

**PROCEEDINGS**  
The 73rd Annual Meeting  
1997

**NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION OF  
SCHOOLS OF  
MUSIC**

PROCEEDINGS  
The 73rd Annual Meeting  
1997

NATIONAL  
ASSOCIATION OF  
SCHOOLS OF  
MUSIC

**© 1998 by the National Association of Schools of Music  
All rights reserved including the right to reproduce this  
book or parts thereof in any form.**

**ISSN 0190-6615**

**National Association of Schools of Music  
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 21  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
Tel. (703) 437-0700**

# CONTENTS

<b>Preface</b> .....	v
<b>Faculty Issues</b>	
Evaluating Teaching in Higher Education Departments and Schools of Music <i>Catherine Jarjisian</i> .....	1
Tenure and Post-Tenure in a Unionized Environment <i>Jerry D. Luedders</i> .....	13
Tenure and Post-Tenure Review: A National Perspective <i>Cathy A. Trower</i> .....	17
<b>American Music</b>	
American Music and World Music: Curricular Issues in Higher Education <i>Lester P. Monts</i> .....	27
Weak Boundaries and Strong Values <i>Thomas L. Riis</i> .....	33
The Future of American Music: Observations and Reflection <i>Mark Wait</i> .....	40
American Music in American Schools: Resources and Curriculum Building <i>Anne Dhu McLucas</i> .....	44
Teaching American Indian Music: A Case Study <i>Tara Browner</i> .....	51
American Music in the Curriculum of a Small Music Department <i>Larry Worster</i> .....	56
<b>Doctoral Education</b>	
What Institutions Hiring Doctorates Are Seeking <i>Mellaseh Y. Morris</i> .....	65
What Institutions Hiring Doctorates Are Seeking <i>Alan E. Stanek</i> .....	71
<b>Implementing the National K-12 Music Standards</b>	
Implementing the National K-12 Music Standards <i>June Hinckley</i> .....	77
Implementing the National K-12 Music Standards: Florida <i>John J. Deal</i> .....	82
Implementing the National K-12 Music Standards: California <i>Patricia Taylor Lee</i> .....	86

<b>Open Forum: Evaluation, Planning and Projections in Smaller Music Units</b>	
Introduction	
<i>Daniel Taddie</i> . . . . .	89
Planning	
<i>Catherine Hendel</i> . . . . .	93
Projections	
<i>Alan Wingard</i> . . . . .	97
<b>Meeting of Region Three</b>	
The Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness	
<i>Tayloe Harding</i> . . . . .	101
<b>Meeting of Region Six</b>	
A Survey of NASM Region 6 Members Regarding Selected Recruitment and Admission Practices	
<i>Ronald Lee</i> . . . . .	115
Successful Recruiting at Fredonia	
<i>Peter Schoenbach</i> . . . . .	121
<b>The Plenary Sessions</b>	
Minutes of the Plenary Sessions	
<i>Dorothy Payne</i> . . . . .	125
Report of the President	
<i>Harold M. Best</i> . . . . .	129
Report of the Executive Director	
<i>Samuel Hope</i> . . . . .	136
Reports of the Regions . . . . .	141
Report of the Committee on Ethics	
<i>C. B. Wilson</i> . . . . .	149
<b>Actions of the Accrediting Commissions</b> . . . . .	151
<b>NASM Officers, Board, Commissions, Committees and Staff for 1998</b> . . .	155

## **PREFACE**

The Seventy-Third Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music was held November 22–25, 1997, at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in San Diego, California. 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 three plenary sessions.

Papers published herein have been lightly edited for certain stylistic consistencies but otherwise appear largely as the authors presented them at the meeting.

---

---

## FACULTY ISSUES

---

---

### EVALUATING TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS AND SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

CATHERINE JARJISIAN

*Oberlin College Conservatory of Music*

I was pleased to be invited to explore with you the evaluation of teaching in higher education departments and schools of music. As someone who purports to teach students how to teach, this assignment has held special interest for me. Obviously, if my colleagues and I undertake to teach teaching to others, we must believe that such an enterprise is possible. It certainly follows that if we can teach teaching, we must be able to tell if teaching has been learned—that is, we must be able to evaluate the quality of teaching. So, I have undertaken this project in part to confirm my own professional practice but also to find out what current research says on the matter.

Understandably, we faculty view the evaluation of teaching quality from perspectives grounded variously in previous experience and “common understanding.” Rarely do we seek to validate our assumptions in a scientific manner, nor are we, or others involved in our evaluation, pressed to do so. Consequently, faculty, students, and administrators alike seem to undertake the evaluation task with some combination of delicacy, mistrust, and fatalism: It must be done; we are not sure it can be done or how to do it; and we already know that not much of value will be gained from having done it. Perhaps it would be useful to examine some commonly held assumptions and to learn what, if anything, has been discovered by those who have submitted them to more rigorous scrutiny. Now here I must insert a caveat: I will attempt to report what I have found in the literature in fairly broad terms, not citing chapter and verse, nor delving into aspects of research design or data collection. I say this with almost no guilt, however, as unless your faculties are unlike my own, they are sure that such findings may apply very well to the schools downstate or even to most schools in the country but certainly not to their own unique situations. After all, are we not special, and are our students not really unusual? And is our school not totally unlike all others?

#### WHAT IS GOOD TEACHING?

Probably the question most basic to the entire evaluation enterprise is whether we even know what good teaching is; is it an art or a science? Aren't we more or less born with the right instincts, rather like perfect pitch, and the best that

environment can do is to support and nurture the appropriate attributes, whatever they are? We all might agree that the reason so many evaluation tools focus on seemingly trivial aspects of our work with students is that we do not even know how to express the more meaningful ones. We can therefore end up counting only what does not really count.

However, a great deal *is* known about what constitutes good teaching, and certainly we all seem to be able to recognize a student who has been well taught. Here is some of what is known or thought about teaching and learning, with interpolations on my part to bridge the gap from research in nonmusic settings to what we are concerned about specifically. First, from the research:

1. Teaching itself includes several activities: instructing in the classroom, studio, or rehearsal hall; conducting laboratories or coaching; mentoring interns and advanced graduate students; tutoring students individually; and advising students on such topics as appropriate educational or professional programs and career opportunities.<sup>1</sup> We might already ask, are we evaluating *all* of these aspects when we evaluate teaching?
2. L. S. Shulman argues that there is an important interdependence between the act of teaching and the content or subject matter being taught; in other words, one is not just a good teacher, one is a good piano teacher, or rehearsal conductor, or methods instructor, or career counselor. Teaching methods are embedded in the content of the discipline.<sup>2</sup> We might further ask what this implies about generic student evaluation forms.
3. Students learn more effectively through social interactions than in isolation.<sup>3</sup> Some studies indicate that students working in small groups learn significantly more than students working individually.
4. Although lecturing is by far the dominant method of instruction in classrooms, research has shown its limitations, particularly when higher levels of learning are called for. Chet Meyers and Thomas B. Jones report that while teachers are lecturing, students are *not* attending to what is being said 40 percent of the time; that in the first ten minutes of a lecture, students retain 70 percent of the information and in the last ten minutes, 20 percent; and that four months after taking an introductory psychology course taught through lecture, students knew only 8 percent more than a control group who had never taken the course.<sup>4</sup> Donald L. Finkel and G. Stephen Monk suggest that any class in which the teacher is the central figure isolates the teacher from the students—from what they know and what they are confused about. These authors recommend the dissolution of what they term the Atlas complex.<sup>5</sup> And of course, higher levels of learning *do* require active student involvement in the learning process.<sup>6</sup>
5. According to M. Scriven, good teaching attends to the quality of what is taught (accuracy and relevance); the quantity of what is learned (student outcomes); and the propriety, meaning the ethics and norms, of the process.<sup>7</sup>

Examination of many student evaluation forms suggests that propriety—such as “begins and ends on time,” “uses class time effectively and efficiently,” “is well organized and prepared,” and so on—is more than well represented. Are we most interested in propriety, or is it just easier to assess?

From this brief research summary, we might conclude that effective teachers perform well in a variety of roles and settings, interact meaningfully with students about content, understand their content thoroughly enough to infer sound and appropriate pedagogical approaches for involving students with that content, undertake systematic means to be certain that students have learned the content, and do all of this in an ethical manner. In the category of “for what it’s worth,” I would add the following:

First, all effective teachers of music find ways for students to engage actively *with* music and musical understandings and to act upon information so that it becomes knowledge. Effective classroom teachers foster student *doing* rather than just hearing *about*. Effective applied teachers foster student independent thinking, critiquing, and problem solving toward improved performance, deeper musical thinking, and artistry. A challenge for classroom teachers is being certain that individual students understand and can do; we teach groups of students, but individuals learn. Challenges for applied teachers include devising sequential approaches for individual students’ needs; planning for instruction and evaluating it; providing appropriate, objective, and regular feedback; and moving students toward independence from the teacher or coach.

Second, good teaching enables all or most students to learn, not just the most capable, who probably are able to learn in spite of poor teaching. The good teacher has not just one way to deliver content but many, and can continue to develop more ways as diverse students’ needs require.

Third, good music teachers think about teaching, as well as about music, and consider this contemplation important. They have a philosophy about teaching, and their teaching actions reflect this philosophy. I will describe one benefit of articulating such a philosophy in a moment.

## IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING

A second basic question has to do with the extent to which it is possible to improve one’s teaching, or perhaps more appropriately here, the teaching of one’s faculty as a whole. How is good teaching fostered? Again, from the research:

1. While faculty may sometimes seem not to value teaching in their own professional lives, a survey of more than 35,000 faculty members found that being a good teacher was an essential goal for 98 percent of them. Interestingly, only 10 percent believed that their institutions rewarded good teaching.<sup>3</sup>

2. Formative evaluation, that is, evaluation conducted with the intent of improving a faculty member's teaching rather than comparing its level with that of others, can result in improved teaching performance if four conditions are met for the teacher: gaining new knowledge about her or his performance, having confidence in the source of the knowledge and in the process for acquiring it, understanding the changes needed and how to make them, and being motivated to make the changes.<sup>9</sup> John A. Centra continues to write that failure to understand how to change is probably what most frequently *prevents* significant improvement.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps we might consider our present tools and the extent to which they supply this important feedback to faculty members. It is suggested that much formative evaluation leads to tinkering; for example, moving the date of a large assignment, because that is the kind of suggestion offered. Further, evaluation results that are intended for formative use but actually are used summatively—to compare colleagues for purposes of personnel decisions—should not be thought of as formative. Formative evaluations, asserts Centra, should be used only as an aid to improvement; any other use at the same time alters the effects on the teacher and the role of the evaluator.<sup>11</sup>
3. Understanding what motivates faculty intrinsically is crucial to improving teaching performance. In studies comparing faculty at liberal arts colleges with those at universities, the university professors were found to be “more goal-oriented, more self-reliant, and more competitive and interested in exerting power and influence over others than the college faculty.”<sup>12</sup> Faculty members at different types of institutions have different motivations. I find myself wondering both about where the faculties of schools and departments of music fit in this variance and also what happens when a faculty member moves from one type of institution to another; how long does it take one to internalize a different professional motivation? Several researchers confirm that faculty members' motivations change as they progress through different career stages—not a surprising finding, to be sure, but do our evaluation methods acknowledge the differences? And here's an interesting tidbit: “The effect of annual teaching awards in raising standards or teachers' performance is more cosmetic than actual, particularly for those who most need to improve.”<sup>13</sup>

My experience on an outside evaluating team charged with selecting recipients of a prestigious and financially lucrative teaching award confirms this last statement. Our team continues to work toward the use of the award program to help establish a climate on that campus for the discussion of pedagogical issues. In particular, we think that these teaching fellows—that is, the award recipients—might and should become initiators of campus discussions about teaching and perhaps mentors to less-experienced faculty members. It is important to us to try to develop a situation in which the entire campus wins, not just those elevated to another tax bracket.

4. Research also suggests that faculty members too infrequently gather evidence for their own use in assessing and improving their teaching and to discuss with trusted colleagues. K. T. Brinko found that assessment designed to increase a faculty member's personal control, as opposed to institutional control, was more likely to lead to subsequent changes in behavior.<sup>14</sup> A number of authors affirm the importance of self-assessment in the total evaluative process. I myself find the use of a videocamera *extremely* helpful in revealing unknown quirks and flaws in my teaching.

I promised a moment ago to describe one benefit of articulating a teaching philosophy, and I do this with another anecdote from my experience with the teaching award program. I have been struck by the power that rests in a faculty member's own teaching statement detailing essential beliefs about personal mission with respect to students and content and how these beliefs inform professional practice; that is, why certain pedagogical approaches rather than others are deemed preferable or appropriate. In one instance a couple of years ago, we read a candidate's portfolio, including his statement, representative course materials, student evaluations, and other requisite components. We were struck even at this paper stage with how different what he *said* he thought about teaching was from the materials—the kinds of tests he gave, for example, and the sorts of comments students made on their evaluations. When we visited his classes and spoke with some of his students, our perceptions were confirmed; he did, in fact, teach very differently from the way he said he wanted to teach. As we talked with him, we discovered that he was aware of the discrepancy, that in fact it troubled him greatly, but he felt confined by students' limitations—their weak academic backgrounds, their reluctance to confront difficult issues, their general intellectual laziness, and so forth. Evaluation team members offered suggestions—nothing he could not have generated himself, but perhaps easier for us given our more detached perspective—about ways to begin to work toward being the kind of teacher he believed so strongly in being. The satisfying result occurred this year, two years later, when he was again a candidate and submitted essentially the same teaching statement. This time, not only did the written materials correspond, but so did the classroom behavior itself, and students seemed to understand the nature of his expectations, to trust them, and to be stretching to attempt to meet them. Now, in his particular climate, he probably always will find challenges in the kinds of student engagement he values, but he definitely has improved his teaching and is happier doing it. To top it off, he was this year's only recipient of the valued award.

I want to pause before moving on to summative evaluation processes to say why I have taken the time to explore the nature of teaching and some thoughts about its improvement. Beside creating an overall context for our consideration of institutional uses of teacher evaluation, these ideas, and others we all might add, seem central to the entire undertaking. In short, if we could imagine the perfect evaluation process, one that guaranteed accuracy of results and the finest of distinctions among

teaching behaviors and among colleagues exhibiting them, and if the use of this perfect system convinced us that virtually all of the teaching in our own institution was mediocre to poor, how satisfied could we be with the result? A rhetorical question, to be sure, and perhaps a silly one, but even though research takes pains to distinguish between formative and summative assessment, the fact is that we want both to improve the quality of teaching and to assess it—and often in one fairly brief procedure. Larry A. Braskamp and John C. Ory point out that the derivation of the word *assess* is from the Latin *assidere*, to sit beside; they contend that “sitting beside” suggests “dialogue and discourse, with one person trying to understand the other’s perspective before giving value judgments. Describing and understanding precede judging,” they say.<sup>15</sup> Others agree, Stake noting that “the assessment of faculty work often has not addressed the dual requirements of ‘to fully describe and fully judge.’”<sup>16</sup> And faculty members err as well because we rarely focus on understanding our work in progress, gathering evidence continuously; we too often find out *with* our administrators student opinions of how well we taught, rather than the difficulties students have experienced as learners during the course of our instruction.

## FACULTY EVALUATION TECHNIQUES

Now, on to assumptions about summative evaluation, though it should be noted that while the functions of formative and summative evaluation are different, many of the means to accomplish them are the same. One huge category of assumptions has to do with the validity and reliability of end-of-course student evaluations of various kinds. Faculty may consider them biased by gender or by instructor personality—they constitute a popularity contest. We complain that teachers of small classes get uniformly higher ratings than those of very large classes, or that high-ability students (or older students) are more capable of fair and balanced evaluation, and so on. Administrators may believe that evaluations across campus must be identical to be trustworthy or useful. What can we learn from the research?

First, some statistical sound bites reported by Braskamp and Ory about student evaluations:

- Student ratings appear to be valid to the extent that they indicate an appropriate dimension of teaching effectiveness.
- No significant relationship exists between gender of instructor and his or her overall evaluation, although ratings do slightly favor women instructors.
- Warmth and enthusiasm are generally related to ratings of overall teaching competence.
- Rank, age, and years of experience are generally unrelated to student ratings.
- Students tend to rate same-sex instructors slightly higher.
- No meaningful and consistent relationships exist between the personality characteristics of the students and their ratings.

- Class size is not a serious source of bias, though there are some differences; generally, the very small and very large settings earn higher ratings than do the mid-size ones.
- Faculty do not receive high student ratings only because they give high grades.
- Student ratings of a given instructor are reasonably stable across items, raters, and time periods, and therefore sufficiently reliable that faculty cannot automatically discredit them.
- Student ratings of instructor and course *do* correlate with other measures of instructional quality, such as ratings by colleagues, measures of achievement, and peer ratings of teaching portfolios. However, there is only a moderate positive correlation between student and colleague ratings of a teacher's effectiveness and a low positive correlation between student and administrator ratings of instructor effectiveness. But there is a high correlation between student and alumni ratings; thus, evaluation at course end, rather than after some longer period of time, seems defensible.<sup>17</sup>

Second, student evaluation forms need work, and perhaps a great deal of work. Many still imply traditional methods of teaching,<sup>18</sup> in turn suggesting to teachers and students alike that the teacher-as-central-figure model is preferable. If items have been pasteurized somewhat to appear more inclusive of nontraditional formats, they still may not suggest or suggest strongly enough the value of completely alternative approaches. From time to time, I imagine my own students completing their course evaluations and scratching their heads about an item—efficient use of diagrams? Did she ever *do* that? Clearly the work itself should influence the assessment methods employed, and an increasing number of workshops and books are available to inform the undertaking.

A third finding may seem counterintuitive: Contrary to the hope or expectation that over time, information from student evaluations will finally sink in and take root, it turns out that yearly use of these forms, particularly if the same form is used repeatedly, results in teachers learning less and less from them.<sup>19</sup>

Fourth, Braskamp and Ory report the following about student evaluation formats:

- Open-ended questions that are narrow in scope obtain the most useful information.
- Apparently the type of item or method—rating scale, written comment, student interview—does not influence the evaluations, themselves, “though faculty regard written comments as less credible than responses to scaled items if their use is for personnel decisions, but as more credible if the purpose is their own self-improvement.”
- On goal-based forms, students rate their own performance or progress on previously stated expectations rather than the performance of their professor. This format may appeal to faculty and administrators who assert that the

proof is in the pudding; that is, that the quality of teaching should be judged solely on the basis of what students have learned.

- A cafeteria system permits faculty to select from a bank of items those they consider most relevant for assessing their instruction in lessons, classes, or rehearsals.<sup>20</sup>

Fifth, what can and what cannot be ascertained from students' responses? More sound bites summarized by Braskamp and Ory:

- When students complete open-ended questions, they tend to focus their comments on instructor characteristics, like enthusiasm or rapport, and on what they learned, rather than on the organization and structure of the course. Students give few detailed suggestions about how to improve a course. Says one author, "students are better critics than course designers."
- Notwithstanding the earlier-mentioned finding that alumni ratings do not differ much from those of current students, it should be noted that "faculty are inclined to give more credibility to the ratings of former students than of currently enrolled ones, because they believe that current students cannot adequately rate the long-term effects of instruction." Other studies suggest that alumni cannot be relied upon for specific information or suggestions but for general impressions only. However, if faculty want comparisons between alumni and student ratings, some of the same general items can be included on both rating forms.
- Negative *comments*, but not necessarily ratings, are more frequent for instructors of large classes than for those of small classes.
- Classroom interviews conducted by colleagues or professional staff members often focus on perceived areas of strength and weakness and can provide both descriptive and judgmental information.<sup>21</sup>

Sixth, how can student evaluations be used?

- Earnest Boyer suggests that faculty assessment should receive attention during freshman orientation;<sup>22</sup> that is, students need to know what they will be asked to do, how they should go about it, and what difference it makes that they take their task seriously.
- According to a number of researchers, student evaluations constitute an important piece of evidence in the collection of data for the evaluation of teaching. However, and this comes as no real surprise, "the quality of evaluation, whatever its purpose, is higher if multiple sources of information are used,"<sup>23</sup> and over an extended period of time. We should resist the temptation or ease of focusing only on what the teacher has done lately or on what can be collected most easily. In addition, ratings of courses based on five or fewer completed forms are of questionable reliability and validity.<sup>24</sup>

- Cashin tells us, “Administrators can no longer look at data from a variety of [teaching] fields and unquestioningly compare numbers directly.”<sup>25</sup> To me, this suggests that even within music, the kinds of teaching and learning are sufficiently diverse to warrant at least a cafeteria system of item selection of, if not completely different, perhaps individual, formats. Obviously, this makes comparison of faculty members according to results somewhat more difficult, though the difficulty can be ameliorated if evaluation is criterion-referenced (determined by measuring results against previously stated standards) rather than norm-referenced (determined by placement of a faculty member’s results among the results of all others). As Braskamp and Ory remind us, “having standards does not mean standardization.”<sup>26</sup> Centra maintains that “relative judgments and merit ratings damage teamwork and nourish rivalries, while at the same time adversely affecting quality” and further that “merit increases to base salary may not only fail to provide the incentive needed but also discourage collaboration and other practices that improve the overall quality of teaching.”<sup>27</sup> If norms *are* used, they should not be used in isolation; information about the norm group should accompany the comparisons; and faculty should arrive at a consensus about which norms are the most appropriate for use in their local institution, discipline, profession, and stage of career development.<sup>28</sup> As a colleague in my field would say, “all solutions are local.”

In addition to student evaluations, many institutions make use of colleague appraisals, even though key players in the colleague-evaluation enterprise raise questions about the efficacy of that practice. For example, we hear evaluators themselves doubt that they can learn anything of value by observing a class or lesson or rehearsal, because *anyone* can clean up an act for an observation. A teacher may resent a one-stop evaluative visit from a colleague who has little or no understanding of the particular instructional setting being visited and may even have a strong preference for a different teaching style. The instructor may also fear a lack of discretion on the part of observers or worry about students behaving differently with visitors in the room. Regarding the latter, however, I know for certain that placing a videocamera in one’s classroom or studio for several days running can reduce large amounts of self-consciousness in both teacher and students! There *is* documented evidence of the importance of colleague evaluation in improving teaching.

In general terms, at least two themes about colleague evaluation emerge repeatedly in the literature. The first is the importance of the evaluated one in establishing an appropriate context for the *multiple* visits.<sup>29</sup> In addition to the instructor’s having explored her or his own beliefs about teaching and compared them with institutional and departmental mission statements, she or he must have at least one meeting with the evaluator to present course objectives or expectations, information about how the class or lesson is run, a context for the particular sessions to be observed, and the instructor’s own perceptions about what and how well students are learning.<sup>30</sup> There

was no support in anything I read for uninformed visitation of just one instructional session by faculty colleagues or administrators.

The second theme is the strong recommendation that anyone involved in observing or communicating the results of visits be trained to do so.<sup>31</sup> It seems to me that this recommendation is about trust, and Centra reminds us that the most trustworthy and competent evaluators are peer reviewers who know the field or content; who are trained in observation techniques and giving feedback; and who understand that since no single, widely accepted definition of good teaching style exists, style indicators should not be used to assess faculty performance.<sup>32</sup> We are reminded repeatedly in the literature that evaluation occurs with respect to stated criteria and that both the evaluator and the evaluated know what is being assessed.

So, what's to be done?

## IMPROVING FACULTY EVALUATION

Perhaps a logical first step is to examine the current context for teaching evaluation in our own institutions, focusing on common perceptions, misperceptions, and even myths held by various players in the evaluation process. We might then look for ways to modify, enlighten, or dispel faulty notions, so that work on a trustworthy process might begin in good faith. I find myself wondering if the director for institutional research might be employed for some of this intra-institutional examination.

A second step might be to determine the principles upon which the evaluation of teaching should occur *on our individual campuses*. I emphasize that final phrase, because both common sense and research suggest strongly that we should not and cannot look for a single system to fit every institution or even every school or department of music. A research university, with many large sections of courses taught by teaching assistants, has both a mission and an institutional structure quite different from that of a small undergraduate college with courses taught by continuing faculty. What it means to be an effective teacher, or a productive faculty member, differs enormously among our various schools, and any evaluation of teaching effectiveness should occur with an understanding of the expectations and constraints of the local campus. So, we need to ask the big questions: What is the function of teaching *here*? How will it be done most effectively *here*? And how will we know that it is being done? Again, the institution's research office might be of service.

I think an important third step, and one often missing in our various procedures, is becoming acquainted with the goals and principles of those being evaluated. When you evaluate my teaching, I think you should know what I believe my function is as a teacher. Am I a dispenser of information? A guide or resource for students to consult as they solve musical problems on their own? A facilitator of students' generation of their own knowledge? What am I trying to accomplish through my structuring of courses or lessons, the requirements and expectations I establish and convey, the kinds of assignments I design, feedback to students, and the ways I assess student progress?

Additional benefits may be accomplished through this third step. First, the *trained* observer or evaluator can, directly or through an intermediary, provide helpful feedback to the teacher about how what is going on in the actual teaching does or does not match up with what the teacher asserts about his or her goals, function, and so forth. Second, the trained evaluator has useful information about the institutional fit of the teacher: Is what the teacher believes and does commensurate with the mission and structure of the school? Third, and to me an important benefit, is the encouragement of self-examination on the part of the teacher. While time constraints do not permit my reporting on teaching-portfolio literature, it does seem to me that at their best, professions and professionals set their own standards, reflect on their own progress, and monitor or police themselves. Does it make sense for the professoriate to be an exception to this principle?

The fourth step on a campus might then be the collective design or modification of an evaluation procedure, including multiple sets of expectations, based on the knowledge acquired in the first three. I am thankful that current books and workshops on faculty evaluation offer at least some guidelines for evaluating student-initiated, collaborative, or active learning, and more assistance continues to become available, so it may not be long before those of us who teach in non-lecture formats can hope for more relevant feedback on evaluation instruments. Regardless, it may be inferred from the research that institutions would not necessarily be lost in the assessment sea if different assessment procedures and instruments were used in different fields and disciplines and perhaps even for different class formats and teaching styles. The key here seems to be stressing comparison with absolute standards for effective teaching rather than with norms. I prefer to think that every institution's goal would be an entire faculty of highly effective teachers, and I want to know that I can be considered highly effective even if many or most of my colleagues are as well.

In short, while evaluating the quality of teaching is multifaceted and complex, it is *critical* to the instructional mission of an institution; it is *important* in ensuring faculty accountability; it can be done with *integrity*; and it does require the good will and active involvement of an *entire* campus community. With you, I look forward to ensuring excellent teaching for *all* of our students. For my own part, the professional practice I alluded to at the outset has been confirmed, but I have new tasks to undertake as well, and I already am scheduling pre-observation conferences with colleagues I have been asked to evaluate during the next few weeks for tenure. Thank you very much.

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Larry A. Braskamp and John C. Ory, *Assessing Faculty Work: Enhancing Individual and Institutional Performance* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994), 39.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 39-40.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>4</sup> Chet Meyers and Thomas B. Jones, *Promoting Active Learning: Strategies for the College Classroom* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993), 14-15.

<sup>5</sup> Donald L. Finkel and G. Stephen Monk, "Teachers and Learning Groups: Dissolution of the Atlas Complex," in Braskamp and Ory, note 1 above, 85.

<sup>6</sup> John A. Centra, *Reflective Faculty Evaluation: Enhancing Teaching and Determining Faculty Effectiveness* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993), 28.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 11.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>12</sup> Braskamp and Ory, 53.

<sup>13</sup> Centra, 13.

<sup>14</sup> Braskamp and Ory, 18.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 12-13.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 176-184.

<sup>18</sup> Centra, xv.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>20</sup> Braskamp and Ory, 170-175.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 170, 189-190, 191, 193.

<sup>22</sup> Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (Princeton, N.J.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990), 40.

<sup>23</sup> Centra, 10.

<sup>24</sup> Braskamp and Ory, 188.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 181.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>27</sup> Centra, 7-8.

<sup>28</sup> Braskamp and Ory, 145.

<sup>29</sup> For example, see Boyer, 31.

<sup>30</sup> Centra, 31.

<sup>31</sup> For example, see Centra, 202-203.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 201.

## REFERENCES

Aleamoni, Lawrence M. *Techniques for Evaluating and Improving Instruction*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1989

Arreola, Raoul A. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. Bolton, Mass.: Anker, 1994.

Grumet, Madeleine R. *Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching*. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

Seldin, Peter and Associates. *Successful Use of Teaching Portfolios*. Bolton, Mass.: Anker, 1993.

Seldin, Peter. *The Teaching Portfolio*. Bolton, Mass.: Anker, 1997.

# TENURE AND POST-TENURE IN A UNIONIZED ENVIRONMENT

JERRY D. LUEDDERS

*California State University, Northridge*

California State University, Northridge (CSUN), is a member of the twenty-two-campus California State University (CSU) system and one of the largest institutions of higher learning in California. It is the third-largest college or university in Los Angeles County, after the University of California at Los Angeles, and CSU Long Beach.

Founded in the fall of 1956 as the San Fernando Valley campus of California State University, Los Angeles, it separated from its parent campus two years later to become San Fernando Valley State College. In 1972, it was renamed California State University, Northridge. It is a comprehensive university; the master's degree is the highest degree offered. Several programs have joint doctoral degrees offered with a University of California campus. It is the largest residential campus in the CSU system. Approximately 10 percent of its enrollment lives in dormitories on campus and thousands more in nearby apartments.<sup>1</sup>

CSUN is organized in nine colleges. The Music Department is one of six departments in a newly reorganized College of Arts, Media, and Communication. The Fall 1996 enrollment was 27,189. Preliminary enrollment figures show enrollment in excess of 29,000 students, of whom 535 are music majors.

## INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

Thirty-five percent of the undergraduates in the 1996-97 academic year identified themselves as white; 15 percent as Mexican American; 12 percent as Asian American/Pacific Islander, 9 percent as African American; 8 percent as other Latino; 2 percent as Filipino; 1 percent as American Indian; and 14 percent as other. Three percent were international students.

Ten percent of the undergraduates carried 16 or more units; 59 percent carried twelve to fifteen units; and 31 percent carried less than twelve units.

The average age of the undergraduates is 24.9 years; of the graduate students, 34.9 years. Nineteen percent of the undergraduates were Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) students in the 1996/97 academic year.

The student-to-faculty ratio for the 1996/97 academic year was 20.39. The make-up of the full-time faculty is as follows: 13 percent assistant professors, 17 percent associate professors, and 66 percent full professors. Coaches or other faculty (lecturers) account for the remaining 4 percent.

The faculty and staff of the CSU system unionized in the early 1980s.

## TRENDS IN FACULTY SIZE

From 1991 to 1995, the size of the full time faculty was reduced drastically while student enrollment remained fundamentally constant. Music Department data illustrate this clearly. In 1991, the Music Department was allocated forty-two faculty positions: thirty-seven lines were used for full-time faculty, thirty-six of whom were tenured. The remaining five full-time-equivalent faculty lines were distributed among approximately 31 part-time applied faculty.

By 1995, through retirement, much of which was stimulated by early retirement incentives, or through resignation, the total number of full-time lines had been reduced by sixteen to twenty-six, six of which remain unfilled. Only twenty were full-time. Since 1995, the number of positions allocated to music has increased by eight. Four of those eight positions have been approved for tenure-track hires. The remaining four have been reassigned to the part-time pool.

## TENURE TRENDS

In 1992 and 1993, the institution hired a new president and a new provost, both of whom remain in their positions. Coincident to the aforementioned faculty downsizing and reconfiguration, tenure became more difficult to achieve. Because CSUN is a highly structured unionized institution, personnel considerations are complex and layered. Separate and independent consideration occurs at the department level by an elected five-member committee and the department chair. The review continues at the college level, again separately and independently by an elected college-level committee and the dean. All consideration is based solely on specified documents designed to demonstrate and assess evidence of professional preparation; teaching effectiveness and direct instructional contributions; contributions to the field of study (scholarship or creative activity); contributions to the university and community; and the promise of being a valuable member to the university in terms of the discharge of personal and professional responsibilities.

In the first year of her administration, the president denied tenure to a substantial number of faculty who had received positive recommendations from all four departmental and college reviewing bodies. Although challenged in court and through union grievances, this trend of increased rigor in the interpretation of stated standards by the administration continues. Now institutionalized, it has had a profound influence on hiring practices and the nature of work of untenured faculty.

## POST-TENURE REVIEW

Post-tenure review has been in place at CSUN for approximately fifteen years. It is defined by union contract and interpreted in the *Administrative Manual*.<sup>2</sup>

Sections of the Faculty Bargaining Agreement that deal with evaluation of tenured faculty members follow:

### **Section 15.29**

For the purpose of maintaining and improving a tenured faculty unit employee's effectiveness, tenured faculty unit employees shall be subject to periodic performance evaluations at intervals of no greater than five (5) years. Such period evaluations shall be conducted by a peer review committee of the department, and the appropriate administrator. For those with teaching responsibilities, consideration shall include student evaluations of teaching performance.

### **Section 15.30**

A tenured faculty unit employee shall be provided a copy of the peer committee report of his/her periodic evaluation. The peer review committee chair and the appropriate administrator shall meet with the tenure faculty unit employee to discuss his/her strengths and weakness along with suggestions, if any, for his/her improvement.

### **Section 15.31**

A copy of the peer review committee's and the appropriate administrator's report shall be placed in the tenured faculty unit employee's Personnel Action File.<sup>3</sup>

Article 2. 1 of the Agreement defines *administrator* as follows:

The term "administrator" as used in this Agreement refers to an employee serving in a position designated as management or supervisory in accordance with the Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act.<sup>4</sup>

At CSUN, the dean of the college is the designated "administrator." The role of the chair of the music unit is limited to the selection of the members of the Post-tenure Review Committee, who are then submitted to the faculty member to be reviewed for his/her approval. The chair has no other evaluative role.

## **COMPENSATION**

Compensation in the CSU system is based on a scale of steps within each rank. The steps of one rank overlap the next rank, a scheme which allows for compensation to increase in the absence of promotion in rank. Until three years ago, all increases in compensation were in lockstep. Each faculty member who performed satisfactorily moved up one step per year until he or she reached the top step within rank. All faculty members performed satisfactorily. Promotions of rank carried a multistep increase. No possibility of merit pay existed, except that associated with promotion in rank.

A new chancellor, supported by system presidents, and opposed by the faculty bargaining unit, implemented a limited merit pay program in 1995–96. Currently 20 percent of all monies available for faculty salary improvement are allocated to merit pay. Each of the CSU campuses developed its own system for allocation of merit money. CSUN created a review process that denies input from chairs, deans, or the provost/vice president for academic affairs. Faculty members apply to a committee

elected at the college level for a merit increase. The application can be no longer than two pages. The college-level committee sends its recommendations to the president, who is forbidden to consult. She can allocate from a one- to five-step salary increase, which becomes the new base salary for that faculty member.

## SUMMARY

The egalitarian structure of faculty compensation provides almost no motivation for positive changes in faculty attitudes or behavior after initial tenure. This seems true no matter what the rank. Further, the post-tenure review process is ineffective unless it contains significant motivation for change. Its effectiveness is very limited at an institution where even limited merit pay is not related to post-tenure. Observation of faculty behavior over a period of twelve years suggests that the post-tenure review process does not alter the performance of faculty members.

Finally, in such a system, widely regarded as impotent, the tools available to the music unit administrator tend to be informal, non-stated modalities of review, motivation, and reward. They include the quality and quantity of teaching assignment; the teaching schedule; office assignment; and funds for travel, equipment, and creative activity. It seems to work.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> California State University, Office of Institutional Research, *CSUN Factbook 1996/97* (Northridge, Ca.: California State University, 1996).

<sup>2</sup> California State University, Northridge, *Administrative Manual: Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures* (Northridge, Ca.: California State University, 1997), Section 600.

<sup>3</sup> California State University Board of Trustees, *1996-1997 Collective Bargaining Agreement of The California State University and the California Faculty Association* (Long Beach, Ca.: The California State University, 1996).

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

# TENURE AND POST-TENURE REVIEW: A NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

CATHY A. TROWER  
*Harvard University*

In the ten minutes that I have been allotted this morning for opening remarks, I can barely scratch the surface of all that is happening on the tenure landscape nationally. I will limit my remarks to a brief overview of public mistrust, the debate over tenure, and some employment statistics, and I will wrap up with academe's responses to the situation.<sup>1</sup>

## MISTRUST

James S. Fairweather's book, *Faculty Work and Public Trust*,<sup>2</sup> opened thus:

The crescendo of criticism and even outright hostility that increasingly characterizes the environment for American academic institutions in the 1990s has caught many academics unprepared. This era is characterized by miscommunication, lack of credibility, and failure to examine objectively (or at least honestly) the inner workings of academe.

He continued by providing an insightful and eloquent overview of the two primary sources of the public's mistrust of higher education: (1) that faculty members are provided unwarranted protection from marketplace fluctuations by tenure, and (2) that few really understand just what faculty members do all day. The general perception is that too much time is focused on producing and publishing esoteric research at the cost of undergraduate teaching.

The "belief that faculty in American colleges are protected from the vagaries of the marketplace by a tenure system, whereas the rest of the nation must deal with employment uncertainty and rapid changes in economic conditions"<sup>3</sup> is widespread among the general public.

The public perception is that faculty and administrators have created a system to make themselves immune from a rapidly changing economic world, and that such an insulated environment makes it difficult, if not impossible, for faculty and administrators to appreciate the concerns of the populace at large. The source of mistrust here can be broadly cast as concern about the economy of the future.

The second source of mistrust centers on perceptions about what faculty do with their time. The perception by the public, politicians, and other outsiders is that faculty in all types of 4-year schools, not just research universities, devote themselves to their own pursuits, which most often fall into publishing research results that have no practical consequences; faculty and administrators are too busy doing their own work to pay attention to anything else. The cost . . . is teaching, especially undergraduate instruction, and public service.<sup>4</sup>

Whether or not one agrees with Fairweather's assessment, the important point is that these views are widely shared among those outside of academe, and indeed, some within.

The academy has been exposed to unprecedented public and market pressures. Across the nation, key constituencies expect greater faculty productivity and accountability, along with more methodical, periodic performance assessments. In focus groups with civic leaders, tenure was

the object of particularly caustic comments. Not a single leader gave unreserved support to tenure as a necessary mechanism for protecting academic freedom. Most consider tenure to be counterproductive and, in fact, symbolic of much of what they consider to be wrong with higher education.<sup>5</sup>

Public demand for access to higher education has intensified and, at the same time, state and federal appropriations have become less reliable, and resistance to tuition increases has become ever more pronounced. "The amounts appropriated to higher education by the states more than doubled over ten-year periods for every year between 1958 and 1990. But this doubling ended with the 1981-1991 decade."<sup>6</sup> Between 1983 and 1993, appropriations increased by only 62 percent and between 1991 and 1993, nineteen states experienced absolute declines, up to 12 percent in California and Virginia.<sup>7</sup>

The notion of work has changed inside and outside the academy. In the broader labor market, the corporate sector, then health care, and, more recently, government have all downsized and restructured. Just a few weeks ago, Kodak announced that it would lay off ten thousand employees. Earlier this year, Apple Computer discharged 30 percent of its workforce, and Heinz announced a 6 percent reduction. In 1993 alone, some 450,000 workers were fired (a number nearly equal to the entire full-time faculty in the United States). The ability of tenured faculty to enjoy guaranteed, lifetime employment, when no other segment of the economy enjoys that luxury, strikes many laypersons as an inexplicable anachronism at best and an arrogant offense at worst.<sup>8</sup>

Not all of tenure's critics are outsiders; many within the academy also find fault with tenure systems. Shirley Tilghman, professor of microbiology at Princeton, argues that for women, tenure systems exacerbate problems in reconciling career and family. "Tenure is no friend to women," she says, and recommends renewable, rolling appointments.<sup>9</sup> In *Imposters in the Temple* Martin Anderson wrote that university presidents find it nearly impossible to lead a tenured faculty.<sup>10</sup> Tenured faculty are invulnerable and know it. They have the real power, not the boards or administrations.

The public outcry against what is happening to the quality of undergraduate teaching is getting louder and harsher. Charles J. Sykes wrote:

Higher education is one of the greatest cons in history. The result is a modern university distinguished by costs zooming out of control; curriculums that look like

they were designed by a game show host; nonexistent advising; lectures of droning mind-numbing dullness often to 1,000 or more semi-anonymous undergraduates herded into dilapidated, ill-lighted lecture halls; teaching assistants who can't speak understandable English; and the product of this all, a generation of expensively credentialed college graduates who might not be able to locate England on a map.<sup>11</sup>

Finally, and quite recently, Richard Mahoney wrote, "Universities are rapidly reaching the point at which they need to ask not 'Can we reform tenure?' or 'Dare we?' but rather 'How can we go about it?'"<sup>12</sup>

Internally as well, then, the basic assumptions about the very nature of academic careers are under review. How can the life of a scholar linked to a discipline, and the life of a professor, employed by an institution, coexist synergistically? How should the work of faculty be defined and constructed to ensure that professors add maximum value to the university and to society and, at the same time, derive maximum fulfillment from a professorial life? Have we tilted too far toward research and specialization at the expense of undergraduate instruction and interdisciplinary activity?<sup>13</sup>

In a 1995-96 survey of thirty-four thousand full-time college and university faculty, 35 percent of all respondents, 43 percent under the age of 45, and 46 percent of all women agreed that tenure is an "outmoded" concept.<sup>14</sup> Faculty of color were especially skeptical of tenure.<sup>15</sup>

## DEBATE

Tenure has been referred to as the most potentially divisive issue in the academy today. The debate surrounding tenure is hot and getting hotter in some states like Massachusetts, where the State Board of Higher Education chairman, James Carlin, just a few weeks ago called institutions "managerially dysfunctional" and "devoid of accountability."<sup>16</sup> Among other things, he called for the end of tenure. A bill to end tenure in South Carolina was seriously considered in 1994, but was not passed. However, Texas recently passed legislation mandating post-tenure review for all tenured faculty. Similarly, board members across the nation are becoming increasingly curious about tenure as they raise questions concerning costs, quality, lifetime job security, and accountability. Many faculty members have been caught off guard by the onslaught and are largely unprepared to answer many difficult questions being raised. While tenure has come under attack at several points throughout history, never has the fire been quite so hot, nor has the assault come from so many directions.

It's not news to any of you that tenure is prevalent—virtually all public research, private research, public doctoral, and public comprehensive institutions have tenure systems. However, it may interest you to know that 20 percent of private liberal arts colleges *do not* have a tenure system.<sup>17</sup> Tenure systems are deeply entrenched and resilient to attack. Tenure is the bulwark of academic freedom, and the death of

tenure would be the death of academic freedom in the minds of tenure's staunchest supporters. Tenure helps assure the quality of faculty entering the system through rigorous probationary periods for junior faculty. Tenure helps offset relatively low salaries paid the professoriate compared to what could be earned in many fields outside of academe. Many noted economists, (including Michael S. McPherson and Gordon C. Winston<sup>18</sup>) believe that, without tenure, the costs of higher education would increase in order to compensate faculty more to attract them to a risky career without a guarantee of lifetime job security. Tenure provides long-term institutional stability through employment security.

Despite the strong positive side of tenure as protection for academic freedom and job security, there is a downside. Some drawbacks to tenure include maintaining the status quo, fostering mediocrity, and leaving a largely unaccountable system. Tenure systems are a one-way proposition in that they commit institutions to faculty members for life, barring dismissal for cause, but do not contractually commit the faculty member to the institution. Some believe that there is a diminished emphasis on undergraduate teaching because tenured faculty typically teach less and conduct more research, or teach primarily graduate courses. Power is in the hands of the tenured, leaving a marginal role for junior faculty. Tenure-track faculty feel that their best course is to keep their mouths shut until they get tenure. Academic freedom is completely stifled in the process. They feel at the mercy of the tenured, even while the requirements for them to get tenure are tougher now than when the already tenured got it. Many feel disenfranchised from the senior faculty and are unable to find time to connect with other junior faculty. They have little time for students and for teaching, which is why many of them got doctorates in the first place. Many find the tenure process "tortuous," "overly stressful," indeed, a "punishing gauntlet."<sup>19</sup>

So what does the future hold? The external political scenarios that may unfold are unknown. State governments may examine the issue and then retreat, or by referendum (as with affirmative action in California) or legislative action, state governments may abolish tenure altogether. Whatever happens, higher education is better served by entering into and shaping the debate than by responding (typically on the defensive) to the initiatives of others. There are usually good reasons for doing unto ourselves before others do unto us.

The costs for treating any issue as untouchable are high. By treating tenure as personnel policy, not as religious dogma, and by placing the discussion in the larger context of faculty careers, it may be possible to temper the acrimony of the debate. It appears that there is a need to provide more data, not just anecdotes, to inform discussions. By adhering to a single model of scholarly excellence, by having only a three-rung ladder for careers that span forty to fifty years, and by offering only an either/or (tenure versus non-tenure-track) employment contract, higher education deprives itself of the full range and use of available talent, and it limits the faculty members' capacity to fully utilize their abilities over the course of their careers.

There is a need to balance rights with responsibilities. Autonomy is a key to faculty members' attraction to academic life, and it is essential. But faculty work

must be responsive to campus missions and to external constituencies. Balance is the key. Campuses are experiencing a host of threats that may serve to weaken and fragment community. It is important to look at policies that may help protect campuses and bring people together, thereby strengthening community.

## REALITY

The world looks quite different today than it did in 1915 when the American Association of University Professors codified language to protect tenure and academic freedom. In 1910, there were 951 institutions, 75 two-year colleges, and no unionized faculty. Today, there are over 3,700 institutions and 1,473 community colleges, and 229,000 faculty members are represented by bargaining agents. Enrollment has grown from 404,000 in 1915, to 1,494,000 in 1940, to more than 14,157,000 today. Academe employed 36,000 professionals (including 7,348 women) early in the twentieth century; now there are over 1,500,000 (including 650,000 women).

## RESPONSES

The academy has responded to all the changes, often quietly and without fanfare—most noticeably in the form of non-tenure-track and part-time positions.<sup>20</sup> There has been a steep ascent in the number of part-time faculty: from 22 percent in 1970–71, to 32 percent in 1982–83, to 33 percent in 1988, to 42 percent in 1992.<sup>21</sup> Of the 900,000 faculty employed in the fall of 1992, 58 percent were full-time and fully 42 percent were part-time. The percentage of part-time faculty has doubled in just two years.<sup>22</sup> Non-tenure track, full-time positions have increased 42 percent over the past ten years.<sup>21</sup> The proportion of full-time faculty who are tenured or on tenure tracks fell from 79 percent in 1987 to 76 percent in 1992, and the percentage of faculty appointments that are neither tenured or on the tenure-track increased from 21 percent to 24 percent.<sup>23</sup> Nearly 75 percent of all medical schools have created new categories of non-tenure track, full-time, long-term positions. The number of clinical faculty in medical schools nearly doubled between 1983 and 1993, but the percentage in tenured or tenure-track positions declined from 59 percent to 47 percent.<sup>24</sup>

According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's 1994 National Survey on the Re-examination of Faculty Roles and Rewards, 34 percent of responding institutions have implemented alternative contractual agreements, and another 17 percent are considering such arrangements.<sup>25</sup>

Using the government data, a recent study divided 483,000 full-time instructional faculty into a "new cohort," 161,000 faculty with seven years or fewer of full-time teaching (33.4 percent), and a "senior cohort," 322,000 faculty (66.6 percent) with seven or more years of experience.<sup>26</sup> Almost 33 percent of the new cohort and 16 percent of the senior cohort were not on tenure-track appointments. Tenured and

tenure-track appointments constituted only 38 percent and 48 percent respectively of all faculty appointments (full- and part-time) for the new and senior cohort. In short, the traditional faculty career that starts with a full-time, tenure-track appointment can hardly be considered typical any longer.<sup>27</sup>

These data reflect economic and political realities that may, sooner or later, render tenure an exceptional employment arrangement. Rather than assault tenure frontally, institutions have added flexibility and reduced payrolls indirectly.

In addition to increasing the number of part-time and non-tenure-track faculty, institutions have made it tougher to get tenure. From 1987 to 1992, 18 percent of all institutions replaced tenured positions with fixed-term positions, 23 percent of all institutions raised tenure standards, and 8 percent took “other actions” to reduce the number of faculty on tenure tracks.<sup>28</sup>

Institutions are also re-examining their evaluation processes. A major trend concerning academic life and tenure is the implementation of post-tenure reviews of faculty. According to the Carnegie Foundation’s 1994 survey cited earlier, 46 percent of institutions have implemented post-tenure reviews, and an additional 28 percent are considering doing so.<sup>29</sup>

In 1995, twenty-eight states had post-tenure review policies in the discussion or implementation stage. In 1989, only three of 446 institutional members surveyed in the American Association of Universities had a formal post-tenure review process, but seven years later, 28 states had post-tenure policies in this stage. In a recent survey, 415 of 680 institutions had installed post-tenure reviews.<sup>30</sup> Post-tenure review, however, is not a new idea. Fifteen years ago, in 1982, the National Commission on Higher Education Issues identified it as one of the most pressing issues facing higher education. The California State University system has had a post-tenure review process in place since the 1970s.

The language of most post-tenure review policies is largely formative. Formative approaches are developmental in nature and tend to carry a counseling connotation, whereas summative reviews suggest that the results of the review will yield rewards or remediation. According to Christine Licata, a national post-tenure review expert, “while the philosophy of most post-tenure review policies drafted today is formative, almost all have summative aspects.”<sup>31</sup>

Another characteristic that distinguishes one post-tenure review process from another is that some apply to all faculty at set intervals—every five years at the University of Wisconsin and the University of Oregon, at least every six years in Texas, and every seventh year in Florida.

Other institutions have selective reviews triggered by performance-related concerns—very low ratings for two consecutive review cycles at the University of Kentucky and Virginia Polytechnic Institute or three consecutive less-than-normal salary increments at the University of Montana. At the University of Idaho, reviews are initiated when a majority of qualified department members or an academic administrator questions a colleague’s performance. Some procedures authorize

negative consequences such as salary reductions, a two-year probationary review, or ultimately dismissal for cause.

While clearly not a panacea to remove deadwood or to reallocate resources (post-tenure review was not designed for those purposes), well-conceived post-tenure reviews provide the opportunity to: (1) enhance faculty development; (2) promote different career emphases over time; (3) match faculty career goals and institutional priorities; (4) clarify performance expectations; and (5) convey collective departmental responsibility for individual faculty performance.

On the downside, post-tenure reviews are time-consuming, may attach a punitive image to evaluations, may incite faculty concerns about further “onslaughts” against traditional tenure and academic freedom, and still may not guarantee improved performance.<sup>32</sup> Whether post-tenure review processes in fact produce the pink slips needed to persuade regents and lawmakers that the system works to enforce accountability seems quite improbable, and, many would argue, quite undesirable.

The one longitudinal report available derives from six years of data at the University of Hawaii, Manoa campus, where 72 of some 600 reviews have rated specific faculty members as subpar.<sup>33</sup> Of those individuals, 21 elected to retire and the rest developed remedial work plans. Among that subset, five were deemed to be making inadequate progress, but none was terminated. Post-tenure reviews may, nevertheless, be a useful device to smooth senior faculty career transitions and to nudge fallow faculty members toward retirement through explicit peer pressure and implicit procedural pressures.

Georgia State University (GSU) has linked faculty workload, reward structure, and post-tenure review.<sup>34</sup> In their first year of post-tenure review, sixty-four faculty members were reviewed. Twenty-seven were determined to be excellent/very effective in the categories of teaching, research, and service. They were recognized and their salaries were brought into line. Twenty-eight were found to be excellent/very effective at teaching and/or service but had limited to moderate research productivity. GSU personnel asked, “Is the research productivity sufficiently promising that we want to invest resources in improving it *and* does the faculty member wish to do so?” For fourteen, the answer to one or both questions was no, so a modified work plan was arranged with a higher percentage given to teaching and service with a corresponding salary modification. For 14, the answer to both questions was yes, so the institution invested resources to enhance research over a five-year period such that it was assumed that these people would join the ranks of the twenty-eight top performers.

Two faculty members were found to be ineffective in teaching. One admitted that he had not tried very hard and was willing to work with the institution’s center for teaching and learning. The other opted for early retirement. Of the remaining seven, when told that they had been randomly selected for post-tenure review, some said that they had been thinking about retiring and that they didn’t want to go through the process of post-tenure review. So the institution let them retire. Some did not intend to stay for five years, so why do the five-year plan that is required? The institution

worked out retirement plans for them as well. Bottom line—almost 10 percent came to a decision to leave on their own through this process—“very humane,” according to GSU administrators.

In North Carolina, reported Judith Stillion, associate vice president for academic affairs at the University of North Carolina, “there was not much controversy [surrounding post-tenure review] because all of the campuses had input in at least three ways during the formative period.”<sup>35</sup> The purpose of post-tenure review was “to encourage and support excellence among tenured faculty by rewarding exemplary performance, providing a clear plan and timetable for improvement of performance of faculty found deficient, and providing for the imposition of appropriate sanctions for those whose performance remains deficient, or discharge in the most serious cases.”<sup>36</sup> In addition to annual reviews, a comprehensive and cumulative review that involves peers occurs once every five years and includes written feedback to the faculty member.

In North Carolina, the most common consequence of a negative review is ineligibility for merit increases (indicated by 61 percent of departments in a recent study of 359 departments at 15 institutions), followed by a requirement to draw up a development plan (indicated by 42 percent of departments). One in four departments indicated that negative reviews could lead to another, more detailed, review or to a formal disciplinary process that could lead to sanctions or dismissal. Positive evaluations, in contrast, are most frequently used to award merit increases (58 percent) but may also be used as a basis for providing additional support (49 percent) to maintain or increase productivity.

## CONCLUSION

And so the professional lives of faculty members are changing as the environment changes and colleges and universities attempt to change in response. The path forward is unclear and likely to be marked with potholes, ruts, roadblocks, congestion, and detours. A great deal more research must be conducted before we can more fully understand the nature of the changes and their impact on faculty members, institutions, and employment arrangements. With that said, I’d like to conclude with the words of P. F. Kluge in his book *Alma Mater*:

It must be odd, having been awarded lifetime membership in a club that has lost its ability to discriminate, to say no, to punish or reward, a club where equity is the ruling standard. What this leads to . . . is a kind of resignation that permits the interests of the community, warm and supportive, friendly and forgiving, to override the harsher and more abstract interests of the college. “To change things, we would have to change ourselves in many ways that are uncomfortable. This is one of the most comfortable places I’ve ever been at. That’s the good news. And that’s the bad news.”<sup>37</sup>

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> These written remarks are for inclusion in the conference proceedings and represent a fuller picture than that presented in my 10-minute overview.

<sup>2</sup> James S. Fairweather, *Faculty Work and Public Trust* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1996), xi.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> J. Harvey and J. Immerwahr, *The Fragile Coalition: Public Support for Higher Education in the 1990s* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1995), 12.

<sup>6</sup> National Education Association, *1994 Almanac on Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1995), 85.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 85-86.

<sup>8</sup> R. Chait and E. Rice, "New Pathways, Faculty Careers and Employment in the 21st Century: A Statement for Consideration by Colleagues" (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1997).

<sup>9</sup> S. M. Tilghman, "Science v. Women—A Radical Solution," *The New York Times*, 26 January 1993, Op-Ed page.

<sup>10</sup> Martin Anderson, *Impostors in the Temple* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992).

<sup>11</sup> Charles J. Sykes, *ProfScam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education* (New York: St. Martin Press, 1988), 5.

<sup>12</sup> Richard Mahoney, "'Reinventing' the University: Object Lessons from Big Business," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (17 October 1997).

<sup>13</sup> Chait and Rice, note 8 above.

<sup>14</sup> L. J. Sax, A. W. Astin, M. Arrendondo, and W. S. Korn, *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1995-96 Faculty Survey* (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, 1996), 41, 95.

<sup>15</sup> "Academic Tenure System Faces Big Changes," *Abilene Reporter News*, 30 March 1997.

<sup>16</sup> "Carlin Says Colleges Are Run Poorly, Hits Faculty," *Boston Globe*, 5 November 1997.

<sup>17</sup> Rita J. Kirshstein, Nancy Matheson, and Zhongren Jing, *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93), Institutional Policies and Practices Regarding Faculty in Higher Education (NCES 97-080)* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1996).

<sup>18</sup> Michael S. McPherson and Gordon C. Winston, "The Economics of Tenure: A Rational Perspective," chap. 5 in *Paying the Piper: Productivity, Incentives, and Financing in U.S. Higher Education*, ed. Michael S. McPherson, Morton Owen Shapiro, and Gordon C. Winston (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993).

<sup>19</sup> G. Rice and A. Austin, *Heeding New Voices* (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, forthcoming); W. G. Tierney and E. M. Bensimon, *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1996); and C. A. Trower, "Junior Faculty Behavior and Experiences: Work Life on the Tenure-Track, Off the Tenure-Track, and at Institutions without Tenure Systems" (Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland, 1996).

<sup>20</sup> For more information on various models for non-tenure-track appointments, see J. Gappa, *Off the Tenure Track: Six Models for Full-Time Nontenurable Appointments* (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1997). For more information on part-time faculty, see J. Gappa and D. W. Leslie, *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993).

<sup>21</sup> Jack H. Schuster, "Reconfiguring the Professoriate," *Academe* (January/February) 1998.

- <sup>22</sup> Jack H. Schuster, cited in *U.S. News and World Report* (3 March 1997), 62.
- <sup>23</sup> Schuster, note 21 above.
- <sup>24</sup> R. F. Jones and S. C. Sanderson, "Tenure Policies in U.S. and Canadian Medical Schools," *Academic Medicine* 69, no. 9 (1994): 772-78.
- <sup>25</sup> C. E. Glassick, M. T. Huber, and G. I. Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997).
- <sup>26</sup> This population includes only faculty whose principal activities are teaching, research, or academic administration. See M. J. Finkelstein, R. K. Seal, and J. H. Schuster, *The New Academic Generation: A Profession in Transition* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press, forthcoming).
- <sup>27</sup> The new cohort, in which far fewer faculty are on tenure-track appointments, includes considerably more women (40.7 percent versus 27.9 percent) and more racial minorities (16.6 percent versus 11 percent) than the senior cohort.
- <sup>28</sup> Kirshstein et al., note 17 above.
- <sup>29</sup> Glassick et al., note 25 above.
- <sup>30</sup> C. Licata and J. Morreale, *Post-Tenure Review: Policies, Practices, Precautions* (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1997), 2, 3.
- <sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>33</sup> M. Goodman, "The Review of Tenured Faculty at a Research University: Outcomes and Appraisals," *The Review of Higher Education* 18, no. 1 (1994): 83-94.
- <sup>34</sup> A. T. Abdelal, D. C. Blumenfeld, T. J. Crimmins, and P. L. Dressel, "Integrating Accountability Systems and Reward Structures," *Metropolitan Universities* 7, no. 4 (Spring 1997): 61-73.
- <sup>35</sup> Judith Stillion, associate vice president for academic affairs at the University of North Carolina, personal correspondence, 10 June 1997.
- <sup>36</sup> "Post-Tenure in the University of North Carolina: A Report of the University of North Carolina Committee to Study Post-Tenure Review" (University of North Carolina, 3 March 1997).
- <sup>37</sup> P. F. Kluge, *Alma Mater* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1993).

---

---

## AMERICAN MUSIC

---

---

### AMERICAN MUSIC AND WORLD MUSIC: CURRICULAR ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

LESTER P. MONTS

*The University of Michigan*

Dealing with diversity in “American music” and its influence on curriculum is quite a lofty undertaking. As an ethnomusicologist, I’m no longer sure what “American music” is. I took a graduate course called “American Music” with the late Johannes Riedel at the University of Minnesota, and I’ve read Gilbert Chase’s book as well as other related texts, but I’m still baffled by the concept of an “American music.” Unless, however, we are speaking about the music of Native Americans, the notion of American music, especially when spoken about in the context of cultural diversity, is, conceptually speaking, a bit confusing to me. Of course, I’m being facetious here: I know what the term means in these circles, but I want to challenge it.

The richness of American musical culture is derived in large measure from other parts of the world—the folk musics of Europe, the traditional musics of Africa, the classical and art musics of Asia and the Middle East are now parts of the American music complex. These musics have been hybridized, appropriated, and transculturated; other musics have been compartmentalized, thereby retaining the salient features of the original music forms. But in the broader context, which is the realm in which ethnomusicologists operate, I believe a more precise way of viewing this music is to include it as a part of “world music.” Within this broader context, we can speak about the folkloric content of music by Beethoven, Smetana, Chavez, Copland, and William Grant Still, alongside Hungarian folk songs, Czech folk dances, Mexican polkas, blues, jazz, cowboy ballads, and square-dance music. I would venture to say that within the borders of the United States, there is more musical diversity than anywhere in the world. In order to include the broader range of musical expression in “America” and its relationship with other world cultures, I will refer to “world music” instead of to “American music,” which I believe to be the more limiting designation.

Throughout higher education, we have heard calls to diversify our curricula as a way to adapt educationally to the changing demographics in society and on our campuses. As a result, we have seen the growth and development of new courses that satisfy ethnic studies or diversity requirements in both our core or general education curricula and in the course of study for music majors and concentrators. While changing demographics may very well be the real reason for these

developments, there is yet another reason we should pursue ways to introduce students to the broad diversity of this phenomenon we call music: the availability of new musical knowledge.

Through the work of ethnomusicologists, folklorists, anthropologists, music educators, and performers of the broad range of folk, traditional, and art music genres today, we know more about music in disparate parts of the world than we did thirty or forty years ago. We all wish to remain on the cutting edge of our discipline, and the introduction of this “new knowledge” allows us to do so. But are we doing an adequate job of infusing this new knowledge and new musical experiences into our curricula? Let me go back to something I alluded to earlier—the single required course dealing with “diversity.” I’m not a proponent of the single-course approach. If the intent of these courses is to introduce students to the broad complexities of another music system, they often fall short by presenting such a narrow perspective that students are often more confused after the course than before they were enrolled. Such approaches often trivialize the richness of the very musical systems they seek to explore. However, that approach is widely used throughout the nation, and we should develop methodologies to maximize its effectiveness. The noted musicologist J. H. Kwabena Nketia has said that it is not so important that one know worlds of music as much as it is to understand at least one world of music other than one’s own. By understanding that other world of music, one can establish and build on a conceptual framework for reconciling and understanding the differences when any two or more music systems are juxtaposed.

Let me propose another curriculum transformational approach, which we can call the infusion model, wherein diverse material is infused into our standard courses on music theory, music history, and performance studies. Introducing this material into existing courses can be a rich and challenging experience for both students and professors.

How does one go about infusing diversity into “mainstream” courses and curricula, and how do we develop faculty to carry out these tasks? I don’t have all the answers, but let me share with you some of my experiences. My early music training was in trumpet performance. Classical trumpet remains my performance medium of choice. I’ve performed in orchestras and at music festivals in many parts of the country. My first university appointment was teaching trumpet, along with courses in music history and theory. During that time in my life, I believed that the symphony orchestra was the epitome of Western musical expression. I had little time for musics from other parts of the world; I didn’t even like playing jazz.

Through my organological studies in ethnomusicology, however, I learned that the symphony orchestra is full of diversity and multiculturalism; that instruments in the orchestra were derived from instruments found in “other” regions of the world. Timpani, cymbals, oboes, bassoons, and triangles, for example, have roots in the Middle East. Xylophones and marimbas are prototypes of idiophones found in Africa or Indonesia. I learned beyond anecdotal and token inferences that Western composers like Claude Debussy and Maurice Ravel were inspired by the music of the

Balinese gamelan; that Bartok and Stravinsky were influenced by European folk music and the music of Africa; and that Beethoven, Haydn, Mozart, and many other eighteenth-century composers were inspired by the military music of the Turkish Janissary bands. I pursued ways to infuse this new knowledge into classroom discussions of orchestration, form and analysis, harmony, and many other theoretical areas. I found that the repertoire used in a course on orchestral literature could incorporate a symphony by the Mexican composer Carlos Chavez or the African American composer William Dawson to complement the study of symphonies by Beethoven or Brahms.

Diversity can also be infused into performance studies. As a trumpet teacher, in addition to teaching the etudes of Charlier, Clarke, and Arban and the sonatas and concerti of Haydn, Bozza, Kennan, and Hindemith, I introduce my students to the trumpet music of Rafael Mendez, Louis Armstrong, and Dizzy Gillespie, and to mariachi trumpet music and other world music genres. I believe it is the eclecticism, the willingness to explore the music of the “other” that has led to the success of Itzak Perlman, Jean Pierre Rampal, James Galway, and Wynton Marsalis. I’ve found that infusing diverse topics into the study of music history, theory, and performance serves to enrich student learning. Students absorb this new knowledge without feeling that something else is lacking.

Faculty members frequently exclude diverse subject matter from their courses because they often don’t understand fully nor accept as relevant the historical, social, and cultural knowledge derived from people outside the Western tradition. Others believe that musical diversity is an incoherent and fragmented concept, that the Western music canon is and should be the guiding force to which we all subscribe. The question remains, however, about what incentives and support we provide faculty to address this set of issues. Let me suggest that we observe how scholars and practitioners in other disciplines respond to change and the advent of new knowledge.

There is no doubt in my mind that when a new surgical procedure is discovered, University of Michigan surgeons will be among the first to acquire the necessary training to master the technique. It seems that our colleagues in the sciences and engineering are perhaps quicker to respond to changes in their disciplines than others of us. I don’t believe curriculum change can occur in a vacuum, so we need to create opportunities for faculty to develop their skills to meet these challenges. The National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminars, for example, can be quite effective in the faculty development arena. I also believe in the practice of faculty teaching faculty, an arrangement in which faculty engage in dialogue under the auspices of an on-campus faculty development seminar. Within the context of these seminars, the substance of musical inclusivity can be melded together with the appropriate pedagogy needed to most effectively deliver the subject matter to students.

The mission statements of most colleges and universities contain a section that addresses the need for diversity and how it contributes to the standard of excellence the institution strives to maintain. Intellectual diversity—through course

requirements dealing with race, ethnicity, and gender—has become a part of general education and core curricula. This is an area in which a music school's diversity courses can play a vital role in curricular expansion. General education courses in world music can be the setting in which the largest number of students are exposed to the world's music and culture.

A few years ago, when I was on the faculty at the University of California, Santa Barbara, the general education program underwent a massive restructuring. The department of music developed a number of courses to contribute to the program in several categories. For many years, Music 115, Music Appreciation, was our "bread and butter" course. It provided high non-major enrollments and basically supported our graduate program with the several teaching assistantships allocated by the college. However, operating under the assumption that all courses in music should satisfy the fine arts requirement, college administrators were quick to place them in that category. The inclusion of those courses in the fine arts category had the potential to reduce the number of students enrolling in Music 115 and the number of teaching assistants assigned to it. Among the other courses proposed for general education were World Music, Music in Afro-American Culture, and Music in African Culture—all ethnomusicology courses. Instead of flooding the fine arts category with these new courses, we pressed the administration to place them in categories such as World Civilizations and Thought, Ethnic Studies, and American Cultures. This was a win-win situation for both the music department and the non-music major students. The students could take music courses, taught from different cultural perspectives, to satisfy several categories of general education requirements. For the department of music, there were many more non-music major students filling our classes, and we preserved the sanctity of our premiere music appreciation course.

"It is with the juxtaposition of different truths that our dialogues about diversity—and our curricula—must begin." That unequivocal assertion is found in one of a series of five reports on higher education and U.S. diversity published by the Association of American Colleges and Universities as part of its 1993 multiproject initiative, "American Commitments: Diversity, Democracy, and Liberal Learning." The University of Michigan participated in that project, and another faculty member and I served as consultants to four other universities. Unfortunately, the cadre of consultants included only one other musicologist.

During the two-year period of our work, I often thought that this was the kind of effort in which music schools should have a higher level of participation—intellectual diversity and music are our business, it is what we espouse as part of what we do, and our expertise could be very useful in explaining the importance of diversity and its contribution to liberal learning.

I believe it is our responsibility as music educators to nurture music inclusivity. As teachers, scholars, and performers devoted to the development of knowledge, we strive to create and maintain frameworks to provide a voice to the disparate forms of musical knowledge available to us into the halls of learning. It is important that we

teach the intercultural and musical competencies necessary for our graduates to fully participate in a diverse and multicultural society.

We should place high value on musical diversity and the benefit it provides. Through our curricula, we should continue to explore the history, literature, theory, and creative expression of human thought and culture, elements that have the potential to enhance the fundamental dimensions of our musical lives. These areas of knowledge, I believe, provide breadth and contribute to a diverse musical experience.

I mentioned earlier the impact of changing demographics on higher education in this country. There's another dimension of demographic change that impacts the issue in a slightly different way, and that is audience development. Throughout the nation, we see symphony orchestras, opera companies, or concert series suffering from declining revenues. The most supportive members of our audiences are aging. Foundation support and subsidies from government agencies such as the National Endowment for the Arts are declining, and ticket prices are increasing. The University Musical Society (UMS) at the University of Michigan is one of the oldest and most successful campus presenters in the country, yet one of its main initiatives these days is audience development. Part of that development includes attracting a more diverse audience. UMS has been successful in this endeavor by reaching out to communities that have traditionally not been avid concertgoers. Through the various residency programs in the schools, it is working to introduce classical and art music to the next generation of patrons. Through research, UMS has discovered that diversity in programming is a key element in attracting diverse audiences, and it has been very successful in that regard.

I believe that ethnomusicologists can offer some assistance to departments and schools of music to deal with the set of issues I have discussed. I want to make it clear that I'm not advocating a missionary effort on the part of ethnomusicology. There are ethnomusicologists who could benefit from having a better understanding of Western music and what it represents intellectually and aesthetically. In order to deal with issues of musical diversity, however, we must move away from the strict lines that separate us into the numerous music subdisciplines and work together toward a common goal. We can all learn from each other, and in the process provide a meaningful musical experience for our students.

We must therefore challenge narrowly circumscribed approaches to music and music learning. Our responsibility as educators is to expand the meaning of "music" beyond widely accepted definitions. As teachers and scholars in a discipline devoted to the development of musical knowledge, we must by necessity create and maintain frameworks to provide a voice to all the disparate music cultures available to us in the academy. It is important that we help others acquire the musical and intercultural competencies necessary to participate fully in a global society.

Negotiating the inclusion of world music into curricula must be accomplished with great intellectual vitality. Otherwise, when it is introduced as new knowledge or a new conceptual framework, questions arise regarding scholarly rigor and academic relevance. We must make a better effort on all fronts to show that the infusion of

world music topics into the curriculum enriches our students' understanding of music in our culture and in the cultures of others.

In the twenty-first century, there will be an increased need to see universities as more than degree-granting institutions of higher learning that provide facilities for teaching and research. There will be an increased need to see our music schools as more than the parochial bastions of Western classical music traditions; they must be seen as places where one is exposed to the universe of music and musical knowledge. I believe we should charge ourselves to place high value on musical diversity and the benefit it provides. As proponents of that diversity, we should pledge to continue to explore the creative expression of music and culture, elements that have the potential to enhance the fundamental dimensions of our musical lives. We can show that these areas of knowledge provide breadth and contribute to a balanced musical experience and to a liberal education. From that vantage point, we can begin to enrich our curricula with the true value of musical diversity.

#### ENDNOTE

<sup>1</sup> *American Pluralism and the College Curriculum* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 1995), 4.

# WEAK BOUNDARIES AND STRONG VALUES

THOMAS L. RIIS

*University of Colorado at Boulder*

I want to begin my remarks by taking issue with the terms of the topic I have been asked to address, namely “Music Curricula and the Expanding American Musical Culture.” If this seems churlish and annoying, please bear with me a moment longer and I will try to make amends.

The specific term that I object to is *expanding*, because while I can’t deny the feeling that many of us experience daily of having to do more and more in less and less time—and having to accommodate more and more interests, groups, styles, and subjects in our curricula than ever before—I do not think the “expanding musical culture” is the chief culprit. Indeed, various musical styles have been there all along. It is only our collective conscience finally speaking to us about the need to address the importance of many historically neglected musical types that moves us to *perceive* an expansion.

Granted, the recording industry and the marketplace have made more music available than ever before, but to recognize this is not to say we need to teach it all. There is a difference between recognizing the power of the marketplace and subscribing to its values. The question I think I am being asked to address is “How do we decide what to teach, given the large number of commercially distinguishable styles available to our students?”

*Relentless expansion* per se is not the issue as much as is the need to *organize* what we nowadays by consensus take to be the large number of legitimate and academically approachable musics of America. Before talking about problems and solutions, then, let us congratulate ourselves on having achieved at least this state of awareness. The desire to include popular music, historical art-genres of the Western European tradition, classical musics of Asia and Africa transferred to our continent, indigenous oral styles, avowedly experimental contemporary music, urban music, rural music, proudly postmodern eclectic works, and *even* academic music is finally, I think, commendable.

But again, how do we organize it all? There are many acceptable answers.

- Traditionally, we have taken a familiar chronological approach, which implies a value—a choice to discuss development and innovation, or at least change, over time.
- We can distinguish among various written and oral traditions, thereby stressing that knowledge is passed on differently when notation or literacy is present; ethnomusicologists often contend that the musical contributions of notaters are qualitatively different from those of non-notaters (Nettl 1983, among many other sources).

- We frequently use a race- or ethnicity-based method, in which we highlight specific musical traits and social conditions and the contributions of a variety of subcultures.
- Or we can examine musics within social classes, concentrating on the economic factors that determine what we are allowed or encouraged to listen to and emulate (Raynor 1972).
- We might take a selective synchronic approach, considering, say, all the music we can find in the 1890s or the 1920s or the 1960s. Such a tack can make the interacting and interdisciplinary events in culture come alive vividly for students. There are many other approaches.

Trying to put the pieces of our music culture together in a different yet honest manner should not be viewed as merely pandering to novelty. Slicing the same old baloney in a new way is not the goal I'm preaching. But insofar as new approaches stimulate our students to think and listen more carefully, they can be helpful to the overall goal of educating musicians for the future. We each have our preferred methods, and it is important for a teacher—possibly before anything else—to *believe in* how and what she or he teaches. This requirement—as critical as it is—cannot be mandated by a new curriculum, although it sometimes can be hampered by an overly restrictive one.

But let us return to the values implicit in our approaches as well as the limits of curricular planning, because—and make no mistake about it—once having chosen the methods and materials for our teaching, we have then implicitly embraced a set of values, or at least a primary value, that goes with them.

Not along ago, musical Americanist Richard Crawford proposed that we carve up the American musical universe into three spheres, identified by the terms “traditional,” “democratic,” and “colonial.” These terms are his more neutral substitutes for the heavily connotative “folk,” “popular,” and “classical.” I like these substitutes because each accentuates the positive while accurately reflecting the source of both audience and creator, listener and composer. The values that Crawford consciously associates with these spheres of activity are, respectively: *continuity* for the traditional/folk sphere, *accessibility* for the democratic/popular sphere, and *transcendence* for the colonial/classical sphere. Each has its advocates in our schools. The articulation of values linked with historical repertoires is an important step in the curriculum organization process.

The fly in our conceptual ointment, however, is that music has a slippery way of escaping from almost *all* assigned categories, no matter how inclusive or seemingly objective those categories may be. Ambiguity is all around us, and my sympathy for Crawford's terms doesn't seem to get us very far away from that.

Many composers consciously embrace at least two of the three values I've stated, and some even claim all three. Is it helpful then even to go through this naming exercise? I believe it is, because such a move focuses and directs our attention as analysts. It makes things more clear—one of *my* professed values is *clarity*—and it focuses our

attention specifically on music at the interfaces or intersections of these spheres or at the edges of any perceived differences and distinctions among genres, styles, and terms. If we fail to recognize the weak boundary issue, as I will call it, our cultural contextualization for our students will be correspondingly weak and inadequate.

Even the simplest of terms and most familiar of musical ideas are lifeless to our students without such positioning. Take, for example, the term *waltz*. What does that mean to you? A 3/4-time dance does not get us very far.

“So,” we say in our class discussion, “who can think of a waltz? I like Ren Shields’ great tune ‘Waltz Me Around Again, Willie.’ It was a smash in 1906.” [Deafening silence in the classroom.] “Perhaps you know the 1948 chart-topper ‘The Tennessee Waltz,’ one of President Truman’s favorites.” [A voice from the back of the class: “Was Truman the guy after Kennedy?”] Another more courageous soul might venture, “I know lots of Tejano fiddle tunes called ‘vals.’ Is that the same thing?” Maybe as the teacher your personal favorite is somewhat more classical and you would mention Johann Strauss’s “Beautiful Blue Danube” (which bears a striking resemblance, by the way, to Bert Williams’ coon song, “I Don’t Like No Cheap Man”).

Without much formal art music training, it would take our students quite a while to get around to mentioning Chopin, Schubert, Weber—much less Richard Strauss or Maurice Ravel—yet all of the latter (the five canonical composers I just named) are as popular nowadays as the former examples once were in both Europe and the United States, to the extent that any are popular at all. The waltz, it turns out, is exceptionally interesting as a teaching genre, multifaceted as a cultural object. It has taken on vastly different characters in the hands of dozens of composers and contrasting images in the minds of thousands of listeners.

By persistently looking at weak boundaries for such familiar terms as *waltz*, we can explore the vexing question of “influence,” or discuss why the Popular also might be the Good—or why it might not. We might notice that “transcendent” does not always mean “inaccessible”—witness the modern adaptations of Chopin, Tchaikovsky, and Gregorian chant—and that, on the other hand, excessive accessibility (via our modern media) can lead to saturation.

Because it is so absorptive of contrasting elements and so filled with referentiality, music is often rich food. That is why we love it so much. That is also why we and our students become gluttons with overstuffed and insensitive ears more readily than we become gourmets.

Teaching at the points of contact, so to speak—between styles, genres, or cultures—is one way to enhance the conveying of musical information, heighten interest, break down artificial barriers, and elucidate complexity without invoking arbitrary and ethnocentric definitions of quality. Consider the following random observations about American music. How could they be worked into an American music curriculum or a general music history curriculum? What values do they conjure up? What agendas do they suggest?

1. The tune of our national anthem originated as a drinking song.<sup>2</sup>

2. The melody for the Marine Hymn (“From the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli . . .”) comes from an Offenbach operetta.<sup>3</sup>
3. Louis Armstrong, an improvising virtuoso of the first rank, was also a skillful music reader, well acquainted with the operatic arias widely performed in his native town.
4. Yale University’s famous fight song (“Boola, Boola”) was ripped off from an African-American musical comedy, which also itself had borrowed a *bel canto* trio from Verdi and interpolated John Philip Sousa’s “The Stars and Stripes Forever.”<sup>4</sup> Both the musical comedy and the march are a century old this year.

These, as I say, are merely random observations—snapshots intended to demonstrate my weak-boundary thesis. Dozens of other far more complicated instances of crossover or mysterious origin could be added to this list.

Now I don’t mean to imply that we must give up all present categories or cease to define American styles in the formalistic ways we have done for a generation. Linking the weak-boundary problem of styles with the need for clear values, however, suggests that we make the issue of blend, or overlapping traditions, of hybridity itself, central—not merely admitting that some styles are less pure or less original than others, but giving up the idea of purity and originality altogether in many instances. This is no easy task, because we are wedded to our social groups, ethnicities, and economic classes, not to mention our Great Man and Great Woman theories of history, more than we care to admit. To become extreme anti-essentialists would be to court social ostracism and professional disaster.

On the other hand, if music characterized by *hybridity* (we might use the anthropological terms *syncretism* or *creolization* also) is not only common but inevitable and indeed central in the repertoire of the United States, what is our stance to be in regard to class groupings, political borders, gender sensibilities, racial categories, or proudly unblended traditions of, say, Native American ritual music? How do we insist on the accomplishments of the previously marginalized, since we neither can nor should avoid the social implications of these issues? We certainly should not use the recognition of hybridity as a justification to commodify at random or to excuse the watered-down commercial exploitation of native musics, soulless mishmashes in the “world beat” sphere.

I have no comprehensive answers and no magic formulas to offer, but I think we would be well advised to begin our histories and our curricula from a new place and, further, to watch our principles very carefully—of course avoiding the usual false dichotomies, artificial binary oppositions, and excluded middles all along the way.

Dispensing with the fancy terms, the idea of *creative mixture* is still left standing, and that is a very good place to start. I believe that hope lies in embracing the mixture, the unapologetically mulatto, the hybrid. In accepting what Amiri and Amina Baraka call the centrality of “brown culture”<sup>5</sup> (neither white nor black) in our country, or the group that Albert Murray nearly thirty years ago identified as the

“Omni-Americans,” we can positively teach the varied styles of U.S. musical culture with some sense of integrity and coherence. All music is not hybrid, but many elements are shared. If we keep our eyes on the ball—the ball being the music itself and its impact—then we can discover wonderfully interesting things about our traditional categories and genres. Contradictory, unsettling, and occasionally even subversive information can come to us out of this scrutiny. But therein lies the true path of educational enlightenment and substantive knowledge.

Let me be clear about this. What we need to add to our recitation of American musical accomplishments or shortcomings is not merely an attitude of inclusiveness. This is not about squeezing one more person on the already crowded culture bus. It is about relating all of us together in a manner that makes sense to our students and of the overwhelming diversity of aural facts at hand. It is about exploring the music that is all around us but that may not yet be integrated into our thinking and talking about music in the academy.

My image of hybridity in the classroom—of the essential mixture—is of a blend comparable to the superior durability of metal alloys over their constituent parts, elements that are mutually related and thereby strengthened. This is what familiarity with the supporting details of the American repertory should do for our curricula.

By way of summary: if we grant that an expansion in the amount of American music deemed worthy of academic study now must be confronted, let’s begin to organize it, taking a few affirmative observations into account.

1. Values are unavoidably attached to our music making; let’s consciously choose such values as accessibility, continuity of tradition, and aspiration to transcendence. By doing this, we clarify the elements that unify and those that divide us as a society.
2. Despite our history of social conflicts, all over the United States for a rather long time, the music itself has often spoken and continues to speak *across* racial, ethnic, geographic, and economic lines.
3. Market music, whether we like it or not, needs to be addressed in our teaching. To say that “the popular genres take care of themselves in every operational and economic dimension”—a quote from the handout I was given to prepare for this session—implies that pop music can be safely ignored in curriculum preparation. If we do this, we are missing both practical teaching strategies and opportunities for important esthetic discussions that take place all too rarely within our classrooms and faculty meetings.
4. We should never lose sight of the importance of preserving a basic historical framework and practical essentials about music theory and structure. Failing to provide our students with an historically valid framework within which to do their own creative exploration is unacceptable.

5. In pursuing the goal to teach across lines of time, place, culture, and style, let us examine the elements most prized within the musics that we teach, whether melody, rhythm, timbre, harmony, word, idea, or form.

That our theory pedagogy does not emphasize all elements equally should clue us in to how the deck has been stacked against historically marginalized music. Harmony and texture are the first-class citizens in the modern conservatory just as they were in Paris in the nineteenth century. Perhaps it is time for an update. Melody merits some discussion, though it gets little beyond the elementary level in most music programs. Timbre and rhythm rarely even rate an entire lecture, much less a course. To paraphrase Gershwin, “We *Ain’t* Got Rhythm”—at least not in theory class.

To be able to teach and discuss in a comprehensive curriculum, fairly examining the hybridity around us, we need at the very least to provide our students with a complete vocabulary. They are—most of them—no better able to theorize about rock or rap than they are about William Bolcom, Bix Beiderbecke, or Amy Beach (if I may be allowed to exult in the three American “B”s). But we can provide them with tools to do it better if we develop analytical systems to cope with rhythm, overtone, timbre, tuning, and the physiology of hearing. Such systems are the keys to clarifying music’s effectiveness for coming generations.

If we are mindful of the principles that I have just listed, we can’t go too far wrong in curriculum planning. I have a few other ideas about American music teaching of the future, but I think this is a good place to let my fellow panelists take over.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> *Encyclopedia of the United States in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Stanley I. Kutler (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1996) s.v. “Music.”

<sup>2</sup> “The Anacreontic Song” was published circa 1780 in London with a cover page noting that it was sung “at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in the Strand.” The melody may have been composed by John Stafford Smith or Samuel Arnold, both members of the Anacreontic Society. See James J. Fuld, *The Book of World-Famous Music* (New York: Crown, 1966), 529–30.

<sup>3</sup> *Genevieve de Brabant*, an *opéra bouffe* in three acts by Hector Cremieux and Etienne Trefu, with music by Jacques Offenbach, which received many performances in Paris in 1859 and 1867.

<sup>4</sup> *A Trip to Coontown* (1897), composed by Bob Cole and Billy Johnson, played with some success in New York in April 1898. See Thomas L. Riis, *Just Before Jazz* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989), 75–79, 83–85.

<sup>5</sup> Amiri Baraka and Amina Baraka, *The Music: Reflections on Jazz and Blues* (New York: Morrow, 1987), 1–30 *passim*.

## REFERENCES

Murray, Albert. *The Omni-Americans*. New York: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1970.

- Nettl, Bruno. *The Study of Ethnomusicology*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1983.
- Raynor, Henry. *A Social History of Music, from the Middle Ages to Beethoven*. New York: Schoken Books, 1972.
- Tokumaru Yosihiko and Yamaguti Osamu, eds. *The Oral and the Literate in Music*. Tokyo: Research Group for Traditional Music in Japan, 1986.

# THE FUTURE OF AMERICAN MUSIC: OBSERVATIONS AND REFLECTION

MARK WAIT

*Blair School of Music, Vanderbilt University*

My colleagues Tom Riis and Lester Monts have shown both the richness and hybridity of American music. It is that very ambiguity that makes it so difficult to define American music. Indeed, in my five years in Nashville, I have even learned that it is difficult to define “country western” music, which is much richer and more complex than is often thought. Still, some generalities can be distilled, and several observations may be useful.

The music that surrounds us in our daily lives is generally not the music we teach. There is nothing new in that statement; it could have been made in any of the past fifty years. But the music that does surround us, and which we define as American music, has been driven largely by popular forces. And so I will assume in these remarks that the term “American music” refers to American *vernacular* music.

The diversification of this music in the past fifty years has been a function of the growth of recording and other forms of mass media. As the means to reach people in other parts of the country expanded, so did the awareness and popularity of certain types of music not theretofore available to listeners. This tended to favor certain types of popular music, for “art music” was already ensconced in the culture through educational systems and local organizations such as symphony orchestras and opera companies. Even 100 years ago, many small towns and communities had their own orchestras and theatre companies. It is amazing, for example, to realize that Oscar Wilde, of all people, spoke in Leadville, Colorado, in 1882, riding in a buckboard wagon all the way from Denver. Even small and relatively inaccessible cities like Leadville had a vital artistic culture in those days.

But regional musics, as opposed to more widely accepted “art music,” had no means of wider promulgation then—none were needed, and none were sought. One type of regional music that benefited from the development of mass media was what is known today as country-western music. Its broader distribution may be traced with some precision to the evening in the 1920s when radio station WSM in Nashville began broadcasting the Saturday Barn Dance, which was later to become the Grand Ole Opry. As the Tennessee Valley Authority brought electricity—and, by extension, radios—to the rural South and Southeast, the Saturday Barn Dance became a weekly staple for thousands and then hundreds of thousands of listeners, and its musicians enjoyed recognition theretofore unimagined and unimaginable.

That much is well known. What is less acknowledged is the effect that this growing popularity had on the music and musicians themselves. Just as the American popular song, an urban entity, evolved from the tender ballads of the 1890s (as in “After the Ball”) to the sophisticated celebrations of forbidden pleasures in the Gershwins’ and Cole Porter’s songs of the 1920s, so country-western music itself acquired the trappings of show business. These trappings were readily apparent

by the time Red Foley and Porter Waggoner reached the first television audiences in the 1950s.

So while country-western music may have reached general public consciousness in the 1970s and 1980s, it was already big business forty years ago. Chet Atkins, for example, is best known as a superb guitarist and as one of the foremost country artists of the late 1940s and 1950s. To the general public, however, it is less known that during the 1950s, when he was just in his thirties, he was also a vice president of RCA who helped bring such artists as Elvis Presley and the Everly Brothers to the RCA label.

Country-western music is perhaps the most striking example of the regionalism that has grown so dramatically in American life. Microbreweries and regional cuisine are other examples, part of a larger trend in U.S. culture generally. All these manifestations have the welcome effect of reinstating a human scale in our culture, just as Jane Jacobs argued for the retention and revitalization of neighborhoods in U.S. cities in the 1950s and 1960s.

Although American music may be *described* according to its regional influences, it cannot be easily defined. As we have seen, no single definition of American vernacular music exists, but we can probably say of American music what the theatre director Jonathan Miller has said of recent American plays. In comparing American theatre to English theatre, Miller said,

Modern American plays may seem more invigorating because of shock of unfamiliarity and the ethnic richness which arises from what, even today, appears to the English as an exotic culture . . . [American playwrights such as] Sam Shepard and David Mamet take pride in hitting the detailed diction of rough, fast, creative, and witty American street talk. Listening to their words you hear language evolving in a way that is rare in English work.<sup>1</sup>

Similarly, much recent American music may have its roots in its folkloric past, but a great deal of it—the best, in my view—has clearly been refined through a sophisticated urban prism of the many cultures that have brought us to where we are.

The appeal of such music is apparent in the sales of CDs and concert billings, and it has made its mark in unexpected quarters, as well. As an example, I refer you to the first track from *Uncommon Ritual*, a Sony CD featuring Edgar Meyer, bass; Béla Fleck, banjo; and Mike Marshall, mandocello and mandolin.

That music may sound like it comes from Nashville, as indeed it does. But it also comes from the opening concert this fall of the Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center. As you may know, the society often permits its individual artists to plan the programming for concerts; this is the concert that bassist Edgar Meyer planned and presented. Such a program was surely a first for the Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center. So, too, I suspect, was the fact that two of the three performers do not read music.

You and I may not think of this as “classical” music, but *Billboard Magazine* does, and so does Sony Records, its producer. Sony also calls its *Appalachia Waltz*

disc classical. That disc features Yo-Yo Ma with fiddler Mark O'Connor and bassist Edgar Meyer, who bring Celtic and Texas fiddling styles to several traditional tunes and original compositions.

I admit to some inside knowledge of Mark O'Connor's and Edgar Meyer's work, for they both happen to be on the faculty of Vanderbilt University, which is located in Nashville. I must admit that when I arrived in Nashville five years ago, I knew practically nothing about country-western music. I was a classically trained pianist, a card-carrying serialist who specialized in the works of Pierre Boulez. But I quickly learned that some of the nation's finest musicians live and work in Nashville. Three years ago, I hired Mark O'Connor to teach fiddling after hearing him play in a local bar. Here was a fiddler with the technique of Heifetz and an astonishing ability to improvise. Surely, I thought, we owe it to our students to make talent like this available to them. And, in due course, we also hired the national dulcimer champion and a mandolinist to teach those instruments, as well.

There is no major in these instruments at Vanderbilt University, nor is there likely to be, but students can get a minor in them, or simply study them to broaden their perspectives and experience. And that is really the point—to bring these musics and these musicians into the curriculum.

These courses, currently limited to applied instruction, have been popular with collegiate and precollegiate students and adults. The rock musician Cyndi Lauper has been one of our dulcimer students. To a large degree, we are able to offer such instruction because we are in Nashville. But I need not remind anyone here that American vernacular music is everywhere. I have been affiliated with four universities other than Vanderbilt, and there are certainly musicians in each of those cities who could enrich the curriculum and culture of their community if they were asked. At Vanderbilt, there is a perception, probably unfair, that the university ignored the music of its surrounding region until a few years ago. Hiring some of these musicians, along with a senior musicologist whose specialty is nineteenth-century popular music, has erased much of that perception. More important, it has brought a cross-cultural awareness to many of our students, who see, for example, the similarities between much baroque music and traditional fiddling.

My experience at Vanderbilt University and my general reflections on American music lead me to offer a few concluding observations. First, there is surely no contradiction in incorporating the most recent popular music in our curricula. Most of us already offer classes on the history of jazz and history of rock 'n roll. It is time we included our most invigorating newer musics, as well.

Second, it is probably easier to offer these musics as applied instruction than it is to find a convenient means of plugging them into the academic curriculum. But that gives this music an immediacy to our students that is appealing and invigorating.

Moreover, it reminds us of something easily forgotten: The arts are a vital, dynamic medium that will evolve as they always have—shaped by *individuals* who find an original voice and a responsive audience. Their originality usually transcends accepted notions or genres of music. That's fine: codification always follows

individuality—always has, always will. And if some of our best musicians happen not to read music, that fact does not detract from their worth as artists or from the validity of their expression.

#### ENDNOTE

<sup>1</sup> Jonathan Miller, *Subsequent Performance* (New York: Viking Press, 1986), 86.

# AMERICAN MUSIC IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS: RESOURCES AND CURRICULUM BUILDING

ANNE DHU MCLUCAS

*University of Oregon*

Having heard some of the broad philosophical topics outlined in the first session this morning—as well as allusions to plenty of specifics—we now get down to brass tacks: What resources are available to faculties and administrators working on curricular issues in American music? In ending the last session I said that American music has come of age—as an art form, as a social and economic force, and as an object of study. During this session, we're going to focus on music as an object of study.

(I will make frequent reference to the fat handout that appears in shortened form as an appendix to this paper. It is by no means comprehensive—in fact, it is quite selective—but it represents several types of resources now available in American music.<sup>1</sup>)

I will start with a brief reference to textbooks, of which we now have a fair number in American music, running the gamut from short paperbacks for the layman, such as the Jean Ferris and Dan Kingman texts, to the long and complex, such as the revised book by Gilbert Chase and the one by Charles Hamm, from the venerable Hitchcock *Music in the United States* of 1969, to the latest by Richard Crawford, due out next year. If I do not spend much time on texts, it is because they are perhaps best viewed in the context of specific courses, which we'll be talking about in the next session, but also because I am not a great user of texts, especially in American music, where I often like to put together my own examples, sets of articles, listening notes, and so on, to match my own approach to a specific topic. This is perhaps the arrogance of the specialist, but it is also a sign of the important stage that we are experiencing in American music: the explosion of information and the expanding exploration of the field make it well-nigh impossible to capture in any one book an orderly progression of history, as we are accustomed to having in texts about European art music. I suppose this could be viewed as a disadvantage—and it is question we might want to take up in the discussion period—but I will hold that this “in-process” state of American musical research is an advantage in teaching rather than a disadvantage.

Besides the general textbooks, each of which touches in some fashion both the art-music tradition and “vernacular music”—that wonderful term coined by Wiley Hitchcock, which encompasses the wild variety of folk, popular, and commercial musics that have existed throughout our history—we also have listed some specialized books in the field of popular and folk music, which now seem to be arriving on the shelves at the rate of one a day, as the courses aimed at the non-major student proliferate. Again, this list is far from comprehensive, but gives you an idea of the range and number of books available.

I've spoken of an explosion of knowledge in American music. Omitted from the resource list, because of sheer volume, are the research tools available of the standard

sort: bibliographies, discographies, encyclopedias, to say nothing of the many dissertations and special-topics books and articles that are being produced. Just to mention two obvious reference tools, we have had since 1985 the three-volume *New Grove Dictionary of American Music and Musicians*, fondly known as “Amerigrove,” and soon we will have the *Garland Encyclopedia of World Music*, with a volume on North America, seen more from an ethnomusicological perspective.

What I’d really like to dwell on here, however, are the *new* tools available electronically and audiovisually, because in a field that is fast moving, the ability to keep up to date is elusive in print—the electronic media set the pace at which American music study is expanding. In the appendix, you will see a sample of just a few of the many Internet Web sites devoted to American music. I will also mention the hundreds of E-mail lists that also take on topics within American music—ranging from Irish traditional music in America to fans of Frank Zappa, there’s a listserve for almost any topic!

This is where we confront one of the main issues in American music bibliography and study—how to separate the good research from the bad. In the century or more of study devoted to European music, a sifting process has occurred; the regular re-evaluation of each subfield has given us the feeling, right or wrong, that we know where the good research is. Of course, the age of the Internet has thrown this certainty into doubt for every field, but this is particularly so in American music, mainly because it does not yet have as deep a research base as does European music.

I regard this seeming deficit as an advantage, however, in teaching. Students of American music, at whatever stage, soon learn that they must rely on their own judgments, form their own aesthetic opinions, and evaluate *every* statement that they read or hear. I will freely admit that part of my research for this talk was done on the Internet—it has connected me with people in specialties I would not have dreamed of, but it has also made me wary, as all our students must learn to be. To help our members cope with this plethora of information, both bad and good, the Sonneck Society has invented a new position: the Web review editor—meaning someone who commissions reviews to be made of various Web sites, so that we can recommend them—or give warnings about them—to the users of our own Web site.

One of the largest and most important categories of resources for teaching American music is that of audiovisual aids, both educational and commercial. To give you a sample of what’s available, we’ll view from just three, so you can see the range:

The JVC survey of music has its definite shortcomings—the excerpts are brief; the notes on context are even briefer, but some of the material is fascinating. At the other extreme, the hour-and-a-half NPR documentary on the song “Amazing Grace” is perhaps too long to be of use, but when excerpted has some stunning material. (There is possibly a new documentary on its way devoted to nineteenth-century composers: the working title is “Pioneers of American Music,” and it will include profiles of Anthony Philip Heinrich, William Henry Fry, The Hutchinson Family

Singers, Stephen Foster, Louis Moreau Gottschalk, Patrick S. Gilmore, John Philip Sousa, Theodore Thomas, Amy Cheney Beach, and Scott Joplin. )

Even much can be gleaned from commercial films—one can think, for example, of Louis Armstrong in *The Five Pennies*, *Hello Dolly*, and others. The example I'll offer for today shows a most remarkable use of real Native American music embedded in a cowboy Western. *Broken Arrow*, a 1950 film of Delmer Davies, starring Jimmy Stewart, with Jeff Chandler in the role of the Apache chief Cochise, shows a rather uncharacteristic (for Hollywood) use of a real native ceremony imbedded in the plot of the movie. If you disregard what they say, some of which is laughable, and pay attention to the music and dancers, you will have a glimpse of one of the most colorful ceremonies of modern-day Native Americans, the coming-of-age ceremony for adolescent girls, in this case as done by the San Carlos Apaches, among whom Davies had lived as a young man and whom he undoubtedly contacted when he wished to do this movie. If you can get over the shock of seeing Debra Paget as the Apache maiden, you will catch a glimpse of a ceremony that few have witnessed in real life.

The explosion of American music available in CD format is probably well known to you—all the retrospective collections of famous pop and jazz artists; the late-blooming publication of some of the treasures of the Library of Congress Archive, one of the latest of which is the eighty-four selections on six CDs comprising the *Anthology of American Folk Music*, produced in 1952 by Harry Smith from old recordings of the '20s and '30s. At the other end of the spectrum, art-music groups are also performing music that has been rediscovered from the American past, for example, an early music group, the Theater of Voices, performing Billings' "I am the Rose of Sharon." This is a completely different sound from that probably enjoyed by Billings in his day, and even more different from the Sacred Harp singers we heard earlier in the video, but this is another context in which American music thrives, and one that may well intrigue music students looking for new repertoire.

One of the most exciting developments in CDs is the interest on the part of several American conductors in exploring the heritage of earlier nineteenth- and twentieth-century music. I'll mention Gunther Schuller, Leonard Slatkin, Marin Alsop, Murry Sidlin, James Paul, Gerard Schwarz, and Michael Tilson Thomas, among others—all of them performing and recording first-rate performances of wonderful music. As an example, I pull out the "Confiteor" movement from the *Mass in D* by John Knowles Paine, with Gunther Schuller conducting the St. Louis Symphony Orchestra. The realm of CDs is endless, and we did not try to make a bibliography.

CD-ROM technology is also with us. I'll just mention now Robert Winter's *New World Symphony* CD-ROM, with its exploration of the American contexts of Dvorak's work—you saw some of it at a plenary session of NASM three years ago, when it was still in development. I understand there's one on Bob Dylan and his song "Highway 66"; there's another on ragtime, and a new commercial CD-ROM on the

history of black music, under the aegis of Quincy Jones, but with professional musicologist advisors.

Another use of CD-ROM technology is, of course, as a research tool. Recently published is the eighteenth-century newspaper project, a Sonneck Society project funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities, in which all musical references in American newspapers of the eighteenth century have been culled. This has been the labor of a large group of people over many years, and is a way to get students into primary research without having to visit dozens of different libraries. The best thing about it is that it costs under \$100—almost any library can afford it!

I have saved the most important resource of all for last: other people. I've already acknowledged the help of the Sonneck E-mail list subscribers, who helped me pull together information for this session and the next one. But I'm also talking about how we can use our students themselves—each one is a representative consumer and/or creator of some form of American music, and they also hold connections to many other people. As a group, our students know an enormous amount about American music—they have each lived in some variety form of it. One of my favorite ways to bring this out is to bring a radio into class, twist the dial through various music stations, and see how quickly as a group we can identify the kinds of music we hear—most of which will be American. Usually someone in the class will come up with a style name, and sometimes even an artist or song name, within seconds. Gathering that information and talking about it, as well as about what's missing from the radio, is a good start toward showing the varieties of American music, as well as students' working knowledge of it.

We can also help students engage in primary research activities, such as oral histories of their own families, their neighbors, and the people in senior-citizen housing. They can engage in field work among groups that are different from their own—even within their own music departments or schools; they can engage in original archival work in local libraries, finding out what the musical past of their own communities is. In short, American music is a place where original work can still be done, and it can be done even at the undergraduate level. Most of us realize that history should be taught by using primary documents. With American music, instead of fishing out those facsimiles of European music, we can have students do research on the living documents, whether recorded, written, filmed, or just talked about in newspapers and diaries.

In the next session we'll give examples of three different curricular ideas for getting students into that material.

## ENDNOTE

<sup>1</sup> I want to acknowledge here the enormous help of Larry Worster, assistant professor of music at Metropolitan State College of Denver, who gave me much-needed mechanical aid and moral support during this session, and without whose help the handout would not exist. Readers interested in the full version of this resource list can find it at the following World Wide Web site: [clem.mscd.edu/~worster/sonneck/NASMBib.html](http://clem.mscd.edu/~worster/sonneck/NASMBib.html).

**APPENDIX:**  
**LIST OF RESOURCES FOR THE TEACHING OF AMERICAN MUSIC**

*Compiled by Larry Worster*

**A Selective Bibliography of Textbooks**

*General*

- Boroff, Edith. *Music Melting Round: A History of Music in the United States*. New York: Ardsley House, 1995.
- Chase, Gilbert. *America's Music: From the Pilgrims to the Present*. Rev. 3rd ed. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992.
- Crawford, Richard. *The American Musical Landscape*. University of California Press, 1993.
- Ferris, Jean. *America's Musical Landscape*. Madison, Wisc.: Brown and Benchmark, 1998.
- Hamm, Charles. *Music in the New World*. New York: Norton, 1983.
- Hitchcock, H. Wiley. *Music in the United States: a Historical Introduction*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Kingman, Daniel. *American Music, A Panorama*. 2nd ed. New York: Schirmer, 1990.
- Kingman, Daniel. *American Music, A Panorama*. Concise edition. New York: Schirmer, 1998.
- Mellers, Willfrid. *Music in a New Found Land: Themes and Developments in the History of American Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

*Special*

- Austin, William. *Twentieth Century American Masters*. New York: Norton, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *"Susanna," "Jeanie," and "The Old Folks At Home": The Songs of Stephen C. Foster from His Time to Ours*. New York: Macmillan, 1975.
- Caldwell, Hansonia L. *African-American Music: A Chronology, 1619-1995*. Los Angeles: Ikoror Communications, 1996.
- Campbell, Michael. *And the Beat Goes On: An Introduction to Popular Music in America, 1840 to Today*. New York: Schirmer, 1996.
- Dizikes, John. *Opera in America, A Cultural History*. New Haven: Yale, 1993.
- Floyd, Samuel A. *The Power of Black Music*. London: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Friedlander, Paul. *Rock and Roll: A Social History*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996.
- Gann, Kyle. *American Music in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Schirmer, 1997.
- Hamm, Charles. *Yesterdays: Popular Song*. New York: Norton, 1979.
- Joyner, David Lee. *American Popular Music*. Madison, Wisc.: Brown and Benchmark, 1993.

- Kernfield, Barry. *What to Listen For in Jazz*. New Haven: Yale, 1995.
- Lornell, Kip. *Introducing American Folk Music*. Madison, Wisc.: Brown and Benchmark, 1993.
- Lornell, Kip and Anne Rasmussen. *Music of Multicultural America*. New York, 1997.
- Oliver, Paul. *Gospel, Blues, and Jazz*. New York: Norton, 1997.
- Roach, Hildred. *Black American Music: Past and Present*. Malabar, Fla.: Krieger Publishing, 1992.
- Robinette, Richard and Thomas Pasqua. *Historical Perspectives in Popular Music*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt, 1993.
- Southern, Eileen. *The Music of Black Americans*. 3rd ed. New York: Norton, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Readings in Black American Music*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1983.
- Tirro, Frank. *Jazz, A History*. 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1993.
- Titon, Jeff Todd. *Worlds of Music*. New York: Schirmer, 1996.

## Videos

[A list of videos pertaining to American music topics may be obtained from Multicultural Media, Web site [www.multiculturalmedia.com](http://www.multiculturalmedia.com)]

## A Sample of Web Resources

Music of the United States of America ([www.umich.edu/~musausa](http://www.umich.edu/~musausa))

A project of the American Musicological Society, in collaboration with the Sonneck Society and A-R Editions. Funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and hosted by the University of Michigan School of Music. Pronounced "Mew-Zah," MUSA (Music of the United States of America) publishes a series of scholarly editions of American music. In addition to musical scores or notations, each volume includes a substantial contextual essay and a critical editorial apparatus.

Nationwide, over 350 libraries subscribe to the MUSA series. On one hand, the project represents a traditional approach to research through the preparation of critical scores. Each edition also features a substantial critical essay which extends scholarly discourse in the field of American music. MUSA engages with cutting-edge theoretical perspectives in its attempts to publish repertoires and represent oral cultural traditions not typically addressed by music editions.

Center for Black Music Research ([www.colum.edu/cbmr](http://www.colum.edu/cbmr))

The Columbia College Chicago Center for Black Music Research documents, preserves, and disseminates information about black music in all parts of the world. It encourages research in the areas of secular and sacred folk music, blues, ragtime, jazz, gospel music, rhythm and blues, musical theater and dance, opera and concert music; reggae, son, merengue/méringue, bomba y plena, salsa, calypso, and other genres from the Caribbean; and traditional and contemporary music from Africa.

Archives of African American Music and Culture  
(<http://www.indiana.edu/~aaamc/websites.html>)

Selected list of Internet resources for African American music.

American Music Resource (<http://www.uncg.edu/~flmccart/amrhome.html>)

AMR is a multi-dimensional source of reference information about all styles of music indigenous to the Western Hemisphere. It is intended to serve efficiently and quickly: text-only. The collection houses over 800 bibliographies, lists and files, and is indexed by *topic* (genre and style subdivisions) and *subject* (individuals—mostly composers). Some listings also include links to selected Internet resources.

Sousa Archives for Band Research ([www.library.uiuc.edu/sousa](http://www.library.uiuc.edu/sousa))

The Sousa Collection at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign comprises 71% of extant Sousa materials. The collection includes not only published and manuscript music for the band medium, but also vocal and violin works with band accompaniment. The names of Sousa Band vocal soloists Estelle Liebling, Marjorie Moody, Mary Baker, Nora Fauchald and violinists Maud Powell and Carolyn Powers (as well as names of other vocal and violin soloists) appear on the music. Many of the parts include annotations, both musical and otherwise; the materials provide researchers with more than a 50-year perspective on performance practice, repertoire, itinerary, personnel, and American musical taste.

Bringing Music History Home: A Guide for American Teachers of Music History  
([clem.mscd.edu/~worster/GrouTOC.html](http://clem.mscd.edu/~worster/GrouTOC.html))

Historically, the teaching of music history to music majors in American colleges and universities has involved, in the main, art music from Europe. The Sonneck Society's Interest Group on American Music in American Schools and Colleges, which generated this booklet, is devoted to encourage the inclusion of American music in our courses—which is not now usual due to the fact that typically most of us were taught little or nothing of our own musical heritage. Our intent in this booklet is to suggest ways to complement traditional Eurocentric topics with American ones. This material was originally distributed as a booklet by the Sonneck Society for American Music to all teachers of music history in the U.S. in 1991.

Sacred Harp and Related Shape-Note Music Resources  
([www.mcsr.olemiss.edu/~mudws/resource](http://www.mcsr.olemiss.edu/~mudws/resource))

Compilation of discography and commentary by Steven L. Sabol (Washington, D.C. Sacred Harp Singers).

Smithsonian Folkways recordings ([www.si.edu/folkways](http://www.si.edu/folkways))

Search the 35,000 track database of all the *Folkways*, *Cook*, *Paredon*, *Dyer-Bennet* and Smithsonian Folkways recordings distributed through mail order.

# TEACHING AMERICAN INDIAN MUSIC: A CASE STUDY

TARA BROWNER

*University of California at Los Angeles*

Teaching American Indian music is surprisingly different from teaching a more general survey in American music. Courses in Native American music cover the same geographical area (including Canada and Northern Mexico); comparable historical terrain; and have a corresponding breadth of repertoire to a typical American music survey. At that point, however, most of the similarity ends. Nearly all of the available resources for Native American music are ethnological rather than historical, and much of the music is in an indigenous language or vocables, making text analysis problematic. Moreover, the “art” or “great works” style of teaching so familiar to nearly all of you is not applicable to the musical expression of Indian peoples, most of whom do not privilege any specific song or style over any others. Finally, since teaching Native American cultures—including their music—involves to a great extent teaching about Indian religions and spirituality, there are conflicts within the larger Indian community with regard to whether Native American music should be taught at the college level to non-Indians at all.

Since so few repackaged resources are available to assist in teaching Indian music, doing so requires building your own course. My talk here today will be about that experience. I would like to add that I have a built-in advantage over most educators tackling a specialized course such as this one: I am part Indian myself (Choctaw), and have been a Women’s Jingle Dress Dancer at powwows in the Great Lakes area, Northern Plains, and California for a number of years. Therefore I do not “research” this music so much as I participate in its performance. The resulting connections with my community keep me constantly updated on such issues as musical evolution and change, political events, and the potential conflicts involved in teaching certain repertoires of music.

The University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) has a structural relationship between ethnomusicology, historical musicology, and music performance unlike any other university in the United States. All three areas are actually different departments, and historical musicology is in the College of Letters and Sciences, while music and ethnomusicology are in the School of the Arts and Architecture. My line is a joint appointment between ethnomusicology and American Indian studies (located within the College of Letters and Sciences). Although perhaps at first confusing to an outsider, within this maze of departments lies the opportunity for a plethora of specializations and course offerings unavailable anywhere else. I also taught a one-semester course in American Indian music while a graduate student at the University of Michigan for three years, but the class disappeared when I left the campus. At UCLA, the course sequence in Indian music was established by Charlotte Heth, and was taught by Richard Keeling for the two years between when

Heth left and I arrived—so the departmental commitment is there regardless of faculty turnover.

UCLA does not currently offer a general American music course. Instead, we have specialized area courses, some of which are in the musicology department. Student demand for classes about American Indian music is fairly high: at Michigan I enrolled about thirty students per course in a semester system, while at UCLA I am averaging about sixty-five to seventy students per quarter. Some specialized courses, such as Chicano/Latino music, have enrollments of about 120 or so, and our jazz sequence, taught by the master performer Gerald Wilson, averages more than five hundred students per quarter.

To teach an area course such as Native American music, you need specialized knowledge, because you must create your own course packs and listening tapes. Currently, no complete textbooks are available that are suitable for college-level classes, although some good supplementary materials do exist. They include the Native American issue of *Selected Reports in Ethnomusicology* and *Native American Dance: Ceremonies and Social Traditions*, both edited by Charlotte Heth,<sup>1</sup> and *Songs of Indian Territory* (covers only the Native American music of Oklahoma) edited by Willie Smyth.<sup>2</sup> Bryan Burton's widely available *Moving Within the Circle: Contemporary Native American Music and Dance*<sup>3</sup> is written in a style suggesting its primary intended audience is the public school general music teacher, as is John Bierhorst's *A Cry From the Earth: Music of the North American Indians*.<sup>4</sup>

Although the extensive musical and cultural knowledge required to teach a complete survey course on Indian music is beyond the reach of many college teachers—who have little time left over from keeping up with their own specialties—keep in mind that Indians are Americans! Our music is performed in this country, and our cultures are interwoven into the fabric of American society. If musicology can be defined as the scholarly study of music, then Native American music is part of that study. In addition, chapters about Native North American music are included in many major American music texts, most notably those by Daniel Kingman, Gilbert Chase, and Charles Hamm, making it essential that teachers of American music have a basic knowledge of American Indian musical expression.<sup>5</sup> I am aware that some of the responsibility for making this music more accessible rests with me and the handful of others in academia who teach it, and recently I did a workshop on powwow music and dance at the 1997 American Musicological Society meeting in Phoenix, which was a repeat of my presentation from the 1995 Sonneck Society meeting. Attendance at both of these events was excellent. For the most part, however, Indian music is performed within Indian cultural contexts, and to experience it you must engage with that community in some way, instead of sitting back and assuming the music will come to you.

Native American music runs the gamut from traditional styles through pop, jazz, powwow, hymn singing, and Quapaw composer Louis Ballard's symphonic music (including opera). One of the most challenging (and enjoyable) aspects of teaching this repertoire is presenting it from multiple cultural viewpoints. For example, Native

American musical expression can be historicized in both Western and Native conceptual frameworks: through Western anthropological analysis *and* the Native tradition of music as a primary means of historical preservation of important events through song texts. Also, Native American histories—both oral and written—offer alternative views of historical events common to Indians and the dominant culture.

Part of studying Native American music is the examination of Indian temporal frameworks—concepts of music and time alien to the typical college student. I use the following example when teaching traditional music of the Great Lakes area:

According to the Ojibwe story of creation, before the Earth came into being, there was a great void, a place of nothingness. And the Creator, seeing this empty space, filled it with sound, and the sound became solid and the solidness became the world. In the Ojibwe *Mdewiwin* ritual, this creation/sound is heard when two shakers are played: a gourd shaker by a man and a copper shaker by a woman. The sound made by the shakers is not a reenactment of the creation/sound—it *is* the sound, brought through an opening in the spirit world from the past into the present in a cycle of rebirth and renewal. The word *Mdewiwin* itself means “to hear the sacred sound,” and is the name of the medicine society that conducts the ritual as part of its ceremonials.<sup>6</sup>

Another example I use is that of Navajo ritual performance, in which music is part of a ceremony that removes people from this time continuum and places them within the Navajo mythic times, where they become active participants in Navajo creation stories, such as Monster Slayer and Changing Woman. In the past, I have asked students to write essays comparing “their” music to one of the Indian traditions they have learned about. The results are surprising. Last quarter I received essays such as “Inuit Music and Rap,” and “Maidu Animal Songs and the Music in My Sorority.” Students take this assignment seriously, and the papers make great reading. At a school such as UCLA, with its large population of immigrant students, *they* have to be the ones connecting with the music—I do not have the cultural expertise in Hmong or Armenian or Persian music (among many others) needed to construct comparative frameworks for them.

When I first developed this class at Michigan, I conceived of it in two parts to be covered in a single fifteen-week semester: traditional tribal-specific music as part 1, and Pan-Indian styles, including powwow music, country, contemporary flute, game music, and historical Pan-Indian genres such as Ghost Dance, as part 2. UCLA is on the quarter system, and rather than jam the course into a single ten-week quarter (and face student wrath), I decided to split it in two and add materials. Currently, each ten-week quarter has six one-hour listening tapes, and students are required to write a paragraph on each example using the terminology they acquire in class. Weekly assignments from a 250–270-page reader, a required term research paper (prospectus approved in advance) of seven to eight pages, an essay exam mid-term (two hours) and an essay exam final (two hours) round out each course. Whether or not I have a teaching assistant, I grade all student research papers.

The traditional music course is taught by a combination of the (old) standard of culture areas combined with indigenous concepts. “Culture-area theory” originated from Western anthropology—and I am not completely happy with it—but a geographical survey of Indian culture is the most efficacious teaching methodology available at present.

Below are some examples of culture-area groupings combined with Indian concepts that I use in my traditional Native American music course:

1. Arctic: Inuit social and game music, and its role in creating and reinforcing community values.
2. The Northwest Coast: Masked dances and song ownership as indicative of social rank; music as material culture and its performance as an affirmation of an individual’s place within the larger social framework.
3. California: gambling music, personal songs, and animal songs. Music and spiritual power.
4. Northern Plains: The Lakota tradition of the White Buffalo Calf Woman and her gift of the Pipe and the Seven Ceremonies. Music and its influence over the forces of nature.
5. Southwest: Pueblo and Hopi Societies. Music as mediator between the dead and the living, and the spiritual (mythic) and physical worlds.

Students are also required to learn musical terminology—both Indian and Western—to discuss musical examples presented during the term. A typical exam has a section on terms such as monophony, heterophony, polyphony, ostinato, hoquet, pentatonic, and microtone, and students must provide examples from class as well as definitions. In their essays, students analyze music according to beat patterns, meters, vocal range and timbre, musical forms, and instruments, and analyze the role of the music in culture.

My course on Pan-Indian music is more oriented towards the study of culture and dance, and I teach basic styles of powwow dancing in this class. Instead of culture areas, this term is organized by genre, as outlined below:

1. Pan-Indian includes contemporary pop, jazz, folk, country, rock, etc., in a historical framework as both new musical forms adapted by Indians for their use, and (especially with folk) as music that Indians use to communicate with the dominant culture. Protest music.
2. Hymn singing and gospel music. Also Native American composers of art music.
3. Flute—a traditional musical idiom goes commercial—why and how.
4. Pan-Indian powwow music—the power of musical form, recording technology, and the automobile to create a new tradition. Intertribal events.
5. Historical Pan-Indian religious music. Sun Dance, Ghost Dance, Dream Dance, and Native American Church.

The same requirements of listening papers, exams, and a research paper are in place for this course, except that the paper is to be on the UCLA powwow, which students are required to attend.

I hope this presentation has given you a window into what teachers of very specialized American music courses do, and how they go about it. Although I teach in an ethnomusicology department, and many schools classify American Indian music as an ethnomusicological "other," I would like to remind you that teaching Indian music is also teaching one way of *being* American, a mission I take seriously in Los Angeles, where one-third of the residents are foreign or immigrant. Our "today" is your future.

### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Charlotte Heth, ed., *Selected Reports in Ethnomusicology* 3 (Los Angeles: University of California at Los Angeles Press, 1980), and *Native American Dance: Ceremonies and Social Traditions* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian, 1992).

<sup>2</sup> Willie Smyth, ed., *Songs of Indian Territory* (Oklahoma City: Center of the American Indian, 1989).

<sup>3</sup> Bryan Burton, *Moving Within the Circle: Contemporary Native American Music and Dance* (Danbury, Conn.: World Music Press, 1993).

<sup>4</sup> John Bierhorst, *A Cry From the Earth: Music of the North American Indians* (New York: Four Winds Press, 1979).

<sup>5</sup> See Daniel Kingman, *American Music: A Panorama*, 2nd ed. (New York: Schirmer, 1990); Gilbert Chase, *America's Music: From the Pilgrims to the Present*, rev. 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1992); and Charles Hamm, *Music in the New World* (New York: Norton, 1983).

<sup>6</sup> Tara Browner, "Spirit in Sound: Percussion in Native American Music," at the Percussive Arts Society International Convention, Phoenix, Arizona, 3 November 1995.

# AMERICAN MUSIC IN THE CURRICULUM OF A SMALL MUSIC DEPARTMENT

LARRY WORSTER

*The Metropolitan State College of Denver*

If you attended the two previous sessions, you heard the reasons for including American music in the course of study many times:

- it is diverse, representing the many subcultures from which it springs and informing its students about the very nature of the multihued American experience;
- it is a rich field, manifesting itself in many forms in the various strata of folk, popular, and art musics, and, hence, demanding the consideration of differing aesthetic systems;
- it is unique, a tradition that both encompasses and diverges from any of its sources;
- the study of American music is the study of American people;
- and the study of American music enhances the teaching of many of the NASM standards: working with musics of diverse cultural sources and historical periods, exposure to a large and varied body of music, forming and defending value judgments about music, and developing improvisation skills.

I am also sure that, as the administrators of music departments, schools, and colleges, you are perhaps wondering where you will find space in your curriculum for American music. I would like to share the experiences of one who, within the context of a fairly small music department, has integrated this into the existing curriculum.

Before I explain my program, a bit of background on myself will perhaps explain the origins of this Americanist. After the usual mandatory piano lessons failed to inspire me to a musical career, I casually picked up a guitar that my brother left home when he went to seek his fortune as a beatnik. Twenty years later, after having made my living playing rock, folk, country, bluegrass, swing, jazz, Irish, country, country and rock, and rock once again, I entered the University of Colorado at Boulder intending to become a college music teacher. I was fortunate to study with several teachers who respected American music as a viable component in the study of European art music: Allan Luhring, who taught me more about American folk and popular genres, and Bill Kearns, whose graduate course covering the entire gamut of American music filled in the gaps in my knowledge of the art music and religious music in which my life had been steeped but about which I had not been conscious. I found that I was like Seattle Symphony conductor Gerard Schwarz, who said, "I had become a great lover of American music, not realizing that I was listening to American music. It was just beautiful and wonderful music that I loved."<sup>1</sup> I completed my doctorate with an emphasis on American twentieth-century music by writing a dissertation on Cecil Effinger, a native Coloradan composer of over 150

works, whom most of you probably know from his inventions, the Musicwriter typewriter and the Tempowatch.

Two years ago, I was hired by the music department of the Metropolitan State College of Denver (Metro), the only urban college in the state of Colorado and perhaps the largest in the nation, serving over 17,000 students on a campus that houses Metro, the Community College of Denver, and the Denver campus of the University of Colorado system, a grand total of 35,000 students. Within this setting, Metro Music is rather small. We have between 225 and 250 music majors taught by eight full-time faculty and thirty part-time faculty. As for the music history department, to paraphrase Louis XIV, "*l'histoire de la musique, c'est moi.*" Upon arriving at Metro, I was given the task of transforming the Eurocentric music history program into the NASM-prescribed study of music of diverse cultural sources, historical time periods, and media.

Under my predecessor, the first year of historical study involved a two-semester survey of the monuments of European art music, and the third year of a two-semester study of historical European art music styles. An outline of the current sequence of study is listed in Appendix 1. Keeping the junior sequence essentially intact, I condensed the two-semester freshman study of European music into one semester, thus opening space for a one-semester survey of the musics of world cultures. For the first semester survey, I chose to use Joseph Machlis's and Kristine Forney's *The Enjoyment of Music*, a textbook that includes American music, not as an historical footnote, but as a parallel development to European music. I have always been puzzled by approaches that wait until the twentieth century to mention that "Oh, by the way, the European settlers of the United States had a musical culture for the last three centuries, but it is not that important and we can cover it in three pages." I believe that this approach disrespects our real musical history and reinforces the nineteenth-century attitude that met the American virtuoso pianist Louis Moreau Gottschalk when he applied to the Paris Conservatoire: "America is only a land of steam engines." Now I believe that when we talk about music, we should also listen to music, so I would like to play you a brief example from Gottschalk's composition *Le Bananier*. This example will also illustrate that I teach American music in a similar manner to European music. I will point out some of the salient musical features and cultural references in the piece before playing it.

Notice that the melody of this mid-nineteenth-century character piece evokes the song of the banana worker both in the plaintive melody and in the accompanying drone. Gottschalk's accompaniment can be seen as either imitating the droning qualities of the banjo, in a similar manner to his imitation of this instrument's rhythmic qualities in other pieces, or as creating as a harmonic background that detracts as little as possible from this haunting melody whose inspiration was most likely an unaccompanied work song. In any case, his elaboration of the melody in the following variations leads us to understand why he was regarded as the American counterpart of Chopin and why, when he died in 1869, funeral services in his

adopted home, Buenos Aires, and his final resting place, Brooklyn, filled churches to overflowing.

The American topics included in Machlis and Forney's book are listed in Appendix 3 at the end of this article. These topics are not only included in this book but are also organized in the appropriate historical sequence; thus, William Billings and Mozart are presented as contemporaries. Although the coverage of most of these topics is brief, their inclusion validates their serious inquiry in class. Students are encouraged to think that American music is important information, not just the professor's pet interest. Appendix 2 lists the American lectures for this class. For the second-semester study of Music Literature of World Cultures, or, as many call it, World Music, I used Jeff Todd Titon's fine textbook *Worlds of Music*, which includes discussion of several American folk cultures (African American and Native American).

The junior history class uses K Marie Stolba's *The Development of Western Music*. Appendix 3 lists the topics included in Stolba's book, again presented in a parallel historical sequence. In addition, the accompanying anthology includes a nice variety of eighteenth-century and twentieth-century audio and score examples. The one gap is in the nineteenth century, and I supplement this with additional examples of my own.

One of Stolba's examples is William Billings' piece, *When Jesus Wept*, from his 1770 publication *The New England Psalm Singer*. Now I also believe that when we talk about music and listen to music, we should music about music, so let's sing this canon together. First, I will tell you a bit about the music. This piece is a product of a New England singing master. These amateur teachers and composers led singing schools in many places in the northeast colonial United States during the eighteenth century. Their work as composers was unique at the time, and Billings' *Psalm Singer* represents the first publication in the United States consisting entirely of the music of a single composer. Notice Billings' particular fondness for the sonority of the open fifth at the cadences. I conduct in a style typical of Sacred Harp singing, a manner that would be familiar to my students from the study of African American sacred music as covered in Titon's *Worlds of Music*.

The last course mentioned in Appendix 1, and the only truly new course that I have added, is a multicultural course entitled "Musics of America." I know that many of you are wondering about the need for another class in music of other cultures. The Metropolitan State College of Denver, like many schools, has a multicultural requirement. Our definition, however, includes only the study of American topics, a limitation that I at first found odd. As I have experienced the campus culture at Metro, I have come to understand that this definition fits as well as any legislated multiculturalism can, particularly because of the urban, multiracial character of our institution. It projects the attitude that, if you take care of your backyard, how your citizens act in the world will take care of itself. Rather than seeing this as a limitation, I found in it an opportunity to develop a class in the music of various American

subcultures. Many of our music majors choose to take this course, thus rounding out their American experience with a look at diverse folk and popular musics.

Additionally, I have included in Appendix 4 a description of this year's celebration of American Music Week (always the first full week in November) at the University of New Hampshire. It is interesting to note that this week-long celebration resulted from the innovative ideas of a single energetic faculty member and a minimum of departmental funds, and that the resulting awareness of the American experience for the student population cannot possibly be measured.

I hope two things are evident from this brief look at the music history sequence at Metro as I teach it: American music is integrated as a normal facet of the study of music history, and the breadth and depth of coverage within this context, and as taught by a single professor, can actually be quite great. The results of covering American music as a normal part of the curriculum are sometimes hard to document, but I would like to relate one more experience to you. Each semester, we award a small prize to the two best papers in the junior music history class. The awardees present an oral version of their research to the assembled student body. It was gratifying that the two best papers of the 1997 spring semester were on American topics: Amy Beach's *Gaelic Symphony* and a stimulating paper entitled "Samuel Barber: A Great American Composer?"

In closing, I can only say that I find the strongest argument for the inclusion of American music in the curriculum is the music itself and the people who perform it. My talk about American music and its relationship to American life pales in comparison to what I feel when I perform or hear pieces from this rich repertoire. I hope that you feel a little of the same.

#### ENDNOTE

<sup>1</sup> Gerard Schwarz, "Gerard Schwarz Inducted as Honorary Member," *The Sonneck Society for American Music Bulletin* 23 (Summer 1997): 43.

### APPENDIX 1: AMERICAN MUSIC IN THE CURRICULUM AT THE METROPOLITAN STATE COLLEGE OF DENVER

#### Freshman: Two-Semester Introductory Course

Semester I—inclusion of American topics in parallel time frames to European developments; folk, popular, and art musics: see schedule for Music 121; possibly schedule a celebration of American music to coincide with American Music Week. Textbook: Joseph Machlis and Kristine Forney, *The Enjoyment of Music* (New York: Norton, 1995).

Semester II—inclusion of African American and Native American folk and popular musics in study of world music-cultures. Textbook: Jeff Todd Titon, *Worlds of Music* (New York: Schirmer, 1996).

**Junior: Two-Semester History Sequence**

Inclusion of American topics paralleling European art music. Textbook: K Marie Stolba, *The Development of Western Music* (Madison, Wisconsin: Brown and Benchmark, 1998).

**Senior: One-Semester Multicultural Course**

Course based on Native American, African American, Hispanic American, Anglo-American, and other ethnic subcultures; folk and popular music. Textbook: Kip Lornell and Anne Rasmussen, *Music of Multicultural America*. (New York, 1997).

**APPENDIX 2: AMERICAN TOPICS COVERED IN  
FRESHMAN MUSIC LITERATURE COURSE**

**Horace Boyer Gospel Festival**

Two-day event encompassing a one-day workshop learning to perform African American gospel music and a performance of the workshop choir and guest choirs on the second day.

**The First New England School**

Read: Machlis and Forney, *The Enjoyment of Music* (EOM), 129–30.

**American Art Music: Gottschalk, Dvorák, and Ives**

Read: EOM, 199–200; 384–86

**American Art Music: Copland and Bernstein**

Read: EOM, 387–92

Listen: Copland, *Billy the Kid*, Scene 1, Street in a Frontier Town; Bernstein, *Symphonic Dances from West Side Story*

**Jazz Styles**

Read: EOM, 393–403

Listen: Ellington, *Ko-Ko*; Rodgers, *My Funny Valentine*

**Minimalism: Philip Glass**

Read: EOM, 453–58

**Technology and Music**

Read: EOM, 443–50

Listen: Machover, *Bug-Mudra*

**Eclecticism**

Read: EOM, 452–53

Listen: Tower, *Petrouschskates*

**APPENDIX 3: AMERICAN MUSIC IN TEXTBOOKS**

Machlis, Joseph and Christine Forney. *The Enjoyment of Music*. New York: Norton, 1995.

Yankee Doodle, Goodbye Old Paint, America, Bay Psalm Book, William Billings, African-American spirituals, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, eighteenth-century subscription concerts in Boston, Charleston, and New York, Francis Scott Key, founding of symphonies in New York, Chicago, and San Francisco, Henry Burleigh, Will Marion Cook, William Grant Still, George Gershwin, Louis Moreau Gottschalk, Charles Ives, Stephen Foster, George M. Cohan, Ruth Crawford, Aaron Copland, Scott Joplin, Louis Armstrong, "King" Oliver, Charlie Patton, Duke Ellington, Dizzie Gillespie, Dave Brubeck, Gunther Schuller, Miles Davis, Rodgers and Hammerstein, Stephen Sondheim, Andrew Lloyd Webber, Leonard Bernstein, Henry Cowell, Harry Partch, John Cage, George Crumb, Milton Babbitt, Tod Machover, Samuel Barber, Ned Rorem, David del Tredici, John Corigliano, Ellen Taaffe Zwilich, Joan Tower.

Stolba, K Marie. *The Development of Western Music*. Madison, Wisconsin: Brown and Benchmark, 1998.

Topics included: Francis Hopkinson, James Lyon, William Billings, John Antes, Benjamin Carr, Moravians, Boston Handel and Haydn Society, European visitors (Jenny Lind, Ole Bull, Sigismund Thalberg), Lowell Mason, Männerchor, Stephen Foster, Louis Moreau Gottschalk, Charles Hommann, William H. Fry, George F. Bristow, John S. Dwight, John Knowles Paine, Edward MacDowell, Arthur Farwell, Charles Cadman, Amy Cheney Beach, Arthur Foote, George Chadwick, Horatio Parker, Charles Ives, Henry Cowell, Aaron Copland, Ruth Crawford Seeger, Virgil Thomson, Roy Harris, William Grant Still, Walter Piston, Howard Hanson, Milton Babbitt, John Cage, Pauline Oliveros, Jean Eichelberger Ivey, George Crumb, Steve Reich, Ellen Taaffe Zwilich

Music included in the accompanying anthology: William Billings, Francis Hopkinson, John Antes, Charles Ives, Henry Cowell, Aaron Copland, Milton Babbitt, George Crumb, Steve Reich, Ellen Taaffe Zwilich

#### **APPENDIX 4: A SHOWCASE FOR AMERICAN MUSIC**

*Sonneck Society for American Music Bulletin* (Fall 1997)

The state of New Hampshire occupies an important place in the history of American music as the home of the MacDowell Colony and birthplace of Amy Beach. The University of New Hampshire has also played a role in American music. Aaron Copland gave a lecture entitled "The Pleasures of Music" as a part of the Distinguished Lecture Series there in 1959 and left the music department a complete copy of his scores in his will. Next year, the university will be home to the Amy Beach conference, to be held right before the national AMS meeting in Boston. Every semester, the general education course in American Music has an enrollment of

approximately one hundred students. Jazz trumpeter Clark Terry is affiliated with the department and frequently gives lectures and workshops. This year the music department is highlighting American music by presenting a week-long series of concerts, lectures, and films during American Music Week.

The concert-lecture series is the work of musicologist Olivia Mattis, whose interest in American music began with research for her dissertation on Edgard Varèse (1992). Sparked by her encounters with Slonimsky, Cage, Ussachevsky, and others who had known and/or been influenced by Varèse, from Abravanel to Zappa, she created the Varèse Oral History Project (numbering some 75 tapes). One of the people she contacted was Gilbert Chase, who met Varèse in Paris in the early 1930s, and who conducted extensive recorded interviews with the composer in 1961 and 1962. She spent many hours transcribing these unpublished interviews, and, after Chase's death, she conducted extensive research in his remarkable American music archives at his home in North Carolina. Learning about Varèse's International Composers' Guild and later the Pan-American Association of Composers led her to consider the issue of nationalism in his music and that of other twentieth-century, particularly American, composers.

When Mattis first arrived at the University of New Hampshire two years ago, part of her fall assignment was to teach an American music class. She took advantage of the timing of American Music Week by organizing a handful of events and giving credit for attending them. In addition, five students chose to make presentations during that week on some aspect of American music in place of their term papers. After holding an interim position at the University of Southern Maine (and organizing the first festival devoted to the granddaddy of electronic musical instruments, the theremin), Mattis returned to New Hampshire this year as a lecturer and immediately began organizing this year's event. She made announcements at the music department convocation and the first faculty meeting, and circulated a flyer calling for participation. Department chair Peggy Vagts, who was impressed with the 1995 American Music Week, quickly committed departmental funds to pay for a guest lecturer and other expenses associated with the week. Most of the participants, faculty, staff, and students, are performing for free. As can be seen by the listing below, the event is impressive not only in its magnitude, but also in its scope. Congratulations to Olivia Mattis and the music department at the University of New Hampshire for their innovative approach to celebrating our rich heritage in American music.

### **Condensed Schedule of Events, 3-8 November 1997**

Monday—Vocal recital by David Ripley, Roxana Tourigny and students. Music of Stephen Foster, Ned Rorem, Woody Guthrie, Aaron Copland, Katherine Hoover, Christopher Kies, and Paul Bowles.

Tuesday—Lecture by John Rogers, composer and theorist: "Computer Music in the USA"; Lecture by Olivia Mattis: "What's American about American Music?"

Wednesday—UNH Guitar Ensemble directed by David Newsam. Music of Duke Ellington, Charlie Parker, Charles Mingus, and Miles Davis; jazz clarinet concert by David Seiler. Program includes “Piano Potpourri,” student jazz pianists.

Thursday—Lecture by Michael Annicchiarico, composer and theorist: “Walt Whitman in Modern Society: John Adams’ ‘The Wound Dresser’”; Guest lecture by Allen Lowe, saxophonist and author of “American Pop—from Motown to Mojo.”

Friday—UNH Wind Symphony, directed by Nicholas Orovich, including *Piece for Rosa* (inspired by Rosa Parks); Film screenings of *John Cage: I’ve Got Nothing to Say, and I’m Saying It*; *American Masters: Meredith Monk*; and *Anima Mundi* (music by Philip Glass).

Saturday—Concert: Kaleidoscope Saxophone Quartet directed by Demetrius Spaneas, performing music of John Cage, Eubie Blake, Colin Homisky, and Stephen Parisi; *Piano Phase* and *Clapping Music* by Steve Reich; *Bone Machines* for trombone quartet by student composer Ryan Dignan; and Terry Riley’s *In C*, performed by The UNH Chamber Singers and Friends, directed by Peter Urquhart.

---

---

## DOCTORAL EDUCATION

---

---

### WHAT INSTITUTIONS HIRING DOCTORATES ARE SEEKING

MELLASENAH Y. MORRIS  
*James Madison University*

The statement of purpose for this series of discussions on doctoral education opens with words that we all probably have heard quite often in recent years: "It is clear to everyone that many traditional conditions in higher education are changing." Music faculty members and administrators can easily relate to this after long periods of brainstorming and planning to stay ahead of these changes—and that is one of the keys to addressing the topic: staying ahead of change by being visionary, realistic, and proactive.

As we look at these issues, we understand that we are all unique—our institutions are small, medium size, and large; we focus on undergraduate education, or we are research institutions. Regardless of our size and scope, the bottom line is the same: we are being affected by change at some rate or degree.

In reviewing recent changes in NASM standards and a variety of revisions in college curricula, we may find that curricular demands are changing ahead of the training in the graduate programs of current faculty or of today's pool of applicants. While some of the positions that were available years ago still remain staples of music programs, even these may now have broader descriptions; also, there are newer curricular areas in music programs for which there are new job titles and positions available.

### TYPES OF POSITIONS OPEN TO DOCTORATES

It is not surprising to see more positions advertised with the doctorate either required, at the ABD stage, or at least "preferred." There may be several reasons. One, a phrase that has been used for a number of years is "master's degrees are a dime a dozen." As so many students continue through this graduate level of study, it is not surprising that standards of excellence are rising and that competition may involve an applicant's additional training. Then, music units may be advertising their positions in line with what their institutions' vision may be about the number of faculty who should possess at least a doctorate before earning tenure. Also, the move toward various types of non-tenure-track term contracts may imply a new type of competitive spirit extending beyond the job search stage and into the realm of the seasoned faculty, making the highest level of training ideal.

*Applied.* Many traditional applied music positions in large schools appear still to be open to those who have master's degrees or to those who have sufficient experience to be considered to have the equivalent of a terminal degree. Yet, even in this performance-intensive job, doctorates are appearing in advertisements as at least "preferred." This is especially true when the positions include any type of administrative work, such as coordinating or directing an area or program. A recent opening required that a candidate for an applied position should come with a doctorate, teaching and performing experience, and leadership skills sufficient to direct an instrumental program. Another listed such responsibilities as instruction in the applied area; performance with a faculty chamber ensemble (so far so good); then, teaching in a secondary area, administrative duties, service on committees, and recruitment and retention of students for the studio. We know how stiff competition can be for qualified students in our programs, so in the area of applied faculty, music units are looking for people not only with reputations but also with the personal characteristics needed to recruit and retain strong studios.

*Music Education.* Candidates with doctorates in music education can find jobs in teaching and coordinating music education programs. Such positions have remained stable, often as the heart of many units. Those seeking these jobs not only will be expected to enter their positions well aware of classroom methodologies and dynamics but also to remain current on these issues as well as on the changes in student dynamics. With the issue of currency critical in precollege classroom teaching, these positions are prime targets for term contracts, more as an incentive to remain current than as any negative statement of purpose.

A specifically identified area of need for music educators with doctorates is string education. Laura Reed, editor of the *American String Teacher*, recently contributed an article to the magazine suggesting that preparing graduate students for string education positions would be sensible amid a profession filled with more performance majors than positions in the job market.<sup>1</sup> There appear not to be sufficient numbers of education-certified string graduates to build and maintain public school string programs. Reed indicated that the String Industry Council, a newly formed group, plans to work with the American String Teachers Association to start more public school string programs. Reed asks, "Are there enough string players who have met state certification requirements to teach in the schools?"<sup>2</sup>

*Music History and Musicology.* Music history graduates and musicologists with a variety of specializations can expect to see advertisements for positions, especially at research institutions. Those with Ph.D.s in these areas may find that additional responsibilities are related to interdisciplinary studies and contributions to the general education or liberal studies program. In fact, there appears to be a growing need to identify history candidates who are particularly interested in and prepared to offer world music for both the major and the nonmajor. The reality for many of our units is a need to generate credit-hour production through offerings in the area of liberal studies. Also, it is to our advantage to embrace nonmajors in our programs as we build the audiences of the future. We can help do this with faculty prepared to

teach courses in American music and in world music. Another focus for the musicology candidate may be found in combining scholarly research and performance practice. An advertisement in the 24 October *Chronicle of Higher Education* sought “an articulate, intellectually adventurous scholar strongly rooted in performance and capable of integrating scholarship and performance.”<sup>3</sup>

*Theory.* Positions in music theory and composition are available for the doctoral graduate, but some of these job descriptions are moving beyond the traditional and are being redefined to include knowledge of computer applications, especially MIDI, and other aspects of music technology. More often, we are seeing positions for “theory/computer assisted instruction” with responsibility for undergraduate programs using computers.<sup>4</sup> Theory positions, as well as those in music education, increasingly stress the importance of skills in music technology. Theory and composition applicants would be more marketable if they also came with leadership skills. They would be positioned to assume administrative duties related to coordinating programs.

Another recent job description included the following (and this one really says it all to me, impacting on the issue of breadth of competency and levels of versatility): expertise in contemporary forms of performance and composition; ability to teach history/theory of performance; capacity to address relevant critical and theoretical issues, and teach broadly across the curriculum in interdisciplinary programs; additional area in world music, electronic music, film music, or instrument building. This example suggests a comprehensive approach to music curricula and the need for increased doctoral study with preparation for combining music with other disciplines for a broad educational perspective. It suggests a focus on non-Western cultures and career goals beyond classical music performance. It suggests that it is just as legitimate to think about the music business as it is to study history, theory, and performance practice. It addresses the reality of newer music-business-degree options as well as the various technology applications now available. It also reflects the more seamless approach to course development occurring on campuses today, with the possibility that faculty members may actually have joint appointments in two different academic units.

Then there are those with doctorates who may have the unusual notion of moving into the position of department chair, school director, or music dean. We all know what institutions are looking for in these searches—candidates who can mediate; perform fiscal management miracles on shoestring budgets; juggle a multitude of assignments and meet deadlines in a timely fashion; persuade; balance dreams with reality; organize; recruit; raise money; meet the public; encourage positive work environments; and work as effectively with students as with faculty, staff, and other administrators. Of course, successful teaching experience and evidence of appropriate types of research are also required. Preparation for these positions may be another topic for NASM meetings.

## WHAT REQUIREMENTS FOR POSITIONS REVEAL ABOUT ISSUES OF SUBJECT MATTER FOCUS, BREADTH OF COMPETENCE, AND LEVELS OF VERSATILITY

Music units appear to be seeking people with broader backgrounds—candidates who can teach not only in their one focus area, the one in which they have spent years developing skill and artistry, but also in at least one, and sometimes multiple, “secondary” areas of teaching. The new buzz words *interdisciplinary*, *world music*, *music business*, and *music technology* call for a different orientation to academia. Film music, recording sciences, music marketing, entertainment law, and instrument building suggest the reality of the entire music world being presented to today’s students and the need for faculty who can address these areas. Today, the bassoon teacher may need to teach in general education. The oboe teacher may find his/her workload includes a theory course or two. The theory teacher may be expected to meet classes in the computer lab on a regular basis and may be expected to have good keyboard skills. The piano professor may need to be competent in piano pedagogy or accompanying/collaborative arts. The music historian will need to know more about music beyond the Western world and take more of a critical-thinking approach to the discipline, making linkages between and among academic areas. We may all need to think beyond the stage or the research project and into the entire music world—for example, legal issues of the business, recording, arts management, and marketing of music products—and the list continues to grow.

Beyond these issues of academic preparation, there are growing expectations for faculty in non-degree-specific skills. I already mentioned a recent advertisement for an applied position requiring not only a doctorate and experience as a teacher and performer, but also leadership skills. Other requirements being listed are pedagogical, organizational, and interpersonal skills.

## WORKING IN ACADEME: ADVISING DOCTORAL CANDIDATES ABOUT PREPARING FOR WORK

In many of our traditional programs, doctoral students may move through course work, written comprehensives, recitals, and orals without much discussion by faculty or advisors on the “world of work in academe.” When we consider the curricular requirements as they currently exist in these doctoral programs, it is not hard to understand the need for such intense focus on catalog requirements and the expectations of faculty, mentors, and advisors. It may be perceived that the energies of the doctoral candidate should be focused primarily on the following:

- how long it will take to finish the degree;
- how to get a dissertation topic approved;
- where to try out the recital programs before the graded performances are scheduled;

- who will be the best faculty members to serve on the student's dissertation committee;
- strategies for success in completing written and oral comprehensive examinations; and
- working toward entering and winning competitions.

Understandably, faculty advisement may be directed toward these and similar academic issues. Much effort probably is focused on meeting standards of excellence, all quite necessary to develop full competency in one's specialization area. But success in the market seems to demand more than the knowledge of a very specialized subject matter. Institutions want faculty who will be full participating members of the college or university community. They want music faculty who work toward the mission of the institution as a whole, think beyond their discipline, and appreciate the breadth of experience available in college life.

In its booklet on assessment of graduate programs, NASM has articulated a reality for those with doctorates in music. Under the heading "Preparation for Teaching," the document states, "Many of those who are enrolled in graduate degree programs in music are or will be engaged in music teaching at some time during the course of their professional careers."<sup>4</sup> Whether the positions are in applied studies, classroom teaching, or ensemble directing, there is a need to find ways to prepare doctoral candidates for the work world and for relating to a diverse student population, to peers, with administrators, and with parents and the community. In some creative way, advisement may better serve students by including such opportunities as:

- studies of a pedagogical nature with the understanding that being a world-class performer or composer or conductor does not necessarily translate into being an effective educator;
- oral presentations to strengthen communication skills for one-on-one, small-group, and large-class instruction;
- a cognate or minor area with a focus on pedagogical preparation and other practical experience;
- apprenticeships with junior and senior faculty with a focus on how to prepare a course syllabus, how to define goals and objectives, and how to evaluate student progress fairly and consistently;
- assistantships in teaching ear-training, keyboard skills, freshman theory, applied minors, and general music appreciation—all with training, supervision, and frequent evaluation by faculty with actual primary teaching assignments in these areas;
- training or retooling in computer applications and other music technology;
- development of an understanding of what it takes to be a faculty member; and

- an introduction to the significance of active membership in professional music organizations (advertisements now include as “duties” working with student chapters of such groups as the Music Educators National Conference).

With the competition in the market and the complexities involved in keeping a job once it is secured, these and other opportunities may have an impact first upon getting hired and then upon actually keeping a job and doing it well.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Laura Reed, “Three Universities Lead the Way in Adding String Education Faculty Positions,” *American String Teacher* (Summer 1997): 84.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 24 October 1997, B59.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 18 July 1997, B38.

<sup>5</sup> National Association of Schools of Music, *The Assessment of Graduate Programs in Music* (Reston, Va.: NASM, 1988), 8-9.

# WHAT INSTITUTIONS HIRING DOCTORATES ARE SEEKING

ALAN E. STANEK  
*Idaho State University*

In preparation for this session, I gathered data from vacancy lists from the College Music Society and consulted music unit chairs through phone interviews. Several of these interviews were with individuals from smaller music units—those having twenty-five to one hundred majors. I was asked to explore the following four questions:

1. What kinds of qualifications are now being sought by institutions hiring the majority of doctorates?
2. What generalizations can be made about balances among expectations for teaching, research/creative and scholarly activity, and professionally related service?
3. Does teaching include the ability to teach nonmajors?
4. How are credentials considered?

The following comments describe qualifications of the “ideal” faculty member for positions in higher education in music.

## QUALIFICATIONS OF “IDEAL” FACULTY MEMBERS

Successful candidates for music positions in higher education should have the following qualifications:

- excellent musicianship combined with the ability and/or experience to perform *and* teach;
- evidence of being successful—including excellence in teaching and documented experience at the high school and/or collegiate level. This may include specific graduate assistantship experience in areas for which they will ultimately be responsible, or experience at another institution;
- intelligence and scholarship as reflected in their academic record. Transcripts should reflect high marks in music theory, aural and other musicianship skills, and music history;
- desirable personality attributes. These are the general characteristics we all look for. The NASM *1997–1998 Handbook* lists examples of what we expect from prospective music teachers.<sup>1</sup> While this list is geared to prospective students in a Bachelor of Music Education curriculum, it reveals the personal characteristics many seek in prospective faculty candidates. These personal attributes include:

- the ability to lead students; the capability to inspire others and excite their imaginations; and the ability to work productively and collaboratively, maintaining positive relationships with others;
- the ability to evaluate ideas, methods, and policies; the ability to remain current within developments in the art of music and in teaching;
- the ability to make independent, in-depth evaluations;
- a positive attitude and outlook on life in general; a passion for music and the ability to communicate it effectively;
- a positive attitude toward students. Ideal candidates should exhibit a willingness to take students from where they are and challenge them to higher levels of thinking, knowing, and doing.

Other qualifications include:

- the ability to do research or creative activity in connection with their primary teaching assignment. For example, Theory/Composition—compose, arrange, write theoretical papers; Music Education—do research in cognitive areas; Performance—give recitals, enter competitions, give clinics, play in an orchestra or faculty chamber music group, conduct all-state or regional honor groups, etc.;
- the ability and evidence of successful efforts to recruit students for the music program—whether to build a studio or major performance ensemble or to assist in recruiting students for the music unit. For music education faculty and ensemble directors, the ability, interest, and evidence of maintaining productive relationships with candidates’ public school counterparts is important. Several of the music chairs I interviewed indicated that *effective recruitment is paramount!*
- the ability to collaborate and/or evidence of successful collaboration with other musicians, especially with faculty colleagues and students in music making, coordinating special music projects, and festivals;
- the evidence of and/or ability to use music technology for teaching and learning. In a few years this ability may be an assumed skill of all faculty, administrators, and students.
- the willingness to take on additional tasks related to the music unit’s standing in the academic community: for example, faculty committees, faculty governance, curriculum council, research council, library committee, technology oversight committee, ad hoc committees, graduate faculty representative, etc.

The bottom line seemed to be that if the person has a doctorate, so much the better! Many of the recent position announcements indicate only “doctorate preferred” rather than “required.” Candidates with master-level degrees are often required to have a national visibility, have won prestigious competitions, and/or to have performance experience in a long-standing career in opera, symphonic music, etc.

## BALANCING TEACHING, RESEARCH/CREATIVE ACTIVITY, AND SERVICE

What generalizations can be made about balances among expectations for teaching, research/creative and scholarly activity, and professionally related service?

- Teaching must be consistently strong and effective. How each institution defines its expectations for faculty members in this area is extremely important.
- Music unit heads and selection committees should ask: On the basis of the quality, type, and regularity of research/creative activity, will the potential faculty member be tenurable?
- Participation in state, regional, national, and international organizations in the field of expertise is expected. Examples include participation in MENC, MTNA, CBDNA, NATS, ACDA, ASTA, PAS, ICA, ITG, TUBA, IDRS, etc. Assisting the institution, advising students effectively, advancing the profession beyond the institution, and contributing to the community are desirable service functions. Music faculty members should undertake a judicious single or multiple selection among many possible items. Readers should refer to *The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education*, a document that NASM distributed to all music units in 1993.<sup>2</sup>

### Teaching Nonmajors

- The quality and effectiveness of teaching does not differentiate between majors and nonmajors.
- The involvement of teaching applied music to nonmajors is often expected, especially in smaller music units. Music lessons for nonmajors often contribute to the overall quality of the school's large ensemble program.
- The College Music Society has emphasized music in general studies for the past two decades. The 1981 Wingspread Conference and annual summer institutes helped us broaden musical understanding and teaching courses for the nonmajor.
- Almost all teachers are involved in teaching nonmajors in (a) applied lessons; (b) ensembles; and (c) music-appreciation courses. Some music faculty will only be teaching majors: for example, music therapy faculty will be minimally involved with nonmajors.
- The smaller the music unit, the more nonmajor teaching occurs.
- Teachers should be inclusive and encouraging.

### Considering Credentials

- Requirements in CMS vacancy lists and position announcements vary from search to search. Audio/video tapes may or may not be required for initial

screening of candidates. This requirement often depends upon the timeline for the search.

- Some search committees look at the written materials from the candidate and listen to tapes at the same time. Sometimes they listen to tapes first.
- The quality and reputation of the degree-granting institution is often considered. A frequently asked question is whether the degree is from a major doctoral-producing institution.
- Candidates for positions should consider that search committees appreciate the candidate's ability to prepare an audition tape—to grab the attention of the auditor from the beginning of the recording.
- In some piano searches, music units ask for specific items on the tape and in a particular order. The works required are quite similar to those asked at freshman and/or graduate entrance auditions—a work by Bach or Scarlatti, a Beethoven sonata, and works from the nineteenth- and/or twentieth-century piano repertoire of their choosing. This has proved to be a highly effective way of ranking performance tapes.
- The quality of work experiences and publications should be carefully considered.
- Well-documented vita should reveal the extent of the candidate's work experience. The vita should include duties, courses taught, major responsibilities, years of service, etc. Important work experiences should be further described in the cover letter.
- Transcripts and letters of recommendation should relate to specific job requirements. Committees look for nonmajor or general education experience for flexibility.
- Evidence that the candidate has taken advantage of opportunities to teach, perform, or serve in special creative ways is considered.
- Some institutions request a philosophical statement or personal essay to accompany the application.
- In one institution surveyed, a cross-campus committee selected all faculty positions. This committee was made up of faculty from the area of specialization, administrators, other faculty, and a student selected by the student senate. The selection of highly qualified faculty members is taken very seriously.

At one institution a five-step screening process was suggested in considering candidate's credentials:

1. Initially, check for minimal qualifications as identified in the position announcement. Usually two people can do this for the entire selection committee.
2. Next, the entire selection committee reads the materials from all the remaining candidates, including the vita, application letter, three current letters of

recommendation and transcripts. A “long list” of approximately fifteen potential candidates is selected.

3. Supplemental materials from these fifteen candidates are requested by letter. Items often requested include: audio/video tapes, examples of compositions, course syllabi, additional names of references for phone contacts, etc. After considering these materials, the top six candidates emerge.
4. Committee members phone references and select the top two to three candidates.
5. The committee interviews the top two to three candidates.

In conclusion, I would like to thank those who participated in the phone interviews for their thoughtful, practical, and candid comments.

### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> National Association of Schools of Music, *1997–1998 Handbook* (Reston, Va.: NASM, 1997).

<sup>2</sup> National Association of Schools of Music, *The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education* (Reston, Va.: NASM, 1993).

---

---

## IMPLEMENTING THE NATIONAL K-12 MUSIC STANDARDS

---

---

### IMPLEMENTING THE NATIONAL K-12 MUSIC STANDARDS

JUNE HINCKLEY

*Florida State Department of Education*

A favorite cartoon of mine says, "We had a good music program last year, but she moved." I often use this as an opening "grabber" for presentations on the National Standards for Arts Education. The reason it gets immediate attention is that it, like so many really good cartoons, has the ring of truth. All too often the total responsibility for the success of the music program resides with the teacher. Administrations and teachers have no commonly held vision of what should be occurring in the music classroom. The test of the quality of a program in too many schools is the attendance at PTA student performances or evening concerts, not what students are learning. In math and language arts programs, parents, administrators, and the community have a common understanding as to what should be going on in classrooms and expectations for certain types of learning. In music classes, those decisions for too many years have rested solely with the music teacher. With the creation in 1994 of the *National Standards for Arts Education: What Every American Should Know and Be Able to Do in the Arts*,<sup>1</sup> the arts education community identified a common vision of what students should learn in arts classes in this country.

Other presentations have provided the history and context for the development of the National Standards, so I would like to focus on their content and potential impact. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, a 1996 gathering of Teachers of the Year from fifty states, identified three key elements for improving education that, I think, relate to the implementation of the National Standards and the mission of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM):

- What teachers know and can do is the most important influence on what students learn.
- Recruiting, preparing, and retaining good teachers is the central strategy for improving our schools.
- School reform cannot succeed unless it focuses on creating the conditions in which teachers can teach, and teach well.

These teachers charged leaders with the following specifics for making things better:

- Get serious about standards, both for students and for teachers.
- Reinvent teacher preparation and professional development.
- Fix teacher recruitment and put qualified teachers in every classroom.
- Encourage and reward teacher knowledge and skill.
- Create schools that are organized for student and teacher success.

Clearly these teachers thought that standards, teacher preparation, and teacher recruitment, together with creating an appropriate climate for learning, were essential to improving the quality of instruction and learning in U.S. classrooms. These issues are also central for the teacher-preparation institutions represented at this conference. Arts educators can no longer “do their own thing.” The public and politicians expect tax dollars spent on education—from kindergarten through the university level—to go for instruction relevant to preparing students for the world of adult work. Many of us may have reservations about the current trend to pare down the curriculum at all levels. Nevertheless, it does exist, and we must respond to it in some way. The common vision provided by the National Standards helps us to communicate about the development of the relevant and practical skills and about the aesthetic sensitivities that are nurtured in an education that includes meaningful study of the arts.

The National Standards have had wide acceptance as a starting point for developing state standards. A survey by the American Music Conference in 1996 indicates that forty-six states have developed some form of arts standards based on the national model.<sup>2</sup> Some music educators with whom I have spoken from various states feel that their states have adopted standards that are so vague to be toothless. Nonetheless, most agree that it is better to have some form of a standard than to have none, because standards indicate that music and the arts deserve recognition in the educational big picture.

It is easy, even in the states that have “good” standards, to question their impact when there is so little current evidence of a dramatic change in music instruction. Here it is important to recognize that the implementation process occurs over time and through stages. According to a compilation of research by the National Science Foundation on implementing math and science instructional models (1991)<sup>3</sup>, the stages of implementation for a new idea in education are as follows:

- Awareness—recognizing or locating an idea, product, or practice
- Understanding—agreeing with the basic concept; willingness to take the next step
- Adoption/Adaption—deciding to move ahead; commitment
- Implementation—putting knowledge to use in a new setting
- Institutionalization—establishing use that continues after the initial glow has ended

Some have said that it takes up to twenty-five years to implement changes in the field of education. This may be true, since we tend to teach the way we were taught. Our natural resistance to change may stand in the way of embracing this more holistic vision of music instruction. Many teachers have become cynical about the plethora of reforms and innovations in the last few years. They refuse to invest any energy into considering inclusion of the National Standards into their teaching because they believe that “this too will pass.” Teachers need models on how to incorporate standards, such as composition or listening, into their rehearsals with traditional band, choir, and orchestra ensembles. Some instructional material support is developing, because several of the new music texts incorporate the standards, but this is a slow, expensive process. A key factor in teachers’ resisting change is the isolation most music teachers experience. They often are the only music teacher in their school and have few opportunities to interact with others in their field, especially since staff development funds were so deeply cut during the recession of the early 1990s. They lack the opportunity to share ideas and reinforcement to try out new teaching strategies. Those teachers who see the standards as an addition to what they already must teach fear that an overloaded curriculum will cause student performance to suffer. Finally, and most importantly, since only seven states have planned any form of statewide assessment in the arts, teachers have little accountability to demonstrate through student achievement the inclusion of the standards into their teaching.

Many of us who are a part of the Music Educators National Conference leadership believe that teacher preparation institutions are the best and most viable vehicles for bringing about the successful implementation of the standards and instituting change in the way music is taught. This is based on the belief that, as new teachers are prepared to teach in a more comprehensive, relevant fashion, they will gradually influence the field, and eventually a more holistic instructional model will become the way of work for most music teachers.

The pressure to improve education is immense and has resulted in a great deal of legislation and, some would say, meddling on the part of politicians. Legislative reform agendas are often criticized for their short-term, superficial, “quick fix” nature. The recognition of a need for long-term vision must therefore come from the educational community itself. The growing loss of faith in public education is a critical issue in the United States today, and we all must work to address it. The coming together of the educational community with visionary statements like those of the National Standards for the Arts and the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future<sup>4</sup> can go a long way toward addressing the roller-coaster nature of recent reform movements if we are willing to stay the course and be serious about implementing the changes implied in those visions.

Most music teachers I know are excellent problem solvers. They are creative teachers, good managers, and have the best interests of their students at heart. They demonstrate many activities that I characterize as “random acts of improvement.” They are busily and independently going about improving the instruction they

provide in their schools. The challenge we face as a profession is to engage in "aligned acts of improvement." We no longer have the time or the resources to teach one set of skills at the middle school and have totally different methodologies and learning objectives for high school students. It probably was never a very good plan in the first place to have so little coordination of instruction among music programs, but the need to demonstrate continuity and relevance to the world beyond school has made the better alignment of the music curriculum a critical necessity.

Charles Darwin once said that it is not the strongest of the species that survive, nor the most intelligent, but the one most responsive to change. Despite all the criticism and challenges educators have received, communicating the need for aligned change within each classroom is our greatest challenge. The effects of the external pressures of emotional, physical, or financial survival often lead us to behave differently than would personal self-assessment. It is much easier to see the changes others should make than to recognize that need for change within ourselves. The dearth of external influences upon the current teaching force to incorporate the standards into their teaching stands at the heart of the slow pace of the implementation of the standards.

Concurrent with the pressure to change education, and the resistance to that change, is the growing concern about the aging of the teaching force and the decline in the number of degrees issued in music education. Based on a March 1996 survey done by the National Education Association, the portrait of today's typical teacher is that "she makes \$35,549 a year, is white, and at 43, she's not as young as she used to be. She's also more experienced than ever, having worked some 16 years in her profession."<sup>5</sup> According to the U.S. Department of Education, in 2003-04, forty percent of the current teaching force will have retired or left teaching.<sup>6</sup>

There is not a large pool of upcoming teachers to fill those vacancies. In 1984-85, 3,671 bachelor's degrees, 945 master's degrees, and 75 doctoral degrees were awarded in music education. In 1989-90, that declined to 2,883 bachelor's, 897 master's, and 71 doctorates. The declining trend continued in 1994-95 with 2,747 bachelor's, 749 master's, and an increase to 103 doctorates. There has been a concurrent improvement in the ratio of the number of music teachers to students in the classroom. This will eventually be difficult to sustain without an adequate pool of teacher applicants to replace those retiring or leaving the profession. In 1989-90, the pupil teacher ratio was 531 to 1; in 1994-95 it was 504 to 1; and the most recent figures for 1996-97 show a 469 to 1 ratio. This good news for us in music education will turn sour unless the downward trend of students receiving music education degrees changes. The other and equally unappealing possibility is that the people hired to fill those vacancies will be untrained as educators or musicians and thus the quality of our programs will eventually suffer. All programs will be affected by the impact of the music teacher shortage, but a recent informal survey done by the current MENC president,Carolynn Lindeman, indicates that there is already a shortage of teachers willing to teach in elementary programs.<sup>7</sup>

Clearly we must all take seriously the charge from the National Commission of Teaching and America's Future to "fix teacher recruitment and put a qualified teacher in every classroom." If we do "fix" teacher recruitment, we will be able to make music education better and more comprehensive by better preparing this large crop of new teachers by using the vision established by the National Standards. In this way, we can act on this charge to reinvent teacher preparation and professional development and get serious about standards. We can make music programs more relevant to students' futures by incorporating consumer skills such as listening and by making connections to other parts of the curriculum, as well as providing a window on aesthetic values, soulfulness, and beauty that too often is not a part of young people's everyday life. The negative repercussions of a teacher shortage can be turned into an opportunity to create a new teaching force with a larger vision of what music education entails.

It goes without saying that we are all responsible for improving education. The finger pointing and blame laying that sometimes exist between K-12 education and universities does nothing to solve the problems we face in the music profession. The lack of respect that is shown in some specialties for the music education degree is a cancer among us that will ultimately be our undoing. If the most talented and brightest among our students are "too good" to be our teachers, what level of competence is acceptable for those who teach our young people about the magic of making music? There is no "they" who will solve this problem for us. There is only us, and we must all solve it together.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, *National Standards for Arts Education: What Every Young American Should Know and Be Able To Do in the Arts* (Reston, Va.: Music Educators National Conference, 1994).

<sup>2</sup> American Music Conference, "Arts Standards Impact Grows," *ACM News* (Fall 1997): 1.

<sup>3</sup> D. P. Ely and A. M. Huberman, *User-Friendly Handbook for Project Dissemination: Science, Math, Engineering and Technology* (Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation, 1991).

<sup>4</sup> National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, "What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future," Executive Summary, Columbia Teachers College (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1996).

<sup>5</sup> J. Archer, "NEA's Portrait of a Public School Teacher: White, Female, Aging," *Education Week* 16 (9 July 1997): 40.

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Department of Education, *Music and Music Education Degrees Conferred, 1985-1995* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1996), 16.

<sup>7</sup> C. Lindeman, National Executive Board of Music Educators National Conference, "Can We Talk?" (E-mail exchange, January 1998).

## REFERENCE

Peeno, L., et al., *Status of Arts Assessment in the States* (Reston, Va.: National Art Education Association, 1996).

# IMPLEMENTING THE NATIONAL K–12 MUSIC STANDARDS: FLORIDA

JOHN J. DEAL

*Florida State University*

Florida's *Sunshine State Standards*<sup>1</sup> in the arts were developed during 1994–96 as part of Florida's Process for School Improvement and Accountability, a 1991 initiative to improve the quality of education for all students in the state. The *Standards*, in seven curricular areas (arts, foreign languages, health and physical education, language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies) are designed to address Goal 3 of the eight state education goals: "Students successfully compete at the highest levels nationally and internationally and are prepared to make well-reasoned, thoughtful, and healthy lifelong decisions."

The *Sunshine State Standards*, adopted by the State Board of Education in May 1996, are statements of what students should know and be able to do at four checkpoints in their career—the end of 2nd, 4th, 8th, and 12th grades. The *Standards* also represent those knowledges and skills for which all schools are held accountable, although statewide assessment currently includes only reading, writing, and mathematics.

Modeled after the *National Standards for Arts Education*<sup>2</sup>, the *Sunshine State Standards* differ primarily in their structure and in the standards provided for pre-kindergarten students. Further, the *Sunshine State Standards* include a section dealing with "applications to life," an area not covered by the national document. The structure of the *Sunshine State Standards* is hierarchical and follows the typical general-to-specific format. The top level of organization is five *strands* (or categories of knowledge): (a) Skills and Techniques; (b) Creation and Communication; (c) Cultural and Historical Connections; (d) Aesthetic and Critical Analysis; and (e) Applications to Life. These five strands are the same across all four arts areas, thus providing consistency in education outcomes in music, visual arts, dance, and theatre.

Within each strand are organized standards, benchmarks, and sample performance descriptions, all targeted toward one or more of the sub-goals of Goal 3 of the state's education goals. *Standards* are general statements of expected learner achievement, while *benchmarks* are statements of what a student should know and be able to do at the end of the developmental levels of grades preK-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12. *Sample performance descriptions* are examples of tasks by which a student could demonstrate achievement of the benchmark. A sample hierarchy in music follows:

**Strand:**

*D. Aesthetic and Critical Analysis*

**Standard:**

*The student listens to, analyzes, and describes music.*

**Benchmark (Grades 3-5):**

*The student knows how to analyze simple songs in regard to rhythm, melodic movement, and basic forms (e.g., ABA, verse, and refrain).*

**Sample Performance Description:**

*Achievement of the benchmarks may be demonstrated when the student listens to “Dona Nobis Pacem” and moves his or her arm in simple arches to show the beginning and ending of the melodic phrases.*

**Goal 3 Standards: 1, 2, 4**

Since the adoption of the *Sunshine State Standards* in 1996, several projects have been initiated to assist teachers in implementing the *Standards*. Before discussing two of those projects, however, it is important to provide an overview of the four organizations that have worked together in these efforts. Florida is fortunate in having a high degree of cooperation among several agencies, all of which have implementation of the *Sunshine State Standards* as one of their primary goals.

The Florida Higher Education Arts Network (FHEAN) was organized in 1985 as a result of a Board of Regents' review of visual and performing arts programs in the State University System (SUS). Originally founded as a liaison between the SUS units and the Board of Regents, the organization now functions primarily as a vehicle for discussion of problems and issues facing arts units throughout the state. Although FHEAN originally consisted of deans and directors of arts departments/schools in four-year public and private institutions, recent incorporation has resulted in a broader membership to include chairs of arts departments and, probably, the heads of arts departments from some or all of Florida's twenty-eight junior and community colleges.

A second entity is Arts for a Complete Education/Florida Alliance for Arts Education (ACE/FAAE). This organization has a dual function: (1) arts advocacy throughout the state; and (2) representing Florida in the Kennedy Center Alliance for Arts Education Network (KCAAEN). ACE/FAAE involves representatives from the business community, K-12 educators, higher education, local arts agencies, community arts presenters, and other arts advocates. Although the group maintains a large board of directors, day-to-day operations are controlled by an executive committee and two standing committees: (1) Awareness; and (2) Curriculum and Professional Development. It is the mission of the latter committee to work directly toward the implementation of the *Sunshine State Standards* and to assist with efforts to provide the highest quality of arts instruction for all children in Florida.

Two state agencies also are involved in this mission: (1) the Department of Education (DOE); and (2) the Department of State's Division of Cultural Affairs (DCA). The Department of Education has divided the state into six Area Centers for Cultural Enhancement (ACEEs)—whose purpose is to provide professional development and technical assistance to Florida public schools in the implementation of the *Sunshine State Standards*. Additionally, the ACEEs coordinate efforts to incorporate the *Standards* into preservice education.

The Division of Cultural Affairs (DCA), one of several divisions within the Department of State, serves as a re-granting agency for state and NEA funds, and a large portion of that money is targeted for arts-in-education projects. Both DCA and DOE are also financial supporters of ACE/FAAE, which serves as the umbrella organization for arts advocacy statewide.

Two initiatives directed at implementation of the *Standards* have occurred in Florida over the past two years. The first was a series of conferences sponsored by FHEAN; the second, a series of two inservice workshops presented jointly by ACE/FAAE and DOE's Area Centers for Educational Enhancement.

FHEAN sponsored the first of two conferences in fall 1995. Entitled "Changes, Choices, and Collaborations: Implementing the *National Standards for the Arts in Florida, K–University*," the conference focused on the implications of the implementation of the *National Standards* on curriculum development, teacher inservice and preservice, and community involvement. Participants in the conference included representatives from higher education, K–12, local arts agencies, community arts presenters, and other advocates for arts education.

The conference centered around the presentation of papers dealing with each of the three focus areas and prepared in advance by leading arts advocates. Prepared responses to each paper were delivered by two persons. FHEAN purposely sought to involve as speakers and responders those who might provide poignant insights and reactions to the issues and those who might ask probing questions outside the "comfort zone" of the participants.

A second FHEAN conference was held in fall 1996. FHEAN members were encouraged to establish committees in their communities or regions that would work at the local level toward implementation of the *Sunshine State Standards*. These committees met in a central location to work with a facilitator to develop strategies to be used upon their return to their communities or regions. A great deal of synergistic energy was developed during this session. The two conferences together provided some of the first opportunities for a diverse group of constituents to gather and discuss the implications of the implementation of the *Sunshine State Standards*.

The second initiative is currently in progress and consists of the presentation of arts inservice workshops in each of DOE's ACEE districts. Sponsored jointly by DOE and ACE/FAAE, the goal of the sessions is to build capacity among K–12 teachers in implementing the *Sunshine State Standards*. One set of workshops was presented in fall 1997 and dealt with two of the *Standards'* strands: (1) Creation and Communication and, (2) Aesthetic and Critical Analysis. A second series of workshops in spring 1998 will address two additional strands: (3) Cultural and Historical Connections and (4) Applications to Life.

The workshops are designed as "train the trainer" workshops in that participants are expected to return to their home schools/districts and serve as resource persons to colleague teachers as they implement the *Sunshine State Standards* in their own schools. Participants who attend both fall and spring workshops will be eligible for membership in the Florida League of Arts Teachers (FLOAT), a newly-designed

resource base of arts educators. Clinicians who presented the workshops were selected from the ranks of arts supervisors and higher education arts faculty, providing further articulation between K-12 and university arts faculty.

Although much work remains to be done, Florida students will benefit from the efforts of all involved in these projects. Florida is exceedingly fortunate in that the four organizations discussed above are all working toward the same goal—providing the highest quality of arts education for all of Florida's children.

### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> State of Florida, Department of State, *Sunshine State Standards* (Tallahassee, Fla.: State of Florida, Department of State, 1996).

<sup>2</sup> Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, *National Standards for Arts Education: What Every Young American Should Know and Be Able To Do in the Arts* (Reston, Va.: Music Educators National Conference, 1994).

# IMPLEMENTING THE NATIONAL K-12 MUSIC STANDARDS: CALIFORNIA

PATRICIA TAYLOR LEE  
*San Francisco State University*

I am happy to report that discussion of the national voluntary standards for K-12 education in music is still alive in California, both at the state and district levels. There is a resurgence of interest in establishing high-quality music programs and a serious shortage of candidates to fill the needed positions. Nevertheless, the rhetoric of standards is too often at odds with the reality of the funding. California provides, once again, a study in paradox and not a paradigm.

In California, the nine content standards from the national report have been recast as eight goals within four "components" of the *Visual and Performing Arts Framework*, published in 1996 by the California Department of Education.<sup>1</sup> This framework, now in its third revision, identifies the four components of excellent music education as (1) Artistic Perception; (2) Creative Expression; (3) Historical and Cultural Context; and (4) Aesthetic Valuing.

Those familiar with the National Standards will recognize that the goals of the Artistic Perception component correspond to numbers 5 and 6 of the National Standards: reading and notating, listening, analyzing, and describing.<sup>2</sup> The Creative Expression component corresponds to the first four national goals, which involve singing, performing on instruments, improvising, and composing and arranging. The third component, Historical and Cultural Context, incorporates both the third and ninth national goals. The California framework asks that "students develop knowledge and skills necessary to understand and perform music from all parts of the world" as well as "develop knowledge and understanding of the relationship of music to history and culture."<sup>3</sup> The final component, Aesthetic Valuing, relates directly to the seventh national standard, evaluating.

Omitted from the California Visual and Performing Arts Framework is any reference to the eighth national standard, "Understanding music in relation to other disciplines." Presumably, in their zeal to establish music as a discipline worthy of study in and for itself, the authors of the California Framework chose to ignore its connections to other art forms and other modes of inquiry.

Where the National Standards suggest appropriate achievement levels for each content standard in Pre-kindergarten, K-4, 5-8, and 9-12, the California Framework offers examples of knowledge and skills for each of the goals and establishes two alternate tracks for grades 9-12, one "proficient" and the other "advanced." For example, the proficient high-schooler would "improvise stylistically appropriate harmonizing parts to given rhythmic and melodic phrases." The advanced student at the same age would be able to do this "in a variety of styles—tonal and atonal." Each goal has been similarly tailored to two levels of possible accomplishment for the high school student.

At the district level, the National Standards also continue to provide an excellent reference for discussion. Last week I met with a group of San Francisco Unified

School District music teachers who had devoted their morning retreat to discussion of the district's own elaborately detailed Content and Performance Standards in Music. This document, now in its fourth reading (each by a different team of music educators), clearly draws from the National Standards and includes the "Connections, Relations, Applications" expectations that are missing from the California Framework. One member of the fourth reading team told me of his special contribution to the enterprise: He had insisted on substitution of the word "and" for "or" in the standard that called for "*singing and playing.*" His argument? An administrator facing budget difficulties might choose to cut instrumental programs if the standards could be met by singing alone. Such are the political realities in California!

The recent lean budget years have taken their toll on music education in California schools. As music programs disappeared from many districts, career preparation in music education became less attractive to qualified students. Prosperous communities began to contract for arts services from "professionals" who could offer "enrichment" to their children. Such arrangements were attractive to administrators, for they required no payment of benefits and could be funded through partnerships with parents, corporations, foundations, or individual donors. What such arts providers lack, of course, is the scope and sequence of real instruction in music. Too often they reinforce the concept of music as entertainment, as a frill. Rarely are they attentive to the goals of the Framework for Performing Arts.

The reality of music education in California schools is as varied as our topography, our population, and the personal income of our residents. Within California, one can find both school districts where high-quality programs exist within normal school budgets and districts of immense wealth, where parents have subsidized basic education to provide splendid in-school or after-school arts programs. In other districts, however, children have virtually no opportunities to experience music, and the level of academic and artistic achievement is among the lowest in the country.

California schools have long been overcrowded. With the California economy now much improved, this year Governor Pete Wilson issued a directive to reduce elementary class sizes. The results have been a severe shortage of classrooms and of teachers. At the same time that standards for the Single Subject Credential in Music have been significantly raised, a record number of teachers, unprepared or underprepared, are teaching with emergency credentials. School districts are being encouraged to develop their own on-site credential programs to provide a quick fix for the lack of qualified teachers. At the same time, the Department of Education's Commission on Teacher Credentialing has adopted much stricter standards for all music programs in higher education. These standards now incorporate significant goals from the National Standards and from our own NASM standards. New music education program requirements include composing and arranging, improvising, use of music from diverse cultures, and valuing (peer critiques).

On Wednesday of this week, California's superintendent of public instruction, Delaine Eastin, issued the report of the California Arts Work Task Force<sup>4</sup> on which my colleague Carolynn Lindeman, the president of MENC, served. This report calls

for “high quality, comprehensive, and sequential visual and performing arts programs based on clearly delineated content and performance standards in every public school for all students.” It calls for literacy in and through the arts, standards and assessment, preparation for careers, and access for all students. It speaks to the legislation and policy, funding activities, coordination, assistance, resources, and partnership efforts necessary to achieve these ambitious goals. As an example of partnership, it calls for the University of California and California State University systems to establish entrance requirements in the arts as a condition of admission. The importance of this kind of incentive for change cannot be overstated.

Assessment in the arts last occurred nationwide in the seventies. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) comprehensive arts testing is projected to begin again in 2007, at grades 4, 8, and 12. Many teachers are apprehensive that testing will begin before the standards are fully implemented. “How can one test the performance of twelfth graders who have not had the full sequence?” they ask. Yet assessment is clearly the necessary “stick” that will ensure that standards are taken seriously.

Higher education must keep this discussion alive. All music education programs in California colleges and universities are called to take a decisive leadership role in quickly and efficiently preparing the new cadre of music educators. Partnerships with local school districts, accelerated curricular offerings, and intensive summer programs are being developed to address the crisis of preparation and staffing that exists throughout the state. The enhanced California Single Subject Credential program in music is designed to prepare teachers to engage in the creative and evaluative activities that meet the goals of both the National Standards and the California *Visual and Performing Arts Framework*.

In this most diverse of states, the inclusion of music from diverse cultures seems particularly appropriate and vital to the education of our children. Faculty in higher education must serve as role models for meeting these standards, make frequent reference to their importance, and take a more vigorous role in helping school districts to implement programs that contribute significantly to student achievement in music.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Education, *Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve* (Sacramento, 1996), 62.

<sup>2</sup> Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, *National Standards for Arts Education: What Every Young American Should Know and Be Able To Do in the Arts* (Reston, Va.: Music Educators National Conference, 1994).

<sup>3</sup> *Visual and Performing Arts Framework*, see note 1 above.

<sup>4</sup> California Department of Education, *Arts Work: A Call for Arts Education for All California Students*, Report of the Superintendent’s Task Force on the Visual and Performing Arts (Sacramento, 1997), 1.

---

---

## OPEN FORUM: EVALUATION, PLANNING, AND PROJECTIONS IN SMALLER MUSIC UNITS

---

---

### INTRODUCTION

DANIEL TADDIE  
*Maryville College*

Evaluation, planning, and projections have assumed greater importance in the revised NASM standards and procedures, in the assessment standards of regional accrediting bodies, and in national trends generally. Given the time constraints and the responsibilities for managing numerous details, many executives in smaller music units find it difficult to attend to these issues and the larger leadership values that they represent. The purpose of this forum is to consider concepts, principles, and practical applications of evaluation, planning, and projections as they apply to smaller music units, to exchange ideas, and to share successful processes and strategies.

The three terms at the heart of this forum are defined in the *NASM Handbook* as follows: "Evaluations provide analyses of current effectiveness; planning provides systematic approaches to the future; and projections create understanding of potential contexts and conditions."<sup>1</sup> These processes are, of course, linked with mission, goals, and objectives. In essence, mission, goals, and objectives ask the question, "What do we want to achieve?" Evaluation asks, "How do we know whether and how well we have achieved our goals?" Planning and projections ask, "What do we do with what we have learned?"

Resources from NASM for addressing issues of evaluation, planning, and projections include the *Handbook*, the *Procedures*, *The Assessment of Undergraduate Programs in Music*, and the *Sourcebook for Futures Planning, Appendix IV: Creating Your Self-Study*.<sup>2</sup>

Evaluation, as already mentioned, is the assessment of whether and how well goals are being achieved. This process may be comprehensive, as in the case of a Self-Study and NASM Team Visit, or targeted to a specific area, such as student learning and achievement. I would like to focus on this latter specific subject, beginning with some general questions and principles and proceeding to illustrations drawn from the experiences of the Maryville Collège music faculty. Some of the specific practices that I mention may or may not apply to your particular institution, but I hope to use these examples to make the larger issues concrete. I invite you to consider ways in which your institution evaluates student learning and achievement and to share those with the group during the discussion period.

Some general questions include the following: What tools can be used to determine whether goals are being met? What internal and external instruments and information are available to facilitate assessment? What must be created from scratch? With what institution-wide practices can evaluation and planning in the music unit be dovetailed? How can student achievement be evaluated? What internal and external indicators of student achievement are already in place? How can these be improved? What gaps are there in the evaluation process? How can these be filled? How can the results of such assessment be used to strengthen student achievement, instruction, course and curriculum design, and integration of knowledge and skills? How can the assessment process lead to reaffirmation, refinement, or revision of mission, goals, and objectives? What is the best process and timetable for this department?

Approximately six years ago, the Maryville College faculty and administration drafted an assessment plan designed to respond to the new emphasis of the regional accrediting agency on outcomes assessment. All academic divisions were to conduct reviews of their goals, major programs, curricula, and departmental procedures on a rotating basis over a five-year period. Library evaluations were to be a part of this five-year review. Goals and means of assessment were left to individual departments. Written reports were to be submitted to the Academic Life Council and Academic Vice President, and an oral report was to be given to the whole faculty. Recommendations with budget implications were to be discussed with the Academic Vice President and Faculty Liaison Committee. A special committee was to draft a plan for, and assess, general education.

The suggested assessment paradigm contains five major headings: (1) what is to be assessed; that is, the specific goals; (2) the data sources and procedures; (3) findings; (4) recommendations; and (5) reports, their frequency, and to whom they should be sent. Divisions have been encouraged, insofar as possible, to use assessment tools and procedures already in place, supplementing them as necessary and creating a coherent total process.

One longstanding practice at Maryville College has been comprehensive examinations during the senior year. Under the current structure, all music majors—Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Music students—take examinations in music theory, aural skills, and music history. The theory test requires a comprehensive analysis of a nineteenth-century work in piano score, and the aural skills quiz includes sightsinging and dictation. The music history examination covers the content of four music history courses, two in Western fine arts music, one in American music, and one in non-Western music; it consists of four essays, short answers covering composers and terms, and two intelligent listening questions. Bachelor of Music students must take an additional examination in the special field. Performance majors take a written examination in the pedagogy and literature of their instrument. In addition, about two weeks before the test, they are given four representative “self-study” selections to prepare on their own. They then take a half-hour oral examination, during which they must perform the pieces and respond to questions about technique, interpretation.

form, and historical background as they apply to these four pieces. Music education students write essays responding to theoretical issues and practical teaching situations. Students must pass all components of the comprehensive examination, and the final grades are entered on the transcripts. The music faculty is now in the midst of its five-year program review and has recommended that comprehensive examinations be revised to reflect new course emphases and a greater integration of all music courses. Hence, one of the fruits of the process is the evaluation of the instruments of evaluation as well as assessment of student learning.

As might be expected, then, comprehensive examinations constitute a major assessment tool. Other useful assessment information is gathered from other offices and individuals on campus. The music faculty has created a chart for all music majors who have taken comprehensive examinations in the past five years. The chart lists each student's name and degree objective; grades on comprehensive examinations (separate components and overall average); cumulative grade point average; music grade point average; where applicable, the scores for all components of the National Teachers Examination and grades for the music methods practica and student teaching; and, for all students, current activities, such as placement in graduate study or a teaching position.

The sample assessment paradigm (see Table 1) illustrates the process for music major learning goal 5: specialized knowledge and skills necessary for professional degrees in performance (piano or voice) and music education. The data sources and findings reflect the assessment process that I have just described. The recommendations as they stand express satisfaction with performance evaluations, both the results and the process, but call for further work on aspects of the music education program. Narrative evaluations from cooperating teachers for music methods practica and student teaching have customarily been passed along to the students, and no copies have been retained. Because of the potential value of such documents for program assessment, the report heading calls for the education faculty to forward copies of these documents to the chair of the Division of Fine Arts. Hence, once again, the evaluation process has yielded both useful information about student learning and strategies for doing so in a better way.

Other recommendations to date include the rearticulation of the mission of the music department, revision of some learning goals, and the creation of a matrix linking objectives based on NASM learning competencies with specific courses.

This illustration describes how one institution has addressed some of the broader questions previously articulated. The stated goals constitute the starting point; and the focus is on broad measures of student achievement, both internal and external, near the end of the educational process. To the extent possible, tools already in place are employed; and useful information is gathered from other offices and individuals on campus. A feedback loop leads to revisions and improvements of the program and its methods of evaluation.

**Table 1**  
**The Sample Assessment Paradigm**

**What Is To Be Assessed?**

e.g., student learning goal: specialized knowledge and skills necessary for professional degrees in performance (piano/voice), music education

**Data Sources/Procedures**

e.g., course examinations, comprehensive examinations, evaluations of music methods practica and student teaching, self-study selections covering the chief style periods

**Findings**

e.g., performance: comprehensive examinations assess well, all performance majors achieved B or higher on performance component

e.g., music education: students achieved good grades from public school cooperating teachers in music methods practica and student teaching

**Recommendations**

e.g., consider the place of conducting in comprehensive examinations, reevaluate the music methods practica (cross-check goals with *NASM Handbook*, interview students to determine goals achieved/not achieved, discuss delivery of the course with education faculty and academic vice president)

**Reports/Frequency/To Whom**

e.g., on an ongoing basis, obtain from education faculty narrative evaluations from cooperating teachers for music methods practica and student teaching

**ENDNOTE**

<sup>1</sup> National Association of Schools of Music, *1997-1998 Handbook*.

# PLANNING

CATHERINE HENDEL  
*Clarke College*

Planning is a continual process of an informed and systematic reflection on and response to in-place procedures and practices carried on by all full-time faculty members. Stated differently and perhaps more simply, planning is a process in which full-time faculty members consciously attend to being the best they can be today, and set goals to assure the best tomorrow.

As suggested by the College Music Society in its *Report on Music in the Undergraduate Curriculum: A Reassessment*, planning requires that we keep the students and their needs in the forefront of our minds.<sup>1</sup> Planning is deciding what we want to be as a music unit, and then taking the necessary steps to arrive at that goal.

This complex process happens neither in isolation, nor in a timely fashion. We must seek assistance from without and within, and take the time to do it right. With this in mind, I would like to examine the description in detail.

*Planning is:*

1. continual process
2. informed
3. systematic examination of
  - a. in-place procedures
  - b. in-place practices
4. reflection and response
5. done by all full-time faculty

In the past, planning in many of our schools coincided solely with a limited self-study and review process. It may have resembled a pattern in which a major portion of the ten-year interim between self-studies was spent in a “recovery and rest,” with an unwelcome “reawakening” in the latter part of year nine! Obviously, this is a worst-case scenario. What I know, and I suspect you do also, is that planning is an activity that takes place every year. Using the “equation concept” recommended in NASM’s *Sourcebook for Futures Planning*, planning can occur in relation to the “total program or to specific discrete elements of the total program.”<sup>2</sup> Use of this approach provides a wide variety of alternative styles in which to plan successfully for the future. Simply reading the NASM program and curriculum standards, we catch a glimpse of this equation concept—the parts: operational components and specific curriculum within the whole: your unique music program. The following model provides one of many possible “continual” planning schema that not only enrich the ongoing attention to the issues of maintaining a strong, viable music program, but also simplify the more formal self-study process by using the remote planning and results that have occurred throughout the interim period.

## PLANNING MODEL

- Year 1 Complete self-study NASM visitation
- Year 2 Complete response as needed  
Accreditation renewed
- Year 3 Review budget for compliance with music unit's long-range plan  
Assess progress in annual department goals
- Year 4 Review catalog copy  
Update or refine mission, goals, objectives  
Revise, add, delete curricular offerings  
Review clarity and precision of procedures
- Year 5 Mid-term review of unit  
Review and revise budget for compliance with music unit's  
long-range plan  
Assess progress in annual department goals relative to personnel  
and equipment
- Year 6 Review catalog copy  
Update or refine mission, goals, objectives  
Revise, add, delete curricular offerings  
Review clarity and precision of procedures
- Year 7 Review budget for compliance with music unit's long-range plan  
Assess progress in annual department goals
- Year 8 Review catalog copy  
Update or refine mission, goals, objectives  
Revise, add, delete curricular offerings  
Review clarity and precision of procedures
- Year 9 Review and revise budget for compliance with music unit's  
long-range plan  
Assess progress in annual department goals
- Year 10 Begin "formal" self-study process

In addition to its continual character, planning must be informed. Planning that enhances, enriches, and solidifies music programs turns outward to gain perspective. Scholars in the field of higher education, in the arts, and in music and the support and materials available in our own backyard at NASM can offer both insight about our task and suggested procedures for achieving it.

Ernest Boyer might describe the planning process as "a shared vision of intellectual and social possibilities." He also provides us with a higher view of the task, namely an "energetic view of scholarship,"<sup>3</sup> that is frequently distorted by the small steps of our students in their day-to-day struggle toward musical understanding and competency. This scholarship is at the heart of the mission of our institutions and our

music departments. It is the challenge we present in the goals and objectives we set for our faculties, “a challenge to strengthen research, integration, application, and teaching.”<sup>4</sup> It is a challenge that overflows in response to the needs of our students.

While the College Music Society’s *Report on the Undergraduate Curriculum* does not address planning directly, the inferences are easily made. This committee speaks of “the need for a more comprehensive perspective” and suggests that it is essential that we revisit the old language and inspect new language in describing our goals and aspirations.<sup>5</sup> The old language may refer to issues ranging from defining music to the limitations of a curriculum based solely on Western music. The new language evolves from a variety of sources that might include technology, global music, new notation systems, new descriptions of traditional and ancient musics, or extramusical issues relative to management and finances. What is critical in this situation is that we use both old and new sources to help inform our best efforts in the planning process.

Informed planning also looks inward to the issues that require attention. The planning may need to address the consistency with which the music unit expresses the NASM standards. But NASM is the first to emphasize that “evaluation, planning and making projections are a set of activities that relate to all aspects of a music unit’s work” and exist to serve the music program within the larger context of scholarship in higher education.<sup>6</sup> The college catalog and publications provide another internal means of informing the planning process. These sources reveal the congruency between the institution and music unit’s expression and implementation of mission, goals, and objectives. This information is critical to successful planning.

It is essential that planning be systematic and that this ordered process occur through in-place procedures and practices. The planning model suggested above demonstrates a systematic approach that occurs through in-place procedures and practices. This model reflects some, but not all of the procedures that we practice at our college at regular intervals. I would invite you to identify the in-place procedures and practices in your setting and at what frequency they occur, and then to examine how these procedures and practices inform your long-range planning process.

The next stage of planning is the juncture at which the results of evaluation are given direction or are responded to in such a way that projections can be made. Stated differently, questions needing responses are acted upon. This part of the planning requires that we “consider” the questions or results of the evaluation, we “determine” a direction, and “evaluate”<sup>7</sup> the proposed action for suitability, practicality, desirability, and other important factors. Frequently, the step in which consideration or reflection upon the information takes place gets shortchanged. This step is crucial if the planning process is to provide a comprehensive foundation upon which futures can be built. Moreover, all of these steps come before making successful, final projections.

In addition to my own personal bias and professional practice, many experts and various sources encourage and promote the inclusion of all faculty in the planning

process. Ernest Boyer suggests that while institutional leadership plays a significant role in determining the quality of scholarship or the excellence of its total program,

when all is said and done, faculty themselves must assume the primary responsibility for giving scholarship a richer, more vital meaning. . . . The faculty are the gatekeepers, they define the curriculum, set standards for graduation, and determine criteria by which faculty performance will be measured—and rewarded. Only as faculty help shape their purposes and engage actively in policy formulation [and I might add planning] will a broader view of scholarship be authentically embraced.<sup>8</sup>

I will be the first to admit that these comments are not earth shaking. It is my hope, however, that by casting a light on those procedures and practices that are so obvious and ever-present to music executives, we might better be able to plan more efficiently and more successfully. As Harold Best in his collaborative quote of Peter Drucker suggested: “Planning does not deal with future decisions. It deals with the futurity of present decisions. Planning deals with what we have to do today to be ready for an uncertain tomorrow.”<sup>9</sup>

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> College Music Society, *Music in the Undergraduate Curriculum: A Reassessment*, Report of the Study Group of the Content of the Undergraduate Music Curriculum, no. 7. (Boulder, Colo.: College Music Society, Inc., 1989), 11–12.

<sup>2</sup> National Association of Schools of Music, *Sourcebook for Futures Planning, Supplement IV: Creating Your Self-Study* (Reston, Va.: 1996), 17.

<sup>3</sup> Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate* (Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990), 78.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> College Music Society, 15.

<sup>6</sup> National Association of Schools of Music, *1997–1998 Handbook* (Reston, Va.: 1997), 70.

<sup>7</sup> NASM, *Sourcebook for Futures Planning*, 19.

<sup>8</sup> Boyer, 78–79.

<sup>9</sup> Harold Best, “Creative Uses of the Self-Study,” in National Association of Schools of Music, *Proceedings of the 70th Annual Meeting* (Reston, Va.: 1994), 105.

# PROJECTIONS

ALAN WINGARD

*Shorter College*

The concept of institutional effectiveness seems to pervade the philosophy of accreditation. According to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools,

this concept presumes that each member institution is engaged in an ongoing quest for quality and can demonstrate how well it fulfills its stated purpose. The quality and effectiveness of education provided by each member institution are major considerations in accreditation decisions.<sup>1</sup>

Although all accrediting agencies seem to recognize the difficulty of evaluating educational quality and effectiveness, they do require a comprehensive system of planning and evaluation in all areas.<sup>2</sup> In this overall process, evaluation, planning, and projections are inextricably bound. The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) recognizes that institutions are not all alike, and its handbook states that "the music unit shall evaluate, plan, and make projections consistent with and supportive of its missions, goals, and objectives and its size and scope."<sup>3</sup>

My assignment is to discuss the third part of the process, "projections," in the small music unit. According to NASM, evaluation, planning, and projections are a

set of activities that relate to all aspects of a music unit's work. Each music unit must determine the scope, breadth, and degree of formal systematic attention to this set of interconnected activities as it makes decisions about (1) mission, goals, and objectives; (2) present and future operational conditions; (3) resource allocation and development; (4) specific programs and services.<sup>4</sup>

To accomplish this task, institutions must involve faculty, staff, and students in the process. NASM requires that "regular, systematic attention shall be given to internal and external indicators of student achievement." The process itself involves all aspects of the music unit's work, including adding, altering, or deleting curricula and addressing "multiple, long-term programmatic and resource issues."<sup>5</sup> This might include (a) planning for the improvement of current programs; (b) examining the viability of current programs; (c) assessing the need for new programs; (d) planning new programs.<sup>6</sup> In our small music unit, this included the reduction of common-core requirements in all music degrees, the elimination of a music degree that was not meeting the needs of students, the redesigning of the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Fine Arts in musical theatre degrees, and discussion of the possibility of the addition of a graduate degree in music education.

This process must be pursued with sufficient intellectual rigor and resource allocations to be effective. In the end, it must serve the music unit's programs, rather than the reverse.<sup>7</sup> As a part of our recent self-study document, Shorter College's music unit sought to deal with the future relationship between our mission, goals, and objectives

and our present and projected future resources. This is one of the areas where being a small, liberal arts college has a direct impact on future projections. Our conclusion was that at present, it seems unwise to consider adding additional degrees or courses or many additional students. With reduced faculty teaching loads and limited space, the unit seems to be operating close to its maximum in these areas.

The goals of the music unit have been related to the priority goals of the institution in a *Twenty-First Century Institutional Plan*.<sup>8</sup> Any expansion of the department must be tied to the larger goals and objectives of the institution as well as those of the unit.

We further decided that the most important issues that will influence the future effectiveness of our music unit were the following: funding for music scholarships, faculty salaries, new equipment, additional funding for the concert series, and, particularly, added classroom and performing space. Another equally pressing issue is student retention. The college is addressing the overall financial situation of the institution by building the endowment, securing grants and foundation support, engaging in long-term fund-raising campaigns, and developing the donor base of the institution.

It seems that asking the right questions is the first step of appropriate and potentially positive projection results. Pertinent issues seem to be the analysis of future influences on the music unit as well as ideas and plans to develop from current conditions.<sup>9</sup> In our case, the result was a logical, flexible set of expectations and operational goals for our institution and the music unit.

The most pertinent and pressing "projections" questions facing the small music unit seem to deal with matters of time constraints and financial support. Music executives and faculties who are already stretched to the limit with administrative detail and heavy classroom teaching responsibilities find it difficult to engage in the kind of dialogue and discussion that is needed to assess, plan, and project. One of the most deciding factors is the extent to which budgets provide for the expansion and improvement of programs. In our college, the process of projecting needed changes in programs must go through several phases. Many decisions that originate with the music faculty and administration must be approved by the provost and often by the Curriculum Committee of the college. The extent to which capital needs are approved is dependent upon the resources allocated for the college as a whole and the part of that allocation which is designated for the music unit.

In the section on evaluation, planning, and projections in our recent NASM Self-Study, thirteen of the nineteen projections are in the category of capital needs. In an institution that is primarily tuition driven, realistic time estimates for such projections are critical. Included in this list are additional funding for music scholarships, departmental operating budgets, recruiting and advertising, replacement of pianos in studios and practice rooms, music library materials, faculty development and travel, an expanded concert series, state-of-the-art equipment for teaching studios, classrooms, and offices, and the music computer lab. There are also two projections that are on the Twenty-First Century Master Plan of the college. These

include additional classroom space for the unit and a new performing arts facility. Other unit and college-wide projections include the reduction of faculty teaching loads, increased faculty salaries, the addition of double-major music degree programs, an instrumental program, and a musical theatre specialist.

Since the college has had several consecutive years of financial stability, additional funding for the unit's operating budget, music scholarships, additional faculty, increases in faculty salaries, and added classroom facilities seems more feasible. These needs are a part of the projected issues and activities of the music unit over the next three-to-five-year period.

The purpose of this forum is to share ideas concerning projections in the smaller music unit and to exchange ideas and successful processes and strategies. The following questions might encourage such dialogue:

1. How can the results of evaluation be used to plan for the future?
2. What are the constraints on the small department?
3. What major obstacles to action exist in the small music unit?
4. What opportunities for action exist in the small music unit?
5. How can the articulation of priorities in the small music unit guide the allocation of resources?

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges, *Criteria for Accreditation: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools* (Decatur, Ga.: SACS, 1996): 19.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> National Association of Schools of Music, *1997-1998 Handbook* (Reston, Va.: NASM, 1997): 69.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 70.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> National Association of Schools of Music, *The Assessment of Undergraduate Programs in Music* (Reston, Va.: NASM, 1991), 15.

<sup>7</sup> NASM, *Handbook*, 70.

<sup>8</sup> Shorter College, *Twenty-First Century Institutional Plan* (Rome, Ga.: Shorter College, 1996).

<sup>9</sup> National Association of Schools of Music, *Procedures for Institutional Membership* (Reston, Va.: NASM, 1993), 69.

---

---

## MEETING OF REGION THREE

---

---

### THE PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

TAYLOE HARDING  
*Valdosta State University*

We all value teaching. We say so and we practice it in the classroom. We tell our young student teachers that it is the highest of callings, and even refer to teaching when we urge our nonmusical friends and neighbors to learn more about music. Why then, have we in music so long been unwilling to allow, much less encourage, our colleagues to evaluate, help, emulate, and share our teaching methods and values and our expectations of students? We talk about teaching a lot, but only so long as it is noncontextual. We produce reams of research on what should be taught, but rarely on what we actually teach, even more rarely on how we teach it, and rarest of all on how and if students learn it. We are willing to talk about student outcomes and their assessment, but we are not eager to let our colleagues actually witness how we teach in an effort to meet the outcomes. We are also not particularly interested in taking the time to help our colleagues with their teaching by discussing their values with them and then witnessing them in action in the classroom or studio, and we are even less interested in watching those of our colleagues who are known to be good teachers in an effort to, perhaps, learn something more about the art of teaching ourselves. Why—if we value teaching as we say we do and, like most of us, teach and train—aren't we more willing to engage in a meaningful dialogue about what and why we actually teach what we do and how we expect our students to learn?

To provide some answers to these and other questions about improving teaching effectiveness, I would like to divide my presentation today into three main areas. First, I intend to bring to our attention what most of us can already articulate: why we feel our faculties are reluctant to explore and adopt peer-review procedures in the music unit. Let me say that there are many reasons why those of us who have actually tried have encountered difficulty in going forward with a peer-review policy. Most of these are traditional, but a few important ones are new, and I'll highlight several of both. Obviously, it is important that if we want to make peer review a reality and really use it to improve teaching in our music schools in a meaningful way, we are going to have to understand our faculty's various complaints and excuses for why it won't work, why it's a waste of time, or why they just don't want to do it. Secondly, some case studies of schools that have built peer-review policies and procedures will be presented and compared. Answers to our questions regarding reluctance and whether peer review will work or help will begin to be revealed when we look

at successful models. And last, I'll attempt to summarize what I believe are the most important points common to some of the cases—and some that are not—all in an effort to build an underlying strategy for peer-review development.

## REASONS FOR RELUCTANCE

First, concerning our reluctance and whether or not peer review does or will work, I offer the following:

First, we are fundamentally skeptical of any program that may be inspired by or related to our American society's preoccupation with accountability. Concern about what financial resources are supporting those things that are not effective with the purpose of downsizing them is stressful for our faculty, and rightly so. Our culture is not obsessed with accountability for the purpose of improvement; we're concerned about reallocating to make the strong stronger and to eliminate the weak. Obviously, all of this thinking flies in the face of the concept of development and improvement, which is one of the primary foundations of the ancient university's charge to enlighten society. Why aren't we obsessed with empowering those we've entrusted, even if they do need support and attention, rather than with a constant and often fruitless and wasteful search for the already excellent? We hear and say that renewed interest in working models of peer evaluation of teaching should be formative, primarily for the purpose of improving our effectiveness as teachers, and therefore positive. But when most of the evidence of the genesis of these models reflects processes where observations reached are summatively based, and the results are used primarily for appointment renewal or tenure and promotion decisions, our enthusiasm for visiting and being visited by peers is, naturally, tempered.

Second, we college professors generally feel that how we teach is our business. So long as our students learn and improve, value what we do, and have a positive experience, we feel that what we have done is good enough, and should be left alone. Allowing others to view it while it's happening, for any reason, is a sort of invasion of our most private skill. Allowing others who may criticize what we do and how we do something so personal as teach is absolutely beyond acceptability, especially if what we ourselves value in our teaching is not part of the evaluations of our teaching.

Third is teaching's rank in the hallowed trinity of academe: teaching, research, and service. Although it comes first in the typical listing order of these three, teaching is far from what the majority of faculty value most. Again, we do value it somewhat, but when it comes to pursuing national reputations, excellence in one's field, and real scholarship, teaching is the stepchild. Those of our colleagues who are excellent teachers are not recognized as such beyond our institutional communities (and often not that far). In fact, we have drawn such a distinction between real musical scholarship or creative or performance activity and teaching as a profession, that the concept of teaching as a professional skill or as one worthy of scholarship for the purpose of improving it seems almost oxymoronic. My former teacher, mentor, and

now colleague and good friend, John Buccheri, talked about this yesterday in his session on training doctoral students to be college teachers. He is quick to point out that the devaluing of teaching by our academies is often very subtle and subconscious. He summons the words we use to describe it: *teaching loads* for one. My Funk and Wagnalls defines load as a *burden*. Not a good word to associate with the reason most universities exist! Buccheri says that only planes, trains, and babies should have loads. We also speak of any time we get for creative, research, or performance activities, or even some service and administrative matters, as *release* time—that is, nonteaching things are our *release* from the *burden* of teaching. Though teaching is our primary charge, and that is why we must be released from it to do other things with our weekly work hours, using such words is more than a subconscious slight on teaching. Teaching, even at those institutions where it is the highest of callings and the chief academic mission of the school, is simply that thing that we must all do, no matter what our real “specialty,” and one for which we prepare but don’t typically strategize. We all don’t perform on the piano, we all don’t conduct choirs, and we all don’t compose, but in the same way that baseball’s shortstop, right-fielder, and catcher *all* hit, we *all* teach. Why don’t we spend the same energy in improving as teachers that baseball players spend in improving as hitters?

Fourth, faculty are concerned about the amount of their time that an organized peer-evaluation plan will take. There is no question here: they are right—they should be concerned. We ask them to do a lot (though I have had mentors who believed that college music faculty were underworked), and now we want to make them evaluate themselves? Didn’t they hire us administrators for that? Why are universities moving at light speed to spread out the responsibility for evaluation to a wider group of people, that is, beyond administrators all the way to faculty? Soon, we’ll be asking the students to pass judgment on faculty, not just hammer them on student evaluation instruments! Though this is a bit exaggerated, faculty are right to be concerned about the amount of their time a peer-review process will take. But, and you know what the *but* is, shouldn’t they be as or even more concerned about the inadequate ways we currently have of measuring teaching effectiveness and the amount of time we all waste in not being effective with students who could learn if we just reflected a bit more on our ability to reach them? Wouldn’t it benefit everyone not only to improve teaching, but to improve how we can document its success? Though how peer review will end up in personnel decisions is a topic I will deal with later, I should say here that documenting teaching effectiveness with the positive and developmental results of a peer-review procedure should make us all feel more secure. I have been intimately involved in the promotion and tenure and annual renewal processes at three state institutions of what I call *piano* (8-20 faculty), and *mezzo forte* (20-40 faculty) size, and I can say that the mechanisms we had in place to measure teaching excellence, at the times when these decision were to be made, were inadequate at best, woeful at worst. I have witnessed first hand the same personnel actions at four other schools, two *mezzo fortes*, a *forte* (40-80 faculty), and a *fortissimo* (over 80 faculty) without actually have gone through it, and they were

no better—in fact, all but two of these seven schools are “research institutions” and advertise their requirement that faculty wishing to be promoted to associate professor with tenure be excellent in research/professional/creative activities first, and relegate the requirements to prove teaching excellence to a minor divider in the dossiers. It is indeed hard to justify spending time gathering meaningful evidence of teaching effectiveness when such values are demonstrated at “continue or discontinue your career” time.

Fifth, improving teaching requires a great deal of work and advance preparation. Music faculty members would simply rather be learning a new work, studying a new book, writing a new book, or engaging in musically creative endeavors than thinking about their methods and the material needed to improve a class they teach. This is the crux of stagnant teaching. Preparing for a class two or three or five times a week, and then delivering it, is like learning and performing a new work *daily*, and many of our colleagues cannot justify in their own minds devoting this kind of energy to their courses. And most applied teachers, quite frankly, feel as though preparing for a lesson they are about to teach is ridiculous—they have been endowed by their creator to be natural teachers because they are excellent performers and know their instrument or voice and its literature so well that they are beyond reproach when it comes to being subject to suggestions regarding prepping for a student’s lesson. Why is all of this? Except for music education faculty members, who have it almost figured out, though they are not always able to convey it, I believe we have not been able to accept and reconcile devoting the time and energy required to be better teachers because:

1. Most of our institutions, teaching-missioned or not, encourage our professional nonteaching concerns in music first. This is obvious at research institutions where promotion documentation makes clear an expectation of excellence in research/creative/scholarship activity. Liberal arts and other colleges with teaching priorities might demand that arts and sciences faculty be excellent teachers first and scholars second and might even practice this in their personnel decisions. But faculty in the music departments of these colleges are expected to perform and present music, and many times this is not considered relevant to their teaching. Though the policies of these school say that excellence in teaching is a requirement for promotion and tenure, they demand musical excellence from the faculty in the form of public presentations of music to enrich their campus culture, and value it highest in the administrative offices and community board rooms.
2. We have been trained in our graduate programs to place our highest value on whatever it is we do musically, and that is never teaching, but performing, composing, conducting, and so on. Though we would never hear anyone say it out loud any more, the old adage, “Those who can, do, and those who can’t, teach” is still alive and felt by many of our constituents. I have a mentor who once said, “Remember, a music faculty is really just a collection

of failures. They'd all be performing for a living if they were able." Obviously this is a miserable thing to say, and a terrific hypergeneralization and overstatement. But, when you remember that most doctorates are not only not designed to make us good teachers, but don't ever pay much attention to the fact that most of us will be college professors, it sheds a different, ironic, and disturbing light on my mentor's remarks.

The College Music Society (CMS) has endeavored to address some of these symptoms and causes and to answer some of the questions above, through its collaboration as a scholarly society with the Peer Review of Teaching Project of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE): "From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching." It is appropriate that the National Association of Schools of Music should do the same. Just as CMS is the music professoriate's agent for exploring professional concerns that involve teaching in higher education, NASM is the music academy's agent for the same. Helping to bring the fullest possible evaluation and development of teaching to the fore is a cornerstone of CMS's existence, and its members, as well as those at NASM member institutions, act both as participants in a larger dialogue and as individuals who practice what they hear and preach. It is only natural that any national dialogue regarding the improvement of teaching be embraced not only by CMS, but also by NASM. CMS has involved itself in the national colloquy on peer review of teaching by sponsoring two panel sessions at national meetings, initiating a series of six articles on the subject for the society's newsletter, and encouraging planning and assessment activities at regional meetings.

As a result of these CMS efforts, after a thorough study of AAHE's Peer Review Project, and following some administrative experience I've had recently with initiating peer review guidelines, I'd like to enter into the second area of my talk today, and examine some of the peer-review policies currently functioning in college music units across the United States. We can then summarize some ideas from them in the final section of the presentation.

## CASES

It is true that each of music's three different types of instruction (classroom, rehearsal, and applied) has its own problems and pitfalls associated with any peer review of its particular vagaries. Each of the four music cases we'll examine deals with these differences, though some see more than three types of music instruction delineated, and some view applied music as the only type with any real review difficulties for which to plan. The AAHE's Peer Review of Teaching Project featured two participants in the field of music: the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) and the University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC). In addition, I bring some data on two policies I helped, and am helping, to formulate at the North Dakota State University (NDSU) and Valdosta State University (VSU) in Georgia.

Formulation of the policies, as we will see, is not only the first step; it is also among the most crucial. Not only must we begin, and begin with our unit's goals in mind, we must also resolve from the outset to involve the faculty in planning and implementing the policy. It will, after all, be their policy, and it will review and improve their teaching, so they must be comfortable not only with its features, but with feeling as though they can change it over time as required—in short, they must own their policy.

First, let me say a word about formulation strategies and what they accomplished at these schools: UNL established a small and committed working group whose task was to “draft a set of thorough yet flexible guidelines that would allow each kind of teaching to be reviewed by peers in the department and externally and that could be used for reappointment, tenure and promotion reviews.” It accomplished this by breaking up the working group into three two-partner teams, each one charged with developing the guidelines for one of the three specific kinds of teaching in music. The results are impressive and represent the feelings and values of the faculty, not of the institution. They are also complex, especially the applied or studio teaching policy, but flexible, which was one of their goals. One of the participants in the working group and in the AAHE partnership, Margaret Kennedy, has stated that the results of their work, a document known as “A Menu for Peer Review of Teaching,”<sup>1</sup> was swiftly adopted by the UNL faculty, and has been in place for a few semesters now. Although the entire menu from UNL is an outstanding model, worthy of study by us all, I find their approach to reviewing the applied lesson teaching to be particularly distinctive, and I will mention this later.

UCSC had already been in the business of organized peer review of teaching for some time before the AAHE project began. While not formalized into a written document, its guidelines and policies regarding peer review are, nonetheless, outstandingly conceived and have, according to Leta Miller of their faculty, been successful in improving teaching and fostering good morale for years. Again, it was a faculty group that drafted the guidelines, though Miller has indicated that she was involved in the process when she was chair of the department some years back, and the process, owing to its informality, is in a state of evolution. Departments like the one at UCSC, which is smaller than UNL's, might benefit, it appears, from a more informal, or at least a simpler, policy. Again, the approach to that most personal and problematic of music teaching types, applied music, is well addressed in UCSC's guidelines.

The other two cases, NDSU and VSU, alas, have been impacted to a great extent by their executive, namely me—not because I am an authoritarian but because these faculties have needed a bit of prodding. You might find that at your school too. I believe strongly, as I will state later, that a faculty-developed, or a “bottom-up,” procedure for designing a peer-review policy is vital to its real effect on the improvement of teaching and learning. But some real momentum for this bottom-up archetype might be hard to initiate, and some models like the ones I found in music at UNL and UCSC, and in other disciplines at other places, can really serve to inspire

colleagues to get moving. Demonstrating executive leadership by bringing the features and results of these effective models to our faculties in the form of written “points of departure” might very well be unavoidable. This, in a nutshell, is my excuse!

Anyway, the NDSU document was one for music, theatre and art, and almost exclusively top-down designed, though the senior faculty assisted (there were a total of six faculty members from these three departments). We used a fine model from the campus’s communications department that features student input to the peer review process. While our NDSU model is not a good one for true collaboration (a feature I’ll discuss in a few minutes), it does bring the notion of student input to the process into a sharp focus. I believe that what we learned at NDSU through this process was due, in large part, to the reflections of students when they were asked the right questions by the right people. And I also believe that this information was useful not only for improving teaching, but also for the inevitable personnel decisions that followed.

So, since I have been able to study two thoughtful and inspired cases for peer review in music teaching; since I’ve come to know the rest of the AAHE’s Peer Review of Teaching Project with some degree of detail, since I’ve participated in the College Music Society’s dialogue on this subject, and since I’ve built a flawed but workable model of our own at NDSU, I feel somewhat qualified to refine my experimentation and lead the effort to develop a meaningful policy for peer review of teaching at my new school, Valdosta State University. Even as we speak, a working group, not unlike the one formed at UNL, is at home in South Georgia, massaging my recommendations and some input similar to today’s talk. They’re doing so in a strategic effort to arrive at a procedure that will be sensitive to VSU’s goals, to the strengths of our faculty, and to the purpose of improving teaching first and arriving at personnel recommendations second.

Let me say something about the actual policies in place at the schools and provide some mild, but meaningful, comparison.

UNL stresses the need for each faculty member to build a portfolio for his or her teaching. We will be incorporating this into our VSU model as well. UNL has suggested in its “menu” that a portfolio is an integral part of the collaborative process of ongoing peer review, not just a summative document prepared by the teacher at promotion and tenure time. At NDSU, we didn’t require faculty members to build portfolios for the peer-evaluation process, but instead encouraged a dialogue among the reviewers and reviewees about the kinds of things we might find in a typical portfolio (objectives, methods, values, expectations for outcomes, etc.). Although the process at NDSU was not particularly strong in its bottom-up collaborative structure, this aspect of teacher and evaluator meeting in advance of a class visit or videotaping to discuss the class, visits, tapings, and student-answered questions was meaningful. The whole issue of teaching portfolios is a topic for another presentation, but I would like to recommend some AAHE resources for understanding, constructing, and using teaching portfolios. They have been developed by faculties in disciplines other than music, but are completely adaptable to our needs. If you follow some of

the suggestions for portfolio building (which can be as extensive as a whole Web site or three-ring binder and supplements just for teaching materials, to as simple as an essay for a promotion and tenure dossier), I think you'll find that the dialogue regarding excellence and improvement in teaching will be enhanced at your school. As we develop policies and procedures for meaningful peer review of teaching, documenting in the form of a portfolio what we each find and feel and value, and what each of us has learned, cements what we've done and where we're going.<sup>2</sup>

UNL's "menu" also provides a list of questions for each teacher to choose from when it comes to focusing on what each believes is important in his/her teaching and what should be reviewed. The NDSU and UCSC models do not specify questions that should be asked or reviewed, but instead simply recommend that members of peer-review teams draft their questions together and then refer to them when reviewing. The NDSU model also provides for the reviewer(s) to ask the questions drafted by the instructors themselves in consultation with the reviewer(s) of a random sample of enrolled students and to relay the results to the instructor. This brings a bit of outcome-based concern to the peer-review process—a strategy not fully implemented in any of the music cases I know, and one upon which we will place a good deal of focus at VSU.

A feature common to all the cases, though not particularly well developed at NDSU, is collaboration. Collaboration is the sharing not only of information but also of duties—review is reciprocal as well as well documented. UNL, UCSC, and we at VSU have and are expanding models where faculty teams work together on more than just one class. This can be tricky at very large or very small schools, but those of us at *mezzo-forte* schools can encourage faculty to form groups of three or four and to review each others' teaching in "round-robin" formats. For instance, I might suggest that our clarinet instructor—whose teaching *responsibilities* (as a father of four, I am sensitive to Buccheri's baby analogy for the word *load* and so I no longer use it) include only applied clarinet and clarinet ensembles—be on a team with one primarily applied-music teacher who also has some classroom responsibilities (our oboist, for example, who teaches applied oboe and music appreciation). I would suggest that they be joined by a music education faculty member whose teaching duties are mostly classroom, but also include a small choir. Then the two applied faculty can review each other, the oboist and music education faculty member can review their classes, and the music education faculty member and clarinetist can review each other's small, conducted ensembles.

Should all teams be "suggested" by administrators? The answer is no. This is where it gets tricky for many schools. I believe, and I'll stress this later, that for collaboration to work effectively, it must involve some degree of faculty design and *choice*. Unfortunately, choice is hard to manage—a really well-known applied teacher or large ensemble conductor will probably be "chosen" by many faculty to be on their teams, and this, of course, will not work. How to solve this dilemma? Give choice, but restrict it a bit. Though UNL and UCSC don't mention choice in their plans, I have confirmed that there is some, and that, with some advance thought

and post-reflection, it works. I might have suggested to our clarinetist that he choose a person who is applied first and has some classroom charges second, and another person with some classroom responsibilities first and some ensemble coaching/ conducting duties second. This limits his choice (especially at the *fortissimo* and *pianissimo* schools), but does not eliminate it.

Design the peer-review policy so that multiple visits, tapings, and so on, of the same course or of private lessons with the same student be reviewed each term. Observing growth and emergence of ideas and student learning is vital to meaningful teaching improvement. Suggest that the teams stay together for two years if possible. Collaboration has to function over time to work best, and several semesters of reviewing by the same folks helps to reinforce each others' observations. And after the two years, rotate just one or two members of a team, leaving one or two in place to be rotated later. This is complicated, but because we can base many of our observations in music peer review on outcomes assessment (I'm getting to this), we are able to evolve our impressions over time in a way that will make this kind of staggered reviewing practical and purposeful.

Though I have emphasized and will continue to emphasize that peer review should be formative first and summative second, I use the term *inevitable* when I talk about personnel decisions. We have to make them, and they will happen. As far as peer review and personnel decisions are connected, it is like Ray Kinsella's diamond in the movie *Field of Dreams*, "If you build one, they will come." UCSC's model is terrific for considering how the results of improvement-of-teaching-first peer review are used in personnel decisions, and the one I helped craft at NDSU was not particularly terrific. Our NDSU model, which was not a reciprocal one either, simply required that reviewers, though they worked with the reviewees before the visits/ interviews, write a report based upon their findings and commit it to a promotion and tenure file. I'm almost ashamed to admit that. Whatever improvement there might be in instruction of those reviewed in this process would be accidental at best, and to spite us all at worst. The UCSC case, though, is one where the entire process of reappointment was structured around the evaluation of teaching, and chief to this process were its peer-review policies. Rather than subjugating the results of a peer-review procedure to a well-established promotion and tenure or annual renewal mechanism, UCSC let the improvement of teaching processes dictate the teaching portion of its mechanism. It is a fascinating concept, and one that deserves some further study and emulation.

I must also say that I am convinced that measuring student outcomes has a major role to play in the process of peer review. I believe most of us already do this in informal and subtle ways. We hear students in our recital hours and know how they're progressing. Again, at *forte* or *fortissimo* schools, this is difficult to observe beyond one's own area of music specialization and requires more concentrated efforts for peer review, but those of us in the "softer dynamic" institutions sponsor recitals that most of our faculty hear. We know whose students are doing what in performance. We also know, because of the highly sequential nature of our music

curricula, who has and has not learned what was necessary in previous terms of musicianship, music history, and so on. And, because music learning is uniquely cumulative, ensemble directors know which applied teachers are succeeding with their teaching and which ones aren't, without having to review the lessons themselves. I must also say that in the cases mentioned, I have not seen formalized observations regarding whether students are meeting the outcomes. Our current peer-review efforts seem to be focused on the teaching itself first and the learning second. I will say that involving students in the peer evaluation process by interviewing them with questions after the reviewed class or lesson, as we did at NDSU, was a real first step in measuring student outcomes, only then we were still just collecting students' "impressions" of their ability to meet the teacher's expectations, not ascertaining how they were actually doing. Ensemble performances tell us a great deal about teaching and learning, but they also tell us, as only a musical endeavor can, about the teacher's creative, professional, and research abilities and understanding.

At VSU, we are trying to formalize the outcomes assessment we musicians do (and teach too, by the way) into our peer-review process. It can be accomplished by urging faculty to bring observations of students' performance and progress to the collaborative discussions they have with one another regarding individual students and methods to help each one. Most of us at *mezzo-forte* schools do this now. Music affords us this enormous opportunity to improve learning—imagine a couple of Western Civ professors talking about how student A is having difficulty with the concept of the Reformation, and that maybe they should try approaching that subject with him or her through an understanding of the Church of England first!

## SUMMARY

From the cases presented so far, here are the main points to keep in mind in building a strategy for peer review of teaching:

1. If our goal is to improve teaching, then *the results of our efforts must be developmental and formative* first, summative and judgmental second. We are, after all, reviewing the folks we have already hired and entrusted with the responsibility of being good teachers. If they have problems with a particular course or courses, we should try to help them improve before we declare that their problems are too severe and then nonrenew them. One of the ways we can make our review efforts developmental and formative is to allow faculty members to decide themselves what parameters and procedures will be used for the review process once we administrators have provided "guidelines" as a point of departure. Not only will this lead to a process that develops and affirms good teaching first, it will also engender in the faculty a sense of ownership of the review process. This eliminates the threat that the review process will be a top-down document that results in mostly summative decisions and not formative recommendations.

2. The whole process of *peer review of teaching must be collaborative*—teams of faculty working together. Those inevitable feelings of intimidation and vulnerability we experience when hosting a reviewing colleague in our classes are dramatically altered when we are asked to do the same with and for them. Collaboration eases stress because it encourages all team collaborators to work together to understand one another's values, goals, strengths, and weaknesses before any visiting, interviewing, and/or portfolio building is undertaken. Another advantage is that under the collaborative model, not all of the substance of peer review of teaching is reached in several classroom visits. Working together to videotape classes, applied lessons, or rehearsals and then evaluating them as a group is one example of purposeful collaboration at work. Mounting teaching colloquia where faculty members present to their whole departments how, what, and why they teach is another. Both models are more effective at improving teaching than an isolated series of senior colleagues' visits to a junior level instructor's music theory class would be. And visits must go both ways—the reviewer reviews not only to recommend, but to learn and emulate as well.
3. We should embrace (as many of us already do) the great gifts that music presents us when it comes to *observing student outcomes*. The performing-arts disciplines share the unique feature that the competence and excellence of their creators and interpreters is the standard medium through which we experience the arts. No discipline is more able to yield evidence that reveals to us the most about the quality of our teaching and our students' learning than music. And yet, we generally have not connected the results of our recent effort in authoring outcomes for each course and program in our music units with our evaluation of teaching procedures and overall learning success. Evaluating outcomes really *is* important! If we simply listen to each other talk about what we value in our teaching and what we expect our students to learn and demonstrate, then we can easily assess the achievement of these values when we hear what the students demonstrate in performance and practice. Talk among colleagues is a crucial precursor to placing the students' performances we observe in a perspective that brings understanding about our teaching effectiveness. And what a great window on teaching and learning this is. Assessing our students' achievement with respect to meeting our outcomes is also perfect for the collaborative process. Not only can we attend our music school's student recitals over time and watch students develop, but we can also share our performance teaching methods and values with our colleagues *before* and *as* we all hear the students demonstrate their learning and development over a period of time—all in an effort to find out how our peers feel they are or are not meeting their objectives and improving the student outcome that we will all have a chance to hear. In short, because students' outcomes are largely demonstrated in some type of public occurrence in music, we have a distinctive opportunity to make teaching the center of a

music school dialogue and focus, and to make “teaching,” as the AAHE refers to it, “community property.”

4. Contrary to a strict definition of peer review, which assumes that students themselves still have only the traditional student evaluation form through which to make their own observations known, *a key to successful peer collaborative review is to involve random student feedback* in the recommendations from one team member to another. Students should be consulted once a thorough understanding of an instructor’s goals and objectives has been reached by all members of a peer review team, and after all classroom/studio/rehearsal visits and/or analyses have taken place. Students’ individual answers to questions developed by their instructor and members of a collaborative team and posed to them from a member of that team will *always* reveal helpful information for their instructor. This does not make the process a “student evaluation” rather than a “peer evaluation,” but instead involves the student in a method from which an individual professor and his/her team can draw real and meaningful observations about the effectiveness of the professor’s current teaching style and methods. Again, the key here is for faculty collaborators to specify their priorities with respect to what they feel is important for the student to have learned, and then to examine it by using means they themselves create as peers.
5. If the measurement of teaching effectiveness through the peer-review process ultimately leads to a personnel decision of one kind or another, the results should also include rewards for the already excellent as well as reprimand and/or recommendation for the not-yet-excellent. The morale-building advantages to this approach are obvious. And though I haven’t yet mentioned it, this is one of the major reasons why we should do what we have done to improve teaching: we must always remember that students choose to go to a particular school primarily because of what they believe they’ll learn at that school. Students, who keep us in business, value teaching not only in talk but in practice, even if we don’t. Our school benefits if we reward good teaching, because potential students will know we feature it and want to come to us. Students already here will want to stay, too.

I submit to you that the AAHE’s Teaching Initiative and its programs regarding the peer review and collaboration process have been initiated with the notion that teaching improvement is our responsibility and that we should embrace it together as faculty. This approach has been incorporated by the two participating schools, and is well documented, especially at UNL. And a key to this philosophy is collaboration, where faculty depend upon one another for guidance, affirmation, and development.

#### ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> See Tayloe Harding, “Peer Review of Teaching Cookbook, on an Annotated Recipe for Initiating a Review Process,” *College Music Society Newsletter* (January 1998).

<sup>2</sup> I would encourage all NASM music executives who wish to revitalize and/or renew the teaching in their music units to review the following documents available from the AAHE: "From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching, A Project Workbook," "The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching," and "Campus Use of the Teaching Portfolio: 25 Profiles." Access to these is through the AAHE at its homepage: <http://www.aahe.org>.

---

---

## MEETING OF REGION SIX

---

---

### A SURVEY OF NASM REGION 6 MEMBERS REGARDING SELECTED RECRUITMENT AND ADMISSION PRACTICES

RONALD LEE

*University of Rhode Island*

This research study is a survey of selected, but wide-ranging, aspects regarding the undergraduate recruitment and admission practices of institutional members of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) located in Region 6. The survey's purpose was to collect information regarding issues and practices in undergraduate recruitment and admissions for presentation at the Region 6 meeting at the 1997 annual conference of NASM. A two-page questionnaire was sent to the heads of all ninety-one members of Region 6 in October, with the request that the completed questionnaire be returned to Ronald Lee on or before 10 November 1997. Region 6 includes members from the states of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The questions covered the following topics: (1) use of web sites; (2) recruitment outside the United States; (3) unethical practices in recruitment and/or admissions; (4) recruitment for nontraditional programs; (5) degree programs that have the largest enrollments; (6) pressure on admission standards in music; (7) discounting tuition; and (8) most successful recruitment practices.

## RESULTS

### Background

Fifty-two (57 percent) of the ninety-one NASM members in Region 6 responded to the survey request. Two responses were not included in the study because the institutions involved did not qualify as degree-granting institutions at the undergraduate level. Consequently, the number used for the analysis of data is fifty. Thirty-one (62 percent) of these fifty respondents are departments of music; twelve (24 percent) are schools of music; five (10 percent) are conservatories of music; and two (4 percent) did not fit into the above categories.

Nineteen respondents (38 percent) are part of a public university, and twelve (24 percent) are part of a private university. Fourteen (28 percent) stated that they are part of a four-year, liberal arts college; three (6 percent) stated that they are independent

institutions; and two (4 percent) of the music units are part of a community college. Of the fifty respondents, seventeen (34 percent) are part of a larger academic unit within the university or college (for example, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Liberal Arts, College of Fine Arts, College of Visual and Performing Arts).

The participants responded as follows when asked to give their number of full-time, undergraduate music majors:

<b>Enrollment size</b>	<b>Number of Institutions</b>	<b>Percent of Institutions</b>
1–50	3	6
51–100	12	24
101–200	16	32
201–400	14	29
401+	5	10

### **Web Site**

All of the fifty participants either have Web sites or are planning to develop sites. Currently, forty-three (86 percent) have functioning Web sites for recruitment purposes.

### **Recruitment Outside the United States**

Twenty-three institutions included in the survey (46 percent) actively recruit music students from countries outside the United States. Four of these respondents identified their recruitment efforts as “extensive,” and nineteen identified their recruitment as “to some degree.” The other twenty-seven institutions (54 percent) do not actively recruit foreign students. Seventeen of the twenty-seven indicated that they respond “only if foreign students request information,” and ten answered “no” to the question.

I asked those who recruit actively outside the United States to identify the one or two countries from which they recruit most extensively. The most common recruitment efforts are in Asia.

<b>Foreign Country</b>	<b>Number of Institutions that Recruit</b>
South Korea	11
Japan	7
Taiwan	5
People’s Republic of China	2
Asia in general	1
Hong Kong	1
Malaysia	1

Eastern Europe was identified by two institutions as a foreign location of recruitment. The following countries or areas were mentioned once: Armenia, Britain,

Bulgaria, Canada, Caribbean, Finland, Germany, Ireland, India, Latin America, Norway, Russia, South America, and Ukraine.

### **Unethical Practices in Recruitment and/or Admissions**

To the question of whether the person completing the questionnaire knew of unethical practices in recruitment and/or admissions, thirty-two respondents (64 percent) said “no.” However, eighteen (36 percent) indicated that they are aware of practices that are or might be considered unethical. Of the eighteen, seven answered “yes” to the question, eight said “possibly,” and three checked “don’t want to answer”—two of whom indicated that they knew of unethical practices.

Additionally, the questionnaire requested brief descriptions of practices that respondents had observed and that they regarded as unethical. Fifteen respondents listed the following:

1. Scholarships or financial aid packages (nine respondents)
  - trying to entice transfers by offering larger scholarships than those which students currently have;
  - asking parents/prospective students to reveal financial aid amounts from a competing institution and then counteroffering with an amount slightly larger;
  - asking or requiring prospective students to respond to scholarship/financial aid offers before May 1 (One respondent emphasized that this is particularly difficult with non-NASM institutions);
  - promising scholarships to students to get them to enroll and then withholding the scholarships until students have participated in ensembles for a set period of time.
2. Wrong or misleading information (five respondents)
  - offering or providing false, inaccurate, or negative information about competing institutions;
  - advertising inflated or misleading information to present a more enticing image.
3. Inappropriate recruitment practices (three respondents)
  - recruiting by a faculty artist from one institution of music students from other institutions as the students participate in summer festivals, juried competitions, or master classes given by or involving that faculty artist (including the offering of special scholarship assistance);
  - fast tracking or reducing admission requirements to encourage students to transfer.

### **Recruitment for Nontraditional Programs**

For the purpose of categorization, I identified four music degree programs—performance, music education, music theory and/or composition, and music history—as being “traditional.” I asked the respondents to list the nontraditional or

other programs for which they recruit. Thirty-three institutions (66 percent) listed the following programs:

- Bachelor of Arts in Music (12 institutions)
- Music Industry, Music Business, Music Management, Performing Arts Management (8)
- Music Therapy (6)
- Recording Arts, Sound Recording Technology, Studio Recording Technology Certificate, Audio Recording (6)
- Jazz (4)
- Performance Diplomas (3)
- Music Theatre (2)
- Music Technology (3)
- Acoustics and Music (1)
- BMO (Bachelor of Music with an Outside Field) (1)
- Church Music (1)
- Commercial Music (1)
- Community Music Certificate (1)
- Computer Music (1)
- Music Special Education Concentration (1)
- Percussion (1)
- Piano Pedagogy Concentration (1)
- World Music (1)

Additionally, I asked the fifty participants to rank the two degree programs at their institutions with the largest enrollments. As expected, the largest enrollments are in music education and performance. In thirty-seven institutions (74 percent), music education ranks as number one or two. In twenty-nine institutions (58 percent), performance ranks one or two. Eight institutions (16 percent) identified the Bachelor of Arts degree program as being the largest or second largest in enrollment size. There are institutions, however, that have sizable enrollments in nontraditional or other programs such as audio or sound recording, church music, music therapy, music technology, jazz studies, and music theatre. The responses, in terms of first and second choices, are as follows:

**Highest enrollment**

1. Music Education (30 institutions, 60 percent)
2. Performance (9, 18 percent)
3. Bachelor of Arts (3, 6 percent)
4. Jazz Studies (2)
5. AAS in Performing Arts (1)
6. Bachelor of Music (1)

**Next highest enrollment**

1. Performance (21 institutions, 43 percent)
2. Music Education (7, 14 percent)
3. Bachelor of Arts (5, 10 percent)
4. Music Therapy (3, 7 percent)
5. Music Technology (2)
6. Audio Recording (1)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 7. Bachelor of Music with Sound<br>Recording Technology (1) | 7. Bachelor of Music (1)                     |
| 8. Music Theatre (1)  | 8. Church Music (1)                          |
| 9. Music Therapy (1)  | 9. Diploma (1)                               |
|   | 10. Jazz Studies (1)                         |
|   | 11. Music Recording Technology (1)           |
|   | 12. Music History/Theory/<br>Composition (1) |
|   | 13. Studio Recording Certificate (1)         |

### **Pressure on Admission Standards in Music**

I asked the respondents, “Are your admissions standards in music under pressure because of admission or enrollment number goals you need to achieve?” None of the fifty respondents stated that they frequently are under pressure and vary their standards depending on the demand. However, a significant number—thirteen (26 percent)—do feel some number-goal pressure. Eight of the thirteen indicated that they hold to their standards even though they feel the pressure; the other five responded that sometimes they do vary their standards, depending on the individual applicant. Thirty-four of the fifty institutions (68 percent) responded that their admissions standards in music were not under pressure because of admission or enrollment number goals that need to be achieved. Three participants (6 percent) gave “other” responses. One stated that “pressure” usually means to increase enrollments, but that in its institution, the pressure was to cut enrollment. The second respondent said that since it is a community college, it has an “open door” policy; testing is for placement, not admission.

One respondent, who represents a large school of music that is not under any pressure, stated that although the school has control of admissions, at times it supports an exceptional musician with a weak academic record. This school has a mentoring program in place for such students.

### **Discounting Tuition**

The questionnaire asked, “Do you discount tuition as part of financial aid packages?” Twenty respondents (40 percent) indicated that they do discount tuition as part of financial aid packages for music students; fifteen answered “yes” to the question, and five “sometimes.” According to the responses, twenty-three of the fifty institutions (46 percent) do not discount tuition. Seven institutions (14 percent) gave other responses to the question. All seven indicated that they offer scholarships or some type of financial aid. One stated, “We offer scholarships which result in reduced tuition expenses. The tuition price for a full-time student does not change.” Another stated, “From a fiduciary standpoint, the College takes into account need-based and merit awards when calculating net tuition revenue. The term ‘tuition’ discount is not communicated to students as a part of the financial aid package.”

This topic needs further definition and study primarily because of the confusion over what “discounting tuition” means. Some respondents regard discounting tuition

as reducing the published tuition amount for students and consequently reducing the tuition revenue to the institution. Others regard discounting tuition as offering scholarships in a manner that reduces the actual tuition that the student pays but does not reduce the tuition revenue coming into the institution. The scholarships are either budgeted through the institutional budget as scholarship aid or generated from scholarship endowments or other sources. Still others respond to discounting tuition in the manner in which one participant did, "Each student is an individual case with respect to financial aid."

### **Most Successful Recruitment Practices**

I asked the respondents to describe what they considered their most successful music recruitment practice or activity. Listed below are the responses grouped in categories:

1. On-campus activities (21 respondents)  
Auditions, faculty contact or lessons, prospective students attending lessons, information sessions for students and parents, performances by music faculty or ensembles, hosting festivals, summer music camps, inviting high school groups to perform on campus, open houses, meetings for parents
2. Personal contact or attention (19 respondents)  
Phone calls, personal letters, face-to-face contact, interaction with faculty and music students, interviews, special lunches
3. Faculty involvement (17 respondents)  
Faculty recruitment and outreach, workshops, master classes, concerts, tours, relationships with school music teachers, adjudication, clinics, conducting, festivals, visibility at conferences and other events
4. Student involvement (11 respondents)  
Recommendations by music students at the institution, undergraduate recruitment committee, tours by ensembles, minirecitals on campus
5. Reputation of excellence (10 respondents)  
Faculty concerts around the world, spectacular applied faculty, showing off the music unit, success of graduates, positive public relations, student satisfaction and word of mouth
6. Recommendations by outside groups (8 respondents)  
Alumni, high school teachers
7. Other  
Recruitment items including advertising, media, CDs, and convention booths (5 respondents); scholarships (4); smooth and rapid admission/scholarship process (2); Web page (2); specialized admissions staff (2)

For further information regarding this study, contact Ronald Lee, Chairperson, Department of Music, 105 Upper College Road, Suite 2, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881.

# SUCCESSFUL RECRUITING AT FREDONIA

PETER SCHOENBACH

*State University of New York, College at Fredonia*

In August of 1993, I became director of the School of Music at Fredonia. Enrollment had dropped from a high of 476 in 1980 to a low of 299 majors in 1992. Various strategies had been followed to respond to demographic and economic factors. While music education had represented a very high percentage of the total (89 percent in 1971, the rest were B.A. Applied), the development of new music concentrations such as music performance (1972); music theatre (1976); sound recording technology and music therapy (1978); and composition (1987) helped the overall numbers.

However, it had become clear that the health of music education was critical to any effort to regain the school's position as one of the two major undergraduate public university college programs in New York State (the other is Potsdam). To achieve a significantly enhanced enrollment, we had to improve our credibility in music education, and to do so, we needed the support of the music alumni. It seemed that our most valuable network for recruiting, the alumni that represent a very large and influential group of music educators in New York State, was feeling estranged from the school. The reasons were various, and not necessarily entirely valid, but the estrangement was clearly a factor in their nonrecommendation of our program to their students.

To some degree, our visibility at local, regional, and state meetings had been declining. The Wind Symphony had not been at the state music educators' winter meeting since 1981. In fact, there had been a series of band directors, none of whom had stayed for any significant length of time.

The string program had gone through several retirements and nonrenewals without new appointments, and the orchestra director had gone on leave, only to resign and take a position at a competing school of music. The voice program was still relatively strong, supported by a very good choral component and a respectable opera and opera theatre program that led to annual full productions.

How, then, could we maximize enrollment while improving overall quality?

A preliminary effort had been launched by my predecessors, an acting duo of faculty who shared power for one year to begin to rebuild bridges to our alumni. The long-time former director, Patrick McMullen, had formed focus groups among our alumni in an effort to get feedback on their perceptions of our strengths and weaknesses. He also carried out a poll for use in assessment with our greater alumni, and started a newsletter, *Notes from Mason* (our building, named after the American composer Lowell Mason). After a few issues in the late eighties, under the initiative of Professor Barry Kilpatrick, it has become a twice-a-year fixture of communication with our alumni. Furthermore, Professor McMullen created a desktop series of pamphlets on our faculty and programs that has aided us in recruiting. We also began to advertise our gains in journals, stressing our growth. The target topics

varied from summer camps and graduate programs, to new faculty appointments, or to other achievements of our faculty.

There had never been a poster for the music school at Fredonia, although all our public and private competition mailed one annually. After years of planning, the opportunity for funding emerged last year as part of an initiative for recruiting. The recently completed design includes numerous photos, and it is being printed together with brochures that will be inserted in a skirt on the poster and updated annually. The mailing will take place shortly.

In addition, several issues had to be dealt with, and while there was a need to prioritize, some had to overlap. The first step was to hire a new, highly qualified band director. This was done at the same time as I was hired, and care was taken to include on the search committee a local leader in the music education community. The candidate chosen in 1993, Russel Mikkelson, had seven years' experience as a high school director, a DMA from Wisconsin, and was an active trumpeter who became second in the faculty brass quintet. He immediately took the Wind Symphony to the September general meeting of the Erie County Music Educators, and by 1995–96 was touring across the state. The Wind Symphony performed at the Band Directors' meeting and at the winter New York State School Music Association (NYSSMA) meeting, winning over that most influential group. Professor Mikkelson also was elected to the New York State Band Directors Association Board of Directors and this winter will be directing the All-State Wind Ensemble, an honor rarely given to in-state conductors.

Together with his appointment came an impetus to develop a summer program with two dimensions: (1) graduate offerings that would guarantee a Master in Music Education in three summers and (2) summer camps for high school students building on the already existent choral camp, which expanded to include band, woodwind, and sound recording components in the next four years. Mikkelson has taken the general supervision of the camps, and W. Steven Mayodonia, head of Music Education, the graduate offerings. There is some overlapping in cases where workshops provide graduate students with hands-on experience with the high schoolers. These efforts not only have brought significant revenue to the college, fueling part-time budgets, but have resulted in direct recruiting.

In addition to the needs of woodwinds, brass, and percussion, the string crisis, central to any orchestra and chamber music program, and also connected to the music education scene, is an even more difficult challenge. The destabilization of the orchestra was especially troublesome. A short-term step was to invite Eiji Oue, then the director of the Erie Philharmonic, and now of the Minnesota Orchestra, to conduct our student ensemble. In doing so, we had the advantage of a long and close friendship based on my time at the New England Conservatory, and on his relationship with a number of my faculty who were principal winds in Erie. However, after the first year, he left the area, and we made a series of temporary arrangements. First, we hired a part-time conductor, a violinist, who was in the doctoral conducting program at the Cincinnati College-Conservatory. With the budget crisis that followed

in 1995, we turned to Mikkelson, who took on the orchestra in addition to the bands. He did an excellent job, and despite the small number of strings and their general weak performance level, the orchestra program enjoyed a stability and quality of training that positioned it for the next step.

In terms of string visibility, I invited three string quartets to compete for a residency at Fredonia in 1994. The first choice was the Rackham String Quartet, one of the Cleveland Quartet groups from the Eastman School. The quartet began at Fredonia in 1995–96, spending a week each semester giving master classes and informances in local school districts and for alumni gatherings, as well as presenting concerts. By 1996–97, we had expanded the arrangement to two-week stays each semester, during which the quartet played and gave “informances” to K–12 audiences in schools in western New York and Pennsylvania. Supported by a grant from the Harry A. Logan, Jr. Foundation, it was very successful, having benefited from participation in the Oberlin Chamber Music America First Educator/Ensemble Seminar.

The presence of the Rackham, while never entirely an organic part of the Fredonia program, added a dimension of high-quality string performance and involvement with the music education community of the region that helped compensate for other shortcomings.

Another step taken was to hire key members of the Buffalo Philharmonic to teach violin and viola (in addition to the cellist already adjunct) when a search for a professor of violin was called off in the 1995 crisis year. These faculty members gave an immediate answer to those in the state who claimed that we were “phasing out” the string program. Alan Ross, violin, and principal violist Valerie Heywood played the Mozart *Symphonie concertante* with the student orchestra, and the latter served as faculty for the annual National School Orchestra Association and American String Teachers Association’s String Conference held at Fredonia every summer since 1992. This program brought hundreds of grade 4–12 string players to our campus.

Finally, in 1997 we hired a new orchestra director, David Rudge, who has a DMA in conducting with a background in violin. He immediately began to play second violin with the three BPO string teachers in a quartet and has been invited to conduct the NYSSMA Zone 1 high school festival at Fredonia in November 1997 (which we began to cohost annually in 1995), and the Chautauqua string ensemble at the all-county festival in January 1998. He is also a candidate for the Orchard Park community orchestra directorship. A student chapter of ASTA has been founded, and already two special events featuring a Czech string quartet and a visiting violist have taken place.

The most visible effort of all to support the School of Music, in general, and the string program in particular took place in February of 1997. On my recommendation, Isaac Stern was nominated for an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters, and I arranged for him to fly in on a corporate plane to receive the award. On that occasion, he played the Bach Double Concerto with a student soloist (Stern played second fiddle) and gave a fabulous acceptance speech, excoriating the governor for his lack of

support of SUNY and emphasizing the importance of arts education. A donor closely associated with Stern gave \$10,000 for the establishment of a scholarship in his name. The event had extensive coverage, especially Stern's praise of the quality of our programs as he observed them in the concert.

It should be added that these most recent gains would not have been possible without the special support of our new president, Dennis Hefner, who offered supplementary adjunct funds to our unit predicated on increasing the enrollment from last year's 116 to 141. These gains in adjunct help have already been converted into three tenure-track positions, for which we have just begun a search.

The future hires, creation of additional instrumental and choral ensembles, exploration of a music education consortium with the University at Buffalo, development of a larger pool of student candidates to improve quality, and closer relations with neighboring institutions such as Chautauqua (of which I am the director of the School of Music in the summer) will help solidify the steps outlined above. After the poster/brochure, a video/CD will be next.

The greatest challenge now is to guarantee the quality of experience to those students we have attracted and to recruit new faculty carefully while maintaining standards in all our academic areas. Only time will tell if these gains can be sustained. I am convinced that our credibility with the alumni is the single most important factor in that outcome.

---

---

## THE PLENARY SESSIONS

---

---

### MINUTES OF THE PLENARY SESSIONS

**First General Session**  
**Sunday, November 23, 1997**

President Harold Best called the meeting to order at 3:17 p.m. and welcomed those assembled. He introduced Allan Ross of the University of Oklahoma, who led the membership in singing the National Anthem and the Thanksgiving Hymn. Arthur Tollefson of the University of North Carolina Greensboro provided piano accompaniment.

President Best then gave special recognition to several individuals in attendance, including Past Presidents Robert Werner and Fred Miller and Honorary Members Bruce Benward, Robert Fink, Helen Laird, Lyle Merriman, Robert Thayer, and Himie Voxman. He then introduced the officers, committee chairs, and staff seated at the podium, who included:

William Hipp, Vice President  
Karen Wolff, Treasurer  
Dorothy Payne, Secretary  
Joyce Bolden, Chair, Commission on Accreditation  
Daniel Sher, Associate Chair, Commission on Accreditation  
C. B. Wilson, Chair, Committee on Ethics  
Charles Boyer, Chair, Nominating Committee  
Lynn Asper, Chair, Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation  
Deborah Berman, Chair, Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Accreditation  
Samuel Hope, Executive Director  
David Bading, Editor and Recorder for General Sessions

Also introduced were the following special guests:

Frances Richard, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers  
Lisa Livingston, Consortium of College and University Media Centers  
June Hinckley, President-elect, Music Educators National Conference  
Gary Ingle, Executive Director, Music Teachers National Association  
L. Rex Whiddon, National President, MTNA

President Best asked music executives who would be retiring in the coming year to stand and be recognized. He then asked music executives new to the Association similarly to identify themselves.

President Best next recognized in turn the chairs of the three accrediting commissions to give their commission reports. Reports were delivered by Deborah Berman, Chair of the Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Accreditation; Lynn Asper, Chair of the Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation; and Joyce Bolden, Chair of the Commission on Accreditation. Each gave a brief summary of actions taken by her or his respective commission during the past week and announced that the full report of commission actions would be mailed with the next newsletter. (The reports of the Commissions appear separately in these *Proceedings*.)

President Best welcomed representatives of seven institutions that joined NASM during 1997. They included, as Associate Members,

Clarion University of Pennsylvania  
College of Saint Rose  
Snow College  
Valley City State University

and as Members,

Florida Baptist Theological College  
Lander University  
University of North Florida

Treasurer Karen Wolff was next recognized to give the Treasurer's Report for 1996-97. Directing delegates' attention to the auditor's written report, she reported that NASM was in excellent financial shape. A motion was made and seconded to receive the Treasurer's Report. **Passed.**

C. B. Wilson, Chair of the Committee on Ethics, took the podium next to give the report of that committee. (The text of this report appears separately in these *Proceedings*.)

President Best next recognized Executive Director Samuel Hope, who introduced the NASM staff members present: Nadine Flint, Willa Shaffer, David Bading, Chira Kirkland, Margaret O'Connor, and Karen Moynahan. Mr. Hope also thanked the Wenger Corporation, Steinway and Sons, and Pi Kappa Lambda for sponsoring social functions at the Annual Meeting and introduced representatives from each of those organizations.

Directing attention to a set of proposed changes to the *NASM Handbook*, Mr. Hope announced that the Board of Directors had already approved the revisions of the Rules of Practice and Procedure, as required by the Bylaws. The remainder of the changes awaited membership approval, Mr. Hope said.

**Motion:** (Edwin Williams, Ohio Northern University) to approve the remaining proposed changes (dated October 1997) to the *NASM Handbook 1997-98*. Seconded and passed.

President Best then recognized Charles Boyer, Chair of the Nominating Committee, who introduced the candidates for office in the Association. He also announced that a chair and two members of the Nominating Committee for 1998 had been elected by the Board of Directors. They were James Scott as chair and Linda Duckett and Rollin Potter as members. Noting that the general election of officers would take place the following day, Mr. Boyer issued a final call for write-in nominations.

To conclude the session, President Best delivered the President's Report, the text of which appears separately in these *Proceedings*.

The session was recessed at 4:20 p.m.

### **Second General Session Monday, November 24, 1997**

President Best called the session to order at 11:15 a.m.

He introduced the following officers of music fraternities and sororities:

Ann A. Jones, Delta Omicron International Music Fraternity  
Wynona Lipsett and Gerri Flynn, Mu Phi Epsilon  
James P. Morris and Darhyl S. Ramsey, Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia  
Ginny Johnson, Sigma Alpha Iota

as well as Larry Linkin, President of the National Association of Music Merchants.

Executive Director Samuel Hope was next called upon to give his report. After introducing staff member Jennifer Nelson-Dowdy and Catherine Sentman Anderson, NASM Projects Consultant, Mr. Hope called attention to his written report distributed to conference attendees and highlighted a few thoughts from it.

Following Mr. Hope's remarks, Secretary Dorothy Payne took the podium to pay tribute to President Best's long and distinguished service to the Association. Noting that Mr. Best was retiring from NASM office and from his institution following the current meeting, Secretary Payne presented him with a plaque and also announced that Mr. Best had been elected an Honorary Member of NASM by the Board of Directors.

After thanking Ms. Payne and the Association for their expressions of appreciation, President Best recognized Charles Boyer, who conducted the election of officers. Ballots were distributed to member institutional representatives and then collected for counting by members of the Nominating Committee and NASM staff.

Finally, President Best introduced Tim Page, chief music critic for the *Washington Post*, who delivered the Annual Meeting's principal address. After speaking

about the role of the music critic as educator, Mr. Page took questions from the audience concerning practices in music criticism.

The session concluded at approximately 12:30 p.m.

**Third General Session**  
**Tuesday, November 25, 1997**

President Best called the session to order at 9:17 a.m.

He first invited the regional chairs or their representatives to give the reports of their regional meetings held the previous day. (Those reports appear separately in these *Proceedings*.)

President Best next read the names of individuals who were completing terms of service in various NASM offices. They included Robert Tillotson (Member *pro tempore*, Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation), Peter Gerschefski (Member, Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Accreditation), Carl Harris Jr. (Member, Commission on Accreditation), C. B. Wilson (Committee on Ethics), and the Nominating Committee for 1997: Charles Boyer (Chair), Terry Applebaum, Patricia Taylor Lee, Melvin Platt, and Mary Anne Rees. Also recognized were three outgoing Regional Chairs: Donald Para (Region 1), Erich Lear (Region 2), and Jim Cargill (Region 3).

President Best proceeded to announce the results of the previous day's election. New officers included:

President: William Hipp

Vice President: David Tomatz

Member, Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Accreditation: James Forger

Member, Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation: Margaret Guchemand

Members, Commission on Accreditation: Don Gibson, Sr. Catherine Hendel, Clayton Henderson, Kenneth A. Keeling Sr., Marvin Lamb, and Mark Wait

Members, Nominating Committee: Mellasenah Y. Morris and Robert E. Parrish

Member, Committee on Ethics: Edward J. Kvet

Bidding the audience safe travel and a blessed Thanksgiving, President Best declared the Seventy-Third Annual Meeting of NASM adjourned at 9:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dorothy Payne  
University of South Carolina

# REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

HAROLD M. BEST  
*Wheaton College*

I should like to begin these remarks from the rather odd perspective of the design of an airplane, let's say the successor to the still-new Boeing 777. This airplane—let's call it the 787—will be larger, faster, safer, quieter, and more fuel-efficient than any of its predecessors. There will be quadruple redundancies in every hydraulic, electrical, navigational, and flight-control system. State-of-the-art automation and electronics will make present-day hands-off flying seem primitive by comparison. The latest structural concepts and lightweight, super-tough composites will be used. This 787 will be thrust forward by the most powerful, quiet, and fuel-efficient engines to date.

A wonderful machine so far? But only so far, for this strategic question remains: How will it fly? What will hold this machine up? Well, wings, of course. No problem. But how do wings work and how should this particular wing work to lift this particular aircraft?

A down-deep law lies at the heart of this question. It is a simple law—big-bang simple. It is Bernoulli's law, the law of fluid dynamics. Bernoulli's law is one of those primordial principles: magnificent and persistent, immutable and all-pervasive. When something is made that conforms to this law, we can rest assured that it will always work in a prescribed way. We can be certain, then, that once this new 787 reaches a certain ground speed; once the pilot pulls back on the yoke; once the aircraft rotates on its axis by reason of the down forces acting on the elevators; once the correct rotational angle is achieved, the partial vacuum created by pressure differentials on both sides of the wing will literally be enough to lift this shining and comfortable leviathan from the ground. It's not that this aircraft decides to fly, because it feels dandy, because the pilot wants it to, or because the skies on a given day are particularly friendly. There is no guessing with this principle, no psychological what-if-ness. An airplane wing dare not say, "Today I'm like really up for flying, but yesterday, I had a headache and I really had to like look deep inside and, you know, find the real me? If it weren't for my aerodynamic support group, some ginseng, a couple of verses of *Kumbyah* and a group hug, I would've lost it." No, this airplane simply *has* to fly by reason of adherence to a comprehensive and common-ground principle. And that's how it is.

Now because this law is so primary and universal, it does more than guarantee flight. Bernoulli's law is why, in the gray salted slush of a Midwestern winter, the back end of my automobile rusts out more quickly than the front. Bernoulli's law is why my vocal folds are now making sounds and why Sylvia McNair's are just as dependent on its constancy as Kermit the Frog's. Bernoulli's law is why ski jumpers, conforming their bodies and skis into the shape of an airfoil, can fly as frightfully high and far as they do. This law is why a sailboat can grace its way into the wind and why the venturi tubes in my '53 Studebaker carburetor can atomize gasoline and

mix it with the airstream being drawn into the combustion chambers. Bernoulli's law is why an Indy racecar hugs the track with such down force that even if it were forced to race on an upside-down road, it would not break loose. And this same law is at the heart of all meteorological research into the vast and complex interaction of wind and water and weather.

The magnificence, even beauty, of this principle lies in its irreducible nature, its sheer constancy and stability, as simple and sure in its primary utterance as it is in its manifold applications in the natural world and our humanly crafted one—it's that simple. Therefore, we do not need one law for flight; another for sailboats; another for venturists and another for ski jumpers; and another for wind, water, and weather. We just have the bedrock principle, a principle with perpetual and disinterested guarantees and that's all we need. Then, as our minds go to work on such principles, as we gather evidence, as we add knowledge to knowledge, and as our imaginations take firmer hold on possibilities, we discover an intriguing world of diverse connections and applications. This is what I call catching up: catching up to the full meaning of something deep and, strangely enough, adding to its grandeur even as we catch up. This imagining and catching up, this learning while adding to, is our touch—the human side of the grand equation. In the case of airplanes, this catching up while adding to means that we learn to make them fly better and better. It also means that they become increasingly graceful, even beautiful, because in this catching up and creating, the human spirit searches for ways to bring comeliness to bear on mechanism and principle.

We call this creativity; in its multiples we call it culture; and in its grander synthesis we speak of civilization and what it comprises: beauty, usefulness, science, religion, art, values, peace, re-formation, and, we pray, loving kindness. In all things, therefore, whatever we touch, it is the final combination of wholeness, beauty, and principle that makes a classic a classic: if airplanes, a Staggerwing Beech, a P-51 Mustang, a Martin Marauder, a Learjet, a Boeing Triple Seven; if music, a *Symphony of Psalms*, a *Musical Offering*, an Ugandan *enzenze*, an improvisation on a *raga*, or *Georgia on my Mind*.

For music, too, is deep down and constant. It, too, is far reaching, widely varied, variously used and variously meaningful. It, too, is irreducibly simple and, in that way, variably complex. It has its own "Bernoulli's law," a three-in-one consortium of the overtone series, acoustical law, and the seemingly infinite reaches of the human imagination, given over to catching up with and transcending these constants. And just as the law of fluid dynamics integrates the fractal complexities of wind, water, and weather with the simplicity of a carburetor, so those of musical creativity unite the complexities, say, of the last movement of Brahms's Fourth with the simple iterations of a twelve-bar blues—both *chaconnes*, both imponderable in their way, both the best that each creator could offer, and both issuing out of obedience to the continuities of principle and imagination. From plainsong to Pärt, from ragtime to rondos, and from the Serengeti to San Diego, we are in the midst of a vast outpouring in which we can recognize change, sameness, genius, excellence, mediocrity, worth,

function, newness, cliché, conservatism, radicalism, and hucksterism. This is how music is and this is why we must learn to make and receive it completely.

Sometimes I like to think that if there were a way to grant music a semblance of personhood, to bequeath it the ability to make its way about, to meet up with all of its kinds, and so to strike up conversation; if then a Bach fugue, an Usarufa harvest song, a medieval puzzle canon, a top-forty ballad, a Nigerian medicine song, a Jewish cantillation, a Jarrett improvisation, and a Znameny chant were found together in the same room, I feel quite sure that it just might be more like a reunion of kin, of siblings even, where mutual recognition and conversation would issue out of common rootedness and long-ago unities. I truly believe it would be more like this than a get-acquainted party or a politely arranged crosscultural orientation session.

Perhaps we should go about our teaching as if this imagined scene were real, we ourselves caught up in the warmth and vigor of this imagined union, because this is how music is and this is how we should love it: not always liking all of it, knowing that all might not be well, understanding that this or that needs correction, even reprimand, but never censure or hatefulness (for how can we correct that which we hate?). There is something teacherly about this kind of love, for it sees unconditionally into the nature of things and, irrespective of their condition or place, makes choices yet avoids preferentialism, even as it probes, adjudicates, and corrects. Then, coupled to unyielding integrity, it leads its disciples into their own conditions of excelling.

Now, permit me to apply these metaphors and thoughts particularly to this association. I ask that you hear me not as an officer and certainly not as a flag-waver or propagandist. I am simply a thankful colleague, a fellow member of the educational community, a somewhat musician and, as of the adjournment of this seventy-third Annual Meeting, a grateful alumnus of this good membership.

If we were to go over the history of NASM, back to its founders and their ideals and on to this time and your own ideals and work; if we were to seek out descriptors that we could apply to the whole, the following would surely come to mind: wisdom, steadied excellence, continued and unflustered inquiry, statesmanship, awareness of the constancy of change (and the constancy needed to monitor it), corporate professionalism, dedication, intelligence, extremely hard work, a preference for what's right instead of who's right, and not least of all, a gathered humility that welcomes into common company the small and large, famous and not quite so, secular and religious, public and private, simple and complex, all in service of how music is.

If we were to review the decisions we have taken about music and music education at all levels, we would discover a progression, not from primitive to sophisticated or average to superior, but a progression from wholeness to increasing wholeness—a steady and widening inquiry into how music is, how people and cultures have been and are—a catching up while adding to, if you will. That this has been done deliberately, thoughtfully, and coordinately does not mean that there has been no debate or disagreement, for we would be neither normal nor useful if there were none.

Nonetheless, in a remarkable way, we have been able to avoid politicizations, rancor, and schism. And this is a tribute to you and your predecessors. How music is has come first.

Then, if you were to dig into the various *Handbooks*, annual *Proceedings*, position papers, speeches, colloquies, briefing papers and documents, principal addresses, studies, futures projects, and analyses, you would discover how the association has devoted itself to making music fully known and available from and to as many parts of society as possible, in the best way possible—what Nicholas Wolterstorff just last year called “dwelling with music.”

However, among these many archived things, the NASM accreditation standards are always with us. More than anything else we have in print or memory, they provide an agreed-to, widely scoped grammar for all that we can think up and actuate in our respective institutions. These standards, remember, have never been imposed but decided upon, and then only after initial drafts, extended hearings, debate, changes, and eventual closure by vote of the full membership. They are what they are *now* because of an increasingly widened vision of how music is and how we can conduct ourselves in the paradox of catching up while going deeper. Consequently, for those whose imaginations are vivid and whose vision reaches back, around, and beyond, the standards are composed in such a way as to welcome the work of the best and most innovative curricular minds, the kind that see into primary, therefore comprehensive matters, the kind that see deeply into how music is. But if we see the standards instead of music as the whole, or if we are tempted to substitute the procedural grammar of the standards for each local poetic fulfillment of them, we will never quite be satisfied and will wonder why our narrow mechanisms seem to fall so short of such a great art form. If we fail to perceive the standards as a formulation of necessary knowledge and skills, we will just end up juggling parts and pieces.

However, to those whose imagination is leaderly, the standards will, in a paradoxical way, be both initially necessary and ultimately irrelevant, as templates always are once a final product is realized and shaped. To hold music and how music is to the size of the standards means that we are giving up on catching up and giving in to stasis. But to hold the standards accountable to the fullness of music and how music is constitutes an excellence that is as preserving as it is dislodging.

Why, for instance, did we vote to place a renewed emphasis on improvisation and composition? To impose a burden, to create budget and credit-hour problems, to embarrass ourselves and our students? No; for if we keep our inquiry active as to how music is, and if we pledge ourselves to create a more completed musician, we have no option but to train our students in these ways, with increasing attention to something quite fundamental, something centuries old and worldwide; namely, thinking in music in order to be able to think it up.

Why are we more and more able to talk intelligently about diversity, and why do we call for it? Why did we introduce it into the standards long before it became an intelligent passion, then a friction, and now a confusion, among so many? I believe

we did it and shall continue to do it because we saw with increasing clarity how music is, not just in our own backyards, but everywhere, in its creative constancy and multiple voicings, believing that only when music's fundamental and principal unity—its oneness with itself—is encountered can its multiple outworkings be discussed. As our most creative minds and spirits probe this issue further, we shall perhaps be led to speak less and less of diversity as a set of reconcilable parts—coming at unity from the outside, if you will—as we are to speak of unity spawning countless metamorphoses and paraphrases.

It is in this context then that we should speak of America's music. I firmly believe that this country's wildly varied outpourings—the great, the good, and the less-than-good—come closer to the diversified fullness of how music is than those of any other country in history. If we think comprehensively and fearlessly about this subject, we should be able to make American music more than a unit or a course in an overly Europeanized construct, and we will likewise be spared the fears of unhealthy trade-offs. If we do this in the right way—organically and carefully—we will also be spared the tragedy of displacing or discounting the grand traditions of Europe. To do otherwise would not only contradict our established intentions about diversity, but discount the confluence of creativity and history upon which so much of our present music making depends. If we were to think of history as lineage, as linear community, as that storehouse from which we draw and to which we add; if we could better understand that we shall in the next moment be history and that what we call history was someone else's present time, we might be less prone to sever ourselves from that which gave us life.

I would like to mention just two more issues that face us: K–12 education, and graduate education, and especially the preparation of college teachers. To my way of thinking, these issues are one and the same, and I shall try to say why in a few moments. It is gratifying to know that NASM, both on its own initiatives and in accord with outside ones, particularly those articulated in the National Voluntary K–12 Arts Standards, continually devotes itself to the education and musical nurture of our children and young people. I have no hesitation in saying that the most important people in our society are teachers of children and that strategically the most important degree that we can offer in our institutions is the music education degree. I do not say this because I have a music education degree—I don't; or because music education degrees have it all together—they don't; or that I'm trying to downgrade any other degrees—I'm not. I say it because of the overwhelming importance of children and the artistic words we are responsible to bring to them. Whether you agree with this is less important than the musical integrity and pedagogical fullness with which we discharge our educational obligation to children and young people; the clarity and determination with which we make our thoughts known to those on the outside who would otherwise down-play, benignly neglect, or outrightly chop away at the arts. We can do nothing better than to remain fervent and inventive.

And right next to the K–12 issue is how we continue young people's education when they become college students, both as music majors and as general students.

The majority of their teachers will have earned doctorates in music. While they certainly will have been trained to master content in increasingly sophisticated and detailed ways, they may not have been kept mindful of the universals and constants within which their specialty flourishes, and they may not have received any training or much incentive to weave these parts back into a liberating and seamless whole. We must help them. As they teach, they may find it difficult to forget the painfully detailed projects from which they have just emerged and may be inclined to treat their students to the same experience by teaching the way they last learned. We must help them. The truth is, most of them will be expected to diagnose fundamental problems and craft solutions at fundamental levels; they will be expected to re-enter the generalities and syntheses of collected knowledge and, more often than not, step outside of their specialty without being given the time to keep up in it. We must help them, not just because of how music is but because they are our lifeblood; they are wonderful, highly gifted, and eager people, and we must nurture them in their responsibilities to their part *and* to the whole. Thus, the interest that the association is beginning to show in reviewing various issues in its graduate programs, including the preparation of students for college teaching, is gratifying. It is my hope that this interest will result in wisely crafted change.

I began these remarks with a metaphor, that of Bernoulli's law. I would like to mention another one, both to draw the K-12 and graduate studies issues closer to each other and to bring these remarks to a close. I speak of the helix. This curiously simple pig's tail of a thing holds an immense secret for teaching and learning by the way it satisfies the tension between the linear—that which proceeds forward into continued and unrepeatable newness—and the circular—that which of necessity must come back around. Each of these, left to itself, poses enormous problems. Here I risk an over-simplification, but quite a lot of education comes down to two disjunct clichés and their many paraphrases: "We've already been over that, so we'll go on." Or, "I can't really answer that now, but when the next few units are covered, we'll get to it." But the helix brings these two statements into each other's company. Music study, or any other study, for that matter, is not a purely linear experience in which one is always moving on to new material, nor is it a wearing, uninventive cycle of repetition. Rather, fundamental concepts and issues are returned to again and again within a helically linear trajectory, always moving from simplicity to complexity, from narrower to wider, from simple relationships to detailed syntheses. What we're really talking about is a lifelong process, with which all sensible music education, from Kindermusik to the most advanced programs, is infused. It is this combination of continuation, intensification, and perspective of which wisdom is made up. Consequently, from the musical nurture of the youngest child to that of the most advanced post-doctoral adult; from music appreciation to doctoral comprehensive exams; from the simple to the complex; and even from one discipline or subdiscipline to another, from the most humble attempts at improvisation, composition, cultural diversity, to the most eloquent iterations, we need always to be asking the same questions, encountering the same primordial fullness, and finding the

simple in the complex and the complex in the simple. *But, all the while we are doing this, we search for increasingly better, fuller, and more inclusive answers.* Hence, that which goes on comes around and that which comes around has been taken to a higher level. So, from the littlest child to the most advanced adult, there is always a combination of recurrence, increasing nuance, and more comprehensive synthesis. This is how music is and this is how all learning should be.

Two years ago, I spoke of the hologram, in which we find the whole to be always discoverable in any one of its parts, thus sparing us the fear of “not getting it all in.” Last year, I reminded us of Chomsky’s chilling thought that children come into the world bringing the sentence with them and we just give them words. And now Bernoulli’s law and the helix show us how the grand, comprehensive storehouse of connections of big-bang primacies can be coupled to continuous inquiry and grand syntheses. This is how music can be, because this is how we as people were created to be and to do, to think up and to craft.

Thank you so much for your work on behalf of music and the people who make and receive it. And on a more personal note, thank you for the countless ways you have contributed to my life’s hologram, brought wholesome words to my creative sentence, helped me to see further down deep, and helped me become better than I once was.

Your work is of inestimable importance. I beg of you not to forget this, even though any number of darksome spirits may rise up in protest. The crooked places in this life need to be made straight and the rough places made plain. A highway, a clear and open highway, coursing through sceneries of rightness, worth, dignity, good report, and musical gladness, needs to be laid down, stone by patient stone. You are the ones; your faculties and students are the ones to do this. I bid you the very best and I join you step by step, stone by stone, and music upon music.

# REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SAMUEL HOPE

This is NASM's seventy-third year. The Association continues to address issues both perennial and new. The major activities of the Association with respect to these issues are outlined below.

## NASM ACCREDITATION STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES

At the 1996 Annual Meeting, institutional representatives approved *Handbook* changes addressing a variety of matters. Standards concerning interdisciplinary programs and distance-learning approaches were enacted, along with amendments to ensure written compliance with various guidelines of the U.S. Department of Education. As has become the Association's tradition, these changes were drafted to ensure the best possible stewardship in terms of functions to be served while leaving specific methodologies and approaches to institutions and programs. This approach is consistent with NASM's philosophy that emphasizes institutional autonomy balanced by mutual accountability, thus de-emphasizing regulatory concepts and mechanisms.

Proposals for *Handbook* changes in 1997 are minimal in scope. They bring specific attention to institutionalized community-education programs in accreditation reviews and provide clarifications regarding programs in which pianists and other keyboard players collaborate with other musicians.

Efforts to review and revise the Association's accreditation procedures document will continue during 1997-98. This review occurs every five years. Revisions are based on institutional experiences as reported to the NASM National Office on questionnaires submitted at strategic points in the accreditation process. Suggestions for change also come from the Commissions, the Board of Directors, and from specific calls for comment during the review period. Members with concerns about the process or the document are encouraged to contact the Executive Director before December 15, 1997. Simplification is the primary goal for this revision.

NASM continues to encourage those engaged in self-study to consider ways to have the accreditation review serve multiple purposes. When requested to do so by institutions, NASM will combine its review with other internal or external reviews using either a joint or concurrent format. The Association seeks to reduce duplication of effort, preferring to see music units spend more time on teaching and learning, artistry and scholarship, individual development and public service.

## NATIONAL ACCREDITATION ISSUES

There are two national private-sector organizations for accreditation with which NASM maintains contact. The Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA) was formed upon the demise of the Council on Postsecondary

Accreditation (COPA) to facilitate communication and cooperation among specialized accreditors; to monitor, comment on, and participate in national policy efforts concerning specialized accreditation; and to provide professional development opportunities for accrediting agency staff. ASPA is continuing to fulfill its mission. It has a number of task forces working on such issues as reauthorization of the federal Higher Education Act, improved communication and understanding with chief executive and academic officers in institutions, and mediation of accreditation disputes. The second organization is the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). This group has evolved after several unsuccessful efforts to create a replacement for the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. Although it remains to be seen exactly what CHEA will do, functionally it is intended to represent higher education accreditation on the Washington scene, consider policy issues, work on relationships between accreditors and institutions, and provide recognition for accreditors that meet certain operational criteria. Early in the summer of 1997, CHEA convened a group of provosts and chief staff officers of specialized accrediting agencies—as far as anyone knows, the first meeting of its kind in history. The result was a positive exchange of views and a positive foundation for CHEA to use in restoring trust and good will on their national, private sector accreditation efforts. We commend CHEA for this good start.

On the federal scene, reauthorization of the Higher Education Act looms immediately ahead. Five years ago, reauthorization and subsequent regulations created a considerable mess. Leaders of institutions and accrediting bodies found themselves confronted with new levels of intrusion. Task forces are already at work to prevent a repeat of this scenario, and to attempt a rollback of some of the more dangerous provisions of the law itself. NASM, through work with ASPA and contacts with other higher education groups, will be monitoring this situation closely. Despite differences that may occur over accreditation policy and accreditation decisions, almost everyone associated with the enterprise understands that it is essential to keep accreditation free, autonomous, and decentralized, and to counter proposals from either the public or the private sector that would encourage totalitarian creep toward a more regulatory approach. It is also important to realize that much of the exchange at the national level on accreditation issues, especially in the private sector, has little to do with NASM's real business, which is helping both receivers and providers of music programs achieve their best. Federal politics and the politics of higher education and accreditation all provide their contextual influences, but they cannot become the center of our work.

The problematic context on the national scene regularly creates conditions where individuals on campuses become confused or alarmed about accreditation in general or the policies or actions of a specific accrediting body. We continue to urge members to be extremely careful when using accreditation as a reason for advancing a particular agenda. When arguing for specific directions or resources, it is important to reiterate intellectual positions that underlie the standards. Simply floating the word "accreditation" is not sufficient and often counterproductive. Also, we continue to

request that you check with the National Office whenever you feel that someone on your campus misunderstands, or has a deep concern, about the actions or policies of NASM. Whenever there is even a hint of trouble, it is best to seek clarification.

## **POLICY**

In the wake of national voluntary K-12 arts standards, states are continuing to establish similar documents that provide frameworks and aspirations for local instruction. It is extremely fortunate that music is well represented in these efforts. NASM, the other arts accrediting associations, and individual member associations concerned with K-12 arts education have been working to keep all discussions focused on content. The standards need many years of service in the field before their promise can be realized. As is the case with our discipline, constant, patient effort is needed. Member institutions are encouraged to help policy makers, teachers, and students in their area stay the course that will make a difference.

A major futures issue here is the respective roles of education agencies, arts agencies, and higher education in K-12 arts education. Distinctions and connections between experiences and study will need to be stated and acted upon with honesty and clarity. A hearing on this topic is scheduled for the 1997 Annual Meeting.

Through various means, the Association continues to monitor larger contextual issues such as tax policies, higher education funding, cultural policies, and evolving organizational and pedagogical concepts at all levels of education. The Executive Director continues to represent the Association on the higher education team that periodically negotiates performing-rights licenses with ASCAP, BMI, and SESAC. The contracts seem to accomplish appropriate payment for the use of music in a fair and efficient manner. In many ways, these are model intellectual property agreements. Along these same lines, NASM has worked with others on defining fair use of copyrighted material in educational multimedia. This surely is one of the most difficult legal and professional issues of the next decade.

We continue to consider policy ramifications of new technologies, expected changes in funding patterns, growing concerns about lack of time, and emerging concepts of governance. Our purpose is always to reflect on change in ways that promote creativity, willingness to experiment and, in specific situations, wise delineations about what can change and what must not. The focus remains helping NASM members be as effective as possible at the local level.

## **PROJECTS**

Many of NASM's most important projects involve preparation and delivery of content for the Annual Meeting. Last year, a large number of individuals worked to produce outstanding sessions. This year is no different. Major time periods are devoted to the following topics: American music, faculty issues, doctoral education, history and theory in the core curriculum, implementing the national K-12 music

standards, and copyright and fair-use issues. Many additional topics will be covered in regional meetings and in open forums for various interest groups. All sessions represent important Annual Meeting–based project activity. 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 Association is in the second year of our open-ended study of graduate education in music. Hearings and sessions at the 1996 and 1997 Annual Meetings, study groups, papers, and discussions will continue contributing to this effort. The focus is issues of quality, creativity, and service beyond threshold accreditation standards. Since every member institution has a vital stake in the future of graduate education, broad committed participation is vital. Please share any ideas you have with the Executive Director or members of the Board.

NASM participates in the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations with NASAD (art and design), NASD (dance), and NAST (theatre). The Council is an *ad hoc* effort concerned with issues that affect all four disciplines and their accreditation efforts. In 1995-96, the Council completed and published a briefing paper on the Work of Arts Executives in Higher Education. This document was mailed to all institutional and individual members of NASM. The Council is now completing three studies: the first is on the relationships among giftedness, study of the specific arts disciplines, and future work, whether in the arts themselves or in other fields; the second is on distance learning; and the third is on an analysis of frequently asked questions about accreditation. The first and third will be mailed shortly. A draft of the second will be the subject of hearings at the 1997 Annual Meeting. NASM and the Council appreciate members' continuing attention to issues and requests for participation from the National Office.

The HEADS project (Higher Education Arts Data Services) continues to provide statistical information based on the annual reports of member institutions. We are looking into the prospect that new technologies will provide new efficiencies.

NASM's Web site is in operation: [www.arts-accredit.org](http://www.arts-accredit.org). The site is full of information, and should be well worth the development time involved. The National Office has also upgraded its computer systems and capabilities to provide faster and more effective service. Major work assimilating these upgrades will continue throughout this academic year.

## NATIONAL OFFICE

NASM's National Office is in Reston, Virginia, a suburb of Washington, D.C. We welcome visitors to the National Office; however, we ask that you call us in advance. We are about eight miles from the Dulles International Airport, a little over 20 miles from downtown Washington. We will be pleased to give you specific travel directions.

The NASM National Office houses the records of the Association and operates the program of NASM. Everything the office does is under the aegis of policies and

procedures established by the Board and the Association as a whole. Our staff members are dedicated and enjoy a wide reputation for effectiveness.

The following individuals serve as Association staff: Karen P. Moynahan, Margaret O'Connor, Chira Kirkland, David Bading, Willa Shaffer, Jennifer Nelson-Dowdy, and Nadine Flint. The staff continues to be grateful for the tremendous cooperation and assistance offered by members of the Association.

NASM's work grows and prospers because of its foundation in mutual support and service. The Association focuses its major energies on accreditation, professional development of music executives, statistical services, and policy analysis. It is able to fulfill these functions because it maintains an excellent communication system and because it is committed to finding reasonable consensus. The Association must not lose sight of central things. The keys are trust, constantly seeking wisdom, working for quality, and serving each other, all in the cause of music. Since communication is so important in fulfilling these traditional goals, we ask you to never hesitate to contact the National Office whenever you have questions, concerns, or requests for assistance. We look forward to continuing our work with you.

Best wishes for the forthcoming year.

## REPORTS OF THE REGIONS

### REPORT OF REGION ONE

The 1997 Meeting of NASM Region 1 was held as part of the Annual Meeting of NASM at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in San Diego. The regional meeting was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chair Donald Para. The business meeting included a welcome to new members of the region, a report from the Board of Directors Meeting, and a call for recommendations for topics for future meetings.

During the business meeting, election of officers was held. Patricia Taylor Lee, San Francisco State University, was elected Chair. Gary Cook, University of Arizona, and Rollin Potter, California State University Sacramento, were elected to the offices of Vice Chair and Secretary, respectively.

Following the business meeting, Steven Lowy, a Beverly Hills attorney specializing in entertainment law, gave a presentation entitled "Music and the Law: The Harmony of Art and Commerce." Following a question and answer period with Mr. Lowy, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Donald Para  
California State University, Long Beach

### REPORT OF REGION 2

The NASM Region 2 meeting was called to order at 2:15 p.m., Monday, November 24, 1997. Chair Erich Lear introduced executives new to NASM (Del Aebischer, Marylhurst College; Gregg Miller, Cornish College; Lynn Brinkmeyer, Eastern Washington University; James Brague, Ricks College; and Vernon Wicker, Seattle Pacific University), and offered recognition upon his retirement to James Sorensen, University of Puget Sound, for his extended and distinguished service to the Association and the field of music. Election of officers for the 1998–2000 term followed, a slate of candidates having been prepared by a nominating committee consisting of James Sorensen, Travis Rivers (Eastern Washington University), and Myra Brand (Western Oregon University). The Chair noted the institutional name change from Western Oregon State College to Western Oregon University. The following officers were elected by acclamation: Anne Dhu McLucas, University of Oregon, as Chair; Russ Schultz, Central Washington University, as Vice Chair; and Timothy Smith, University of Alaska Anchorage, as Secretary. There being no additional business for the good of the Region, the Chair introduced the session presenter, Paul Smith from Washington State University. Professor Smith described his approach to "Distance Listening," providing information on hardware, software, copyright and fair-use parameters, course-specific pedagogy, content-specific aspects of world musics,

on-campus partnering in his pilot project, and off-campus resources and contacts. His presentation was followed by a lengthy and informative question/answer/discussion period. With thanks to those attending for their participation, the Chair adjourned the Region meeting at 3:45.

Respectfully submitted,  
Erich Lear  
Washington State University

### **REPORT OF REGION THREE**

The annual meeting of Region 3 was convened at 4 p.m. on Monday, November 24, 1997. A brief business meeting was held in which the Chair summarized the discussions of the Board of Directors seminar. Election of officers was conducted with the following results: Robin Koozer from Hastings College was elected Chair, Terry Applebaum from the University of Missouri at Kansas City was elected Vice Chair, and Eric Unruh from Casper College was elected Secretary.

Taylor Harding from Valdosta State University in Georgia gave a stimulating presentation on "Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness." He presented models of peer evaluation systems from The University of Nebraska at Lincoln, the University of California at Santa Cruz, North Dakota State University, and Valdosta State University. From these models he derived five recommendations for a successful peer review procedure: (1) results should be developmental and formative, (2) policy should be collaborative, (3) process should include the observation and evaluation of student outcomes, (4) reviews should involve random student feedback, and (5) results should include rewards for excellence. The presentation was followed by a period of lively discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 5:30.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jim Cargill  
Black Hills State University

### **REPORT OF REGION FOUR**

The members of NASM Region 4 (Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, and Wisconsin) met at 2:15 p.m. on Monday, November 24, at the Hyatt Regency Hotel, San Diego. Executives new to NASM were introduced and welcomed. A discussion of topics of interest for the 1998 meeting ensued. Suggestions included:

1. Issues pertaining to master's degrees, including time spans, alternative formats, summer study, admitting students without a traditional background

for graduate work in music, part-time graduate students, joint programs with other disciplines.

2. Union-faculty issues
3. Affirmative action changes

Following this discussion, members were presented information on the topic of legal issues for music executives. Presenters were Dean Popp, Associate Vice President, San Diego State University; and Karen L. Robinson, litigation counsel for the California State University System. Ms. Robinson holds a BA in political science and JD from the University of California at Los Angeles. General perspectives and suggestions from Dr. Popp included the importance of triangulating communications (obtaining more than one point of view), the need to inform faculty of the Faculty Education Privacy Act, the importance of honestly evaluating lecturers/adjunct faculty as well as full-time faculty, and maintaining a "paper trail" for these employees. Dr. Popp ended his presentation with the observation that "Some faculty, staff, and students are simply crazy." Popp noted that discrimination issues/charges are becoming a catchall response to all negative decisions by administrators.

Ms. Robinson offered insight into what happens when administrative remedies do not solve a problem, and a lawsuit is initiated by a faculty member. She noted that it is important to clarify what the administrator is being sued for, and indicated that suits involving federal statutes must be filed against the institution, while suits relating to state and to common law can be directed at individuals. She indicated it is important to determine if the institution will defend the administrator; this is generally true if the administrator's actions occurred within the scope of his/her job duties. Ms. Robinson suggested that to avoid being sued, administrators need to monitor their own conduct, as issues may be resolved based on the credibility of the administrator. She also agreed with Dr. Popp that consistency and documentation are exceptionally important when evaluating faculty.

The presentation was followed by an extended question and answer session, leading those present to conclude that legal issues for music administrators are a pervasive concern.

Respectfully submitted,  
Judith Kritzmire  
University of Minnesota, Duluth

## REPORT OF REGION FIVE

The meeting of Region 5 was called to order at 4:00 p.m., November 24. Following the introduction of officers, eight new members of Region 5 were introduced. A report of the Board of Directors' business and seminar meetings was read to the

membership, along with a request for suggestions regarding issues for the 1998 meeting in Boston. There was no old business for action or new business for discussion.

Dr. Wayne Bailey, Director of the School of Music at Texas Tech, provided an interesting and informative session entitled "Fundraising Through Friendraisers." Dr. Bailey outlined how his unique approach to fund raising broadens a music unit's community support base and serves as the root of a total development program improving fund raising, concert attendance and unit visibility.

The basis of Dr. Bailey's approach begins with providing "musicales" in the homes of a select number of leading members of the community. Faculty members and students from the school of music provide a wide variety of chamber and ensemble music which is adapted to the specific needs and surroundings of each musicale.

In addition to contributions received as a result of each performance, further contributions have come from the attendees, their friends and acquaintances. This groundwork of support has also increased community attendance at on-campus concerts and has generally increased the visibility and prestige of the school of music. The program has been very successful in Lubbock, Texas.

Many questions followed the presentation.

Respectfully submitted,  
Edwin L. Williams  
Ohio Northern University

## **REPORT OF REGION SIX**

The annual meeting of Region 6 was called to order at 2:15 p.m. by Chair Ronald Lee (University of Rhode Island). The chair made several announcements prior to the opening of the business portion of the meeting. Included among these announcements was the agenda for the day's meeting. Also announced was the vacancy of the position of the Region's Vice Chair. Larry Smith, the former Vice Chair, has accepted a new position as President of the School of American Ballet at Lincoln Center.

The Chair then opened the business meeting by introducing the music executives new to Region 6. They include:

James Barnes, Moravian College  
Terry E. Ewell, West Virginia University  
Daniel S. Godfrey, Syracuse University  
Daniel M. Heslink, Millersville University  
Diane H. Roscetti, University of Maine  
Mark Terenzi, Kean College of New Jersey  
Lawrence J. Wells, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

Nominations for the position of Vice Chair were opened. Those nominated were:

Peter Schoenbach, State University of New York, College at Fredonia  
Robert Adams, Susquehanna University

Nominations were closed by the Chair, and a secret ballot was taken of the membership present at the meeting. Peter Schoenbach was elected for a two-year term.

Prior to the day's meeting, the Chair had requested the membership to submit topics to him for the 1998 regional meeting. These suggestions were placed on a ballot for the members to consider. The Chair asked the members present at the day's meeting for additional suggestions. Since there were no additional topics added to the ballot, the members voted on the topics listed on the ballot. The topics receiving the most interest included faculty evaluation, the status of arts education in the schools, community music schools, and the liberal arts degree in music. Suggested topics for the years 1999 and 2000 were also solicited.

There being no further business, the Chair closed the business portion of the meeting. The meeting then focused on the topic for the Region 6 meeting—Successful Recruitment and Admissions: Issues and Practices. The session covered several topics such as recruitment in foreign countries, admission standards versus number goals, discounting tuition as part of financial aid, innovative but inexpensive advertising, Web site recruitment, recruitment of music majors for non-traditional programs, and model programs and recruitment activities. Presentations were given by Steven G. Baxter, Dean, Conservatory of Music, Peabody Institute of the John Hopkins University; Stephen Marcone, Chairperson, Department of Music, William Paterson University of New Jersey; and Peter Schoenbach, Director, School of Music, State University of New York, College at Fredonia.

Following the presentations by the speakers, Chair Lee presented the results of a survey he conducted on recruitment and admissions practices in music departments and schools in Region 6. The survey was undertaken in October 1997. The floor was then opened for a question and answer period. A lively discussion followed during this period. The Region 6 meeting was closed precisely at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robert Parrish  
College of New Jersey

## **REPORT OF REGION SEVEN**

The November 24, 1997, meeting of Region 7 began with a welcome to and introduction of new executives.

There was no formal business before the Region. Topic suggestions for future meetings were solicited.

Cheryl Brown of the University of California at San Diego made a presentation on shared department leadership. Her presentation was followed by discussion.

Respectfully submitted,  
Charlotte Collins  
Shenandoah University

## **REPORT OF REGION EIGHT**

The annual meeting of Region 8 of the National Association of Schools of Music convened at 2:15 p.m. on Monday, November 24, 1997, at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in San Diego, California. Presiding was the regional Chair, Roosevelt Shelton (Kentucky State University). There were thirty-seven attendees.

The Chair introduced the regional Secretary, Daniel Taddie (Maryville College), and then expressed thanks to Peter Ciurczak (University of Southern Mississippi) for his service as Chair, noting that the latter had resigned as Chair due to retirement.

The Chair of the Nominating Committee, John Roberts (Eastern Kentucky University), proposed the following candidates for office: for Chair, Roosevelt Shelton (Kentucky State University); for Vice Chair, Daniel Taddie (Maryville College); for Secretary, Jimmie James Jr. (Jackson State University). All were elected by acclamation. These officers are to complete the remaining year of the unexpired term plus the following three years of the regular term.

The following music executives new to the region were welcomed: Larry D. Griffith (David Lipscomb University), Craig Hodges (Asbury College), Naomi J. Oliphant (University of Louisville), and Mary Dave Blackman (East Tennessee State University).

Forms were provided for members to suggest topics and speakers for the 1998 Regional Meeting in Boston. An opportunity was provided for regional representatives to express any concerns which should be forwarded to the NASM Board of Directors. No specific concerns were expressed.

The Chair then introduced the guest speakers, Dr. Terry L. Mohn (University of Tampa) and Dr. Ronald D. Ross (Louisiana State University), who addressed the group on the subject "Alliances with Music Dealers and Manufacturers: Equipment Loan Programs." Dr. Mohn focused on concerns of upper administration, while Dr. Ross described the successful Yamaha Piano Loan Program and the

Apple Lease-Purchase Plan at his own institution. Numerous comments and questions followed, some directed to Mike Bates of the Yamaha Corporation, who was in attendance.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Daniel Taddie  
Maryville College

## REPORT OF REGION NINE

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Annette Hall, University of Arkansas at Monticello. Chair Hall introduced the officers for the region: William Ballenger, Oklahoma State University, Vice Chair, and A. C. "Buddy" Himes, University of Southwestern Louisiana, Secretary. A motion was made and seconded for the adoption of the agenda. The motion carried. Vice Chair Ballenger introduced and welcomed executives new to NASM from Region Nine.

Chair Hall called upon the state chairs to present brief reports of activities from their respective states. Reporting were Chalon Ragsdale, University of Arkansas; Michelle Martin, McNeese State University (Louisiana); William Ballenger, Oklahoma State University; and Sam Logsdon, Texas A&M University, Corpus Christi.

Secretary Himes called for issues of concern to Region Nine which needed to be reported to NASM. No concerns were voiced. However, a call was made for information relative to the numbers of hours required at various colleges and universities in the region. Secretary Himes also called for suggestions for the 1998 meeting of Region Nine.

At the conclusion of the business meeting, Chair Hall introduced Charles Boyer from Adams State College in Alamosa, Colorado. Dr. Boyer's presentation was entitled "Curriculum Development for the Future: What Will We Do When the 20th Century Becomes Music History?" The points raised in the presentation were: (1) the new millennium is not futuristic—it is reality; (2) the problem with curriculum reform is the reluctance of faculty to change.

Dr. Boyer stated that we do not need to teach students all that is known; rather, the goal should be to equip them to learn for themselves as the future reveals itself. He suggested that it would be advantageous to think in terms of competencies rather than courses and semester hours. Also, we should focus on what students need to know for the future, not what we (faculty) have learned in the past. He postulated the scenario: What if by some catastrophe a master "delete" key were punched and all curricula were by accident erased? How would we reconstruct a music curriculum so that it made sense in today's world for the graduates of tomorrow?

**Dr. Boyer answered several questions following the conclusion of the presentation. Chair Hall called for a motion that the meeting adjourn. The motion was made, seconded, and carried. With this, Chair Hall adjourned the meeting.**

**Respectfully submitted,  
A. C. "Buddy" Himes  
University of Southwestern Louisiana**

# REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

C. B. WILSON, *CHAIR*

No formal complaints have been brought before the Committee on Ethics during the 1996-97 academic year. However, under NASM procedures, the Executive Director has responded to inquiries concerning the ethics of student and faculty recruitment. In addition, the Committee on Ethics has scheduled sessions with the membership on Sunday afternoon and Monday morning during the Annual Meeting.

NASM representatives are respectfully reminded of their responsibilities to make their faculties and staff aware of the Association's Code of Ethics, particularly its provisions concerning student recruitment.

Institutional members also are asked to review the Code's provisions along with the complaint process outlined in the NASM Rules of Practice and Procedure. Both are found in the NASM *Handbook 1997-98*. Questions about the Code of Ethics or its interpretation should be referred to the Executive Director, who will contact the Committee on Ethics as necessary.

In addition to this formal report, I wish to remind the membership about two ideas concerning the nature of our Code of Ethics.

First, the Code represents a common agreement. It is our Code, collectively and institutionally. As institutional representatives, we have voted to accept its provisions.

Second, the Code's purpose is to encourage orderly process. Its provisions work for the benefit of everyone involved. But, it is effective only to the extent that each of us ensures that all involved with our music unit work seriously with the Code.

The times continue to produce anxieties. Worry about the student and faculty recruitment practices of neighboring institutions can become corrosive.

The NASM Code of Ethics is a set of guidelines that helps us work together on behalf of a common artistic and educational mission by maintaining the good faith and trust we have in each other. Please do three things. First, read the Code of Ethics periodically. Second, and perhaps most important of all, make sure that your faculty members understand that by being a member of NASM, your institution has agreed to abide by all provisions of the Code under all circumstances. Third, when faculty are being hired or students recruited close to—and especially after—the deadlines stipulated in the Code, please take initiatives to ensure that all parties are aware of and working under the Code.

We want to draw your attention to a particular problem. Many of our faculty teach at summer institutes and festivals. It is especially critical that these individuals understand the student recruitment provision of the Code of Ethics. The NASM National Office will place a reminder about this issue in the spring *Report to Members*, and we ask that you discuss this matter with faculty before they leave for summer engagements. It is important to explain the reasons behind provisions of the Code as well as the provisions themselves.

If you have questions or concerns about the Code of Ethics or about compliance with it, please take the first step and call our Executive Director. Let us continue to

work together in the spirit of cooperation and mutual support indigenous to our art form. The Committee on Ethics and I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of these ideas.

Respectfully submitted,  
C. B. Wilson  
West Virginia University

---

---

## **ACTIONS OF THE ACCREDITING COMMISSIONS**

---

---

### **REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON NON-DEGREE-GRANTING ACCREDITATION**

**DEBORAH BERMAN, CHAIR**

*November 1997*

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

After positive action by the Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Accreditation, the following institution was continued in good standing:

Interlochen Center for the Arts

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

Progress reports were accepted from four institutions and acknowledged from one institution recently continued in good standing.

Two programs were granted Plan Approval.

A progress report was accepted from one institution concerning programs recently granted Plan Approval.

Three programs were granted Final Approval for Listing.

A progress report was accepted from one institution recently granted Final Approval for Listing.

Four institutions were notified regarding failure to submit the 1996-97 HEADS Data Survey.

Supplemental Annual Reports from nine institutions were reviewed.

### **REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGE ACCREDITATION**

**LYNN ASPER, CHAIR**

*November 1997*

After positive action by the Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation, the following institution was granted Associate Membership:

Snow College

Action was deferred on one institution applying for Membership.

Progress reports were accepted from two institutions recently continued in good standing.

# **REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION**

**JOYCE J. BOLDEN, CHAIR**

**DANIEL SHER, ASSOCIATE CHAIR**

*June and November 1997*

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

Clarion University of Pennsylvania  
College of Saint Rose  
Valley City State University

Progress reports were accepted from eight institutions and a progress report was acknowledged from one institution recently granted Associate Membership.

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

Florida Baptist Theological College  
Lander University  
University of North Florida

Action was deferred on seven institutions applying for Membership.

Progress reports were accepted from five institutions and a progress report was acknowledged from one institution recently granted Membership.

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

Adams State College  
Augustana College  
Boise State University  
Boston University  
California Institute of the Arts  
California State University, Hayward  
California State University, Los Angeles  
California State University, Northridge  
Central Michigan University  
Furman University  
George Fox University  
Hamline University  
Hope College  
Indiana University  
Ithaca College

Kennesaw State University  
Kentucky State University  
Longwood College  
Louisiana Tech University  
Michigan State University  
Ohio Northern University  
Ohio State University  
Philadelphia College of Bible  
San Francisco State University  
Shorter College  
Silver Lake College  
Sonoma State University  
University of Colorado at Boulder  
University of North Carolina at Pembroke  
University of Rhode Island  
University of Tennessee at Martin  
University of Texas at El Paso  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Walla Walla College

Action was deferred on forty-seven institutions applying for renewal of Membership.

Progress reports were accepted from fifty-five institutions and acknowledged from four institutions recently continued in good standing.

An application from one institution applying for renewal of Membership was denied.

Sixty-four programs were granted Plan Approval.

Action was deferred on twenty programs submitted for Plan Approval.

A progress report was accepted from one institution recently granted Plan Approval.

Thirty-four programs were granted Final Approval for Listing.

Action was deferred on eleven programs submitted for Final Approval for Listing.

A progress report was accepted from one institution recently granted Final Approval for Listing.

Progress reports were accepted from three institutions with substantive change requests.

Progress reports were accepted from five institutions with low enrollments.

Two institutions requested Consultative Review.

Nine institutions were granted second year postponements for re-evaluation.

One institution was granted a third year postponement for re-evaluation.

Five institutions were notified regarding failure to satisfy overdue financial obligations.

Seventeen institutions were notified regarding failure to participate in the 1996-97 HEADS project (failure to submit the most recent annual report).

Four institutions were notified regarding failure to participate in the 1995-96 and the 1996-97 HEADS projects (failure to submit the last two annual reports).

One institution was notified regarding failure to participate in the 1994-95, the 1995-96, and the 1996-97 HEADS projects (failure to submit the last three annual reports).

Supplemental Annual Reports from nine institutions were reviewed.

## NASM OFFICERS, BOARD, COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES, AND STAFF FOR 1998

*President:* \*\*William Hipp, University of Miami (2000)

*Vice President:* \*\*David Tomatz, University of Houston (2000)

*Treasurer:* \*\*Karen L. Wolff, Oberlin College Conservatory of Music (1998)

*Secretary:* \*\*Dorothy Payne, University of South Carolina (1999)

*Immediate Past President:* \*Robert Werner, University of Cincinnati (2000)

### **Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Accreditation**

\* Deborah Berman, San Francisco Conservatory of Music, *Chair* (1999)

Laura Calzolari, Music Conservatory of Westchester (1998)

James Forger, Michigan State University (2000)

### **Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation**

\* Lynn Asper, Grand Rapids Community College, *Chair* (1999)

Richard Brooks, Nassau Community College (1998)

Margaret Guchemand, Essex Community College (2000)

### **Commission on Accreditation**

\*\* Joyce J. Bolden, Alcorn State University, *Chair* (1998)

\*\* Daniel Sher, University of Colorado at Boulder, *Associate Chair* (1998)

Lynn Wood Bertrand, Emory University (1999)

Ronald Crutcher, University of Texas at Austin (1998)

Richard Evans, Whitworth College (1998)

Don Gibson, Ohio State University (2000)

Sr. Catherine Hendel, BVM, Clarke College (2000)

Clayton Henderson, Saint Mary's College (2000)

Shirley Howell, University of Northern Colorado (1999)

Kenneth A. Keeling, Carnegie Mellon University (2000)

Robert A. Kvam, Ball State University (1999)

Marvin Lamb, Baylor University (2000)

Gerald Lloyd, University of Massachusetts, Lowell (1998)

W. David Lynch, Meredith College (1999)

Ernest May, University of Massachusetts, Amherst (1998)

David Nelson, University of Iowa (1999)

Jon R. Piersol, Florida State University (1999)

Mark Wait, Vanderbilt University (1998)

### **Public Members of the Commissions and Board of Directors**

\* Leandra G. Armour, Nashville, Tennessee

\* Christie K. Bohner, Alexandria, Virginia

\* Cindy Boyd, Dallas, Texas

## **Regional Chairs**

- Region 1: \*Patricia Taylor Lee, San Francisco State University (2000)
- Region 2: \*Anne Dhu McLucas, University of Oregon (2000)
- Region 3: \*Robin R. Koozer, Hastings College (2000)
- Region 4: \*Judith Kritzmire, University of Minnesota, Duluth (1999)
- Region 5: \*Edwin Williams, Ohio Northern University (1999)
- Region 6: \*Ronald Lee, University of Rhode Island (1999)
- Region 7: \*Charlotte Collins, Shenandoah University (1998)
- Region 8: \*Roosevelt Shelton, Kentucky State University (1998)
- Region 9: \*Annette Hall, University of Arkansas at Monticello (1998)

## **COMMITTEES**

### **Committee on Ethics**

- Chalon Ragsdale, University of Arkansas, *Chair* (1998)
- Wayne Bailey, Texas Tech University (1999)
- Edward J. Kvet, Loyola University (2000)

### **Nominating Committee**

- James Scott, University of Illinois, *Chair* (1998)
- Linda Duckett, Mankato State University (1998)
- Mellaseh Y. Morris, James Madison University (1998)
- Robert E. Parrish, College of New Jersey (1998)
- Rollin R. Potter, California State University, Sacramento (1998)

### **National Office Staff**

- \*\* Samuel Hope, Executive Director
- Karen P. Moynahan, Associate Director
- Chira Kirkland, Administrative Assistant and Meeting Specialist
- David Bading, Editor
- Willa Shaffer, Projects Associate
- Jennifer Nelson-Dowdy, Accreditation Specialist
- Jan Timpano, Constituent Services Representative
- Kimberly Radcliffe, Accreditation Coordinator
- Nadine Flint, Financial Associate

\* Board of Directors

\*\* Executive Committee

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC**

11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 21  
Reston, Virginia 20190