 1,300 students) deals with retention and tenure issues. Basically, you have to be a flexible faculty member and teaching is the critical issue. Other things are appreciated, but this one item is truly the focus.

Dr. Wurgler described a different situation at Murray State, which had recently undergone a major revision of promotion and tenure requirements. It starts with a typical statement:

Tenure signifies the department's desire to retain a faculty member for continuing employment. Excellence in teaching must be documented, plus service beyond what is required of the position. Scholarly/creative activity should reflect not only achievement, but also potential for achievement in professional activity and reputation. Documented evidence of potential for professional growth as a teacher, leader, and musician must be presented.

Their system now requires that faculty achieve a minimum number of items from their provided list in the handbook (2 from Tier Two and 3 from Tier Three) to be considered for promotion to Associate Professor. "Generally, Tier One is comprised of activities that are significant at the national or international level, while Tier Two is State or Regional Level, and Tier Three is on campus or local" (2012). Additionally, a majority of the activities must be in scholarly or creative activities. Tier 2 scholarly items includes items such as: published refereed article in periodical at the regional or state level; article in a refereed online journal in the discipline; peer-reviewed CD with limited circulation, or major performance/conducting at the regional level. In teaching items include competition acceptance/success as it reflects student, studio, or ensemble participation at the regional level; regional- or state-level teaching award, prize, or honor earned in field of expertise; or summer teaching at a national or international workshop/camp/program (invited and paid). Finally, service items include professional consultantship at the regional or state level; evaluation of professional program at the regional or state level; or adjudication at the international, national, or regional level. As we can see, these promotion guides are quite different from what is expected at smaller institutions, such as Asbury University. Dr. Wurgler indicates that both the faculty being evaluated and the committee who is doing the review appreciate these guidelines.

From The University of Memphis, Dr. Rushing discussed that, as many other places do, they list potential ability in instruction and/or public service and/or research. Interestingly, they also indicate that there must be evidence of good character, mature attitude, and professional integrity. Basically, there expectations are a mix across areas, with the expectation that you need to be a good teacher, but also must have some creative activity or scholarship. They are towards the direction of a research model, but not completely. However, Director Skip Snead indicated that at his research institution (University of Alabama), it is expected that you are at least a good teacher and contributing to service, but unless you have a strong record of creative activities or scholarship, you would not be granted tenure.

Unfortunately, many colleagues are resistant to changes. In his role as a college president in *Horsefeathers*, Groucho Marx sang, "I don't know what they have to say, it makes no difference anyway, whatever it is, I'm against it. No matter what it is or who commenced it, I'm against it" (Paramount, 1932). Sadly, there are real reasons for resistance to any change by colleagues that is joked about in the movie.

There are concerns about loss aversion, or the risk of forfeiture of whatever we have of value. We also have the endowment effect, which is thinking that what we currently have is more valuable than anything people will come up with. Frankly, we have a *status quo* bias in universities; a pervasive preference for leaving things as they are, since we can live with that, regardless of our concern.

While these are psychological reasons for the avoidance of change, there are also problems that occur for newer faculty as well as over time for faculty who have been in the profession. Regardless, it seems that research is an increasing issue across more types of universities, regardless of their historical classification. Younger scholars are being challenged with a developing life. They have families or other personal issues, developing research fields, relationships with colleagues and administrators, teaching classes, and generally increasing their understanding the chosen field.

These problems may be worse for women, since with all these issues, they also have even less flexibility if they desire to have children. However, it should be noted that at many institutions, they could stop the tenure clock prior to and after the birth of a baby; this time off can even include the father at many institutions. Unfortunately, this is rarely done by faculty due to perceived or real expectations put upon our colleagues.

For our colleagues who have been at institutions for some time, they often have leadership demands placed upon them, without any change in the expected teaching or creative activities. Other faculty, with a strong level of accomplishment, may end up with a waning expertise over time, unless they have remained deeply involved in a field. Sadly, the increasing volume of work expected from our colleagues makes these situations difficult to change, now or in the foreseeable future.

On the positive side, some colleagues indicate some interesting thoughts regarding undergraduate colleges. Many small private colleges do have faculty-research funds. The abundance of available internal money means that junior scholars can pursue ambitious scholarly agendas without constantly seeking external grants, which are few and difficult to win. The leave policy can also be quite flexible at many small colleges. "Several of my colleagues and I have enjoyed two years of sabbatical leave before going up for tenure -- something I have been told would never be allowed at many larger universities." A "lack of graduate students may be undesirable for some But in the short term, not having graduate students frees up a lot of time for junior professors to work on their own research instead of, say, reading drafts of other people's dissertations." Clearly this type of situation can be an advantage for some colleagues.

Some faculty believe that small colleges are often more collegial than huge universities. While there are people who thrive on the cutthroat competition of the bigger (research) universities, some work better in situations where one assistant professor's success will not be a problem among other junior faculty colleagues competing for those limited tenured spots. After speaking to colleagues at similar smaller institutions, one colleague indicated that these positive circumstances were not an aberration.

There is a problem even with some of the position searches at universities. At a liberal-arts college, since they have to hire someone who is a sufficiently dedicated researcher to get tenure, but not so focused as to neglect their teaching or possibly working to leave for a research university or industry position. Indeed, another colleague indicated that as tempting as it might seem, they indeed cannot just employ a fine teacher. As has been indicated, many colleges have increased research requirements for earning tenure, without increasing resources or a teaching

load decrease. Consequently, if the search committee were allowed to hire that *teaching* candidate as a new faculty member without some research momentum, they will not be able to earn tenure.

One suggestion given is if colleagues were allowed for discipline-specific variances. This would permit faculty to decide the appropriate values accorded to each form of scholarship, define these values, and decide how the criteria should be evaluated. It would permit a more representative and balanced evaluation model.

At a Research I university in the Midwest, professors can choose from **research, teaching, or outreach** as the primary focus and one of the other two areas as their secondary focus. While they might be in the minority, professors who concentrate mainly on teaching are supported by this system.

One group working at another research institution recommends changing the expectations for faculty, suggesting a newly imagined faculty workplace that includes a variable probationary period that does things such as extensions for parenthood, rather than a fixed seven-year up-or-out provision for tenure. Another suggestion was providing tenure for faculty members focused on teaching or creating a nontenure track that affords a meaningful role in shared governance. Other ideas have been developing interdisciplinary centers with authority to be the focus of tenure or creating broader definitions of scholarship and appropriately broader outlets and media were they are supported for *publish* their research. Interestingly, one suggestion is for tenure with a defined period of time or the option to earn salary premiums while forgoing tenure entirely. Some of these ideas may seem radical, but if given some consideration without the “whatever it is, I’m against it” attitude that Groucho Marx suggested, there well might be some excellent ideas being considered by our colleagues around the country.

However, given the current values regarding research and creative activities that seems to exist in many universities, what are some ideas for successfully pursuing research and earning tenure? In music it can be almost anything to satisfy this requirement as long as certain criteria are met. The activity could be theory driven or investigative practice-based. The topics can be incredibly broad and address items such as audition practices, recruiting efforts, specific performance techniques examinations, teaching methods used in music, field experience work, performances or compositions to be performed, historical practices in teaching instruments, etc. The challenge is writing or doing something that is reviewable for possible acceptance at a conference, performance, or publication; they cannot just be invited events.

Having scholarship or creative activities is not a new idea; it is just that it is being expected at a wider array of institutions. It is expected and can be a bit of a challenge, but is achievable. Some specific possibilities include:

- A detailed review of literature.
- An initial review of literature that is the jumping off point for a concept to be addressed.
- Submitting reviewed performance for performances at important venues.
- Reviewing the literature performed by an instrument or group.
- Concepts or the implementation of evaluation concepts of student performances.
- Practice methods for helping students grow.
- Recurring student questions or persistent problems in a specific teaching context.
- Descriptions of consistent student problems and assisting in correcting them.
- Having compositions reviewed for performances or awards.
- Having compositions requested by ensembles.
- Describing something people use online and making them useful.
- Surveys about an area of interest in music.

We also have the scholarship of teaching and learning that can be described in Boyer’s (1990) model. This would include writing about things that are important to us that we often do.

In the area of **criticality**, without finding fault, we can write about distinctive orientation to ideas and approaches or understanding the basis for something, but without finding fault. The [purpose is to better understand the idea. With **reflective practice** we can develop our self-awareness and practice. We can also approach **praxis**, where we work to link theory and practice.

We must realize that we are often doing things that can be used for success in post-secondary schools. It can provide systematic mentoring of our younger colleagues to assist them with what is needed for success at our Departments, Schools, and Colleges of Music. Basically, we would be developing faculty job coaches who assist with dealing with an organization. Of course, this would require the administration to understand the demands of a role such as this, but it would likely lead to more successful of our intelligent and capable colleagues who need the guidance of someone who understands where they are and what they need to do to be successful. All of us, new and seasoned faculty, need to maintain our connections with colleagues in the field to stay current and understand our fields, whether they are in composition, performance, theory, education, or any area. This requires being involved in our fields beyond the limits of our campuses, as this also helps us to understand where the fields are going and being part of it.

Regardless of the approach taken with whatever we work on, it is necessary to separate the work into manageable parts. For instance, if we are pianists, we might plan a series of concerts, but we do not work on all the literature for all the concerts at once. We take a concert and work on each piece. For some it might mean working an aspect of all the pieces simultaneously or working on one piece at a time, but we must break down what might seem an impossible task if it is all perceived as one task. Regardless of the field, we need to write it up or perform whatever we are working on at places other than our own campus. We need to organize it in a way that it has criticality, reflective practice, and praxis.

We could also have systems that recognize the value of outstanding teaching. A structure such as this would allow more teaching by faculty who wish to be recognized in this area, since the demands of research time do not absorb them. Also, people who move into this area would need to focus on sharing what they have learned and this would get them into the area of research, broadly defined.

If a faculty member is focusing on research or creative activities, then they may need to establish a structure to plan the necessary time spent needed to work on research or presentations. However, we must understand that not everyone must do research or creative activities in music, or any field for that matter. One advantage that music has is that people in other fields have little understanding of what we do and this can be used to our advantage as we explain the different approaches. However, this might be the way other fields will also want to move towards.

Currently, community engagement is already being added at universities. Whether this is for political or to develop a different perception of what being a professor is, it is a critical areas where colleagues can choose to excel. In fact, work in this area can lead to presentations, publications, or performances; which fits the current definition of scholarly or creative activities.

We have nontraditional types of research as well. As has been said, universities are adopting service in local communities; especially universities that are not research institutions. This could easily lead to urban research and outreach that would connect the campus to the surrounding city and region; even to other areas of the world.

Innovative teaching is another area where we can recognize some of the incredible work being done by colleagues. For example, colleague could receive merit-based raises (when there are raises) or other awards, to reward successes in teaching regarding creation of a popular undergraduate course that gives students hands-on experience in how music and other fields relate to a better life and efforts.

We want to make sure that we reward people for the work that matters to them personally. If this were to happen, there would be even happier faculty for this recognition. Some institutions have changed their tenure-and-promotion policies so they recognize involvement in public

scholarship as well as more traditional activities like writing books, invited performances, and publishing in scholarly journals.

As a flute professor states, “Documented creative activity and research is critical. Even while still in graduate school, submit articles for publication in flute journals; apply to conduct lecture-recitals, performances, or educational clinics to regional and national conferences; and work to make yourself marketable in a geographical region larger than your state of residence. Events such as juried activities are considered more valuable than nonjuried activities.” Starting in graduate school helps us to develop and ultimately establish paths that we wish to pursue.

Everything we do in colleges’ matters, if we are being creative. This is especially true at institutions that are now being creative with what they consider research or scholarly activities. Our role is to be structured, and organize and present them in places that are considered appropriate. We need to clarify what areas we are working on and how they serve our professional development and the universities’ expectations. We might need to work differently or work with our universities to help them develop different ways to evaluate the faculty for retention. However, in the end, everyone succeeds with a happier faculty and an institution that accepts different things from each faculty member, depending on their individual personal and professional focus.

References

- Beard, C. E. Career Advice from Flute Professors in Higher Education. *Flutist Quarterly*, Winter, 40-43, 2007.
- Boyer, E. L., *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate* (Special Report). Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Fogg P. Teaching Your Way to Tenure. *Chronicle Of Higher Education* [serial online]. September 2006;53(2):16. Available from: Academic Search Complete, Ipswich, MA. Accessed November 19, 2013.
- Ghodsee K. A Research Career at a Liberal-Arts College. *Chronicle Of Higher Education* [serial online]. April 25, 2008; 54(33): C1-C4. Available from: Academic Search Complete, Ipswich, MA. Accessed November 19, 2013.
- Murray State University Faculty Handbook*. Approved September 7, 2012 by Murray State University.
- Murray, R. *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. Maidenhead, Berkshire, England: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press, 2008
- Schultz Jr., J. P., J. A. Mead, and I. Khurana. The Changing Roles of Teaching, Research, and Service in the Promotion and Tenure Decisions for Accounting Faculty. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 4, 109-119.
- Stripling, J. Most Presidents Prefer No Tenure for Majority of Faculty. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 20, 2011, v. 57 Issue 37, pp. A12-13
- Tagg J. Why Does the Faculty Resist Change?. *Change* [serial online]. January 2012; 44(1): 6-15. Available from: Academic Search Complete, Ipswich, MA. Accessed November 21, 2013.
- Uzokaa, M., A. Fedoruka, C. Osakweb, J. Osujic, and K. Gibb. A multi-criteria framework for assessing scholarship based on Boyer’s scholarship model. *Information Knowledge Systems Management*, 12, 2013.

THE PLENARY SESSIONS

MINUTES OF THE PLENARY SESSIONS

THE WESTIN DIPLOMAT RESORT
HOLLYWOOD, FLORIDA

**First General Session
Plenary Business Meeting
Sunday, November 24, 2013**

Call to Order: President Wait called the meeting to order and welcomed all attendees to NASM's 89th Annual Meeting. He then introduced Isaiah McGee of Claflin University and Sang Woo Kang of Providence College (accompanist) to lead the singing of the National Anthem and the Thanksgiving Hymn.

Recognition of Honorary Members: Seven honorary members were introduced and recognized:

Robert R. Fink, Past Chair of the Commission on Accreditation
Don Gibson, Past President, Past Chair of the Commission on Accreditation, and current Treasurer *pro tempore*
Robert B. Glidden, Past President, Treasurer, and Executive Director
William Hipp, Past President and Treasurer
Thomas W. Miller, Past President and Past Chair of the Commission on Graduate Studies
Daniel P. Sher, Past President and Past Chair of the Commission on Accreditation
David G. Woods, Past Treasurer

Recognition of Sister Organizations and Guests: Attending representatives from four of NASM's sister organizations also were recognized:

Michael A. Butera, Executive Director, National Association for Music Education
Nancy Ditmer, President, National Association for Music Education
Glenn Nierman, President-Elect, National Association for Music Education
R. Terrell Finney, Jr., Vice President and President-Elect, National Association of Schools of Theatre
Daniel Lewis, Past President, National Association of Schools of Dance
Martin Prchal, Former Chief Executive, European Association of Conservatoires

Recognition of Retirees, New Representatives, and those on the Podium: Music executives leaving their positions this year and those new in their positions were asked to stand to be welcomed, recognized, and/or thanked. Representatives seated on the podium were introduced.

In Memoriam: Douglas Lowry: Delegates were asked to stand to remember Douglas Lowry, former dean of the Eastman School of Music, Treasurer of NASM, and Chair of the advisory Commission on Creative Multidisciplinary Convergence of the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations. During the fall, NASM's Board of Directors awarded Dean Lowry posthumous Honorary Membership in NASM.

Greetings from the European Association of Conservatoires: Substituting for Vice President of the European Association of Conservatoires, Gretchen Amussen, Martin Prchal was re-introduced and conveyed AEC's greetings to NASM.

Commission Reports: Neil E. Hansen, Chair of the Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation and Dan Dressen, Interim Chair of the Commission on Accreditation, reported results of 2013 Commission reviews. The Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation reviewed 21 applications and approved renewal of Membership for two institutions; they also reviewed 16 progress reports and two other business matters.

The Commission on Accreditation reviewed 321 accreditation-related applications and 52 administrative matters in June and 324 accreditation-based applications in November. As a result of these 2013 reviews, NASM welcomes three new institutions to Associate Membership and six new institutions to Membership. President Wait then recognized new-member institutional representatives:

Associate Membership:

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Gonzaga University
University of Mary

Membership:

Gettysburg College
Jazzschool
Louisiana College
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
University of Texas at Tyler
Washington Adventist University

Additional details will be included in the full reports which will be made available on the NASM Web site. President Wait expressed the Association's gratitude to the Commissions' chairs and members, visiting evaluators, and those completing Self-Studies during the preceding year.

Treasurer's Report: Don Gibson presented the Treasurer's Report.

Motion (Gibson/Menghini): to approve the Treasurer's Report. **Motion passed.**

Report of the Committee on Ethics: David Robbins, Chair, reported that there had been no complaints brought before the Committee in 2012-13. Members were reminded to apprise all faculty members of the provisions in NASM's Code of Ethics. Additional information regarding interpretation of the Code was also provided.

Action on Proposed Amendments to the Handbook: Mr. Hope presented proposed changes to the *Handbook*; President Wait invited a motion to approve.

Motion (Goble/Wilder): to approve the proposed *Handbook* changes. **Motion passed.**

Report of Nominating Committee: Tayloe Harding, Chair, presented the report of the Nominating

Committee, asking all candidates for office to stand when introduced. He announced that voting would occur during the Second Plenary Session.

Keynote Address, *The Work of Music*: President Wait introduced Executive Director Samuel Hope, who is retiring at the end of the current year after 38 years of service. Mr. Hope presented his address to the NASM membership. After extended applause, President Wait announced the start of next sessions at 10:30 a.m.

Monday, November 25, 2013

Call to Order and Honorary Membership: President Wait reconvened the membership at 11:17 a.m. and announced that earlier in the year, NASM's Board of Directors had voted unanimously to award Honorary Membership to Samuel Hope in recognition of his 38 years of service to the Association

Report of the Executive Director: Mr. Hope reported briefly from the comprehensive report that will be available on NASM's Web site.

Election of Officers: Tayloe Harding recognized members of the Nominating Committee and thanked them for their service. He then re-introduced the slate of candidates. Committee members and National Office staff members assisted in conducting the election. President Wait thanked those retiring or leaving office and announced that the official notification of election results would be posted on the NASM Web site following the close of the Annual Meeting.

Report of the President: President Wait's report reviewed NASM's historic development, stressing current values of artistry and intellect, teaching, and openness. The full address will be part of the meeting's proceedings on the NASM Web site.

New Business: There was no new business.

Adjournment: President Wait adjourned the meeting and announced the start of next sessions at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Catherine Jarjisian, Secretary

**GREETINGS FROM THE
EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF CONSERVATOIRES (AEC)**

MARTIN PRCHAL
Koninklijk Conservatorium, Royal Conservatoire in The Hague

Dear Mr. President, Members of the Association, dear Colleagues and dear Friends – Good morning!

It gives me great pleasure to be here at your annual meeting and to convey greetings from the European Association of Conservatoires, or AEC. Our President, Pascale De Groote, and Chief Executive, Jeremy Cox, in particular would like to convey their very warmest wishes for the success of this meeting. Originally it was AEC Vice-President Gretchen Amussen who was supposed to address you at this occasion but unforeseen travel difficulties have made it impossible for her to be here today, which is why she asked me to take her place. Some of you may remember that I addressed the Annual Meeting in 2010 shortly before I left my position as the AEC Chief Executive to accept my current post at the Royal Conservatoire in the Netherlands and I certainly didn't expect I would be standing here in front of you ever again. But considering the circumstances it will be an honor for me to share some remarks with you on behalf of our European colleagues, although I hope you will not see my presence here as a kind of “ghost from the past”.

Let me start with thanking NASM President Mark Wait for his presence at the AEC 60th anniversary and annual meeting in Palermo a few weeks ago. Mark, your wise remarks provided an inspirational start to our meeting, one in which we sought to take stock, measure our accomplishments, evaluate the challenges that lie ahead, and explore new ways to provide support and advocacy as strongly as possible for the community of conservatoires AEC represents.

From an institutional point of view, I believe that this support and advocacy is more important than ever. Although I enjoy my current post in which I am closer to music and music education just as I wanted, I also observe a context in which it will be critical for the future of our institutions to use and maintain our capacity for institutional and curricular innovation. This includes constantly asking ourselves the question “how do we know we are good at what we do?” It includes looking for new ways of curriculum design and delivery. It also includes, at least in my context, setting up strategic partnerships with other schools of music or organisations in the music profession to develop high quality education, because with expertise levels rising and financial resources diminishing we are no longer in the position to offer everything on our own. We need to do all this because we have the responsibility to continuously consider how we can improve the chances for our graduates in an employment market that is becoming increasingly competitive.

For this permanent search for improvement, one of the things I believe is absolutely crucial is to have strong associations. Associations that not only protect our interests and what's already there, but that can also give space and inspiration for innovative thinking on where to go next.

We also need associations to help us in terms of continuing professional development and to hold

up a mirror to ourselves, either by doing reviews with a focus on improvement or through other means. In the European context we are part of a small network of institutions, which is currently experimenting with the exchange of external examiners from other countries for the assessment panels for our final recitals, so that we can start formulating an answer to the question of what we mean when we say that we have the ambition to be informed by and aspire to international standards of performance with our students.

I believe we are in the fortunate position that we have strong associations in music at both sides of the Atlantic. NASM and AEC have worked side by side for over 15 years on vital issues for our sector, and I like to think that we continue to enrich each other mutually through conversations that center on our educational and artistic traditions, cultures, knowledge and experience. While NASM brings to the table its extensive knowledge in the field of accreditation, the immense cultural diversity represented by the AEC and the challenge of integrating this diversity into common frameworks constitutes one of our greatest strengths. So that when our associations come together and collaborate as we do, we are both revitalized and enhanced.

Today, with over 290 members in 58 countries, we can proudly say that AEC is a vital European player, prized for the quality of its activities and publications, and its ability to both reflect on current practice and to “imagine the future” in a broad intercultural context. And it has done so, in no small measure, thanks to the inspiration and support you have provided. Because if there is anything we have learned over these last years, it is that we exist and grow only inasmuch as we listen to each other and work together. A chamber symphony, if you will.

So if we say that we need strong associations, we will also need associations led by inspirational leaders. We need leadership that fully understands the characteristics of music within the broader context of higher education, that respects traditions and all that has been achieved, but at the same time has a vision of how things should be developed further. I know very few in which these qualities are so uniquely represented as in the person I got to know very well and learned to admire over the years, your remarkable executive director Samuel Hope.

Therefore let me, on behalf of all European colleagues, especially honour him today. Sam, for as long as most of us can remember, you have played a vital role for the AEC and become for us the most trusted and valued of friends. Since the signing of the first Memorandum of Understanding between NASM and AEC in 1998 to your participation in the latest Polifonia project working group on Quality Assurance and Accreditation, you have helped us steer through the complex waters of these subjects. You advised us on how to develop our own set of criteria and procedures for AEC reviews, sharing your expertise and experience, inviting European colleagues to observe NASM activities and attend the NASM annual meetings and workshops for visitors. And your help will still be crucial in a time when the AEC studies the feasibility of developing an independent agency to perform accreditations across Europe. You have provided guidance and inspiration and indeed it was you who helped instigate this now well-established tradition of bringing greetings at the annual meetings of both associations.

My European colleagues join in wishing you the very best for the new chapter which is opening in your life – and dearly hope that we will have many opportunities still to extend our warmest welcome to you and Judy.

Let me also congratulate NASM with the appointment of Karen Moynahan to be Sam’s

successor. I have had the privilege to work with Karen at various occasions and there is no doubt in my mind that she will do a great job leading NASM into the future.

And to all of you here, dear colleagues and friends, may I wish you every continued success in your many endeavors, and may our two associations continue to gather and celebrate all that we share and all that we can grow together for many decades yet to come.

Thank you so much.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

MARK WAIT
Vanderbilt University

First, let me thank you for the opportunity and honor of serving as the president of this Association. It is a privilege to be among esteemed colleagues from every part of the nation, representing many kinds of institutions, all united in the pursuit of excellence in educating our students in music.

I first attended the annual meeting of the Association in 1993. That was the very first year I had served as a music executive, and after I had arrived at Vanderbilt University in the summer, I learned that this also happened to be the year we were scheduled for a reaccreditation visit. (Funny – during the interviews they forgot to mention that.) But the visit occurred, and we got through it.

With this annual meeting, we as an Association are entering the 90th year of our existence. Our history is distinguished, rich, and varied. In recent weeks I have spent a good deal of time exploring that history, and marveling at our Association's many accomplishments over the years. I have been struck by many things: the breadth of our achievements, the consistency of values that have united and motivated and driven us for nearly a century, and the quality of leadership we have all been privileged to work with over the years. Taken together, these achievements, values, and leaders form an intricate fabric that continues to unite us to this day. It serves as a model for the challenges of the present and the opportunities for the future. Woven into that fabric are the hopes and beliefs and ideals of nearly a century of music in higher education. Our 90 years have witnessed a golden age of music in society, when the role of art music reached an apex. It has been a remarkable time.

And so today I would like to review with you just a few of the highlights of our history – the times when we took steps that helped make us the Association we are today, or when turning points led us in new directions. This is timely, because we're about to encounter another turning point – the retirement of the baby-boomers. And, more importantly, let us affirm what we as educators and we as an Association believe in and advocate. These represent continuities – continuities of time, and of people. The links with our shared past are many, and they are strong.

Our beginnings, frankly, were not auspicious. Our Association was founded partly as an attempt to address conditions that were far from ideal. The first President of NASM, Kenneth Bradley, remembered that “[t]here were ... music schools which were really teachers' rooming houses. The purposes of these institutions was to attract private teachers, regardless of their merits, to teach in the conservatory and be listed as faculty members. Teachers paid for this ... by giving a commission to the school for each lesson. Teachers set their own rates. Rivalry was intense and not always ethical.”

And so several leading music executives decided that they should, as they put it, “[come] to an understanding among themselves relative to the improvements of their courses of study.” In other words, they needed to clean up their act.

And over the next few years, they did. The Standards began to take shape – for entrance requirements, the Bachelor of Music degree, a Soloist’s Diploma, and a Teacher’s Certificate. And a Code of Ethics was written. By 1950, when the Association was just over 25 years old, there were 202 members, and more Standards – for the Master of Arts, Master of Music, and Doctor of Philosophy degrees.

At the 30th annual meeting, we encountered the future. At that meeting, Earl Moore, the long-standing chair of the Commission on Curricula, spoke of a future that included expanding population and enrollments, and the urgent need for preparing music teachers for studios and schools. That was in 1954. The baby-boom had just hit the public schools. The first boomers were 7 or 8 years old then. And Earl Moore was already talking about the urgent need to prepare music teachers for an expanding population.

He was right. Between 1947 and 1963, the number of music students in elementary and secondary schools grew from 2.5 million to 11 million, a gain of 440 percent in just 16 years. The number of school bands and orchestras doubled in the 18 years after World War II. And over 1,200 symphony orchestras were reported to be in existence. In fact, 580 *new* community orchestras had been formed in just 10 years. A golden age, indeed.

Meanwhile, our Association continued to grow. By 1970, there were 363 institutions in NASM. In the early 1970s, themes quite familiar to us today were beginning to emerge. At the 1973 annual meeting, President Everett Timm spoke of potential federal interference in accreditation and the future impact of electronic advances on the entire field of music. That was 40 years ago. He couldn’t have known about Pandora, YouTube and MOOCs, but he nailed it.

By 1984, NASM had 521 members. The Association’s approach to accreditation began to focus even more on helping institutions to improve *on their own terms* in order to ensure that the accreditation process encouraged creativity. That has long been the philosophical underpinning of NASM, and especially in the past several years of these annual meetings. Continuities.

In November 1998, NASM signed a Memorandum of Agreement with the Association of European Conservatories. For 15 years now, this agreement has facilitated communication between the two associations and their member institutions, providing the framework for specific projects and exchanges. And so this year, as in past years, we are pleased to welcome our colleagues from AEC institutions at our annual meeting, and we look forward to future collaborations.

NASM has now grown further to 643 institutions constituting a broad array of programs from preschool through graduate and post-graduate music education. And the Standards have been revised recently, just as they have been at regular intervals throughout our history. These revisions always have the same goal: to encourage institutional creativity and to share the vision of excellence that we as members have agreed upon over the decades, a vision that has served generations of music students, audiences, and communities throughout our nation.

So as we enter our 90th year, what are the principles that have guided us? What are the themes and the values? Are they still relevant today? I think they are, and I think it is essential to affirm them as we look toward the future.

Throughout our Association's history, our approach to music has been comprehensive, all-inclusive. Together, we have undertaken a broad array of aspirations and activities. We have sought not only to train the musicians of the future, but to elevate *all* aspects of music in American society. And higher education has always been a special focus, which is all the more remarkable when we realize that NASM was formed at a time when relatively few people went to college, and when professional music training was in its infancy. Professional training has come a very long way since 1924. *Make no mistake: that professional training came to maturity because of us.* It is thanks to NASM that conservatories, colleges, and universities have become major resources for the preparation of artists, scholars, and teachers. And their influence goes far beyond professional training: these institutions also provide introductory and advanced studies for musical amateurs, and they provide facilities that support musical activities for entire communities. From the very beginning, NASM has nurtured institutional resources on behalf of *all* serious work in music. We provide the substance, *and* we set the tone. We have made, and we continue to make, a tremendous difference.

This all occurs because we set high expectations and ambitious goals for ourselves as musicians and as institutions, and then we achieve them. Our accreditation process is based on peer review, *self*-regulation, and respect for *local* decision-making. It provides the best of two worlds: oversight *and* institutional autonomy. Peer review – all of us in this room, working together – is the essential ingredient of this fabric of mutual expertise and trust; it is *the* sustaining life force of our Association. That has always been the case, and never more so than now.

Besides accreditation, our Association provides at these annual meetings a forum for **development of leadership skills** – an array of innovations and new techniques in the profession, with opportunities for examination and questions, for exploration and debate. The Association, at its annual meetings, attends to *our* professional development. Every one of us has learned something of value at these meetings that we take back to our own institutions. That is one of the purposes of these annual meetings – to provide a marketplace of ideas that we all share for our mutual benefit.

Another essential function of our Association is **policy analysis**. NASM was founded to deal with policy. “Policy” may sound dry, but it has real consequences. Remember, we were founded in 1924 partly to turn those rooming houses for teachers into true places of education. That's policy with real consequences. Over the years, NASM has become an educational policy force for music in higher education, and our influence has been felt far beyond music itself. Just consider the efforts in the past several years in favor of content-based accreditation in the face of rampant assessmentism. Thanks to our rigorous peer-review and the recognized integrity of our processes and our national office, we have established credibility among accrediting organizations and government agencies. We maintain an active, vital presence in arts and education policy. True, we all live with the burdens and constraints of assessment to a degree that is distracting at best. But those burdens would be far, far worse if NASM had not been active in this arena during the past decade and more. This policy analysis and activism on our part must, and will, continue. It will require constant vigilance. We are committed – as an Association, as educators, as artists, and as scholars – to maintaining that vigilance, and to creating the conditions and the working room that are necessary for music study at every level, in every dimension, and in every place.

Peer review, professional development, and policy analysis have been hallmarks of our Association for almost a century. These things are *what we do*. They are *activities* and *strategies*.

But what drives them? What about our *values*? It is the *values* of any organization that give it definition, and legitimacy. At NASM, our values go to the very heart of education and the arts themselves.

Above all, we believe in **artistry and intellect**. From those modest beginnings in 1924, we have sought to promote the highest standards of artistry and intellect, recognizing that these are qualities developed in *individuals* – that is, in our students. They are *personal* qualities, not institutional traits. We really do put our students first. *They* have been the driving force of all our work, as we seek to advance excellence in music study and performance in every location, at every level. This is true in every degree offered, in every kind of institution. Whether we are part of a large public university, a small religious college, a community college, or a community performing arts school, our purpose, our mission, our goal is the development of the talents, abilities, and potential of each *student*. In this we are all united, as educators and as an Association. Developing artistry and intellect is both our goal on the horizon and the reason we go to work every day. It's what we do.

And we do this through another of our essential values – our explicit devotion to **teaching**. Teaching is the link between mentor and student, from one generation to another, from one culture to another, from one musician to another. It is fundamental communication. It is often the link between the musician and the audience. Teaching is the generating principle of progress – in the arts, in science, in society. Teaching is, simply stated, our link to the future – nothing less. And NASM, throughout its history, has invested itself in questions of teaching at all levels – *how* to teach, *what* to teach, and how to relate teaching to our evolving profession and to the world at large. The importance and possibilities of teaching have been explored in depth at every annual meeting of this Association; it is a primary theme of *this* meeting. We recognize with pride the mission of teaching in the role of all musical activity. This principle is as old and sacred as civilization itself. It is the core of preparing music professionals, and it is essential to developing musical knowledge and skills among the population as a whole.

A third value of our Association, today and throughout our history, is **openness**. This takes many forms, but the most important one is apparent just looking around this room. NASM welcomes all sizes and types of institutions that meet our basic Standards. There are many dimensions to music study. The range of musical activities is enormous. Those of us in this room are all parts of a great kaleidoscope of musical activity, every part complementing and enriching every other part in the vast mosaic of musical activity. Each of us is proud of our place and role in this mosaic, as we should be. But at the same time, we realize the value of the other parts of this mosaic, and we learn from them. Let me cite a personal example. Since 1998, I have served as a visitor to many institutions in our Association. I come from Vanderbilt University, a private, small-to-mid-size university in the mid-South. And the institutions I have visited include large leading public universities, a distinguished private religious college, two community arts schools, and a progressive arts institute. In every case, our Standards have been applicable to the widely diverse curricula and students of those institutions. And as a music executive myself, I have learned something important on every one of those visits – something applicable at my own school of music, something that has made my school of music better than it might have been otherwise. That is one of the principles we hold dear as an Association. *Taken together in the aggregate, we – all of us in this room – are greater than the sum of our parts*. And that is why it is essential that we all recognize and understand and value the richness of the mosaic of which we are a part. We all have something to contribute to each other. We shouldn't be asking, "What's in it for me?"

Rather, each of us – each of our institutions – is a citizen in the society of our Association. If we fail to recognize that, and if we fail to give appropriate value to our diversity, if we see only our own place on the continuum, without reference to our fellow citizens, then we limit ourselves and the potential of our Association. And any institution seeing itself in this fashion – seeing only its *own* place and values in the continuum – sets up a self-limiting perimeter, and diminishes itself. So let us recognize and celebrate our diversity, our inter-connectedness, and the strength of our common bonds.

In all of our diversity, we as an Association are devoted to the vitality of the curriculum, and to our ability to prepare today's students for musical life and professional activity in the coming decades. This has been a primary focus of our annual meetings for several years. We started this focus with a simple question: what skills and knowledge will today's students need 30 or 40 years from now, when they will be at the same point in their careers as we are now? This year we are continuing that conversation by considering the many opportunities that exist within our Standards for institutions of all kinds. Our emphasis is on *opportunities* – that is, on the *future*. In each of our institutions, we consider our curriculum as our students' doorway to the future, for that is precisely what it is.

These opportunities encompass the entire range of relationships that NASM represents – the marriage of artistry and intellect, the importance and integrity of teaching, our connections within and beyond the field of music, the relationship between the individual and the community, and *above all*, our dedication to students. All of these relationships are codified and given life in our Standards. That is where our relationships and our goals find concrete expression. Our Standards are the result of expert individuals – all of us in this room – working together over a long period of time, developing a kind of group expertise, just as we hear in great orchestras, or in great chamber music. And this is only achieved when we as individuals *transcend* our own world, and enter into the mutual trust and respect that one finds in chamber music. NASM stands for – it embodies – that collective, *creative* experience.

Another hallmark of our shared history is leadership – intelligent, dedicated, and wise leadership. All of us in this room stand on the shoulders of those who preceded us, and of those who have been our esteemed colleagues. A brief glance at the names of NASM officers over the years – and of the Honorary Members who are with us today – reveals a virtual Pantheon of leadership in music in higher education. These are the people who have been our mentors and our colleagues, and we owe them all a huge debt of gratitude for helping to build the greatness and the unity that have characterized NASM over the decades.

And we owe special gratitude to our Executive Director over the past 38 years, Samuel Hope. Sam has presided over, and has helped guide, the most far-reaching growth in the Association's history. With foresight and wisdom he has helped bring our philosophy and processes into the Twenty-first Century. With goodwill and unflinching generosity he has welcomed hundreds of institutions and new music executives into the fold of NASM. And with tenacity, vigilance, and strategic brilliance he has helped this Association and other artistic disciplines to maintain their ideals of self-improvement and democratic peer review, to retain content-based accountability, and to resist the encroachment of bureaucratic and arbitrary assessmentism. For this wisdom, generosity, vigilance, and brilliance, all of us in this room, and future generations to come, owe Sam Hope our profound and heartfelt gratitude and admiration.

We are fortunate to have the expertise and comprehensive knowledge and skills that Karen Moynahan will bring to the role of Executive Director. All of us have benefitted from her advice and wise counsel over the years. Meanwhile, NASM faces another turning point in the future of leadership among our music executives – among us. Those of us constituting the so-called “baby boom generation,” are starting to retire. We are seeing this in our own faculties, and among ourselves. Within the next five to ten years, a new generation of music executives will assume leadership of our nation’s schools and departments of music. To a large degree, this new generation will have been trained in the 1980s and 1990s, and their perspective and views of the world will necessarily be different from ours.

The coming years will witness dynamic change in our schools and departments of music – perhaps the most dramatic, pervasive changes in almost 70 years. We – the generation being replaced – are keenly aware of the heritage of the past, and we might wish to ensure that this heritage is honored, and that there is continuity in our traditions and institutions. But the fact is that each generation must find its *own* solutions to challenges, and must create the future according to its own lights and wisdom. It has happened before. Just after World War II, while we were busy being born, a generation of returning veterans was assuming leadership of schools and departments of music throughout the nation. Their faculty experience was often minimal – certainly less than ours was when we became music executives. But these leaders created the great institutions that helped lead music activity in this nation for the past half-century. They were the builders, and they were our mentors, and we have been honored to follow in their paths.

And now it will soon be our turn to hand over leadership to a new generation. This transition may appear daunting to us now, but we have the confidence that each new generation will find solutions and create realities that elude us. That has always been the case. That is the nature of change, and we look forward to the creativity that is to come, and that will shape the musicians of the future.

In all of these essential areas of music education – the preparation of teachers, professional curricula, and the change of leadership – there is one guiding light that we all follow: the importance of the musical work itself. Music, and specifically art music, is the goal and the guiding force that we all serve. We can be assured that there will *always* be art music, in one form or another. In the past, art music was often characterized according to national and cultural boundaries. Although these boundaries have been largely blurred or eliminated by the internet and other features of globalization, there is still the deeply human yearning for music that reflects human experience and aspirations on a profound level. Opera companies and symphony orchestras – some of them – may come and go, but the art work is present in all ages, and in all places. We have often read about the so-called decline or even “death” of classical music, but such pronouncements are nothing new. Indeed, they have been with us for hundreds of years, and it is both amusing and reassuring to read them, and to know that they were wrong. As Charles Rosen reminded us, “The death of classical music is perhaps its oldest continuing tradition.”

This is not to say that we do not have challenges in the place of music in our society, in the way that it is presented to our audiences, and the way that it is taught in our schools and conservatories. We must find new and imaginative ways of engaging our society in the quality – and qualities – of our greatest works. But we also know that music, like other art forms – literature, dance, theatre – will find its means, and will find its way in the world, just as it always has. And thanks in large part to the efforts many of us are making in entrepreneurship, our

students will find *their* way in the world. The forms that music may take in the future are unpredictable, just as they have always been. What is constant in every age is that the artwork will endure. That knowledge is as affirming as it is certain.

For all of us, one of life's greatest privileges is assisting in this cause, promoting and enhancing the art form that we all embrace and to which we have dedicated our lives. And so it is a great pleasure to join with you in this Association as together we recognize and honor the past, navigate the challenges of the present, create a better future for our students and for generations of musicians to come, and ensure that the artwork endures.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

The 2013-2014 academic year marks NASM's 89th season of service. As always, efforts to support and advance the music profession in the United States remain at the core of the Association's projects. Its work in various areas, including accreditation, professional development, research, and monitoring and analyzing policy surrounding higher education and the arts, is continually being improved and enhanced. As NASM serves an ever-growing and diverse membership, its projects in accreditation and beyond continue to evolve and intensify. The Association's principal activities during the past year are presented below.

Accreditation Standards and Procedures

Much of the yearly work of NASM involves accreditation. This includes preparation for Commission meetings, arranging accreditation visits, providing consultations for member institutions, and development of standards and resources for the accreditation review process. NASM Commissioners, visiting evaluators, and staff members work to help make this a valuable component in the advancement of music programs for many institutions in higher education.

With the next comprehensive standards review set to begin in 2015, NASM is now focusing on specific areas of standards review. This process will continue until the next comprehensive review. Institutional representatives should feel free to contact the office of the Executive Director at any time if they have any views on the Standards for Accreditation that they feel would assist in improving the work of NASM. The Membership is voting on several proposed standards changes during the 2013 Plenary Business Meeting during the First General Session.

At this time, all NASM Self-Studies and submissions to the Commissions should be based on the most recent editions of the September 2008 *Accreditation Procedures*. All current accreditation-related documents, templates, and procedures are available for download from the Association's Web site at nasm.arts-accredit.org. Brief additions or amendments are added from time to time. Improvements made throughout the revision process of these documents should help to make the accreditation review process more efficient, more flexible, and more adjustable to local conditions. Please do not hesitate to contact the National Office should questions arise.

The Association continues to encourage the use of the NASM review process or materials in other accountability contexts. Many institutions are finding efficiency by combining the NASM review with internal reviews. The Association is gladly willing to work with institutions and programs to produce a NASM review that is thorough, efficient, and suitably connected with other internal and external efforts.

Projects

NASM participates in the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations with NASAD (art and design), NASD (dance), and NAST (theatre). The Council is concerned with issues that affect all four disciplines and their accreditation efforts. NASM President Mark Wait and Vice President Sue Haug are the music Trustees of the Council. CAAA sponsors the Accrediting Commission for Community and Precollegiate Arts Schools (ACCPAS), which reviews arts-focused schools at the K-12 level. This undertaking connects K-12 and higher education efforts. Margaret Quackenbush of the David Hochstein Memorial Music School is the chair of the ACCPAS Commission, and Amy Dennison of the University of Cincinnati is the music appointee.

The CAAA Commission on Creative Multidisciplinary Convergence (formerly the Commission on Multidisciplinary Multimedia) continues its work on behalf of the four arts accrediting associations. In addition to consulting Appendix I.I. of the NASM *Handbook*, institutions wishing to learn more about the topic of Creative Multidisciplinary Convergence and Technologies (CMCT) may access the CMCT Tool Kit of advisory documents through the Web site of the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations (CAAA). Members of the commission include George Brown from Western Michigan University (NAST), Daniel Lewis from the Limón Institute (NASD), Peter Raad from Southern Methodist University (at-large), and Jamy Sheridan from Maryland Institute College of Art (NASAD). The late Douglas Lowry of the Eastman School of Music was serving as chair and music representative to the Commission at the time of his passing. Individuals interested in this topic, particularly those representing institutions that offer multidisciplinary or multimedia studies, are encouraged to share thoughts and ideas by contacting the office of the Executive Director.

Each NASM Annual Meeting provides various opportunities for the discussion and dissemination of current information surrounding music study, higher education, administration, and other related fields. A large number of individuals work each year to produce outstanding sessions.

The 2013 Annual Meeting will include discussion of the following topics: external and internal influences on the work of music teacher preparation programs, the preparation of future music educators at the graduate level, leadership, assessment, the undergraduate curriculum, renovating and repurposing buildings, health and safety issues for music students and faculty, and copyright and intellectual property.

Four separate pre-meeting development sessions for music executives will also be held immediately prior to the Annual Meeting including an extended pre-meeting workshop for new music administrators in higher education. This workshop will address issues that directly affect music administrators such as working with faculty and administration, financial management, and leadership issues. There will also be ample opportunity to discuss these topics and interact freely with other attendees. The Association is grateful for all those who developed specific agenda material for the Annual Meeting, as well as those who serve as moderators and lead discussion groups.

The Higher Education Arts Data Services (HEADS) project continues to be refined and improved over time. Participation by member and non-member institutions remains strong. Following the close of the 2012-2013 HEADS Survey, the resultant Data Summaries were published in March 2013. Additional capabilities and services will be added as time and financial resources permit. Comparative functions of HEADS Special Reports will be discussed during the second of two HEADS sessions.

Policy

The Association continues to be concerned about the music education of children and youth. Tremendous challenges are appearing on the horizon as issues continue to develop regarding K–12 arts education. In the next years, the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act will be reauthorized—a major project for all concerned. At the same time, new technologies, social conditions, and the evolving public mood create new opportunities and challenges for music that are being met with the usual creativity and expertise. A national P–12 arts education standards project is in process, a sequel to the National Voluntary Arts Standards project completed in 1994.

Following the 2008 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA), negotiated rulemaking on the law began in the spring of 2009. HEA rulemaking is the process by which regulations are created that dictate how the Department of Education must carry out provisions of the Act. Various parties within the higher education communities, including leaders of accrediting groups, work diligently to develop and/or respond to regulations. NASM Executive and Associate Directors offer guidance and support throughout the rulemaking process to those involved in rulemaking negotiations, and they continue to participate in policy analysis efforts and responses to federal regulatory proposals.

The primary sets of federal program integrity and gainful employment regulations were released in 2010 and 2011. Institutions and accreditors are continuing to take steps to ensure compliance. A set of NASM advisories highlighting certain components of the program integrity and gainful employment regulations is available through the Publications section of the NASM Web site.

The current 2008 version of the Higher Education Act is set to expire at the end of 2013. It is expected that Congress will begin the reauthorization process in 2014 or 2015. The staff of the National Office plans to monitor legislative developments and proposals and will provide updates to the Membership from time to time. The 2008 version continues until reauthorization is completed.

More policy challenges are on the horizon on local, national, and international levels. Certain attitudes and efforts exist that purport to replace current systems based on trust of expert knowledge and experience, and independence of institutions regarding academic matters, with centralized systems focused almost solely on assessment techniques and accounting. There is much more work to be done to educate many about the dangers of this approach. The NASM Executive Director will keep you informed as issues and projects progress.

In addition to accreditation policy mentioned above, the Association is concerned about tax policy, intellectual property, growing disparity in educational opportunity at the K–12 level, and the cultural climate produced by technological advance and saturation. Many contextual issues that affect NASM schools grow out of large social forces that can be understood but not influenced significantly. Economic cycles and downturns have a profound effect, but no single person or entity controls them. NASM continues to join with others in addressing policy approaches regarding deductions for charitable contributions on federal income tax returns. Increasing personal philanthropy is a critically important element in future support for education and the arts, particularly in these uncertain economic times. NASM continues to monitor with concern proposals that would bring increased federal involvement in the activities of and control over non-profit organizations and philanthropies.

National Office

The NASM National Office is in Reston, one of the Virginia suburbs of Washington, D.C. We are always delighted to welcome visitors to the National Office; however, we ask that you call us in advance, particularly if you wish to visit with a specific staff member. The office is about eight miles east of Dulles International Airport, and a little over twenty miles from downtown Washington. Specific travel directions are available upon request.

The Association's outstanding corps of volunteers is joined by a dedicated and capable National Office staff. Samuel Hope, Karen P. Moynahan, Mark Marion, Tracy L. Maraney, Derek Bowden, Willa J. Shaffer, Chira Kirkland, Jenny Kuhlmann, Lisa A. Ostrich, Sarah Yount, Anne Curley, Erin Moscony, Teresa Kabo, and Stacy A. McMahon continue to enhance NASM's reputation for effective administration of its responsibilities. The staff deeply appreciates the support, cooperation, and assistance of NASM members.

The primary purpose of the National Office is to operate the Association under rules and policies established by the Membership and the Board of Directors. The office has grown in its services to NASM over the years, and now is extremely busy carrying on the regular work of the Association, developing new systems and refinements to old ones, and assisting a growing number of institutions seeking accreditation for the first time.

As a staff, we are able to see on a daily basis the great foundational strength of NASM. Fundamental to this foundation is wisdom about the need to cooperate in order to build music in higher education as a whole, as well as in each member and applicant institution. NASM has always been able to make commonality and individuality compatible. It has promoted no methodological doctrines; only concepts, conditions, and resources necessary for competence and creativity. This foundation will serve NASM well in the challenging times ahead.

NASM is blessed with the willingness of volunteers to donate time, expertise, and deep commitment to the accreditation process. As time becomes ever more precious, the value of this volunteerism continues to rise. The strength of NASM is peer governance and peer review. The work of our visiting evaluators and commissioners is a wonderful expression of commitment to the field and of faith in the future.

This will be the final NASM Annual Meeting in which I serve as Executive Director. I announced my decision to retire on December 31, 2013. In December 2012, the NASM Executive Committee voted to approve the recommendation put forth by the voting Trustees of the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations (CAAA) to name Associate Director Karen P. Moynahan Executive Director Designate of NASM. She will become and be designated Executive Director of the four arts accrediting associations and thus of the National Office for Arts Accreditation on January 1, 2014. She will also serve as *ex officio* Trustee to the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations. These transition plans were announced to the NASM Membership on December 12, 2012.

The entire staff joins me in expressing what a privilege it is to serve NASM and its member institutions. We hope you will always contact us immediately whenever you think we may provide assistance. We look forward to continuing our efforts together.

On a personal note, I want to express deep appreciation for the opportunity to serve as your Executive Director for 38 years, and for the encouragement and support that you and your predecessors have given to the Association and to me. I know you join me in congratulating and supporting Karen P. Moynahan as she assumes her new role. I look forward to continuing participation in efforts that support a strong future for music in higher education.

Best wishes for the forthcoming year.

Respectfully submitted,
Samuel Hope
Executive Director

ORAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SAMUEL HOPE

Mr. Hope presented the following report on the occasion of his final NASM Annual Meeting as Executive Director, following 38 years of service.

Serving as Executive Director of NASM has been a great honor and pleasure. An honor because of the opportunity to serve a great cause. A pleasure because of constant interaction with colleagues connected to something bigger than themselves, colleagues holding fast to content and substance. Every year the sense of honor grew, as did the pleasure in our work together. Looking back, that work individually and together has resulted in a massive aggregation of true wealth for the work of music. Led by its member institutions and their administrators and faculties, and supported by NASM, this wealth contains far more than endowments, buildings, and equipment. It contains people and programs that engage content and do the work of music. It contains aspiration, and expertise, and will, and a vast record of achievement. It contains commitment to perpetual engagement with music on the part of institutions large and small. And it contains the beauty of music itself, pouring forth from your students, faculties, and alumni.

NASM is a great organization because it serves something beyond itself. It is able to serve this kind of wealth building, because of its values and its fealty to the nature and substance of music. Its principles, approach, and standards are consistent with the thing that it is working for and with the manners in which that work is done. In a few moments our president will speak more about these values and consider them in terms of artistic mission and the future. The connection between NASM and the art of music is so strong, so multilayered, and so deeply influential, because music itself is at the center of its people. This centering is a primary force in the kind of transcendence we have been speaking about during this meeting.

In 1924, when NASM was founded, Calvin Coolidge was elected President of the United States. Lenin died. Fascists under Mussolini gained in the Italian elections. Hearings on the Teapot Dome oil scandal were held in Washington. Paul Whiteman commissioned George Gershwin to compose "Rhapsody in Blue." Hubble proved that there were galaxies beyond the Milky Way. A tornado destroyed 25 towns in five Midwestern and Southern states. Nobel Prizes were awarded for the discovery of x-ray spectroscopy and the electrocardiograph. A New York to San Francisco airmail service test flight took 27 hours. There were 2.5 million radios in use in the United States, up from 5,000 sets in 1920. Koussevitzky became conductor of the Boston Symphony. Thomas Mann's *The Magic Mountain*, Strauss's *Intermezzo*, Janacek's *The Cunning Little Vixen*, and Sibelius's *Symphony 7* made their appearances.

In other words, the world was being the world, and artistic life was being artistic life. The themes of politics, financial scandal, scientific advancement, natural disaster, mass media, performance, and artistic creation underlie the items I have read for 1924. They are still with us today. They have been in NASM's context for 89 years. We have all worked together in the context produced by these and other themes during my years as your Executive Director. But NASM has not just played along with the particular variations on perpetual themes that a specific time produces. It has fashioned its own themes and created its own variations as times demanded. As time continues, it is useful to remember something: even though the events I mentioned are left to resonate as history and the lessons of history, the works of art I mentioned are still with us in their

original glorious form. They still speak in whole and in full as they did the first time. This, too, is a lesson of history.

During my years at NASM, the Association has been blessed with outstanding leadership elected by representatives of member institutions. Time does not permit naming everyone, but I would like to read the list of Presidents with whom I have served: Everett Timm, Warner Imig, Robert Bays, Thomas Miller, Robert Glidden, Robert Werner, Frederick Miller, Harold Best, William Hipp, David Tomatz, Karen Wolff, Daniel Sher, Don Gibson, and Mark Wait. This is an honor roll of brilliant administrators with a deep love of music and the people who make it possible. Each is unique, but they all shared the same permanent question no matter what the topic: how better to serve the NASM membership.

The gratitude I have to all of these individuals and to Sue Haug who is our Vice President and President-elect, and to the other members of the Executive Committee, is deep and real, but it is also a symbol of the gratitude I have for all of the officers, Commission members, Board members, and intuitional representatives who have contributed so much to the richness, integrity, and majesty of the Association's work and record. I am deeply honored that former Presidents Don Gibson, Robert Glidden, William Hipp, Thomas Miller, and Daniel Sher, and Executive Committee members David Woods, Robert Fink, and Florence Miller, wife of the late former President Frederick Miller, are with us at this meeting.

My work with NASM has also led to similar work with the fields of art and design, dance, and theatre. Of course, each art form is different. Personalities are attracted to and are shaped by the nature of each discipline. But still, among the arts there is a shared spirit, a shared habit of mind, a creative energy, and a need to work together. As the first and oldest arts accrediting agency, NASM has been in a unique position to provide assistance to its independent sister organizations, especially in their early years of development. Today, through the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations, there is a common forum to work for the good of all on matters of common interest and responsibility, while retaining the essential independence of each association. The influence of NASM's values and approaches over the years has made a significant positive impact on the arts in American higher education as a whole.

In music, there have been opportunities to work with staff and elected leaders of other national organizations such as the College Music Society, the Music Teachers National Association, and the National Association for Music Education. These occasions have influenced progress for music in our society. It is wonderful to see great ideas for music move forward with the participation of so many thousands of music professionals acting in different settings, many of whom are unaware of the multi-organization cooperation and parallel action that are working in the background.

I am also in constant remembrance of the wonderful relationship that NASM has with the European Association of Conservatoires. This relationship is a model of international cooperation and mutual support between two independent organizations with common music-centered goals, each serving institutions in different regions of the world. I mention in gratitude the leadership of the late AEC Presidents Ian Horsbrugh from the United Kingdom and Johannes Johansson from Sweden, the current AEC President Pascale De Groote from Belgium, and AEC Executive Directors, formerly Martin Prchal, and now, Jeremy Cox. As was the case with NASM, these leaders also represent the leaders, faculties, and work of many individual institutions that

continue the work of music in their place and for their time. I wish to thank Martin Prechal for being with us at the meeting and for delivering his thoughtful and generous greetings from our European colleagues.

NASM is an organization built and sustained through the continuing contributions of volunteers. But NASM could not operate effectively without an outstanding staff. The present staff was introduced yesterday. Each one of them makes a vitally important contribution to the work we do on your behalf, and it has been a source of great satisfaction to work with them and their predecessors. Four present staff members have served as my assistant for a period of time: Willa Shaffer, Chira Kirkland, and Mark Marion in the past, and Sarah Yount at present. A special thank you to each of them for their support and their many contributions to my own work.

Today, we are nearing the end of a yearlong transition. On January 1, 2014, Karen P. Moynahan will become Executive Director of NASM, the fifth person to serve in that role. Karen joined the NASM staff in 1981. An NASM meeting in Dallas was one of her first staff experiences. Fortunately, we did not scare her away. Since that time she has become a nationally esteemed expert in accreditation, statistical information, professional development, and policy analysis, the four primary services that NASM provides. She not only knows what NASM does, but she knows and understands the contexts that influence the work of the Association. Her list of professional contacts is long and distinguished. The officers of NASM and the other three arts accrediting associations separately made the right decision, not just because of Karen's great expertise and experience, but also because of the values, principles, acuity, and willingness to help that she brings to the work that the associations continue to do. Many of you have worked with Karen over the years, and you have confidence as I and other members of the Executive Committee do that the core operational values and principles of NASM will continue to inform the daily staff and program development work of the association. Conditions for continuing transcendence on the basics are present. A firm foundation is present for continuing evolution and change informed by wisdom constantly sought.

I also want to thank Karen for being an outstanding colleague for over three decades. It has been a pleasure to work with her, to see her grow professionally, and to see her reputation for expertise and service increase nationally. Karen continues to bring an extraordinary personal dedication to NASM and to the work of the National Office. I cannot thank her enough for what she has done over the years to support my efforts, those of the entire staff, and most especially the efforts of member and applicant institutions.

I wish to thank my wife Judy for her unfailing love and support, and for her generous spirit, and for her deep respect and affection for the people of NASM. I could not have served in this role without her.

Before I close, I want to say a few words about accreditation. We all know the components of accreditation: standards, self-study, visit and visitors' report, response to the visitors' report, commission action. We know the work of accreditation and the results of accreditation. These matters are all important. They describe the elements of interaction among institutions and programs and accrediting organizations.

For a moment I ask you to abstract these elements from your experience with NASM or any other accreditation process. I ask you to think of these elements and the sequenced system they create

as an empty form, a lifeless set of operational steps.

Now, I ask you to consider all the different sets of values and purposes that can be used to animate this form. These values and purposes can be democratic or authoritarian, for example, but not both in the same organization. They can range across many sets of contrasting values, such as those I spoke about yesterday, and those our president will discuss in a few minutes. These days the word “accreditation” does not define itself. One has to know the values and principles informing the work of a particular organization.

It is important to remember that American higher education generated the concept of accreditation using American principles such as representation, reciprocity, consent of the governed, checks and balances, and so forth. The result was a democratic peer-based system with several strategic purposes. One of the most important of these strategic purposes was and is to have a non-governmental mechanism through which the academy and the professions control academic decision-making and the destiny of academic work. This mechanism protects local institutional decision-making and destiny-setting first by respecting it and second by providing common consensus-based frameworks of quality indicators developed, owned, and operated by the academy itself, frameworks that leave detailed decisions at the institutional and programmatic level. This concept for accreditation is in the tradition of self-governance that informs democratic institutions of all kinds.

Today accreditation in the United States and elsewhere is under great pressure to keep the form and name of accreditation, but change the values that animate it and shape its decisions about standards, and self study, and so on. In too many cases, the change proposed is from democracy to autarky. When these values take hold, those being accredited become subjects rather than participants. Common ownership is lost. And ultimately, strategic control of academic decision-making and academic destiny can be lost.

I have sought a brief way to encapsulate the way that NASM and the other arts accreditors continue to approach accreditation. I offer for your consideration “Accreditation as Learning.” Everything we do in NASM is connected to the humble business of learning on every level. “Accreditation as learning” is so much more positive, effective, productive, and transcendent than “accreditation as process,” or “accreditation as power,” or “accreditation as personalities.”

NASM is a great continuity of learning. It was a great professional honor to join this continuity in 1975. I started on Roger Bacon Drive in October. With us at this meeting is Bob Glidden, my immediate predecessor, who was on the Executive Committee that hired me, along with such luminaries as Everett Timm, Warner Imig, and Himie Voxman. I thank Bob and his colleagues at the time, as well as successive Executive Committees, for their confidence, support, and wisdom as we tried to do our best to fulfill the responsibilities the NASM membership had given us.

At first, my learning curve was steep. Then it got steeper. Along the way we enjoyed ourselves. There were the many letters from eighth graders that began, “Dear Mr. Hope, Please send all your information.” The address on Roger Bacon Drive gave rise to letters addressed to Dr. Roger Bacon. The staff drafted a response, not sent, that began with, “We regret to announce that Dr. Roger Bacon passed away. You will be pleased to know that the spirit of his scientific inquiries was carried on by Isaac Newton, Albert Einstein, and many others.”

Yes, I came to the NASM staff one October day in 1975, full of expectation and aspiration, and on another December day at the end of 2013, I will leave it confident, fulfilled, thankful, and ready to help the arts and higher education from a new place and perspective. I consider myself fortunate and blessed beyond measure to have held, for a time, the NASM Executive Directorship in trust for the content and the people of music, and for the special group of people and institutions that is NASM. I thank you for the Honorary Membership, for granting me Emeritus status, and for all your kind words of appreciation, and for years of support and service to music and to NASM. My cup runneth over.

Best wishes to all of you, to Karen, and to NASM, with high expectations for ever-advancing achievements in the years ahead.

REPORTS OF THE REGIONS

Meeting of Region 1 Sunday, November 24, 2013

James Gardner, University of Utah, presiding.

Attendees: Ernie Hills, California State University-Sacramento; Donna Fairbanks, Utah Valley University; Elvin S. Rodriguez, La Sierra University; Laurence Paxton, University of Hawaii at Manoa; Steve Bettis, California Baptist University; Todd Sullivan, Northern Arizona University; Andrew Glendening, Redlands University; John M. Kenney; Brian Harlan, Cal Arts; Giulio Ongaro, University of the Pacific; Matt Leder, Northern New Mexico College; Donn Schaefer, University of Utah; Margaret Schmidt, Arizona State University; Dale Merrill, Chapman University; Rex Woods, University of Arizona; Kory Katseanes, Brigham Young University; Geralyn Giovannetti, Brigham Young University; Keith Bradshaw, Southern Utah University; Tony Mowrer, Fresno State University; José A. Díaz, Fresno State University; Kathleen Tesar, The Colburn School; Deborah Smith, The Colburn School; Sara Hiner, The Colburn School; Dee Spencer, San Francisco State University; Gary Cobb, Pepperdine University; James Gardner, University of Arizona; Thomas Priest, Weber State University.

Number = 24 (Not all individuals signed circulated roster.)

Chair serves on Board of Directors and organizes the session.

Vice-Chair serves in lieu of the Chair.

Secretary takes minutes at annual meeting.

A motion was made to have the Vice Chair become the Chair and the Secretary become the Vice Chair. This motion was approved. Rex Woods, University of Arizona, was elected to office of Secretary. James Gardner became Chair and Thom Priest became Vice Chair.

James Gardner asked the group what issues they would like to see addressed by NASM at the Annual Meeting.

Issues identified included: Moving from quarters to semesters and reducing core requirements, distance education, technological means to gather demographic information from students, developing marketing strategies, identifying successful marketing strategies, how music departments can reach out to communities to educate and develop audiences; developing university marketing strategies built around a particular ensemble (for example, string quartet); on-line ensembles, streaming music ensembles; developing music units with lower levels of funding.

Respectfully Submitted,

Andrew Glendening, University of Redlands
Chair

Meeting of Region 2
Sunday, November 24, 2013

Chair - Todd Shiver - Central Washington University
Vice Chair - Mark Hansen - Boise State University
Secretary - Michael Connolly - University of Portland

Attendance:

Todd Shiver, Central Washington University, Regional Chair
Michael Connolly, University of Portland, Secretary
Torrey Lawrence, University of Idaho
Mark Hansen, Boise State University
Diane Soelberg, BYU-Idaho
Sheila Woodward, Eastern Washington University
Philip Miller, Northwest Nazarene University
Carlene J. Brown, Seattle Pacific University
Keith Ward, University of Puget Sound
Thom Hasenpflug, Idaho State University
Brent Weaver, George Fox University
Debbie Hansen, Whitworth University
Dave Robbins, Pacific Lutheran University
Bryan Johanson, Portland State University
Jeff Richmond, Southern Oregon University

Welcome new members:

Lance Beaumont- northwest Christian University
Philip Miller - Northwest Nazarene University
Jeff Richmond - Southern Oregon University
Sheila Woodward - Eastern Washington University

Introductions and Announcements

Reminder of the region 2 sponsored session:

2:15 Monday, November 25

Diplomat 1 (second floor)

The impact of the edTPA on music teacher preparation programs

Future NASM Meeting Sites:

2014 - Scottsdale, AZ, Westin Kierland Resort

2015 - St. Louis, Mo, Hyatt Regency St. Louis at the Arch

2016 - Dallas, TX, Omni Dallas Hotel

2017 - Scottsdale, AZ, Westin Kierland Resort

Ideas for next year's (2014) region 2 session:
Dealing with RCM budget models
Funding models that encourage blended classes/online classes/MOOCs, etc.
Assessment in the music department
Making the most out of your Special Reports requests for HEADS

Respectfully Submitted,

Todd Shiver, Central Washington University
Chair

**Meeting of Region 3
Sunday, November 24, 2013**

Region 3 Business Meeting – Attendance 46

- Introduction of new members
- Returning membership introduced themselves
- List Serve Up-date and attendance sheet
- Topics for discussion 2014 Region 3 Session
 - Has NASM been contacted by FTC, similar to MTNA
 - Academic analytics – arts are missing
 - Teacher certification process is changing – issues to discuss – regional to national
 - New National music standards – music teacher preparation impacted
 - Current technology, apps, iPad, etc
 - Music industry – online teaching with guitar – Skype
 - Blending online learning with traditional formats
 - Is an online degree a legitimate, accredited degree program?
 - Issues with adjunct/contingent faculty – definition of responsibilities
 - Bridge Building – SNAAP and analytics – American for the Arts – build a broader base with NASM
 - Faculty evaluation – systems and processes
 - How school have broadens their tent to allow more non-classical music idioms

Region 3 Program

- Attendance 38
- Tayloe Harding, University of South Carolina and Todd Queen, Colorado State University
- Topic: Music Leadership in the Music Unit: Why, How, and How-to

Region 3 Business Meeting Attendance

Jim Austin	University of Colorado, Boulder
Melissa Berke	University of Nebraska at Omaha
Donna Bohn	MidAmerica Nazarene University
Colby Carson	University of Denver
Valerie Cisler	University of Nebraska-Kearney
Nancy Cochran	University of Denver
Julie Combs	Missouri State University
Jennifer Cowell-DePaolo	Casper College

Stephen Eaves	Friends University
Tim Farrell	University of South Dakota
Ladd Faszold	Missouri Baptist University
Kurt Gartner	Kansas State University
Beth Gigante Klingenstein	Valley City State University North Dakota
Don Govang	Lincoln University
Meg Gray	Lincoln University of Missouri
Kevin Hampton	Southeast Missouri State University
Chuck Hausen	University of Northern Colorado
Mary Pat Henry	University of Missouri Kansas City
Martha Hicks	Southwest Baptist University
Calvin Hofer	Colorado Mesa University
Ruth Krusemark	Benedictine College
Trilla Lyerla	Baker University
Dan Masterson	Bethany College
Carol Mathieson	Culver-Stockton College
Gary Mortenson	Kansas State University
Glenn Nierman	University of Nebraska-Lincoln
David Oehler	Northwest Missouri State University
Kathleen Ohlman	Doane College
Murray Oliver	Colorado State University
Fred Peterbark	University of Colorado- Boulder
Todd Queen	Colorado State University
Marc Reed	Fort Lewis College
James Richards	University of Missouri St. Louis
John Richmond	University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Nancy Roberts	Black Hills State University
Tomm Roland	University of Nebraska at Omaha
Michael Sekelsky	University of Central Missouri
Jack Sheinbaum	University of Denver
Timothy Shook	Southwestern College
Larry Smith	Missouri Baptist University
John Spilker	Nebrask Wesleyan
Steven Taylor	Colorado Christian University
Una Taylor	Chadron State College
Dori Waggoner	Central Methodist University
Robert Walzel	University of Kansas
Robert Weirich	University of Missouri Kansas City
Russ Widener	Wichita State University
Peter Witte	University of Missouri Kansas City

Respectfully Submitted,

Timothy R. Shook, Southwestern College
Chair

**Meeting of Region 4
Sunday, November 24, 2013**

Business Meeting

The Region 4 Business meeting was convened Sunday, November 24, 2012, at 8:20 am
Approximately 38 people attended.

Elections – None were held

Members were reminded of a Region 4 resource – the listserv, for polling via e-mail the members in Region 4 for feedback on matters of concern. It has been used in the past year to consult NASM Region IV members about matters of mutual concern.

Members were urged to actively participate in the annual meeting sessions.
Members were reminded of the Region 4 Program Session and given an overview of the panel members participating.

Solicitation of the members for topics for the 2014 Region 4 Program Session yielded multiple suggestions that focused on student-related topics from recruiting and pre-enrollment remedial preparation through graduation and employment. The suggested topics will be reviewed and ultimately ranked via the list-serv for selection and submission to the National Office for 2014.

Topics included the following:

- +Recruiting of diverse, college-ready music major populations
- +Remedial preparation for music majors prior to first semester of enrollment
- +Career Advisement – For what careers are students well prepared by completing a music degree?
- +Relevancy of curriculum to future work/career.
- +Defending Liberal Arts and in general terms.
- +Retention from 1st to 2nd year.
- +Integrating real life issues into curriculum, convergence/work force relevance and learning outcomes.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 am.

Program Session

The session began at Monday, November 25, at 2:15 pm with introductions by moderator Paul Bauer

"Music Education Faculty Under Siege – How Can Administrators Help?"

The program session was attended by approximately 50 people and was well received.

Panelists:

+**Jan Edwards, The Ohio State University**

+Joseph Manfredo, Illinois State University
+John Richmond, University of Nebraska – Lincoln

Session adjourned at 3:35 pm with some attendees spending extra time with the 3 panelists afterwards.

Respectfully Submitted,
Paul D. Bauer, Northern Illinois University
Chair

Meeting of Region 5
Sunday, November 24, 2013

Michael Crist called the meeting to order at 8:15 am.

After the introduction of new executives all attendees introduced themselves and forwarded new contact information to the Chair. Richard Blatti volunteered and was elected as the Region's new secretary.

The Chair proceeded with the report from the NASM Board Meeting that he had attended. He made the membership aware of recent political moves, such as the intention to have universities level tuition costs towards future income of students. He asked that membership contact their state representatives and be involved from a political standpoint.

Michael Crist reminded the attendees of Region Five's presentation on assessment. This was followed by a discussion of possible topics for the 2014 NASM conference.

The following topics were discussed:

- Online offerings
- 3-year degree programs with 120 total hours
- Changes in Demographics
- National bench markings relating to faculty evaluations
- Helping music executives in the leadership process
- How to share the creative process with community and upper administration
- Internet II, video streaming and the latest in technological development
- Master's degree in music education online

Membership expressed the following concerns for discussion at the Board level:

- What is gainful employment for the free-lance musician in the eyes of government?
- What is the role of experiential education in music?
- How do we get musicians to represent themselves well through both written and verbal communication?

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Ulli Brinksmeier, College of Mount
St. Joseph
Secretary

Meeting of Region 6 Sunday, November 24, 2013

The meeting was called to order by region Chair, Dan Goble (Western Connecticut State). All present introduced themselves and a contact list was circulated. There were 51 representatives present.

Announcements

An announcement was made of the Region 6 presentation: *Panel Discussion: A Survival Guide For Music Executives to be held on Monday, November 25, 2:15 pm to 3:45 pm. Location: Diplomat 3 (2)*

Moderator: Marshall Onofrio, Westminster College of the Arts

Panelists: H. David Caffey, University of Northern Colorado; H. Keith Jackson, West Virginia University; Mary Ellen Poole, San Francisco Conservatory; Nancy Jo Snider, American University; Eric Unruh, Casper College

The secretary position for region 6 is currently. Diane Falk Romaine (William Patterson), Richard Kravchak (Marshall), and Patricia Crossman (Community College of Baltimore) expressed interest.

Old Business

The minutes from the 2012 meeting were distributed and accepted (motion - Diane Folk Romaine, second - Patti Crossman)

New Business

Suggestions for the 2014 Region 6 Presentation were accepted. These were:

- SNAAP and other tools for tracking graduates,
- Recruiting music students
- Models for course scheduling
- What will music schools look like in 10 years

- Preparing students for the variety of jobs they will have and communicating that to parents
- External private funding for state schools
- What music can bring to general education courses
- Blended and flipped classes in music
- Budget cuts
- Copyright law: using content on websites, streaming and other usage questions
- Entitled student: effective methods of dealing with students and parents

After a polling of the room two suggestions were chosen as finalists:

- What will music schools look like in 10 years and
- Recruiting music students

By an overwhelming majority (48 to 3) "What will music schools look like in 5 to 10 years" was chosen. After a brief discussion, it was decided that the presenters will have final say over the exact title of the presentation.

Issue or Concerns to the board:

A suggestion was made that there be as much transparency as possible in "why" standards changes occur. (Outside concerns and the like)

The Chair received a motion, and second, to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn passed 8:46 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

H. Keith Jackson, West Virginia University
Vice Chair

**Meeting of Region 7
Sunday, November 24, 2013**

Laura Franklin, Brevard College, Interim Chair

- I. Laura Franklin called the meeting to order at 8:15
 - a. The agenda was announced-elections and soliciting new topics
 - b. All attendees introduced themselves individually
- II. Elections
 - a. Nominations for Chair of the region was opened to the floor
 - i. Laura Franklin, Brevard College was the sole nominee
 - ii. A motion that nominations be closed was made, seconded and passed
 - iii. Laura Franklin was elected unanimously
 - b. Nominations for Vice Chair of the region was opened to the floor
 - i. Jeff Moore, University of Central Florida was the sole nominee
 - ii. A motion that nominations be closed was made, seconded and passed
 - iii. Jeff Moore was elected unanimously
- III. Solicitation for future meeting topics

- a. Any new standard or change to the current NASM standards should have a session describing the change and ways schools can best react to the change
- b. Fundraising by a development and music specialist
- c. Improving retention and graduation rates
- d. What metrics to use-How to use Delaware data
- e. Ways to stay connected to the alumni-tracking student outcomes

Building Relationships with Public Schools for field experience/Partnerships for Pre-Student Teaching

Respectfully Submitted,

Laura Franklin, Brevard College
Interim Chair

**Meeting of Region 8
Sunday, November 24, 2013**

- 36 members present
- Review and approval of Agenda with addition: Motion for approval by Christopher Doane, University of Louisville; seconded by Jeffrey Pappas, University of Tennessee.
- Review and approval of Minutes from 2012 Region 8 meeting: Motion for approval by Lee Harris, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga; seconded by Rob James, Eastern Kentucky University.
- Report of Nominating Committee Chair: Skip Snead
Slate of Officers presented: Chair-Randal Rushing; Vice Chair-Michael Miles; Secretary-Martin Camacho- Zavaleta. Motion to Accept Slate of Officers by William Michael Parkinson, Middle Tennessee State University; seconded by Luvada Harrison, Spellman College. Slate approved.
- New officers elected.
- Introduction of Officers
- Introduction of executives in attendance
- Introduction of Music Executives New to Region 8: (not all present)
 - Alcorn State University - Donzell Lee
 - Birmingham-Southern College - Jeffrey Kensmoe
 - East Tennessee State University - Maria A. Niederberger
 - Huntingdon College - Jennifer K. Canfield
 - Jackson State University - Darcie Bishop
 - Judson College - Betty Campbell
 - Kentucky State University - Shannon Brogan
 - Kentucky State University - Hunt Butler
 - Middle Tennessee State University - William Michael Parkinson
 - Mississippi College - Angela Willoughby
 - Rhodes College - Carole Blankenship
 - University of Mississippi - Robert D. Riggs
 - Western Kentucky University - Scott H. Harris
- Announcement of Future Meetings
 - o 2014 November 21-25 Westin Kierland Resort, Scottsdale, AZ
 - o 2015 November 20-24 Hyatt Regency at the Arch Hotel, St. Louis, MO
 - o 2016 November 18-22 Omni Dallas Hotel, Dallas, TX

- o 2017 November 17-21 Westin Kierland Resort, Scottsdale, AZ
- Reminder to Membership: **REGION 8 SESSION: Monday, November 25 2:15 – 3:45 Diplomat 4/5 (2)** Session Title: *Dealing with Tenure at a Changed (from Teaching to Research) University*; Presenter: Harry E. Price, Kennesaw State University; Moderator: Randal Rushing, University of Memphis
- Suggested Topics for Future Meetings
Online learning – how to incorporate into music curricula
Entrepreneurship – training students and faculty
- Announcements
Several schools announced upcoming position vacancies.
- Adjournment at 8:35 am

Respectfully Submitted,

Sara Lynn Baird, Auburn University
Secretary

**Meeting of Region 9
Sunday, November 24, 2013**

Called to order at 8:17

Recognized new executive and new institutions.

No retirees

Program on Monday.

Items from the board meeting:

- Federal Issues -- Fed education higher education act
- Hold the line on our independence
- Topics for consideration for future meetings (whole)
- Pending large shift because of Baby Boomers retirement
- Leadership training sessions
- K-12 teacher training issues at fed level--build focus groups
- Opportunity for NASM for leadership in creativity--help all areas
- Additional standards on non-major involvement
- Online education--happening now--when the first school brings online applied music
- Online ensembles

Bring ideas to this forum--topics for our presentation--ideas to share with the board
Jim B--PRAXIS II test--discussed in teacher ed part of the meeting

Election of secretary--
Tom Webster, East Texas Baptist
Stephen Beck, LSU

State Reports

AR--Met in LR in April--discussed classes

PRAXIS II problems--go to LR on

Louisiana did not meet

OK--met in Sept 20 in Tulsa

NASM reaccred. process--college night as All-State collegiate meetings, New trends in
Music Education Curriculum, next meeting January 2014

TX--Jan 2013--conference Theme--Closing the Loop--

Scholarship Fund--50 students more than a million dollars

Commission on Research and Communication

Using a Google listserve on Legislative updates

Sept 2013---preparation of budget and bylaw updates

Jan--Celebration of Association-Dan Sher speaker in Austin

Tom Webster is the new secretary.

Gale Odom is new chair.

One item of business--solicit ideas for session 9--Stephen Tepper--Vanderbilt--Public trends in
policy--creativity---national reputation

Collaborating with arts, Mark McCain, Department of Art (Mark.McCoin @utsa.edu)

TX and media

Topic--Integration of traditional music studies with new media studies--interact to create new
programs

New Music and new media--Don Boomgaarden, Loyola volunteered to be a panelist

Respectfully Submitted,

Ronda M. Mains, University of Arkansas
Secretary

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

DAVID P. ROBBINS, CHAIR

Thank you, Mr. President.

No complaints were brought before the Committee in 2012-2013.

As your institution's representative to NASM, please make your faculty and staff aware of all provisions in the Association's Code of Ethics.

Let us all use these provisions as we develop our programs. Questions about the Code of Ethics or its interpretation, or suggestions for change, should be referred to the Executive Director. He will contact the Committee on Ethics as necessary.

Supplemental Remarks: Report of the Committee on Ethics

In addition to our formal report, I wish to speak for a moment about the importance of the NASM Code of Ethics to the well-being of every institutional member of NASM, and indeed, to music in higher education.

For 89 years, NASM members have maintained a Code of Ethics. Every word has been approved, either by us or by our predecessors. The Code is ours collectively, and we have it to protect the public, each other, and the field as a whole.

In music, healthy competition is essential. Mobility of faculty and students is also essential. But competition and mobility can become destructive if we fail to agree on the ground rules. In the NASM Code of Ethics we have an agreement to agree.

The deadlines in the Code of Ethics regarding student and faculty recruitment are extremely important as the basis for the kinds of competition and mobility that build up the field. May 1st and April 15th are the dates that we have agreed to respect. Admission with a music scholarship based on merit or faculty hiring after the applicable date carries important responsibilities for music executives.

It is important that all NASM institutional representatives do the following with regard to this issue:

First, inform appropriate administrators, faculty, and staff of the specifics of the Code regarding recruitment deadlines and policies, and explain why these policies are important for all to follow.

Second, inform prospective students of their responsibilities regarding scholarship offers. Use their application or recruitment as an opportunity to broaden their sense of good citizenship in the music community as a whole. The NASM Web site has an excellent piece on this topic written especially for students. It can be found under the section titled "Frequently Asked Questions: Students, Parents, Public."

Third, in situations where the deadlines have passed, follow the Code and consult with the music executive of any other institution that may be affected before making an offer. Beyond the courtesy

of good practice, these provisions of the Code help all of us maintain an orderly process in faculty and student recruitment.

There is one other issue that I would like to mention. We have all agreed to a provision in the Code of Ethics that requires certain procedures when students with scholarship support from their current institution wish to transfer and receive scholarship support from the new institution.

The NASM Code of Ethics dictates that a transfer-offering institution must obtain a release from the student's current institution before an offer of admission with scholarship can be made. Neither this provision, nor any other parts of the Code, address or include every transfer-related communication, transaction, or agreement possible within or among institutions.

It is important, therefore, in all institutional documents and presentations, to make clear distinctions between items that are based directly upon the language and meaning of the NASM Code of Ethics and those items that are matters of institutional policy or practice – those items that the Code itself does not address.

For example, the Code of Ethics does not include any provisions indicating that the institution to which the student may transfer can or should seek to obligate the student's current institution to hold or continue the student's present scholarship through any stage or all stages of the transfer application process.

Various arrangements may be offered or negotiated among institutions, and between institutions and students, but they may not be linked to or presented as necessary for compliance with the Code of Ethics unless they are specifically required by the Code.

Thank you for your participation in and oversight of the hard work accomplished in our institutions each year to recruit and enroll students, to hire faculty, and to manage transfers, and for your continuing good record in abiding by the Code we have set.

ACTIONS OF THE ACCREDITING COMMISSIONS

NEW MEMBERS

Following action by the Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation and the Commission on Accreditation at their meetings in November 2013, NASM is pleased to welcome the following institutions as new Members or Associate Members:

Jazschool
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
University of Texas at Tyler
Washington Adventist University

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGE ACCREDITATION

NEIL E. HANSEN, CHAIR

November 2013

A progress report was accepted from one (1) institution recently granted Associate Membership.

Action was deferred on two (2) institutions applying for Membership.

Progress reports were accepted from three (3) institutions recently granted Membership.

After positive action by the Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation, the following institutions were continued in good standing:

Broward College
Schenectady County Community College

Action was deferred on one (1) institution applying for renewal of Membership.

Progress reports were accepted from ten (10) institutions and acknowledged from one (1) institution recently continued in good standing.

One (1) institution was notified regarding failure to submit the 2012 Accreditation Audit.

One (1) institution was notified regarding failure to submit the 2012 Affirmation Statement

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION

DAN DRESSEN, INTERIM CHAIR
JAMES C. SCOTT, ASSOCIATE CHAIR (*PRO TEMPORE*)

November 2013

Progress reports were accepted from two (2) institutions and acknowledged from one (1) institution recently granted Associate Membership.

After positive action by the Commission on Accreditation, the following institutions were granted Membership:

Jazschool
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
University of Texas at Tyler
Washington Adventist University

Action was deferred on thirteen (13) institutions applying for Membership.

Progress reports were accepted from two (2) institutions recently granted Membership.

After positive action by the Commission on Accreditation, the following institutions were continued in good standing:

Auburn University
Binghamton University, State University of New York
Bucknell University
California State University, East Bay
Carnegie Mellon University
Central State University
Eastern Michigan University
Friends University
Immaculata University
Moody Bible Institute
Pacific University Oregon
Radford University
Saint Olaf College
Simpson College
Stephen F. Austin State University
Texas Tech University
Trevecca Nazarene University
University of Delaware
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of North Alabama
Washington State University
Wesleyan College

Action was deferred on seventy-four (74) institutions applying for renewal of Membership.

Progress reports were accepted from one hundred five (105) institutions and acknowledged from eleven (11) institutions recently continued in good standing.

Substantive changes were approved for two (2) institutions.

Progress reports were accepted from two (2) institutions with recently approved substantive changes.

Twenty-nine (29) programs were granted Plan Approval.

Action was deferred on seventeen (17) programs submitted for Plan Approval.

Progress reports were accepted from ten (10) institutions recently granted Plan Approval.

Nine (9) programs were granted Final Approval for Listing.

Action was deferred on two (2) programs submitted for Final Approval for Listing.

Progress reports were accepted from eight (8) institutions recently granted Final Approval for Listing.

One (1) institution was notified regarding failure to proceed with application for reaccreditation.

Eight (8) institutions were granted second-year postponements for re-evaluation.

Progress reports were accepted from five (5) institutions reporting enrollments less than NASM minimums.

A progress report was accepted from one (1) institution recently granted postponement for re-evaluation.

One (1) institution was placed on Administrative Warning regarding failure to pay annual Membership dues.

Seventeen (17) institutions were placed on Administrative Warning regarding failure to submit annual reports.

NASM OFFICERS, BOARD, COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, AND STAFF
November 2013

President

- ** Mark Wait (2015)
Vanderbilt University

Vice President

- ** Sue Haug (2015)
Pennsylvania State University

Treasurer

- ** Don Gibson (*pro tempore*) (2013)
Florida State University

Secretary

- ** Catherine Jarjisian (2014)
University of Connecticut

Executive Director

- ** Samuel Hope

Past President

- * Don Gibson (2015)
Florida State University

Non-Degree-Granting Member, Board of Directors

- * Kate M. Ransom (2014)
The Music School of Delaware

Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation

- * Neil E. Hansen, *Chair* (2014)
Northwest College
- Kevin J. Dobreff (2013)
Grand Rapids Community College
- Myrna Nachman (2015)
Nassau Community College

Commission on Accreditation

- ** Dan Dressen, *Interim Chair* (2013)
Saint Olaf College
- ** James C. Scott, *Associate Chair [pro tempore]* (2013)
Steven Block (2014)
University of New Mexico

Commission on Accreditation (continued)

- Christopher P. Doane (2013)
University of Louisville
- Maria del Carmen Gil (2014)
Puerto Rico Conservatory of Music
- Craig Johnson (2013)
North Park University
- Edward Kocher (2014)
Duquesne University
- Lawrence R. Mallett (*pro tempore*) (2013)
University of Oklahoma
- Mark McCoy (2015)
DePauw University
- Mary Ellen Poole (2015)
San Francisco Conservatory of Music
- John W. Richmond (2014)
University of Nebraska – Lincoln
- Jeffrey Showell (2013)
Bowling Green State University
- Ann B. Stutes (2015)
Wayland Baptist University
- John D. Vander Weg (2015)
Wane State University
- Keith C. Ward (2014)
University of Puget Sound
- Michael D. Wilder (2014)
Wheaton College
- Peter T. Witte (2015)
University of Missouri, Kansas City

Public Members of the Commissions and Board of Directors

- * Laurie Locke
Georgetown, Texas
- * Ann C. McLaughlin
Chester, Maryland
- * Cari Peretzman
Lewisville, Texas

REGIONAL CHAIRS

Region 1

- * James E. Gardner (*Interim Chair*) (2013)
University of Utah
Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah

Region 2

- * Todd Shiver (2015)
Central Washington University
Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington

Region 3

- * Timothy R. Shook (2015)
Southwestern College
Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming

Region 4

- * Paul Bauer (2014)
Northern Illinois University
Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin

Region 5

- * Michael R. Crist (2014)
Youngstown State University
Indiana, Michigan, Ohio

Region 6

- * Daniel Goble (2014)
Western Connecticut State University
Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia

Region 7

- * Laura Franklin (*Interim Chair*) (2013)
Brevard College
Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, Virginia

Region 8

- * Randal Rushing (*Vice Chair*) (2013)
University of Memphis
Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee

Region 9

- * Mark Edward Parker (2013)
Oklahoma City University
Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas

COMMITTEES

Committee on Ethics

- David P. Robbins, *Chair* (2014)
Pacific Lutheran University
- Todd E. Sullivan (2015)
Northern Arizona University
- Cynthia Uitermarkt (*pro tempore*) (2013)
Moody Bible Institute

Nominating Committee

- Taylor Harding, *Chair* (2013)
University of South Carolina
- Dale E. Monson (2013)
University of Georgia
- Mario J. Pelusi (2013)
Illinois Wesleyan University
- T. Clark Saunders (2013)
The Hartt School
- Pamela S. Wurgler (2013)
Murray State University

National Office Staff

Full-Time

- ** Samuel Hope, *Executive Director*
- Karen P. Moynahan, *Associate Director*
- Mark Marion, *Management Associate for Accreditation and Systems*
- Tracy L. Maraney, *Management Associate for Finance and Operations*
- Derek Bowden, *Management Associate for Accreditation and Education Services*
- Willa Shaffer, *Projects Associate and Webmaster*
- Chira Kirkland, *Editorial Associate*
- Jenny Kuhlmann, *Data and Records Associate*
- Lisa A. Ostrich, *Executive Assistant to the Associate Director and Meetings Associate*
- Sarah Yount, *Assistant to the Executive Director*
- Anne Curley, *Accreditation Specialist*
- Erin Moscony, *Accreditation Coordinator*

Part-Time

- Teresa Kabo, *Accreditation Associate*
- Stacy McMahan, *Office Manager*