

**PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
43RD
ANNUAL
MEETING**

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

1424 SIXTEENTH ST. N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF
SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
43rd ANNUAL MEETING

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1967

Published by the
National Association of Schools of Music
Suite 202
1424 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Library of Congress Catalogue Number 58-38291

Copyright © 1968

National Association of Schools of Music
Suite 202, 1424 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036

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

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Officers of the Association 1967-68..... | iii |
| National Office | iii |
| Program of the 1967 Annual Meeting..... | 1 |
| Commissions..... | 3 |
| Minutes of the Plenary Session..... | 4 |
| President's Report..... | 7 |
| Treasurer's Report..... | 19 |
| Executive Secretary's Report..... | 21 |
| Report of the Commission on Curricula..... | 27 |
| Report of the Graduate Commission..... | 30 |
| List of Schools Approved for Associate and Full Membership in NASM — June and November 1967 Meetings..... | 32 |
| Addresses: | |
| "The Dynamics of Change," <i>James Nickerson</i> | 34 |
| "The Present Status of the Copyright Revision Bill," <i>Harold Spivacke</i> | 46 |
| "Tradition and Experiment," <i>Lukas Foss</i> | 52 |
| Committee Reports: | |
| Nominating Committee..... | 57 |
| Ethics..... | 58 |
| Music in General Education, Improvement of Teaching, Pre- Collegiate and Non-Credit Activities and Teacher Education in Music..... | 59 |
| State Certification and Legislation..... | 63 |
| Publicity and Public Relations..... | 63 |
| Junior Colleges..... | 65 |
| Library..... | 66 |
| Independent Schools..... | 67 |
| Summary of the Meeting of Regional Chairmen..... | 68 |
| Report of the Sub-Committee on Music Education..... | 69 |
| Address presented to State Certification and Legislation: | |
| "The Maintenance of Standards Through Teacher Certification," <i>Dr. Russell Getz</i> | 72 |
| Address presented to Region V: | |
| "NASM and Specialized Accreditation," <i>John A. Flower</i> | 81 |
| Future Annual Meetings..... | 86 |

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION — 1967-68

OFFICERS

President: Robert Hargreaves, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

1st Vice-President:

Warner Lawson, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

2nd Vice-President:

LaVahn Maesch, Lawrence University, Appleton, Wisconsin.

Recording Secretary:

Thomas Williams, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois.

Treasurer: Carl M. Neumeyer, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Illinois.

REGIONAL CHAIRMEN

Region 1: Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah.
Paul Strub, Eastern New Mexico University, Portales, New Mexico

Region 2: Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington.
Jay Slaughter, Ricks College, Rexburg, Idaho

Region 3: Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming.
J. Laiten Weed, Yankton College, Yankton, South Dakota

Region 4: Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin.
Sister Theophane, Alverno College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Region 5: Indiana, Michigan, Ohio.
Ferris E. Ohl, Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio

Region 6: Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia.
Nathan Gottschalk, Hartt College of Music, West Hartford, Connecticut

Region 7: Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia.
Arthur Fraser, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina

Region 8: Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, Tennessee.
Hugh Thomas, Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham, Alabama

Region 9: Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas.
Louise Waldorf, Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts, Chickasha, Oklahoma

NATIONAL OFFICE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

1424 Sixteenth Street, N.W. Suite 202

Washington, D. C. 20036

David A. Ledet, *Executive Secretary*

Kurt Werner, *Staff Associate*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
FORTY-THIRD ANNUAL MEETING
NOVEMBER 1967

PROGRAM

Commission meetings, 21–22 November
Executive Committee meetings, 23–24 November

FRIDAY, 24 NOVEMBER 1967

8:00 a.m. Registration

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

9:30 a.m. Roll Call

Report of the Commission on Curricula
Report of the Graduate Commission
Election and Introduction of New Member Institutions
Report of the Committee on Ethics
Reports of the Standing Committees
Report of the Treasurer
Reports of the Executive Secretary
Report of the President
Report of the Nominating Committee

12:30 a.m. Luncheon — Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia

SECOND GENERAL SESSION

2:00 p.m. ADDRESS: "The Dynamics of Change"

JAMES NICKERSON
President
Mankato State College

2:30 p.m. ADDRESS: "The Present Status of the
Copyright Revision Bill"

HAROLD SPIVACKE
Chief, Music Division
Library of Congress

3:00 p.m. Standing Committee Meetings

7:30 p.m. Workshop for Examiners

7:30 p.m. Information for Prospective Members

8:30 p.m. Regional Meetings

SATURDAY, 25 NOVEMBER 1967

THIRD GENERAL SESSION

- 9:00 a.m. Election of the 1967-68 Officers
Report of Second Development Council
Revision of By-Laws and Regulations

11:00 a.m. ADDRESS: "Tradition and Experiment"

LUKAS FOSS

Conductor

Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra

12:00 p.m. Executive Committee — Luncheon Meeting

FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

- 2:00 p.m. Report on Evaluation Procedures in Music by
Contemporary Music Project

ADDRESS: "Evaluation Criteria for Music in Education"

SAMUEL ADLER

Director

Institutes for Music in Contemporary Education
Eastern Region, Eastman School of Music

DEMONSTRATION SESSION:

"Comprehensive Musicianship"

Students from Midwestern and
Eastern Regions, IMCE

Moderator — ARRAND PARSONS

Director, IMCE

SUMMARY: GRANT BEGLARIAN, *Project Director*
Contemporary Music Project for
Creativity in Music Education

4:00 p.m. Introduction of 1967-68 Officers and Regional Chairmen

4:15 p.m. Adjournment

4:30 p.m. Executive Committee Meeting

The forty-third annual meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music was held in Chicago, Illinois, on 25-26 November 1967. The attendance was the largest in the history of the association, with a record 331 delegates from member institutions, 67 registered guests and numerous other guests.

The principal addresses were given by Dr. James Nickerson, President, Mankato State College; Harold Spivacke, Chief, Music Division, Library of Congress; Lukas Foss, Conductor, Buffalo Philharmonic

Orchestra; and Samuel Adler, Director, Institutes for Music in Contemporary Education, Eastman School of Music.

COMMISSIONS

COMMISSION ON CURRICULA

Thomas Gorton, *Chairman*, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas (1970).

Robert L. Briggs, University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma (1968).

Jackson K. Ehlert, Jordan College of Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana (1969).

Warner Imig, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado (1970).

Robert Marvel, State University College, Fredonia, New York (1970).

Warren Scharf, Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio (1970).

Himie Voxman, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa (1969).

Earl V. Moore, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, *Consultant*.

GRADUATE COMMISSION

Everett Timm, *Chairman*, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana (1968).

Henry A. Bruinsma, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona (1969).

Richard Duncan, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia (1968).

Roger Dexter Fee, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado (1968).

Lee Rigsby, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio (1969).

Edwin Stein, Boston University of Fine and Applied Arts, Boston, Massachusetts (1970).

James B. Wallace, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan (1970).

Howard Hanson, Eastman School of Music, Rochester, New York, *Consultant*.

MINUTES OF THE PLENARY SESSIONS

The first general session of the Forty-Third Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music, Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois, was called to order at 9:30 a.m., with President Hargreaves presiding. Mr. Louis Sudler, representing Mayor Richard B. Daley and the Chicago Chamber of Commerce, was presented by President Hargreaves and extended warm greetings and best wishes for a successful meeting to all members and guests in attendance. In response, President Hargreaves expressed the gratitude of all for the friendly greeting by Mr. Sudler.

The report of the Commission on Curricula was presented by Thomas Gorton, Chairman, followed by the report of the Graduate Commission by Everett Timm, Chairman. Both reports were approved by formal action of the membership.

Thomas Gorton also presented the report of the Bachelor of Arts Degree Sub-Committee. A motion was made by Gorton, seconded by Sandresky, that the statement (circulated to the membership earlier and also printed in the 1967 *Bulletin*) on the Bachelor of Arts degree program replace the present statement in the *NASM By-Laws and Regulations*. Motion carried. Chairmen of the new member institutions and chairmen of those institutions promoted to full membership were then called to the platform for presentation of certificates.

A report of the Committee on Ethics, Myron Russell, Chairman, was presented and accepted by the membership.

Carl Neumeier, Treasurer, presented a detailed financial report for the fiscal year 1967. It was approved by the membership.

President Hargreaves introduced the new Executive Secretary, David Ledet, who presented a concise report of the activities of the national office since his appointment, July 1, 1967.

In his report to the membership, President Hargreaves spoke of the numerous meetings he had attended as official representative of the

Association and in a stimulating address expressed his concern for the role of the Association in the future of music in America.

The final item of the first general session was the report of the Nominating Committee by Acting Chairman Reid Poole. The slate of candidates presented is listed in the report of the Nominating Committee.

Dr. James Nickerson, President, Mankato State College, was introduced by President Hargreaves to open the Second General Session. His address "The Dynamics of Change" was provocative and challenging and well received by the membership.

Sharing the podium with Dr. Nickerson was Dr. Harold Spivacke, Chief, Music Division, Library of Congress. Dr. Spivacke gave a clearly defined report on the "Present Status of the Copyright Revision Bill."

Meetings of the Standing Committees completed the agenda for the Second General Session, where topics of wide interest were presented and discussed.

Music in General Education — Robert Trotter
Improvement of Teaching — Kenneth Cuthbert
Pre-Collegiate and Non-Credit Activities — G. Gene Taylor
Teacher Education in Music — Robert Marvel

Joint Meeting — Agenda: The Tanglewood Symposium — Its Implications for Higher Education

Louis Wersen — Purposes, Plans, and Objectives of the Tanglewood Symposium

Wylie Housewright — General Implications for Higher Education

Warner Lawson — Critical Issues

Warner Imig — Improvements for Teacher Education and Improvement of Teaching of Music

Everett Timm — Economic and Community Support for the Arts and Continuing Education

State Certification and Legislation — Eugene Crabb

Junior Colleges — Eugene Bonelli

Library — Lee Rigsby

Independent Schools — Leo Heim

Committee on Ethics — Myron Russell

The Workshop for Examiners with Thomas Gorton and Everett Timm presiding was well attended and brought about a gratifying exchange of questions, suggestions, and directives.

Regional Meetings, with the Chairman presiding, completed the busy agenda of the opening day.

Election of Officers for 1967-68 was the first item of the Third General Session with President Hargreaves presiding.

A detailed report of the Second Development Council was presented by the Chairman, LaVahn Maesch. The report summarized in detail conclusions of the committee as they surveyed the role of NASM in future years. Following this report, proposed revision of the By-Laws were presented for formal action to the membership. On motion of Maesch/Dayton Smith the following revisions of the By-Laws and Regulations were approved.

The appropriate sentences of Page 15, Article 6, No. 1, of the By-Laws to be amended to read as follows:

\$100.00 for preparatory school members

\$100.00 for junior college members

\$150.00 for schools offering only the baccalaureate degree in music and/or music education

\$200.00 for schools which offer work through the master's degree in music and/or music education

\$300.00 for schools which offer major programs in music and/or music education through the doctorate

Lukas Foss, Conductor, Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra, concluded the Third General Session with a perceptive address on the subject, "Tradition and Experiment." Mr. Foss' comments were warmly received by a capacity audience.

At the fourth general session, Saturday, November 25, Samuel Adler, Director, Institutes for Music in Contemporary Education, Eastern Region, addressed the membership on "Evaluative Criteria for Music in Education." Following the address an interesting demonstration session on "Comprehensive Musicianship" moderated by Arrand Parsons and utilizing two students each from Northwestern University and the University of Indiana gained high approval from members present. President Hargreaves introduced the newly elected officers and regional chairmen for 1967-68 to conclude a rewarding Forty-Third Annual Meeting.



PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Little did I know when I stood before you last year in Dallas blithely comparing the processes of settling the NASM and its executive secretariat down in Washington to the serio-comic aspects of the movie "A Period of Adjustment" that I should soon be whistling another tune — something from "The Gay Divorcee," if not indeed a mournful version of "The Merry Widow Waltz"!

My honeymooners' allegory, you will recall, had reference not only to the mundane business of setting up housekeeping in a Washington office but to the subtler aspects of a developing partnership between a pair of individuals who for better or for worse had linked their destinies in the service of a great national organization. Thus, a "career" executive secretary and an elected official were the consenting parties who "sought to plan a glorious future in the midst of present uncertainty and with a nervous eye on that old devil, budget."

It was no failure in the twosome's relationship, nor any lack of faith in the future of their undertaking which led Warren Scharf to resign the position he had so magnificently initiated as executive secretary of the NASM. Rather, it was the resurgence of an earlier affection — one that each of you can understand — the love for music-making in the campus environment which recalled him to the ranks of academic music executives.

Your executive committee was thus faced with the formidable task of finding a successor capable of carrying forward the active management of NASM affairs, of continuing the momentum already established without loss of energy, and of coping with the increased demands of an inevitably expanding operation. The selection of David Ledet from a field of truly outstanding candidates was a protracted undertaking

soberly pursued and, we are increasingly convinced, effectively consummated. In Dr. Ledet we have found a quiet competence and a sturdy self-reliance which — coupled with a penchant for the gracious gesture and a native friendliness — should fit him ideally for his role as “our man in Washington.”

In our Dallas meeting, I enumerated for you five of the challenges to the NASM of which I had become increasingly aware. Let us review the intervening year’s activities against that structuring, as much to remind ourselves of the great opportunities yet remaining for accomplishment as to take any small pride in seeming gains:

1. What is the NASM? What ought it to be in the judgment of its music-administrator members? and
2. After accreditation, what?

In partial answer to these questions we can point to the attractive brochure *NASM* which in terse fashion highlights the purposes, structure, and benefits of the association. We can point further to *A Basic Music Library* — a representative listing prepared by our Library Committee. We can mention a greatly expanded *Bulletin* — more than twice the size of its immediate predecessor — and to an improved *Directory* of member schools, which for its enhanced accuracy and completeness is finding more and more interested users. We could mention the more frequent newsletters and mimeographed bulletins coming from our Washington office. Finally, we can rather boastfully exclaim about *Music in Higher Education* — surely the most complete and authoritative publication of its kind ever available — and recognize in this first-of-a-series the tolling of a bell for that eternal plague of the music administrator, the “I need to convince my administration” questionnaire!

All these and more are a part of our effort to increase the “visibility” of NASM to the outsider and the value of the association to its members.

Much less obvious — but perhaps equally important — is the seemingly continuous flow of ideas and suggestions through correspondence, conversations, committee meetings, executive sessions, and the annual meeting itself. Some of the brilliant ideas, alas, are much more fleet of inspiration than of execution! From rhetoric to reality is not an easy step, but even here progress is discernible. Last year we said:

In recognition of the importance of decisive action in the immediate future of the NASM, and believing that the present ferment of change in the nature and function of accreditation, in the place of the arts and humanities on our

campuses, and in the importance of creative and artistic pursuits in our national culture presents an imperative for new momentum, I have asked the Executive Committee to authorize a second Development Council.

It is my hope that such a Council will find it possible to chart paths acceptable to the membership of NASM which will lead with a minimum of delay to the broadening and consolidation of our position as spokesman for all manifestations of music in American higher education, to the further enhancement of the place of collegiate music in American musical life, and to the extension of the study of music in the university years of America's intellectual elite.

Without question we must find additional sources of financial support for the accomplishment of these and other objectives.

Very possibly we shall find it to our advantage to invite the cooperation of other organizations representative of the ambitions of the arts in American education.¹

The second Development Council was duly authorized and appointed; its distinguished membership included LaVahn Maesch, chairman, Reid Poole, Carl Neumeyer, and James Wallace. Addressing itself first to the imperatives — essentially the finding of "additional sources of financial support" and the evaluation of suggestions that NASM hold only biennial national meetings — the group presented a well-reasoned report which was approved by the Executive Committee at its June meetings. Certain items of the report have already been made known to you and the whole will be presented formally for your consideration in the third general session on Saturday morning.

A second look at the more pressing problems requiring prompt solution by the Association brought to your Executive Committee the realization that action on these would be enough to expect of the Development Council II; other minds — free of the imminent practical concerns — should be asked to "dream" about the possibilities of broadening, consolidating, enhancing, extending! For this purpose, a Council for Plans, Projects, and Improvements was instituted under the chairmanship of Warner Lawson, comprising in addition Victor Babin, John Brownlee, Bryce Jordan, Roger Miller, and Edwin Stein.

Although this Council has not yet made any recommendations for consideration by the Association, the Executive Committee has begun the process of referring investigations to them. An example just given the Council for review is the problem of several requests for a form of accreditation to meet government funding standards from institutions not fitting present NASM classes of membership.

¹President's Report, *The Bulletin*, NASM. February 1967, pp. 18, 19.

We have, at least, met some of our major problems — previously latent — head-on. We have made a beginning. But after all, the main reason for our existence presently remains that of serving as the accrediting agency for music in American higher education. Thus our annual meeting has a special reason for being — providing as it does the only time in which the work of the Commissions can be detailed to the membership and their recommendations regarding the admission of new members and the introduction of new curricula can be approved, questioned or rejected. Moreover, the continuing existence of a flexible set of standards — working guidelines to quality education in music — requires continuous thinking and refinement by our member school executives. The function of the annual meeting as a forum for the exchange of ideas on major issues in music education cannot therefore be minimized.

3. Inclusiveness vs. Impotence.

The statistics of our growth in recent months and that indicated for the years immediately ahead suggest that we are much closer to inclusiveness than many might have thought possible or even desirable a few years ago. A number of you have served as "missionaries" to schools in your area — regional chairmen in particular have agreed to explore the possibility of NASM membership for unaffiliated institutions. Although many of the newer institutions may not be ready for application procedures, it seems reasonable to believe that all undertaking major music programs would wish to measure those programs against the standards of the national accrediting agency.

Dr. Paul A. Miller, Assistant Secretary for Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has pointed out that:

. . . much of the discussion about and references to higher education revolve around approximately 100 colleges and universities. It is time that we all became more familiar with the entire system of higher education in this country; the differing traditions, the varied quality of work, and the best ways in which the strong can strengthen the weak through association.²

In this process of encouraging new membership we must beware the possible misunderstanding that the NASM would seek to make of every school the complete conservatory, professional school of music, or gradu-

²Paul A. Miller, "Clearing the Way for Innovation," *Educational Record*, Spring 1967, Vol. 48, No. 2, p. 140.

ate institution. As *Time Magazine's* education editor in writing of "Universities: Anxiety Behind the Façade" has warned:

Self-restraint is sorely needed; small liberal arts colleges need not try to become second-rate universities.³

Part of our function can surely be that of lending dignity to the limited objective, sanctity to realistic goals.

Geographical pockets of incomplete membership remain — for reasons not always known to me. For example, no unit of the University of California system presently holds membership, although five campuses of the state college system are active and esteemed partners in NASM. Perhaps the fact that one campus of the University of California has begun correspondence regarding membership gives evidence of an emerging pattern!

Our continually evolving relationships with other organizations — the American Association of Junior Colleges, the American Association of Theological Schools, for example — and through the National Commission on Accrediting, the regional accrediting associations and the National Commission on the Accreditation of Teacher Education — suggest that your Association is well aware of its opportunity for expanded service and of the need for progressive change.

4. The Education of the Educators, and
5. The Education of the Body Politic.

The very nature of the program planned for this convention — with its heavy emphasis on the Tanglewood Symposium and related aspects of the place of music in the general society — suggests that we have not forgotten the broader social ramifications of our quest for an enhanced recognition of music in American collegiate life.

Unsuccessful in its request to the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities for funding was an equally important evidence of our continuing concern with the education of the educators and of the body politic. This took the form of a proposal for a study of the place of music as a part of liberal education. In the words of Barnaby C. Keeney, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities:

The council, as well as members of the staff and screening panels who evaluated it, saw in your proposal considerable merit; but felt that it lay outside our present areas of active interest.

³*Time Magazine*, June 23, 1967, p. 78.

Our very limited present budget has forced us to select those relatively few fields of support which we and our advisers find most crucial.⁴

We are encouraged to feel that a reworking of our proposal may yet find foundation support, and are hopeful that our Committee on Music in General Education will assist our secretariat in undertaking this as a major project.

In my 1966 report, I was able to identify two encouraging indications of coming improvement in what many of us have felt to be an area of academic discrimination against the music student — the content of collegiate admissions tests. The College Entrance Examination Board has agreed to consider the inclusion of music material in the standard content of admissions tests; we have no final action to report at this time but do consider this a continuing project. At the level of selection for the graduate school, we have been asked by the Educational Testing Service to endorse a panel of experts who will assist in planning the nature and scope of an additional form of the Graduate Record Examinations.

Perhaps more exciting is the news contained in a recent letter from Roger L. Stevens, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts:

. . . I want to assure you that the Endowment's interest in the study of college entrance examinations and admission requirements (and their influence upon the secondary school curricula in the arts) remains active.

We experienced some difficulty in getting the study underway, but a grant has been made to the Association for Higher Education for the purposes I outlined in my letter to Warren Scharf. It is being directed by Dr. Lawrence E. Dennis, a man with considerable experience in higher education administration and the arts. It is our understanding that the Association for Higher Education will appoint shortly a national commission to carry out the study. By way of a copy of this letter, I will inform Dr. Dennis of your considerable interest. I feel sure he will wish to contact you or one of your associates at NASM.

Thank you again for conveying your continuing interest in this project, for the resolution which supports this activity, and for your expressed willingness to provide further assistance.

In a newsletter of last January I gave some details of the exploratory meeting during our Dallas convention in which representatives of several fields other than music were invited to consider the prospect of a unified agency for accrediting and promoting the arts. Further discus-

⁴Barnaby C. Keeney, in a letter to Dr. Warren A. Scharf, dated 2-1-67.

sion of such a project took place in Washington during February in connection with a meeting of the Board of Directors of the relatively new National Council of the Arts in Education. From the February meeting, it was clear that no consensus was possible at this time among the diverse organizations representing some 20 facets of dance, theater, visual arts, and music. Your Executive Committee had previously authorized Dr. Scharf to proceed with preliminary negotiations which could lead to submission of a specific proposal regarding joint representation in the Washington office for NASA and NASM. Such a practical step has now been authorized by your Executive Committee. Effective at the earliest feasible date — possibly the first of December, 1967 — the secretarial activities of the NASA will be transferred from New York to merge with the Washington headquarters of the NASM. This action represents, we believe, not only an opportunity for greater financial stability but the very kind of cooperation which can promote a strengthened voice for the arts in the academic councils of the land. The representative of a third major field of the arts — the American Educational Theatre Association — is presently exploring with us the feasibility of a shared secretariat as a part of a working federation of arts accrediting associations.

Through the exchange of ideas with our related professional organizations in music, through plans for the provision of increased financial resources, through cooperative endeavors among organizations of the kindred arts, through the pursuit of foundation support and activity in specific projects — through all of these and more we shall continue our efforts toward the education of our academic and governmental patrons for increased receptivity and understanding.

It was again my pleasure to represent NASM at the January meetings of the National Music Council in New York City. Combining as it does an astonishing variety of agencies, organizations and associations related in manifold ways to the spectrum of musical life in our country, the National Music Council was in those sessions primarily concerned with three matters: changes in its own constitution and operations (including the then impending retirement of our own Howard Hanson from his 23-year tenure as president), the promotion and performance of American music abroad, and the responsibilities of hosting the International Music Council Congress in 1968. Much emphasis was placed on the fact that when the International Congress is held in Europe, government funds seem lavishly available to assure a favorable representa-

tion of the host country's artistic accomplishments; in the United States on the other hand, the constituent organizations of the National Music Council will be called upon to assist its officers in providing matching funds to merit a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Recognizing the increasing importance of Washington, D. C., in the nation's cultural life, the officers of the National Music Council have determined to hold sessions of the International Congress in both New York City and the national capital. I have offered the services and support of the NASM to Mr. John Browning, Executive Secretary of the National Music Council, and it is my hope that we may play a significant role in this international setting.

As did a half-dozen or more other NASM participants in wide geographical distribution, your president attended a regional meeting of the AACTE devoted to the work of the Evaluative Criteria Study Committee. The avowed intent of these regional discussion meetings — following as they did the individual submission of "Opinionaires" on the NCATE *Standards for Accrediting Teacher Education* — was to bring the viewpoints of "selected professional organizations" to the attention of the members of the Evaluative Criteria Study group instituted by AACTE. You will recall that a new constitution for the revitalized NCATE gave the responsibility for rebuilding the criteria to the AACTE.

As reported to you last November, the "process of rebuilding criteria will take three or four years" and "AACTE will focus its efforts on the development of new evaluative criteria rather than on procedural aspects of accreditation."

Because I believe that there is real evidence of success in calling attention to our points of view, and because the very extent of that success suggests clearly that the field of music is not alone in cherishing integrity and influence in the education of those who would teach its art, I want to quote to you some excerpts from the first-year progress report of the Evaluative Criteria Study (1966-67). This report was published in Volume XX, No. 6 (September 15, 1967) of the AACTE *Bulletin*.

1. The Accreditation of Teacher Education:

Strong support was given to the principle of national accreditation of teacher education.

Approval for present NCATE procedures was given by roughly half of the Evaluative Criteria Study participants; another one-third gave partial ap-

proval with suggestions for modifications. The remainder either disapproved or gave no opinion.

2. Nature of the New Standards.

The primary purpose of accreditation should be the application of an acceptability floor; the stimulation of improvement will result as a by-product, and should be fostered through *specialized* interest groups. Improvement should be stimulated also, over the long pull, through a periodic "raising of the acceptability floor."

The standards should be explicit in nature, with specificity wherever appropriate. In addition, they should deal with the three components in a teacher education program: general education, *specialization*, and professional education. They should deal with certain aspects of general education—balance, pattern, and quantity—and the *specialization* component (content), and with the whole of professional education.

Participants in the study indicated that more attention should be given to *evaluating the specialization component*. It is believed by many that there should be greater *coordination between NCATE and other accrediting groups* (regional accrediting associations and state departments of education). The responsibility of the *professional organizations and learned societies in upgrading the quality of the specialization component also was stressed* by a number of participants in the study.

3. The Substance of the New Standards.

The new standards should: (a) give less attention to the institutional structure (organization and administration) for teacher education; (b) include a greater emphasis on evaluating the prospective graduates of teacher education programs; (c) be explicit on the encouragement of innovation and experimentation in teacher education.

4. Procedural Matters.

There is agreement among a substantial number of participants in the study that there should be *more involvement of specialized interest groups* in the evaluation and accreditation of teacher education. On the question of the nature of such involvement, there was a spread of opinions ranging from support for an informal, indirect involvement *to support for a formal, direct involvement in the accreditation process*.

It is believed by many that the *specialized interest groups have a major role to play in the improvement of teacher education*. It is felt that this improvement role can be carried out most effectively through such activities as the following:

- a. Preparing guidelines or standards for their respective *specialization areas* which might be used by institutions and existing accrediting agencies.
- b. Working with institutions directly and with other professional organizations in promoting the improvement of teacher education.
- c. Assisting institutions in the task of evaluating the competence of their prospective teachers (and other school personnel) through the development of sound evaluative instruments and procedures.

Widespread support was registered for the importance of having high-

quality institutional evaluators who are given thorough orientation and training for their assignments.

5. Current Status and Next Steps.

" . . . it is anticipated that the first draft will be sent to participants in the Evaluative Criteria Study sometime during November or December for reactions. *The Committee, after reviewing the feedback from participants, will make appropriate modifications in the preliminary draft. It is hoped that the revised preliminary draft will be ready for testing in eight to ten pilot institutions sometime in January or February, 1968.*

The Committee expects to have its recommendations to the AACTE Executive Committee ready by late 1969. Upon approval by this body, the recommendations will be transmitted to the NCATE for action. . . . "

and presumably at that time the course of our future cooperation in the accreditation of teacher education will be mutually determined!

A pair of unusual privileges came during the past Spring when I was asked to speak as your representative in ceremonies honoring the birthdays of two great institutions of the NASM — Dr. Rudolph Ganz and the Oberlin Conservatory of Music. While the Oberlin Conservatory had with collective effort reached the impressive age of 100 years, Dr. Ganz had single-handedly attained to the eminence of nine decades! Knowing the great affection in which Dr. Ganz has long been held by the members of this association, I was particularly flattered to be included in a head table group otherwise composed of truly distinguished people gathered together with a ballroom full of accomplished representatives of our art to bring homage to this great man and musician. You would be interested, I think, to know that a Chicago Musical College preparatory department dropout also made the grade to the head table — blue eyes and all — to bring the crowning gift of humor to a nostalgic occasion. It was, of course, that celebrated violinist from nearby Waukegan — Jacques Benny!

The Oberlin centennial year program included a week of residency by Aaron Copland; it was a particular pleasure to share the convocation platform with the distinguished composer and see at close range his unfeigned delight in the superb performance of his *Lark* given by the College Choir under the direction of our colleague Dean Robert Fountain!

Just in passing, may I remark that the increasing maturity of music in American education becomes more believable when one realizes that three of our Conservatory members have this year attained the century mark! In addition to Oberlin, the New England Conservatory has celebrated its centennial during the past ten months, and the College-

Conservatory of the University of Cincinnati is just launching its own 100th birthday festivities.

In closing my report to you a year ago, I said, "Our campus cultivation of the arts may, then, be taking on an importance which transcends the difficulties and occasional frustrations we experience as their champions." It is a delight to be able to conclude this report on a note of enthusiastic support of that point of view — an endorsement coming not from prejudiced authority but from the University of Michigan's great president, Harlan Hatcher:

There is a harmony between the human soul and the world of art; there are sustaining truths about life which escape the laboratories. . . .

Life is a pure flame and we live by an invisible sun within. There must not be two worlds of culture — one scientific and one humane and artistic — with a linguistic and spiritual chasm between them. They are interdependent, and the modern university must make it as easy and reasonable as possible for them to act in unity on students and faculty within the environment of the campus and the community.

There are many encouraging signs that we are doing so. . . . Plainly evident is the mood of readiness in the country and the growing number of creative centers across the nation, usually with a focus in the colleges and universities themselves. . . .

Music, literature, and the fine arts are more vital in the college course and campus life than they have ever been in America. . . .

. . . The result is a noticeable movement toward geographical balance in the culture of the country, with the colleges and universities playing a leading role in the achievement.⁵

Gratifying as is President Hatcher's assessment of our success in building the cultural achievements of our campus and our country, there is in his almost casual acceptance of an academic parity between the arts and the sciences a basis for heady elation. The artist today, says Hatcher, "needs to know and understand in a wider sense the learning of his times . . . a knowledge of the world revealed by these disciplines [the sciences and social studies] is as vital to the artist *as a knowledge and appreciation of art is to the scientist in the laboratory across the campus.*"⁶

With Hatcher we are glad to conclude that the arts and sciences need not represent two separate cultures — rather they combine to form the whole man of our day

⁵Harlan Hatcher, "The Fine Arts in the Colleges and Universities," *Music at Michigan*. Vol. 1, No. 2, Spring-Summer, 1967.

⁶*Ibid.*

. . . comparable to Spencer's King Arthur, man of magnanimity — the true renaissance man. They are both a part of the fabric of life itself and must be kept in harmonious relationship. The role of the college and university is to cultivate an understanding and appreciation of both, and to encourage genius in either. There is no environment in modern society except the colleges and universities where this mission can be accomplished.

Let us therefore continue to build a solid structure of *knowledge, appreciation, and, where possible, skills in the arts* as a natural part of the college curriculum. Let us give it *full academic recognition; search out and reward the great teachers and creators in these fields and make them equal in all ways in the fellowship of scholars.*⁷

ROBERT HARGREAVES, *President*

⁷Ibid.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Chicago, Illinois
November 24, 1967

Copies of a summary report of cash receipts and disbursements and of investment transactions for the fiscal year ended August 31, 1967, have been distributed to all representatives of member institutions. The report reflects the activity of the Association during its second full year of operation in the Washington office. As anticipated when the decision was made to establish a central office, the Association has operated at a deficit during these two years. This can be expected to continue until more adequate resources become available.

Receipts from dues represent an increase of \$1905.00, reflecting growth both in institutional and individual memberships. Examination fees received also show an increase as the periodic reexamination program has been more fully activated. On the other hand, this has also meant considerably greater expenditures for examinations and a considerable increase of work load and expense in the central office. As our resources diminish, our income from invested funds also continues to diminish.

Total receipts for the year, including redemption on maturity of certain Treasury Bills and United States Bonds, were \$87,839.02. Total disbursements, including reinvestment of a portion of the redeemed securities, amounted to \$88,947.83. This excess of disbursements over receipts reduced the cash balance by \$1,108.81. The second page of the report shows that it was also necessary to reduce our investments from \$37,615.58 to \$24,685.13. Together these reductions in resources in cash and investments represent a deficit of \$14,039.26. It becomes very apparent that this kind of annual deficit cannot be carried from our invested resources beyond the 1967-68 fiscal year.

This report is based on figures extracted from the professional audit prepared by Alexander Grant and Company. A copy of the complete audit has been placed in the hands of each member of the Executive Committee.

CARL M. NEUMEYER, *Treasurer*

ALEXANDER GRANT & COMPANY
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
210 EAST WASHINGTON STREET
BLOOMINGTON, ILLINOIS 61701

President and Executive Committee
National Association of Schools of Music

We have examined the financial statements of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC (an Ohio corporation, not for profit) for the year ended August 31, 1967. The statements have been prepared on the basis of cash receipts and disbursements, and accordingly our examination was directed primarily to testing the accuracy of the cash transactions.

In our opinion, the accompanying statements present fairly the assets and liabilities of the National Association of Schools of Music at August 31, 1967, arising from cash transactions and the revenues collected and expenses disbursed by it during the year then ended.

The accompanying supplemental statement of investments at August 31, 1967, has been subjected to the tests and other auditing procedures applied in the examination of the financial statements and, in our opinion, is fairly stated in all respects material to the basic financial statements taken as a whole.

ALEXANDER GRANT & COMPANY

Bloomington, Illinois
October 23, 1967

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

I quote from an opening paragraph written by my predecessor, Dr. Warren Scharf, a gentleman who preferred the meandering, contemplative, philosophical, tweedy life among the halls of ivy,

"An Executive Secretary's report, I am informed by members of the small and relatively undistinguished company of those bearing that title, should invariably begin with a lengthy listing of activities, calculated to impress his constituency with the efficiency and zeal of himself and his office, while incidentally underscoring the point that the office is under-staffed and under-equipped, though richly supplied with both talent and industry."

In the four months that I have been in office my experience has shown that not a word of this should be changed.

Therefore, may I give you a brief summary of NASM's accrediting function and membership growth.

1. MEMBERSHIP GROWTH RATE

Nov. 1966, 17 applicant institutions; 13 accepted into associate membership.
Nov. 1967, 17 applicant institutions; 11 accepted into associate membership.

2. PROSPECTIVE NEW MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

We are now corresponding with over 275 institutions regarding membership. We have 105 individual members, with 33 new this year.

3. REEXAMINATION OF MEMBER INSTITUTIONS, on the ten-year cycle

Scheduled for 1967-68, 41 — 12 of these have taken place with 29 scheduled over the rest of the year.

Scheduled for 1968-69, 37 — the examiners will be set early in the spring of 1968. 51 member institutions have been notified of reexamination full 1969-70. The examiners will be set in early spring 1969.

Next year, 1968-69, we will schedule approximately 40 institutions for re-examination for 1970-71, thus continuing to visit about 10% of the full membership each year.

4. APPLICATION FOR PROMOTION TO FULL MEMBERSHIP

The backlog of institutions eligible to become full members was cut appreciably when, last year 15 of 22 eligible associate members became full members. We have 2 applications for this November meeting. All schools who have been associate members for 2 years are eligible. I urge you, if your institution is an associate member, to assess your situation and apply before the 5-year deadline.

5. AS A RESULT OF THE BY-LAW STATEMENT regarding the submitting of dossiers for all new curricula to be recognized in the Directory, the Commissions have considered requests from 13 institutions to recognize 18 curricular patterns. These are in addition to those surveyed automatically in the process of reexamination or full membership. NASM accredits the total curricular program, and if a new program has been put into effect between associate and full membership, it is looked at automatically.
6. CONSULTATIVE VISITS
Scheduled for 1967-68, 10 consultative visits.

REVISION OF FORMS AND PROCEDURES

We in the Washington office, the Commissions, the Executive Committee, our examiners, and the music executives of member institutions that are being re-examined, and also those executives of institutions that apply for associate membership, know that our forms and procedures still are not the epitome of clarity. Warren Scharf knew this and was carrying on a continuous project to clarify forms and procedures. This work is being continued and we hope that as the years go on you will notice changes for the better.

LIAISON

You have been represented at several occasions this past year. Ed Stein was our representative at Gunther Schuller's inauguration as President of New England Conservatory. Warner Lawson was our representative at the inauguration of Archibald M. Woodruff as Chancellor of the University of Hartford. Warner is a distinguished alumnus of that institution.

Your Executive Secretary attended the Conference on Accreditation sponsored by the National Commission on Accrediting. The meeting was held in Washington on September 21-22. We will pass out copies of the summary at the meeting. We continue to enjoy excellent rapport with Dr. Frank Dickey of the NCA.

The American Council on Education, the parent group of the National Commission on Accrediting, held its annual meeting in Washington, October 11-13. Your secretary represented NASM in that rather high level atmosphere of over 1,200 college and university presidents. The theme of the meeting was "Whose Goals for American Higher Education?" The plenary sessions and panel discussions were excellent.

NASM was officially represented by Warren Scharf, Everett Timm and myself at the Sixth Annual Conference of the National Council of

the Arts in Education, commonly called NCAIE, at Penn State, August 29–September 1. Other NASM members, David Stone, and ex-institutional representative Frank Stillings, were present as representatives of MENC and MTNA respectively. Bill Doty was program chairman. The theme was "The Achievement of Excellence in the Arts Through Accreditation." Dr. Doty had arranged a fine program with such cordon-bleu speakers as Barnaby Keeney, Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities; Rolf Larson of NCATE; Kathryn Bloom, Director, Arts and Humanities, U. S. Office of Education, and others. Claude Palisca, the representative of the American Musicological Society, was elected President to replace Dean Norman Rice of Carnegie-Mellon University.

President Hargreaves will report at length on our relations with NASA. However, somewhat along this line, your Secretary attended a meeting in Philadelphia on October 18 during the Annual Meeting of NASA. At this meeting were representatives of NASM, NASA and the American Educational Theatre Association. The purpose was to discuss the feasibility of a possible federation of the arts in accreditation.

The decision at the end of this meeting was to meet again in St. Louis in January, 1968, to continue the discussion of a workable federation plan. All parties concerned thought that the potential benefits were such that the project was extremely worthwhile. I shall report to you from time to time in the Newsletter as to the progress of this project.

We are continuing our joint examinations with the six regional accrediting agencies and NCATE. Two special projects are in the works, one with North Central on the accrediting of independent schools of music and one with New England Association on the same subject.

Our negotiations with the American Association of Theological Schools have been very fruitful and the Executive Committee has approved the final draft of the joint NASM–AATS Committee. As you recall, this agreement has to do with cooperation in the accreditation of graduate programs in church music and it is expected that this will result in the addition to the NASM roster of a number of schools of music affiliated with theological seminaries.

THE DMA STUDY PROPOSAL

The study of the DMA degree was not fundable by the U. S. Office of Education during the last fiscal year. It was re-submitted in July

and we hope to hear the results of their deliberation in the near future now that appropriations for USOE have been signed by the President.

MUSIC IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Volume I, No. 1, of MIHE came off the press last week and was mailed to member institutions, in care of the institutional representative, and to individual members. Some of you probably received your copies before coming to this meeting. Three copies were sent to member institutions,

- Copy 1) For the Department Chairman
- Copy 2) Please deliver to your college or university library
- Copy 3) Please deliver to your President.

Individual members are sent one copy. The above is gratis. All further copies of this particular publication are on sale from the Washington office at \$4.00 per copy. One further word regarding MIHE. All production credit for this book goes to Warren Scharf and Larry Cook. The present staff only carried through on plans that were already made.

Looking forward to next year's edition, may I (as Warren did), urge each of you to be scrupulous in completing the Annual Report Form and returning it on time. We also welcome suggestions regarding information that should, or should not, be included on the Annual Report Form. These may be sent to me, or better to Warner Lawson, Dean, Fine Arts, Howard University, Washington, D. C.

Other publication projects include: 1) The Directory for 1968; 2) The Bulletin for 1968; 3) A suggested list of books for institutions offering graduate degrees; 4) MIHE: 1968, reflecting the status of NASM institutions for the school year 1967-68; and 5) A listing of Doctoral Dissertations.

NCATE

At present, our agreement with NCATE is in effect. In essence it states that, if an institution graduates 10 or more music majors per year, NCATE must include a music examiner from the approved NASM list. We are on excellent terms with Rolf Larson, the Executive Director of NCATE. He sends his greetings and will speak to us at any time. In the meantime, we are staying close to the developments relative to their new guidelines and will probably have a full report from Dr. Larson after their year of pilot studies under the new criteria. We shall cer-

tainly keep you apprised of what those guidelines and criteria are, and, if influence seems necessary, we shall not hesitate to exercise it. President Hargreaves will have more to say on this subject.

COMMITTEE ON STATE CERTIFICATION AND LEGISLATION

Letters were sent to all state supervisors of music and state education officers notifying them of the NASM person in their state (the state member of NASM's Committee on State Certification and Legislation) who is qualified to advise on matters pertinent to state certification and music education programs in higher education. The response has been very gratifying.

NASM-AAJC

The first meeting of a joint committee of NASM and the American Association of Junior Colleges was held in Washington in October. Eugene Bonelli and myself represented NASM. The purpose was to define ways and means of cooperation between the two groups. It was an extremely successful meeting. We plan a joint publication and will, in the not too distant future, be able to spell out the NASM position on Criteria, Guidelines, and Procedures relative to the accreditation of the two-year colleges. This has great import for the acquisition of federal funds for these institutions, and also, of course, for the setting of standards of excellence in regard to the transfer student. The Junior College Committee will continue to help in what appears to be a major step forward.

CONCLUSION

There have been other developments, but rather than to bore you with the mundane happenings of office life, I shall say that the above are some of the more interesting developments. I wish to emphasize in closing that most of my work has simply been to follow through on projects already started by my excellent predecessor.

I am enjoying my work for NASM — it is extremely exciting and challenging.

There are three major criteria for choosing an investment:

- 1) evidence of stability
- 2) growth
- 3) yield

I believe in the future of NASM. It certainly has evidence of *stability*, albeit traditionally rather conservative (which is not without

virtue). Founded in 1924, it is today an example of one of the oldest and most steadfast of all accrediting agencies. Its accrediting criteria and procedures are absolutely sound and valid. It stands as an example to the profession.

NASM has *growth* potential. The growth rate has more than doubled in each of the last two years and when one considers the continuing application of prospective members among the colleges and universities, and the tremendous potential for membership among the 900+ two-year institutions, the prospects for future growth are excellent. The two-year institution may well be the sleeping bear of present day education. Indeed, the bear may be awakening.

The *yield* is excellent. Not only do I pay the grocery bill, but I have the challenge, excitement, and gratification of striking a blow, on the national level, for music.

In my opinion, NASM stands on the threshold of an even greater future as an influence for good in music education.

One last word regarding the program for the 43rd Annual Meeting. The program is predicated upon the following premise:

For those who cannot accept the status quo, there is a fundamental executive postulate which seems worth applying to the music executive. This axiom states that there must be a better way of doing any job and the man who would make a significant contribution must find that better way.

You will note that all the general sessions are devoted to well-grounded, intelligent, constructive change. Many of the Standing Committee topics and Regional Meetings are devoted to that subject. In any event, we hope that you will agree that this meeting provides a forum for the discussion of major issues relating to music in higher education. I am convinced that you, as administrators of the finest music departments in the United States, are probably the greatest single force for excellence and constructive change in the music curricula in higher education in our country. Admittedly, NASM accreditation criteria are minimum standards — it remains for you to pace each other on the road to excellence.

DAVID A. LEDET, *Executive Secretary*

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON CURRICULA

The Commission on Curricula recommends that Associate Membership be granted to the following institutions:

1. Brevard College, Brevard, North Carolina; Nelson F. Adams, Chairman, Division of Fine Arts
2. Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington; Dr. Wayne S. Hertz, Chairman, Department of Music
3. Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado; James E. Miller, Chairman, Division of Music
4. Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia; Dr. Ronald J. Neil, Chairman, Division of Music
5. Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio; Lawrence DeWitt, Head, Department of Music
6. Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota; Herbert E. Owen, Chairman, Department of Music
7. Southwest Missouri State College, Springfield, Missouri; Horatio M. Farrar, Head, Department of Music
8. Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee; Dr. James A. Wattenbarger, Chairman, Department of Music
9. University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii; Dr. Armand Russell, Chairman, Department of Music

The following two institutions are recommended for Associate Senior College Membership, in view of their change from previous Junior College status:

1. Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri; Richard S. Johnson, Chairman. (A Junior College member since 1940.)
2. Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, North Carolina; John P. Adams, Acting Head, Department of Music. (A Junior College member since 1950.)

The Commission on Curricula recommends that Full Membership be granted to the following institutions:

1. American University, Washington D. C.; Dr. Lloyd Ultan, Chairman, Department of Music
2. Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Dr. David L. Stone, Dean College of Music

3. Tennessee A & I State University, Nashville, Tennessee; Dr. Edward C. Lewis, Jr., Head, Department of Music
4. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee; Alfred L. Schmied, Head, Department of Music
5. West Texas State University, Canyon, Texas; Dr. John E. Green, Head, Department of Music

The Commission on Curricula recommends that the following institutions be continued in good standing as a result of reexamination:

1. Arkansas State University (Jonesboro)
2. Bethany College
3. Cottey College
4. Furman University
5. Heidelberg College
6. Hollins College
7. Indiana University
8. Lewis and Clark College
9. Northwestern University
10. Ohio State University
11. Rosary College
12. Southern Methodist University
13. Southwestern University
14. University of Arizona
15. University of Colorado
16. University of Iowa
17. University of Kansas
18. University of Redlands
19. University of Southwestern Louisiana
20. Webster College
21. Whitman College
22. Yale University

Other actions by the Commission on Curricula, in addition to the above approvals:

- (1) Action on seven applicants for associate membership was deferred for responses to questions raised by the Commission.
- (2) Action on three applicants for full membership was deferred for responses by the institutions.
- (3) Upon reexamination one school was placed on probation and action on nine institutions was deferred for further study.
- (4) One school was continued on probation.
- (5) Four new curricula were approved.

(6) Two new curricular plans were given tentative approval, for further consideration when there have been graduates under the programs.

(7) Action on one new curriculum was deferred pending further information.

(8) Two new curricula were denied approval.

THOMAS GORTON, *Chairman*
Commission on Curricula

REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COMMISSION

The Graduate Commission recommends the approval of the following:

- I. ADMISSION TO ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP
 - Central Washington State College
 - Colorado State College
 - Mankato State College
 - University of Hawaii
 - Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
 - Union Theological Seminary
- II. FOR FULL MEMBERSHIP
 - American University
 - Temple University
 - Tennessee A. & I State University
 - University of Tennessee
 - West Texas State University
- III. CONTINUED IN GOOD STANDING
 - Arkansas State University (Jonesboro)
 - Indiana University at Bloomington
 - Lewis and Clark College
 - Northwestern University
 - Ohio State University
 - Rosary College
 - Southern Methodist University
 - University of Arizona
 - University of Colorado
 - University of Iowa
 - University of Kansas
 - University of Redlands
 - University of Southwestern Louisiana
 - Yale University
- IV. NEW CURRICULA AS INDICATED HAVE BEEN APPROVED FOR LISTING
 - Eastern Kentucky University — Master of Music Education
 - Eastern New Mexico University —
 - Master of Arts in Music Education
 - Master of Music in (certain) Applied Music (Fields)
 - Southeastern Louisiana State College —
 - Master of Music in Theory

Master of Music in History and Literature
 Master of Education with a Major in Music Education
 Master of Arts in Music Education
 Master of Music in Applied Music
 Texas Woman's University — Master of Arts in Music Education;
 Theory; Church Music; Applied Music
 University of Houston — Master of Music in Music Literature; Theory
 and Composition; Performance
 University of Miami — Master of Music in Theory-Composition; Ap-
 plied Music (Conducting)
 University of Wyoming — Master of Arts in Performance; History and
 Literature; Music Education

V. CHANGES IN DEGREE TITLES were approved as follows:

Louisiana State University —
 Drop: Master of Arts in Theory
 Add: Master of Music in Theory
 Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary —
 May drop: Doctor of Church Music
 and add: Doctor of Musical Arts

VI. DEGREE PLANS were approved as follows. These will not be listed until transcripts have been made available and approved.

Henderson State College — Master of Music Education
 University of Miami — Master of Music in Church Music
 University of New Hampshire —
 Master of Arts in Music
 Master of Science in Music Education

VII. ACTION ON REQUESTS of 12 schools were tabled for various reasons which will be transmitted to the schools.

The Graduate Commission has completed the revision of the Bulletin on Graduate Studies; this set of guidelines for graduate degrees in music will ultimately succeed Bulletin #35 on Graduate Studies. The new version contains no alarming changes but it should be compared carefully with your existing graduate programs when you receive mimeographed drafts in the spring. Since a printed version should become available after the June 1968 meeting of the Graduate Commission, the Commission requests that any comments be sent to the Executive Secretary's office before June.

In the new bulletin the term "studies in performance" is used instead of "applied music" primarily because it has proven more meaningful in discussions with non-musicians.

The Self-Survey report and Master's and Doctor's questionnaire forms are being revised.

I move the adoption of this report.

EVERETT TIMM, *Chairman*
Graduate Commission

COMPOSITE LIST OF INSTITUTIONS APPROVED
NOVEMBER 1967

ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP

Brevard College, Brevard, North Carolina
Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington
Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado
Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia
Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio
Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky
Southwest Missouri State College, Springfield, Missouri
Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee
Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York
University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii

FULL MEMBERSHIP (from Associate Member status)

American University, Washington, D. C.
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Tennessee A & I State University, Nashville, Tennessee
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee
West Texas State University, Canyon, Texas

APPROVED FOR SENIOR COLLEGE STATUS

Mars Hill College, Mars Hill, North Carolina
Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri

RE-ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas
College of the Holy Names, Oakland, California
Cottey College, Nevada, Missouri
Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina
Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana
Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oregon
Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois

Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas
Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas
University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado
University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas
University of Redlands, Redlands, California
University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, Louisiana
Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington
Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

THE DYNAMICS OF CHANGE

JAMES F. NICKERSON, *President*
Mankato State College

President Hargreaves and friends of many years ago. Some of you are former students, employers, and co-workers of mine. Nearly twenty years ago I appeared on the National Association of Schools of Music program here in Chicago on another matter. As I recall, the task was to present a recently developed audiovisual presentation of a problem in orchestration. Your invitation to address you again has given me an opportunity to renew old friendships and to express special appreciation of the fact that my institution, Mankato State College, has been honored today by acceptance as an associate member institution of this association.

Your invitation has given me opportunity to examine some of your recent efforts and plans, your long term thinking. I have looked at the report of the Northwestern University Seminar on comprehensive musicianship held in 1965. I have read the report of the Tanglewood Symposium on music in American society held in the summer of 1967. I have examined the materials of your Institutes for Music in Contemporary Education which represents a two-year effort spanning 1966 to 1968. I find in your work and in your planning an urgent effort to relate music education to the issues of contemporary society. You say that music education must be concerned with all kinds of people and all kinds of music; that any institutional program must be based on the instructor's own comprehensive musicianship, on his professional competence and personality rather than upon specific musical substance or material. I find emerging consensus among you that musicianship is really interdisciplinary, that it is a functional blending of theory, of ear training, of analysis, of performance, of sight singing, of history and conducting. You say that the musician in training needs to become self-directing, imaginative, critical in his judgment and broad in his musical and cultural perspective. The directions reflected in your reports represent major changes in musical training and they reveal a new kind of commitment on your part as designers of programs for tomorrow's

musicians. These directions call for major innovations in your training programs and in your methods and devices for evaluating "comprehensive musicianship." Such major innovations will call for major changes in curriculum, in recruitment and reorientation of faculty, changes of attitudes within your faculties and your student bodies, and changes in your own procedures, policies and outlook as dean, director, or chairman of music in your college or university.

My task today is to assess the dynamics of change, the problems, principles, and prospects for change in our music programs. It has often been said that it is not a dearth of ideas and plans which holds back our innovations as much as our own inability and impotence to effect change on our campuses. I am reminded of discussions within the American Association for Higher Education Executive Committee a year or so ago. They attempted to assess means for change within member colleges and universities. They reiterated that knowledge of what could and should be done far outstripped our ability to move. With support from the Charles F. Kettering Foundation the American Association for Higher Education began a major study of conditions which can produce change within colleges and universities. The booklet, *Faculty Role in College Governance*, recently issued by the Association is the first phase of their assessment of means for change in American higher education.

In examining the dynamics of change my comments will follow four main points: (1) The nature of change, (2) some principles of college governance and management, (3) needs of management, and (4) the impact of these principles, needs and expectations on your work as music executives.

I

Conflict of ideas, dissent and tension are essential to vitality and change. It is not dissent for dissent's sake that we seek but the clash of ideas necessary for the pooling of wisdom which gives us an approximation of truth or an assurance of validity in that which we do. Change thrives upon tension, criticism and unrest. Yet we tend to fear change for change is unsettling and threatening. Eric Hoffer, longshoreman-philosopher, has said that no one really likes the new. We are afraid of it. Every radical adjustment is a crisis in self-esteem. We need, Hoffer says, inordinate self-confidence to face change without inner trembling. Yet drastic change is one of the agencies which releases man's energies if it is coupled with opportunity for change and some reinforcement of one's sense of self-reliance.

Defense can even be made for "change for change sake." You may recall the well-known Hawthorne effect which refers to a series of experiments carried on at one of the Westinghouse plants, experiments designed to establish the effects of change in color and lighting in the working environment upon worker production. In this set of experiments where color combinations were varied from the garish to the tasteful and where lighting was changed from shadowy to bright, performance and production increased consistently. However, in subsequent experiments where color was changed from the tasteful to the garish, and lighting from bright to dim until workers could scarcely see objects before them, their production remained high, even increased. The inconsistency of these results led the experimenters to realize that the experimental variable was neither color nor light but the fact that experimentation was going on. To the worker, someone seemed to care, someone was trying to better conditions. The efforts toward change apparently produced the lift and vitality within the worker. And since knowledge and understanding are at best only approximations to truth, there is much to be said for continuing effort and struggle for change as being necessary and contributory to the vitality within each of us in our professional effort.

The changes we seek in college curriculum or methods or in task orientation ultimately must come from faculty action, from change in attitude, in orientation, in self-identification with the new, and in development of new skills, new insights, and new materials necessary for the doing of the new. But faculties are with but few exceptions trained for the traditional. They are comfortable with the established. They are threatened by the new and often oppose and prejudge change before due hearing. Further, our faculties lag in the disposition to make decision or to accept responsibility for decision. Debate often seems endless. Faculty senates and committees are reluctant to call the questions and poll the membership. But the rate of change pressed upon us in the late 20th Century requires that we find new and efficient ways of decision-making within our colleges and universities in order to keep pace with the society around us.

Education is dangerous business. Education is committed to change. This is its purpose, its justification. We are full partners in higher education, whether we be professor, chairman, director, dean or president. Each of us is asked for commitment to change, to accept responsibility to find the ways and means by which change can be brought about.

II

I should like to suggest some principles of college governance or college management which bear on our discussion today.

*The Need to Harness the "Community of Authority" and
the Sharing of Power Within This Community.*

Responsibility and authority are a function shared by the full college or university community. In contrast to business and industry, government, or to the elementary and secondary schools, the university campus operates much more by consensus. Your task and mine as administrators is one of encouraging and developing consensus among the varied groups who have a stake in our collegiate enterprises. College faculties as a "collection of peers" have both authority and responsibility in decision making. A faculty member or a group of faculty members in a single discipline or sub-discipline have knowledge and insight to be tapped. The range of scholarly effort within the university requires the careful and unique contribution of each discipline in the development of policy as well as in the details of teaching or research. There needs to be a joint involvement of all in a common cause. The directing or guiding of the college effort becomes the development and management of consensus rather than control by directive or application of a rigid hierarchy of officers and men as is so commonly found in other types of enterprise.

*The Art of Delegating Responsibility and Authority
Subject to "Reserved Control."*

Responsibility and authority need to be clearly delegated yet remain subject to reserved control. This is perhaps our greatest failing in college management. It is a condition of governance we must foster. While a board, president, dean, department head or faculty member may delegate responsibility and with it requisite authority, the board, president, dean or department head still retains power to act. In the case of the board it has retained its legal responsibility for management, yet has delegated responsibility and authority in appropriate amounts to its administration and faculty subject to "reserved control." In so doing the board retains its power to override a delegated decision or act, yet it does so sparingly. This is the principle of reserved control. In similar fashion each administrative officer delegates or redelegates responsibility and authority for decision and action. In this delegation of responsibility and authority the board, administrator, or faculty member

strengthens initiative and provides for the joint effort and helps to foster the necessary consensus. Thus the college effort rests upon shared power and responsibility of all parties plus a willing and a clear delegation of authority and responsibility on a reserved control basis.

Policy-Making Is the Business of All of Us, But Implementation Must Be Specifically Planned For and Delegated.

For the purposes of this discussion we might well call *governance* the development of policy and *management* the implementation of policy. It is the responsibility of the faculty and to a lesser extent, the students, with assistance from administrative officers to develop and recommend policy for board approval, and to guide internal operation of the institution. However, operational management and supervision must be delegated and reserved to management (or administration). This means the delegation of responsibility according to plans, procedures, schedules, criteria, etc., together with responsibility for supervision and evaluation of performance consistent with procedures, policy and regulations which may apply. Substantive implementation is the role of the individual faculty member. But this role is limited, specific, definable and capable of supervision and evaluation. Thus, to the faculty is delegated responsibility for policy and some responsibility to administration to assist the faculty in policy development. Similarly, to administrative officers is delegated responsibility to refine and improve procedure, to supervise, to expedite, to defend, to criticize, and to evaluate performance as may be appropriate. In the discharge of these responsibilities some measure of trust is called for, trust of faculty members by administrators and trust of administrators by faculty to discharge their delegated responsibilities in a professional manner. With the delegation of responsibility must come an understanding and an acceptance of the complementary role of faculty and administration in the matter of policy development and policy implementation.

Plans, Procedures, Personnel Policies and Practices Should Be Designed to Enhance Faculty Confidence, Vitality and Self-Identification to Insure a High Level of Faculty Performance.

Policies and procedures should provide faculty members with satisfaction in work done. Satisfaction should grow from an increase in excitement, from pride in job, from pride in student achievement and

from identification and appreciation of the college as a worthy institution. Policies and procedures should provide good opportunity for professional and personal growth for each faculty member. Procedures, rules and regulations not only serve to focus effort upon the functional needs of an institution but, simultaneously, focus upon the satisfactions and self growth of each faculty member. Procedural arrangements should facilitate and encourage change. They should remain tentative and adaptable and be subject to review at any time.

*Administrative Organization and Practice Should Reflect
(or at Least Be Adaptable to) the Functions, Objectives,
or the Services to Be Produced.*

It is particularly important that American colleges and universities need to look at their somewhat rigid and archaic organizational patterns. The tight logic of much of subject matter organization and the resultant schools, departments, divisions, institutes and so on which reflect these subject matter divisions appear to be much too limiting. If administrative units are to serve the intellectual growth and development of college students they may well assume forms substantially different from that which we now know. The pressures for interdisciplinary approaches, and for broad institutional services, appear to be too great to allow us to continue indefinitely with our present compartmentalization of knowledge department by department. These appear to be giving way to more functionally defined units within our colleges — to different forms of experimental colleges, administrative units dealing with freshmen, to institutes seeking to meet interdisciplinary demands related to specific functions. Genetics, nutrition, international education, urban studies are examples. At least our choice of organization should reflect in some measure the principal functions that guide an institution.

*All Policy, Plan or Procedure Must Be Weighed in
Terms of Collegiate Function.*

Elsewhere above we have commented concerning the importance of faculty member self-realization in our policy and procedure. However, the ultimate test of all we do must lie in appropriate discharge of function assigned to or accepted by the institution. Acceptance of role or goal is not solely a faculty determination, but must represent some reconciliation of the range of demands of the state (or other constituency), the faculty, the students, the alumni, or the community. Subsequent actions of faculty in determining curriculum, academic standard,

admission and retention policy must be consistent with the accepted or defined goals of the institution. Similarly, all performance, whether teaching, research, or other service must be compatible with these accepted goals. This is the "Achilles' heel" for many faculties whose dedication through the years may have turned to a complete identification with academic excellence within a particular discipline. Consequently, decisions on policy and procedure pertaining to a college or to a specific administrative unit may become inconsistent with accepted goals or purposes of the institution. When this happens, a major responsibility falls to administrative officers to reflect the concerns of the many constituencies which make up the college in such a manner that a more appropriate consensus may be achieved concerning particular policy or procedures.

III

Next I should like to comment on several of the more important needs of management.

Management is an inexact and unprecise science. There is no expectation that there is a single way to achieve change or even that there is a best way. This would be quite unrealistic. Management, though inexact and unprecise, is the marshalling of insight and talent in an organized way to produce the training, the research, or other services which are the task of a college or university.

Among the needs college management faces is a need for increasing and effective delegation of authority and responsibility, delegation from board to president, from president to dean, from dean to department head, and to faculty member and on to students. Gone is the day of the benevolent autocrat presiding over his comfortable college. Gone is the day when one man can seek to render all major decisions for an institution. In his place is a broadening base of responsibility among administrators and faculty, a diffusion of responsibility and authority which makes the task of administration more difficult, yet the decisions more valid. Team management, the use of a small executive team representing major functions of a department, division, or college, appears to be more appropriate for the complex administrative tasks of the day. In each case, there is attempt to share power and responsibility among peers and to find means to tap the "community of authority" which is the college faculty. However, accompanying this shared power within the community of authority is the principle of "reserved control." Power, responsibility and authority are shared and delegated by the superior, subject always to recall or denial, should this become necessary.

A further need in management is for sharper delimitation of role, of responsibility, of expectation. College management is no longer a comfortable task. If there is to be full accountability to board, to legislator, or to constituency, a president, dean, chairman, faculty member or student must know the expectations placed upon him if he is to function effectively and gain satisfaction. So too must each faculty member understand and recognize the expectations placed on him.

In today's college there is growing need for tighter management, for better fiscal control and financial accounting, for more careful space use, for clearer delegation of time and effort to particular functions. These demands call for sophisticated management information systems. Today's computer is supplying us with the kinds of cost analyses, department by department, course by course, which allow us to justify and defend more completely the various tasks we do. Coupled with this is an increasing emphasis on the developing of long term and short term planning for our institutions, a clear statement of objectives, these objectives to be translated into systems analyses and systems development to produce these objectives over five years, ten years, or twenty years, as called for.

Such planning takes its focus from our statements of institutional mission, from an analysis of the service functions we are asked to meet, the manpower training needs expected of us, the need for a liberalizing education of those whom we serve, and from a careful analysis of the growing range of services we render to our various constituencies, e.g., industry, government, other educational institutions. We must realize that the courses and content of our curricula are never as firm or as static as they would appear in our catalogs, that our catalogs and our curricula reflect only what prevails at the moment and that the decisions reflected in our current procedure, courses, or content can be changed and should be changed according to changing needs as we assess them. Thus, the reexamining of plans, both short term and long term, the reassessing of mission, the careful look at our management information as supplied to us by our computers, are factors which produce change, constant change, if we are to remain vital institutions appropriate for the day in which we live.

Management faces another important need, reflected in the growing pressures from our faculties and from our students for a clearer voice in college and university governance. It is incumbent upon us to review and refine constantly our systems of due process, of appeal, of review,

in fact to review the entire decision making process within our colleges. As responsible administrators, we must recognize and accept the growing role of faculty and students in shaping our institutions and guarantee for them complete fairness and a maximum of objectivity in the decisions we make in the name of the institutional effort. In our type of society there is good reason to insure a strong voice for faculty and for students as well as for administration. The allegiance of administration is to the task and the results, to cost control and efficiency, and to the many roles of the institution. The allegiance of faculty is more specific and substantive in terms of academic discipline, concern for particular students or selected institutional services as well as to personal reward and stimulation. The allegiance of student tends more to personal services received, to fiercely held if occasionally transitory ideals and causes, e.g., freedom from coercion or over supervision, more self-determination, or greater student determination of the substance of education. Each of these allegiances and concerns must become appropriately blended into institutional policy and procedure. Each of these voices must be integral to the institutional decision-making process. To fail in this is to invite distrust and to encourage violent and emotional conflict leading to paralysis or even revolt.

IV

What impact will these principles, needs or expectations have upon your work as music executives? In my introduction I indicated that I had read the reports of your Northwestern University Seminar and the Tanglewood Symposium held recently. Your evidenced commitment to relevance in music instruction, i.e., music relevant for today's society and training for a functioning, comprehensive musicianship for the teachers, commits you as music men to major efforts to change both the substance of music and the method of teaching. This in turn commits you to effect change and excitement within your own faculties toward these major changes in musical training.

The rising clamor of faculty and of students for voice in governance of our institutions, including our schools and departments of music, foretells your own growing concern and attention as music administrators to the importance of faculty and student consultation. As administrator you will master the art of developing consensus. Simultaneously, you will assert and hopefully convince your faculty of your own management responsibilities in executing policy and plan growing from faculty or student decisions and recommendations. You will learn to value but

not to fear the voices of the faculty and students and will recognize the validity their judgments can give to final policy decisions.

In all your operations you will seek processes which scrupulously guarantee fair treatment of faculty and students and which assure full hearing of their concerns. You will not be threatened by appeals from your own decisions nor will you refuse to listen to complaints or concerns from those whom you guide and direct.

Likewise, the emerging patterns of change and administrative effort suggested above will mean careful attention on your part to the delegation of responsibility, to careful job definition, toward recognition of appropriate levels for decision, toward clearer lines of report and toward explicit expectations for job performance, as well as attention to the means and conditions which will lead to satisfaction and growth for the individual professor.

My prediction is that you will devise different organization and different practices in your music schools and departments which will be more appropriate to the changes you seek. Your organizational structure may very well forsake traditional departmental lines, e.g., theory, instrumental music, vocal music, or history, in favor of some broadly structured groups related more closely to interdisciplinary courses and programs. You may create special task forces charged to develop new program materials, to make performance evaluations consistent with the broad musicianship you extol. Very likely you will explore team teaching in some depth within many of your offerings. I expect the idea of off-campus internships or other clinical musical experiences related to performing groups and to teaching-learning situations in music may assume much greater importance in a typical student's program.

Within your own administrative responsibility you will surround yourself with much more detailed management information. You will necessarily concern yourself much more with staffing patterns, with space utilization, with information concerning program costs, as well as devote considerable time to developing, refining, and updating five and ten year projections of enrollments, staffing needs, space needs, equipment and so on. You will learn to be precise and careful in budget development and in budget control. Without this care and concern with the details of your operation, management decisions will of necessity fall to others and your own important and necessary leadership will be weakened thereby.

As department chairman or head you occupy one of the most influential and difficult positions in administration. You are half-way between the substance of scholarly effort and the concern for effective management. You lead and inspire through your own comprehensive musicianship, yet you serve as a bridge and as a chief interpreter of the plans, goals, needs, and expectations of your department to those who must collate the concerns of an entire college or university. You funnel, interpret, and reconcile these plans, goals, and needs from department to school or central administration and from central administration or school to department. You supervise and evaluate the effort of your peers yet you are both staff member and management. Yours is a difficult task indeed.

As dean or director you collate and direct university concerns for policy development, for long and short term planning. You guide the process of budget development and supervise budget control within your school or college. You expedite the professional affairs of many. As dean or director you are more a spokesman and influential friend in court and less the musician, not at heart, but certainly in practice.

For each of us who serve the ladder of administration there are a number of questions important to hold in front of ourselves; among these are:

Can you keep or carry your faculty with you? Can you earn and hold their trust? Can you pace the drive for change so that you can carry your faculty with you?

Can you delegate responsibility and authority? Are you willing to delegate with a minimum of worry to you? Can you learn to relax knowing that other people are doing the necessary work? Can you keep hands off when a subordinate is doing work which you know you can do better? Will you be able to back him in failure as well as in success?

One simple test you might hold before yourself. Will your organization, be it department or school, run on for a week, a month or a year without you? Or does every matter cross your desk? Are you a possible bottleneck in expediting the affairs of your school or department. Are there routine channels for all types and kinds of decision or action within your organization? Have you been clear and unequivocal concerning who handles what? Or do you handle every decision on an *ad hoc* basis as you would any crisis as it arises?

Perhaps you can answer most of the above questions favorably. If so, does it mean that you are running a tight and slow-moving ship or that things are moving and that there is excitement and life in your department or school? Perhaps the paramount question you must raise is: What is the overall effect of your own effort upon your program, and upon the department or school effort as it affects the students you serve? Do the students in their outlook, in their knowledge, in their performance, and in their attitudes reflect the kind of programs and goals that have been outlined and echoed in the Northwestern report and the Tanglewood Symposium?

V

From this brief exploration into the dynamics of change I hope you are able to reaffirm a few ideas which may help to energize, to encourage, and to prod your own faculty and students toward music instruction which is fully appropriate for the 1980's and 1990's and thereafter.

There are no panaceas, no easy modes of instruction, only problems and men of varying sensitivities and drives to meet these problems. I hope for each of you the maximum of success in breaking out of the traditional molds and in creating music programs fully worthy for these last decades of this century.

It has been my rare privilege to be your guest. Thank you and success in your efforts to encourage the change called for by your seminars, symposia and institutes.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE COPYRIGHT REVISION BILL

HAROLD SPIVACKE, *Chief, Music Division*
Library of Congress

The present copyright law was enacted in 1909. Although amended many times since then, it has obviously been in need of complete revision for quite a while. Recognizing this, the Congress asked the Register of Copyrights to study the subject and prepare a general revision of the copyright law. For over a decade, the Copyright Office has worked on this subject and called into consultation practically all of the leading copyright experts in this country. These studies resulted in the bill which, after extensive hearings, was passed as "H. R. 2512" by the House of Representatives on April 11, 1967. This bill was then introduced into the Senate where additional hearings were held by the Committee on the Judiciary, but the bill has not yet been reported out to the Senate as a whole. When it is reported out, it is highly unlikely that it will be identical in all respects with the bill passed in the House of Representatives, so that the usual conference procedures will probably have to take place.

Under the circumstances, it is obvious that I cannot present to you today any official statement from the Copyright Office or even from the Music Division of the Library of Congress. I do not like to play prophet, but I really have no alternative at this moment. I shall proceed on the assumption that the law as finally enacted will not differ materially from the bill passed by the House of Representatives with respect to the points which I shall try to discuss in this brief talk.

The subject of copyright is important in the lives of all the citizens of our country, but I doubt if there is any field in which it is more important than in the field of music. Unfortunately, there are many musicians and even some people in the academic world who are not completely aware of this. I do hope that, if nothing else, my talk will impress upon all of you the importance of the subject in your daily work

and that you will make every effort to familiarize yourselves with the copyright bill after it has become the law of the land.

Proceeding now to a discussion of those questions which I think are of greatest interest to us, I should like to begin by mentioning section 102, which covers the subject matter of copyright. In this section, the subject matter of copyright has been considerably broadened, and it attempts to be all-inclusive. But the point that I think bears special mention is the inclusion of the word "phonorecord" — sound recording. Heretofore, the Copyright Office has been reluctant to accept sound recordings as copyright deposits because of the wording of the present law, but in the new law, it appears that these will be included. Thus phonograph recordings will now be protected by copyright, and copyright deposits will be required in connection with registration. The general purpose of the copyright of sound recordings is to prevent other people from making unauthorized copies of the actual records but not to prevent the making of a different record of the same piece even though the interpretations may resemble each other.

Another major change is a basic one and relates to the duration of copyright. Under the present law copyright may be obtained for a period of twenty-eight years with the right of renewal for another twenty-eight years. This gives a maximum protection of fifty-six years. The new bill provides for a period of copyright extending for the life of the author plus fifty years. This is more in line with the duration of copyright in the countries subscribing to the Berne Convention, and will generally prevent the confusing situation now existing where some works are protected in Europe but in the public domain in the United States, or vice versa. Moreover, there are formulas in the bill providing for considerable extension of copyright protection for those works already registered and renewed.

Another important change is the elimination of the common law protection. Under the present situation, an unpublished work not deposited for copyright is theoretically protected in perpetuity. This has resulted in the situation already described where some works which are in the public domain in Europe, particularly unpublished operas, are still protected in this country under common law. In general, the new bill would treat all the creations of an author, whether published or unpublished, in the same fashion so that they will all fall into the public domain fifty years after his death. This provision will, in my opinion, eliminate a great deal of the confusion which now exists. The new bill

also makes special provisions for those cases where the death date of the author is not easily ascertainable.

Still another change which I believe will prove very welcome relates to the copyright notice. Under the present law, failure to include the notice in a publication or the inclusion of a faulty notice may result in the complete forfeiture of the copyright. The new bill allows for correction of such errors, but on the other hand, it does protect those who innocently infringe because of the inadvertent omission of the notice.

These are but a few of the many changes in the new bill, and all of them should certainly be of interest to you either as authors, as composers, or as users of copyrighted material. I earnestly recommend that you read all these provisions and familiarize yourself with them. There are, however, two changes which I know are of interest to every one of you, and I should like to devote the remainder of this talk to them.

The first of these is generally known as the elimination of the "for profit" provision. The present law restricts the exclusive rights of a copyright owner of a piece of non-dramatic music to the right of public performance for profit. The composers and owners of musical copyrights have resented this discriminatory provision for decades, and it goes without saying that they are pleased by the change in the new bill. On the other hand, many of those in the field of education who are concerned with the performance of music have reacted with consternation to this change. Personally, I admit that I was surprised by this adverse reaction. For at least a century, the schools and churches of our country have paid royalties for the use of plays without protest. It seems only fair that the composer should be reimbursed for his creative efforts in the same manner as the playwright.

On the other hand, the user of music need not lament his fate too much because he has been accorded many new privileges in this bill. I refer to the sections dealing with fair use. The words "fair use" do not occur anywhere in the present 1909 law. It is true that through the years the doctrine of fair use has grown up as a result of judicial decisions, but this accords the user only a very tenuous protection because any judge may come up with another opposing viewpoint on a specific question. For instance, I do not believe that there have ever been any decisions in this country relating to the fair use of material in the collections of public libraries. There are also many other areas of daily practice in educational institutions involving fair use for which there is no judicial

decision upon which one can rely. The new bill includes an extensive series of sections on this subject and attempts as far as possible to clarify this situation. I feel that a somewhat deeper discussion of these is important at this meeting.

I should like to begin the discussion of the fair use provisions by quoting in its entirety section 107:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of section 106, the fair use of a copyrighted work, including such use by reproduction in copies or phonorecords or by any other means specified by that section, for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research, is not an infringement of copyright. In determining whether the use made of a work in any particular case is a fair use, the factors to be considered shall include:

- (1) the purpose and character of the use;
- (2) the nature of the copyrighted work;
- (3) the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
- (4) the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work."

Although clearly stated, we must all recognize that in its application, this section will undoubtedly be subject to various interpretations. Fair codes of practice will have to be developed in the years to come, but the philosophical basis seems to me broad enough to provide for adaptation to changing conditions.

The next section is most welcome to those of us concerned with libraries. It enables those having custody of unpublished documents. I should add that unpublished sound recordings are specifically included in this provision.

The section that is probably of greatest interest to the members of this organization is section 110, which is specifically devoted to performances in educational institutions. It is too long to be quoted verbatim, but I shall attempt to summarize it. In listing performances which are not infringements of copyright, it begins by exempting the performance of a work by instructors or pupils in the course of face-to-face teaching activities of a nonprofit educational institution, in a classroom or similar place devoted to instruction. It goes on to exempt performances which are a regular part of instructional broadcasts. The section also includes in its listing of performances which are not infringements of copyright, performances which take place in the course of services at a place of worship or religious assembly. Finally, it

exempts from infringement performances by such groups as school choruses or other groups where the performers are not paid and where the performance is not for private profit. On the other side of the fence, this section includes a provision which accords to the copyright owner the right to object to a public performance, even if not for profit, but provides that he must give advance notice of his objection. I feel sure that, on reading this section, some of you will think of situations not specifically covered by its provisions, but it is really impossible to write into a law all the specific instances of fair use which may occur in all academic situations. We must remember that the basic four principles in section 107, which I quoted, will still apply, and I feel sure that future practice will enable most educators to decide for themselves whether or not a performance constitutes fair use.

Before closing, I should like to repeat a recommendation I made when I spoke on the subject of copyright before the NASM a few years ago. I suggested then the necessity for having a committee of your own to study the problems which will undoubtedly arise when the new copyright law is passed. I urge you to begin these studies as soon as possible. Many of the problems can be foreseen now, and they are very complicated ones. Take the problem of fair use, which I have just discussed. It would be unfair to expect a committee to come up with a recommended code of practice after only a few weeks of study. It seems to me that a considerable degree of preliminary investigation will be necessary. Every academic institution is right now operating under the doctrine of fair use, but I feel sure that investigation will show that there is no unanimity of opinion as to what constitutes fair use existing among the administrators in these institutions. It will be necessary to gather these opinions and weigh one against the other in an attempt to come out with a statement that will be acceptable to the majority if not to everyone. This will require a considerable amount of time, but you must remember that there is not much time left. It is probable that the new copyright law will be passed in a few months and take effect not later than a year after that.

Still another question which should be studied by the NASM is the possibility of licensing agreements. If the law as finally passed resembles the bill already passed by the House of Representatives, some arrangements may have to be made with the performing rights societies. I have heard of two bases for formulas already being considered. One would be based on the enrollment of the institution and the other on the

budget. There may well be other possibilities. I should not be surprised if the performing rights societies have already progressed far in their studies of this subject, but I have no knowledge on this point. I do believe, though, that it is in your interest to crystallize your own viewpoints so that when any negotiations actually begin, you will know where you stand as a group.

I am sorry that the limited time at my disposal allowed only this very brief discussion of some of the problems of copyright. If nothing else, I hope that I have succeeded in impressing on you the importance of the subject because copyright plays an important part in the daily instruction and other activities in every institution represented here today.

TRADITION AND EXPERIMENT IN MUSIC EDUCATION

LUKAS FOSS

*Composer, Conductor and Music Director of the
Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra*

Forgive me for speaking to you extemporaneously. Whenever someone reads from a paper I feel like grabbing it and saying, "Let me read it for myself. I can do it faster that way and understand it better."

In this country the main cultural burden falls upon the colleges and universities. I often think back with nostalgia to the days when I taught at UCLA, when I led a full university life. I believe that sooner or later the world of symphony, in which I now move, will be incorporated into the bigger world of the university. I see the time coming when the universities will be the patrons of the local symphony orchestra. To a certain extent it is already happening. The tie between the University of Buffalo and the Buffalo Philharmonic orchestra is strong. We would not have as good an orchestra if it weren't for Buffalo University, if it weren't for the fact that our first desk men in Buffalo are teaching at the University, if it weren't for the University's capacity to help our orchestra in its most daring and educational ventures. For instance, 5 years ago we had scheduled Stockhausen's ambitious choral work, "Momente." I was on the point of canceling when the University saved us to the tune of several thousand dollars. This kind of help, this understanding, this concern, points the way toward the future. I will not be at all surprised if some day Boston University and/or Harvard would "own" the Boston Symphony. The Boston Symphony may not like this, but this sort of thing is bound to happen. Symphony orchestras are going from crisis to crisis. Foundations are helping temporarily, but in the long run they cannot provide the solution. The universities can. Personally, this would suit me because I believe in our American colleges and universities. Education and research may yet be the ones to bail us out of war and destruction.

What I like most about our universities is the students. Our young

generation is the keenest, the most curious intellectually, and the most concerned about the meaning of life, which we have ever had in America. No matter how busy I am, I always take time out to visit campuses, to lecture to students, and in a sense to turn myself student again. Everything I do, be it conducting or composition, attempts to educate myself or others. The best teacher, the only one really worthy of the name, is probably the teacher who learns whenever he teaches, who guides but covers territory new to himself. The other kind, the kind that rehashes known knowledge, who teaches the same course in the same manner year in, year out, could easily be replaced by computers, *will* be replaced by computers. This type of teacher has his counterpart in the conductor who rehearses not that which needs to be unraveled but that which he has practised rehearsing: *his* repertory of 19th century vehicles. For these works he has a quasi-memorized list of things he will say to the orchestra. This type of conductor will occasionally schedule an innocuous modern piece, and probably will never have enough rehearsal time to work it out, because "the Brahms or the Beethoven Symphony isn't ready." As a composer I have often suffered from the hands of this conductor in the days when I wrote more conservative music. Fortunately, my work has become so strange and complex that this conductor will keep at a safe distance. In essence a conductor is a teacher. He teaches "the whole," the total musical experience, to the men who only know their individual part. He guides the men as does the teacher; and he is only as good as the results he obtains from others. He has a vision of what might be obtained and he must show to others how to obtain it. But the range of his discoveries is limited. Less so, the teacher's. At UCLA around 1957 there was a moment — perhaps only a moment — when my teaching became discovering. I had become increasingly dissatisfied with the way our young instrumentalists are tied to the printed note. Ask them to find a note on their instruments which they do not see in front of them and they are at a loss. I decided to make up a game of ensemble improvisation: listen to a note the other plays and find your own note, the one you would like to hear together with the others. Thus I began what was to be a mere pedagogic experiment. I became increasingly involved. Soon my students and I spent many hours a week practicing a kind of "controlled" improvisation. The only trouble was it sounded forever like "music badly memorized," music that would be better written down in advance. One day I asked myself what might the kind of music be that is better not fixed beforehand, improvised, which can and should be "made up"

at rehearsals rather than in the composer's lonely studio. With this question I opened a door I had never intended to open and which eventually changed me more than it changed my students. When, after 5 years, I decided to leave ensemble-improvisation to others who had more time to do it consistently, my composition and my whole attitude toward composition had undergone a complete change. Before, I had been an arch-traditionalist. I wrote the music I loved, the music of the past. I had such a love affair with the music of the past that I never thought of venturing out into something new. Now I found myself, for better or for worse, in a no-man's land of unending possibilities. I was forced to search, to look ahead.

A leading European avant-gardist told me once that he identified with the fairy tale knight who had to leave home, who went out to seek — whatever it is that knights seek — the philosopher's stone? But one command: "Never look back." For this command to have any meaning the knight has to have something to *not* look back to, a home, a love, a past. For too many of our modern knights it is only too easy to not look back because they have little or nothing to "not look back" to.

Via this little story I am trying to illustrate the relationship of tradition and experiment. Tradition is that home which we must love and then forego. If we get stuck in the past it becomes a form of escape, an avoidance of the present, of the future, of discovery. Likewise, if we have never sunk our roots deeply into the past and plunge headlong into the future, we will become anarchists, book-burners, prophets of chaos, and this, too, is a form of escape. What Boulez so aptly called "la fuite en avant," an escape forward. I cannot tell you how many timid escapist souls masquerade in the avant-garde, a group which also contains the bravest (but we should discard that military term "avant-garde").

Schoenberg said, "Talent is the ability to learn, genius is the ability to develop." I think to develop means to take your past, as it were, — take it by the hand, and lead it into your future. And the future will open to you in a way that has meaning. Let us never give up teaching knowledge, respect, and love for past achievement. A psychologist, whose name I believe was Wallach, suggested some 40 years ago that we distinguish four stages in the artistic process: preparation, incubation, illumination, and verification. I would say that the initial one, preparation (the background), is the one we either get during our school days or we shall never get it. It is the conservatory and the school's supreme

responsibility. I am a little worried when I see a school curriculum replace courses designed to give a solid background by *activities* (usually group activities). Activity deteriorates in the hands of those who do not have the background, who do not have "the preparation," who are not ready for "incubation." It deteriorates to a form of free-associating, even dabbling. It makes the student feel as if he were doing something, when really he isn't. And just this is often called "creative." There are all kinds of muddled notions about self-expression and creativity handed down to us from the early days of progressive education. Let me tell you this: I have never met a really creative person who talks about creativity. Stavinsky never uses the word "creative" but every second rate teacher of second hand knowledge does. (When all is said and done the only creative people are mothers.)

There are other terms that I would like to debunk, clichés such as *a work of art being intellectual rather than emotional*, or vice-versa, a distinction which should be made only with sick people. In a sick mind the one may mushroom at the expense of the other. In the arts the greatest intellect goes hand in hand with the greatest emotion. One enhances the other, carries the other forward. Take Beethoven's "Grosse Fuge": a fantastic *tour de force* of intellect, on a par with the greatest scientific discoveries of our age. Everytime I look at that score I am overwhelmed by the adventurous explorations, by the far out places he reaches, by the complexities of thought. Well, it is also Beethoven's most passionate piece of music. For in healthy people (like Beethoven) intellect and emotion are one. That "either or" notion is, allow me to say, sheer nonsense, holding back our understanding of art.

Another pitfall: *liking one thing at the expense of another*. As a teenager I traveled through France and fell in love with Gothic cathedrals. Then I came to St. Peter's in Rome. Of course, I did not appreciate it because it was not a Gothic cathedral. The prejudice of the immature. An expert never likes one thing at the expense of another, because he is able to reconcile conflicting styles. He likes each thing for what it is. If he is a Wagnerian he doesn't have to hate Verdi. He can appreciate the Renaissance without putting down the Middle Ages. He can admire Schoenberg without turning against Stravinsky. We must impart this "knowing" attitude to our students.

Art is a harbor for much lazy thinking and false criteria. Take "*I know what I like, and this is not for me.*" By that statement I recognize, immediately, an uneducated person. Who was the painter whose answer

to "I know what I like" was, "Madame, so does a cow." The educated man will never be proud of his limitations. He will always pull at his chains. His curiosity will be aroused by a closed door. He will have learned in school respect for that which he does not understand. The uneducated, on the other hand, mistakes his limitations and prejudices for a kind of "patriotic" common sense, like "having your heart in the right place." Ask him to explain why he does not like something and he will get angry. Angry at what he does not understand, *because* he does not understand. Behind his anger lurks a fear that he is being had; that something is being put over on him (the enemy). In other words, the unknown worries him — makes him insecure and defensive. From defense he will jump to the offense and cast doubt on the sincerity of the artist in question. Instead of coming to grips with the work of art he will challenge the artist's *motivation*, and from this there is only one step to making himself the custodian of morality. He will hold the artist to his morals and he will point a warning finger. (The men in charge of culture in totalitarian governments are forever warning the artist.)

With these loose remarks I am trying to illustrate what education in general, and musical education in particular, means to me. The dangers of American college education are also known to me, such as the hunt for degrees, which is threatening the seriousness of the learning process, and, in music especially, the danger of competitiveness, which is forever rearing its head. (It belongs on the football field.)

But I am digressing. Let me sum up. What I demand from the teacher of the future is a greater sense of discovery, born out of a deeper love of the past; a greater sense for experiment born out of a deeper understanding of tradition: teacher becomes student, past becomes future, tradition becomes exploration and experiment.

Some of the happiest moments of my career were spent with my students. I hope that some day, perhaps, I shall be able to turn myself full-time into a teacher(-student) again, working on music and with music in leisure, without deadline, without the pressure of weekly concerts. Thank you.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee consisted of five of the nine regional chairmen: Robert House; Jay Slaughter; David Stone; and Reid Poole, Acting Chairman. Henry Bruinsma, Chairman, was unable to attend. Provision was made for write-in nominations before the meeting but no nominee received the required number of nominations (five) to be placed on the ballot. Mr. Poole reported that James Wallace had asked that his name be withdrawn from nomination for the office of President. There were no nominations from the floor. The ballot presented to the Association was as follows (the persons elected are indicated by an asterisk preceding the name):

| OFFICE | NOMINEES |
|--|---|
| President | *Robert Hargreaves Ball State University |
| First Vice President | *Warner Lawson Howard University Richard Duncan West Virginia University |
| Second Vice President | *LaVahn Maesch Lawrence University Robert Trotter University of Oregon |
| Recording Secretary | *Thomas W. Williams Knox College |
| Treasurer | *Carl M. Neumeyer Illinois Wesleyan University |
| Members, Commission on Curricula | *Thomas Gorton University of Kansas |
| To succeed Thomas Gorton, Chairman (For three year term expiring 1970) | A. Kunrad Kvam Douglass College of Rutgers |
| To succeed William Bergsma | William Bergsma University of Washington *Robert Marvel State University College, Fredonia |
| To succeed Warner Imig | *Warner Imig University of Colorado Harold Goodman Brigham Young University |

| OFFICE | NOMINEES |
|---|--|
| To succeed Edwin Stein | *Warren Scharf Baldwin-Wallace College Bryce Jordan University of Texas |
| Members, Graduate Commission To succeed Karl Ahrendt (For three year term expiring 1970) | *Edwin Stein Boston University Emanuel Wishnow University of Nebraska |
| To succeed James B. Wallace | *James B. Wallace University of Michigan Wiley Housewright Florida State University |
| Committee on Ethics To succeed Myron Russell, Chairman (For three year term expiring 1970) | *Myron Russell The University of Northern Iowa Earl Beach East Carolina College |

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

The year 1967 brought four alleged violations of the Code of Ethics to the attention of the Ethics Committee. One case was settled with a minimum amount of negotiation and one was considered outside the jurisdiction of the committee. Two cases are still under consideration.

It would be reasonable to assume that there have been other unreported violations during the year; however, most of these should have been unintentional.

A violation, knowingly, or unintentional, is a serious matter.

The Committee on Ethics recommends that every NASM representative study the Code of Ethics at least twice a year.

Is it unreasonable to expect us — those who work in the most beautiful and at the same time most powerful of the arts — to live in peace and harmony with each other.

EDWIN GERSCHEFSKI
GENE TAYLOR
MYRON RUSSELL, *Chairman*

COMBINED SESSION OF FOUR STANDING COMMITTEES

MUSIC IN GENERAL EDUCATION

ROBERT TROTTER, *Chairman*

IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING

KENNETH CUTHBERT, *Chairman*

TEACHER EDUCATION IN MUSIC

ROBERT MARVEL, *Chairman*

PRE-COLLEGIATE AND NON-CREDIT ACTIVITIES

G. GENE TAYLOR, *Chairman*

At the general combined meeting, a presentation of the Tanglewood Symposium sponsored by MENC was given by Louis Wersen, Wylie Housewright, Warner Lawson, Warner Imig, and Everett Timm. The second hour of the meeting was given over to separate discussion meetings of each Committee. The following are reports of the Committees.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MUSIC IN GENERAL EDUCATION

ROBERT TROTTER, *Chairman*

WYLIE HOUSEWRIGHT, *Guest*

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

DEAN TROTTER: Do university admissions policies, and the over-rigidity of their application, cut music enrollments off at the roots?

DEAN HOUSEWRIGHT: Yes, but the problem is not only with college admissions policies but with high school administrators who dictate the curricula which college admissions officers evaluate. We must force high school curriculum-makers to realize that just as their students must have mathematics and English to be considered fully educated people they must also have experience with the arts.

DEAN TROTTER: Should standardized admissions tests include questions on the arts?

DEAN HOUSEWRIGHT: Dean Warner Lawson was at Princeton this summer insisting that this problem be looked into, but the pressure for

it must come from high school administrators as well as from those of us at the college level.

PROFESSOR BOARDMAN: What kinds of questions should be included in these standardized tests, factual or creative ones?

DEAN HOUSEWRIGHT: Probably both, but there are problems with either. It is difficult to frame questions which test creativity while in the case of factual questions the typical high school curriculum does not prepare students to deal with the arts in this way.

PROFESSOR POLK: Shouldn't there be a third kind of question dealing with instrumental ability, and how could such questions be formulated?

DEAN HOUSEWRIGHT: In this area no test can satisfactorily replace an audition. In any case there should not be too much weight placed on purely professional abilities; university music schools are not, after all, conservatories.

PROFESSOR POLK: Why can't they be, and why can't they insist on the same sort of admissions standards that conservatories do?

DEAN BESTOR: There is no reason why university music schools can't be conservatories but most of them aren't, and it is not quite honest to admit students on a purely professional basis to a curriculum that will inevitably make demands upon his general non-musical education which his background will not have equipped him to deal with.

DEAN TROTTER: What was the discussion at the Tanglewood Symposium that led to the recommendation that music per se be included in every student's curriculum? Would it not have been more defensible simply to specify the inclusion of some non-verbal art?

DEAN HOUSEWRIGHT: Yes, it probably would.

PROFESSOR MORDENTI: Does the Tanglewood Symposium mean to imply that performance always has to be the center of music instruction?

DEAN HOUSEWRIGHT: No, the point was simply that the typical student now goes through a liberal arts college with no association whatsoever with the arts.

MR. WERSEN: The university is not training the music educator in the understanding of the general implications of music as a liberal art and its place in society.

DEAN HOUSEWRIGHT: What should the universities expect its students to bring to their musical experience?

PRESIDENT SCHULLER: The universities should aim to make every student a potentially discriminating musician. This is not impossible if the schools will take the bull by the horns and say that this is a part of a responsible education. It can be done in eight years of pre-college study, and in fact it has to be done then because if it isn't, then it's too late.

One other point. Most schools insist on limiting their student's musical experience to the serious classical tradition and excluding from the curriculum all other musics, some of which are equally sophisticated and many of which are closer to the student's experience. The problem, however, is that we don't have the teachers to teach this wide a spectrum of music and we are in danger of spreading the curriculum too thin.

CHARLES BESTOR, *Recorder*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING

KENNETH CUTHBERT, *Chairman*

The Committee on Improvement of Teaching and the Committee on General Education convened in a joint meeting at 3:00 p.m. on Friday, November 24. The purpose, plans and objectives of the Tanglewood Symposium were discussed and it was agreed that the Committee on Improvement of Teaching endorse the Tanglewood Symposium and the motion was made at the general session on Saturday morning, November 25, 1967, that recognition would be made in NASM and MENC Journals and on local and regional commercial television.

The resolutions which were presented and passed on Saturday, November 25, 1967, were as follows:

1. That the membership of the National Association of Schools of Music endorse and support the Tanglewood Symposium report "Music in American Society." We further recommend that the widest possible coverage be given in educational, administrative and other journals.
2. The Committee also recommended that NASM and MENC establish a joint committee on Improvement of Teaching for the purpose of seeking out and recognizing outstanding music teaching at all levels — elementary, secondary and higher education.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION IN MUSIC

ROBERT MARVEL, *Chairman*

In keeping with the importance and timeliness of the Tanglewood Symposium, the Committee on Teacher Education in Music devoted its meeting in Chicago on November 24, to a discussion of the Symposium's implications for the education of music teachers.

After an initial presentation by Louis Wersen, Wylie Housewright, Warner Lawson, Warner Imig, and Everett Timm, which was made to the Committee, along with the Committees for Improvement of Teaching, Pre-Collegiate and Non-Credit Activities, and Music in General Education; the Teacher Education in Music Committee met with Everett Timm as a resource consultant, to discuss some of the issues raised, in greater depth. Following are some of the major conclusions reached:

1. The technological revolution of our age has implications for the education of music teachers that many are only dimly aware of at this juncture.
2. Music educators are not, in many respects, establishing a rapport with their students in terms of the total musical culture of those students. The casual, recreational and informal contacts with various musics outside the classroom are often more influential on the students' ultimate taste than music as taught in the school.
3. The conception approach to teaching music in the schools has great implications for teacher education in music.
4. Greater attention must be given in music teacher education to courses that are in aesthetics or that are aesthetically oriented.
5. Most music teachers in the elementary and secondary schools are not, at present, adequately equipped to present properly the materials of contemporary music.

Other points discussed included the growing Arts Council movement, along with other aspects of our total musical culture, and their relationship to formal music education; and the influential role which government is now playing — particularly through the U. S. Office of Education and the National Foundation for Arts and Humanities.

There was agreement that the members of the Committee should keep in close touch with the developments which may come from the Tanglewood Symposium, and that it might be advisable to devote attention to some of these developments at future meetings of NASM.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRE-COLLEGIATE AND NON-CREDIT ACTIVITIES

G. GENE TAYLOR, *Chairman*

This Committee discussed the implications of the preceding combined session.

REPORT OF THE STATE CERTIFICATION AND LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Present were representatives from 33 States. Eugene Crabb, Chairman, presiding.

The Chairman called the meeting to order, reviewed NASM action on the minutes of the 1966 convention and requested committee action on unfinished business.

It was recommended by J. Paul Kennedy and seconded by Wayne Batty that the Certification and Legislation Committee recommend again to the Executive Committee of NASM that they review or appoint an *ad hoc* committee for study and/or approval in principal the Certification Plan of MTNA.

The chairman introduced Dr. Russell Paul Getz, Co-ordinator of Fine Arts, Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction, who spoke on "The Maintenance of Standards Through Teacher Certification." A brief question and answer period followed near the end of which President Hargreaves visited the committee to discuss matters pertaining to national, state and local concern that were within the Committee's province of action.

After discussion, President Hargreaves requested the chairman to prepare and send a letter to him relating to the "program approval accreditation plan" by institutions (as presented in Dr. Getz' address), suggesting that NASM recommend its consideration by those states not at present using such a plan.

J. PAUL KENNEDY, *Recorder*

REPORT OF THE PUBLICITY COMMITTEE

The Publicity Committee started its activities in August when it prepared its first release announcing the dates and location of the 43rd

Annual Meeting of NASM. This release went to the various educational media.

In early October, another release was prepared which went to the same trade educational publications. During this time, the Committee visited the various newspapers, radio, and TV stations. The newspapers were given copies of the general release for publication during Thanksgiving week. They also agreed to cover sessions that would be of interest to the public.

WEFM, Chicago, a station devoted to the highest standards of music, staged an hour long panel session which was taped for broadcast on Thanksgiving evening. Participants were George Stone, Program Director, Arrand Parsons, Himie Voxman, Thomas Williams, and Everett Timm.

On Thanksgiving morning President Robert Hargreaves was interviewed on "Today in Chicago," Station WMAQ Channel 5 TV. Through the offices of George Howerton and George McClay of Northwestern University, we were again able to get a session on the Northwestern Reviewing Stand. This desirable program is broadcast over 175 affiliated stations, The Voice of America, Armed Forces, and Radio Free Europe.

Dr. MacBurney conducted the interview. It opened with a ten minute tape especially prepared by Howard Hanson, establishing the topic for discussion. The topic had to do with his concern over the widening gap between contemporary composer of serious music and his audience. Participants were Robert Marsh, music critic, *Chicago Sun-Times*, Robert Hargreaves, and Roger Fee.

Station WFMT, Chicago, taped for later broadcast the address given by Lukas Foss. The Committee arranged for a welcoming address by Louis Sudler. Mr. Sudler is a fine musician, well-known Chicago businessman, producer of the Artist's Showcase television series, and President of the Orchestral Association.

Photographs were made of the presentation ceremony for newly admitted institutions. Complimentary prints were given to the delegates and also sent to newspapers. The presidents of all newly admitted and promoted schools were sent congratulatory telegrams. Finally, a post-convention release was sent to the appropriate news media providing a short résumé of the Convention highlights and the names of newly

admitted institutions and also those promoted to full membership.

The Chairman again wishes to express his sincere gratitude to the other members of the Committee, Edward Cording, George McClay, and Arthur Wildman.

Respectfully submitted,

WALTER A. ERLEY

REPORT OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE COMMITTEE

The Junior College Committee of the National Association of Schools of Music met Thursday, November 23, 1967, at 3:00 p.m. during the annual meeting in Chicago.

The Committee discussed problems and prospects of junior college music programs in various states throughout the nation. Following this, the Committee developed a consensus as to what could best be done to improve music education in the junior colleges and NASM's contribution to this development.

The chairman reported on the establishment and first meeting of the Joint Committee with the American Association of Junior Colleges. It was the consensus of the Junior College Committee that this new Joint Committee will bring to bear the resources of both national organizations, thereby offering the best opportunity to assist established junior colleges in improving their music programs and to aid new junior colleges in establishing quality music programs best suited to the needs of each particular constituency.

The Junior College Committee endorsed the idea developed at the first meeting of the AAJC-NASM Joint Committee; namely, that a major contribution to this stated objective would be made by the publication of a set of guidelines and criteria for junior college music programs which would be national in scope. This publication could also incorporate a revision and expansion of the NASM standards for junior college accreditation.

The committee then developed the following list of suggested topics for inclusion in this publication:

1. The role and scope of music in the junior college. (The MENC study of this name, which should be published in the spring of 1968, will be of invaluable help in developing this topic.)

2. Description of three categories for junior college music programs:
 - a. The service program, consisting of performance organizations and general cultural courses in music as a part of the liberal arts curriculum.
 - b. The Bachelor of Arts program with a major in music.
 - c. The professional music degree transfer program.
3. Guidelines for selecting the type of program best suited to the needs of the constituency served by each particular college. These guidelines would relate each of the following topics to the categories listed in (2.): administrative organization; faculty; teaching loads; performance responsibilities; facilities and equipment; cost and budget planning; population of the area; availability of part time teachers; library materials and facilities.
4. Procedures for setting up state articulation committees to facilitate the transfer of music credits from junior to senior colleges. The section would also list existing publications of this nature and how to obtain them. (Mr. Reed Poole reported on the Florida study which has recently been published.)
5. NASM criteria for professional transfer programs. This would include publication of the NASM standards of attainment in the different areas of music study at the end of the second year.
6. NASM accreditation. Purposes of specialized accreditation.
7. Consultative visits apart from NASM accreditation or in conjunction with Regional accreditation. This section would include a list of available consultants showing at least one in each state.
8. Community service programs in music which the junior college might undertake. (Dr. Harlacher's report on "Community Service Programs in Junior Colleges" will be of help in developing this section.)
9. The establishment of piano tuning and instrument repair programs in community junior colleges.
10. Procedures for applying for federal funds to assist junior college music programs. List of the types of funds available.

In view of the current problems of junior college music programs and the many requests for assistance being received from throughout the nation, the NASM Junior College Committee recommends that this timely project be given high priority. The Committee feels that the publication of a set of guidelines and procedures can be of immeasurable benefit to junior colleges throughout the nation in upgrading or in establishing effective music programs.

EUGENE BONELLI, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

The Library Committee of NASM met twice at the Chicago meeting — Thursday, November 23, and Friday, November 24. The first meet-

ing (Lee Rigsby presiding) was attended by committee members only and concerned itself with future projects. The most significant of these was the development of a basic bibliography for schools offering masters degrees in music. After much discussion, it was agreed that such a bibliography would be most helpful and that it could be incorporated into a revised edition of the present publication with asterisks by those items essential to undergraduate programs. Two new members of the Library Committee were introduced: Dr. Homer Ulrich of the University of Maryland, and Dr. Michael Winesanker of Texas Christian University.

Dr. Rigsby announced that Dr. William Weichlein, representative from the Music Library Association, would be present at the Friday meeting to discuss possible joint projects of NASM and MLA.

Virgil Smith presided at the Thursday meeting which was open to the general membership. Dr. Weichlein outlined certain projects of NASM and MLA and assured the group of the interest and help of the latter organization.

The remainder of the meeting was given over to discussions from the floor concerning the recent publication "A Basic Music Library for Schools Offering Undergraduate Degrees in Music." Many fine suggestions were made for the improvement of the publication which were duly recorded and submitted to the committee for its consideration and action.

LEE RIGSBY, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

Last Spring, when our Executive Secretary asked me to assume the chairmanship of the Independent Schools Committee of NASM, I was fortunate in having the generosity and helpfulness of my predecessor, Mr. Charles S. Kent, Director of the Peabody Conservatory, to bring me up to date on the activities of this Committee. I wish to publicly thank him for the materials sent to me and for his excellent suggestions.

Since there was no opportunity for a meeting of even a few representatives of the Independent Schools other than at the November session in Chicago, I shall confine my brief remarks to the agenda submitted in the general program for that occasion. It was as follows:

1. Music in Music Education.
2. Performance Standards in Independent Schools.
3. Federal Grants to Independent Schools.

Genuine interest in these points was shown in the large attendance and the enthusiastic participation of all those present. It was evident that the Independent Schools are still fulfilling a most important place in the training of professional and practicing musicians and are the leaders in setting and maintaining the highest standards. We were fortunate in having Mr. Ray Robinson, Associate Director of the Peabody Conservatory, chair that part of our discussion concerning Federal Grants. His knowledge and experience in working with government officials was of real value and was much appreciated especially by those in the process of applying for funds.

Although no recommendations or resolutions were adopted for consideration by the Executive Committee of NASM at this meeting, it is my opinion that this group, although a minority, will contribute much to the welfare of the Association and will seek a voice in its affairs in the future.

Respectfully submitted,

LEO E. HEIM, *Chairman*.

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING OF REGIONAL CHAIRMEN

1. Eight of the regions (no response from one) went on record in favor of some sort of two-year election pattern for regional chairman.
2. Only one region indicated an interest in registration fees for non-member schools.
3. Strong interest in changing pattern of convention sites, with preference for west, east, and south locations alternating with midwest. Region 4 strongly in favor of maintaining present pattern.
4. All regions in favor of Code of Ethics revision, as follows:
 - 5 regions simply in favor of revision.
 - 1 recommends that Article 6, paragraph 3 be stricken (transfer student scholarship problems).

- 2 recommend revision with emphasis upon faculty procurement problem. Concerned with faculty "raiding" and for cut-off date (May 1?) and for need to contact administrator concerned.
5. One region recommended elimination of roll call and other procedural matters.
6. Recommendation (1 region) that constitution be revised to establish a Board of Directors, including regional chairmen, with voting by regional chairmen staggered.
7. A majority of the regions expressed a desire to increase the time span of the conventions.
8. Allow period for small group discussion on a basis other than geographic organization, if national meeting times are extended.

LAVAHN MAESCH, *Second Vice-President*

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON MUSIC EDUCATION

JUNE 1966

(Statement of approval given by membership November 1967)

Preparation for Music Instruction in the Elementary Classroom. The elementary school music program is of critical importance as it is the basis of all further musical instruction. It should obviously be designed to produce the basic components of musicianship in every student; however, the likelihood that this can be done is reduced by the insufficiency of trained musical specialists and by the equally serious lack of musical training of many classroom teachers. This situation should be of vital concern to all schools of music and schools and colleges of education which collaborate in the preparation of elementary teachers.

Music Supervision in the Elementary Schools. In many small school systems, the elementary music supervisor or consultant handles all or most of the musical instruction in the classrooms; in other situations, the job consists more in stimulating and coordinating that program. In any event, as one charged with the general improvement of musical instruction, the role of music supervisor or consultant calls for thorough musi-

cianship, strong teaching ability, and effectiveness in working with and through others. Preparation should include completion of a degree with a major in music as outlined in "The Bachelor of Music Education Degree," (NASM *By-Laws and Regulations*, 1965, Minimum Undergraduate Curricula, Section III, sub-section G), plus successful teaching experience.

A Field of Concentration in Music. The special nature of musical instruction has long been recognized, particularly at the intermediate grade level, where musical knowledge, aural and reading skills, and fine musical discrimination become primary targets. Ability to handle such instruction calls for above-average musical background. Those who are preparing to teach in the elementary schools, and who have active musical interests, should therefore be encouraged to complete a minor or field of concentration in music. This should assist them in teaching music as a departmentalized subject, to the extent that their future teaching assignment may allow.

A pattern of some professional depth should be devised, including:
Music theory (harmony and sight-singing)
Music history and literature
Piano
Voice and/or choral groups
Music methods and materials for the elementary schools
Observation and practice teaching in elementary classroom music to comprise 10%-50% of the total practice teaching assignment.

A Minimal Program for a Minor, or a Concentration in Music. It is seldom that a school system can secure enough music specialists to handle the entire elementary music program. In many instances, the classroom teacher must be prepared to carry forward essential instruction between visits of the music supervisor. This is particularly true in the primary grades where great depths of technical information and musical facility are not demanded of the teacher. However, the elementary classroom teacher should not possess less than the fundamental musicianship which the schools themselves are seeking to produce in students. Briefly this means:

1. familiarity with a body of standard musical works
2. broad but discriminating musical tastes
3. awareness of basic musical design and general outline of its evolution
4. ability to perform by rote and by note
5. initiative in musical activity appropriate to one's interests and talents

These musical understandings and skills cannot be assured in all candidates by any single pattern of courses. Upon entrance into the elementary education program, questionnaires or placement examinations may be administered to ascertain depth of musical training and experience, to probe musical attitudes and tastes, and to sample knowledge of composers, works, and musical vocabulary. On the basis of such evaluation, the decision can be made whether to assign the individual to one or more courses designed for his needs, such as

Introduction to Music (historical, structural, and stylistic survey of music literature).

Fundamentals of Music (practical study of notation, keyboard, and sight-singing).

Beginning Piano.

In addition, the classroom teacher should possess:

1. an understanding of music's role in the schools
2. acquaintance with essential materials and procedures for teaching music in the elementary classroom
3. operational ability in musical instruction

To promote these ends, the following are considered essential:

Music methods and materials for the elementary schools.

Observation and practice teaching in elementary classroom music, to comprise 5%–10% of the total practice teaching assignment.

ROBERT W. HOUSE, *for the*
Sub-Committee on Music Education
of the Commission on Curricula
June, 1966

THE MAINTENANCE OF STANDARDS THROUGH TEACHER CERTIFICATION

DR. RUSSELL GETZ

Co-ordinator of Fine Arts

Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction

I am very happy to take part in this 43rd annual meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music. I am glad for the opportunity to speak to you about the subject of Teacher Certification. Teacher Certification, after all, is one part of a very complex situation.

The process whereby we bring teachers face to face with our children in the classrooms seems to go through cyclical changes every few years. As the economy fluctuates, as national emergencies arise, as the growth of population accelerates, so does the concern for the standards by which we measure the right and the privilege connected with permission to teach. I would like to submit to you that certification standards *should not*, in themselves, fluctuate as a means of combating shortages in the supply of teachers.

It is significant that the Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction and the State Board of Education have shown within the past year that they are not at all satisfied with the present certification policy. This setting up of new standards of certification in Pennsylvania has been the subject of five conferences within the past year. It is my understanding that other states are likewise engaged in the throes of self-evaluation concerning certification.

What then is the purpose of certification? In its simplest form, certification provides educational services by competent professional personnel for our children and adults. It also serves to prevent incompetents from entering the education profession.

In a more pointed purpose, certification should distinguish those people who are able to get children to learn and to want to learn. Our tool happens to consist of music, but the purpose is just as real as if our tools were science or reading.

One of the basic changes which is responsible for the dissatisfaction with today's certification regulations is a change in emphasis from a quantity of preparation to quality. It has become well established through many disheartening stories that credit counting by clerical help is not conducive to guaranteeing that only competent teachers will be certified. There must be other measurements which can be applied to discover the qualitative aspects of a program of preparation. Various means of measuring quality have been suggested, primarily having to do with passing course requirements by proficiency examination, rather than depending upon semester hours of credit.

One of the most logical approaches toward moving in the direction of quality has been to place the major share of responsibility for certification upon the colleges and universities which actually have prepared the teachers. The U. S. Office of Education has been publishing standards since 1952 which are to assist State Departments of Education in their accreditation or approval of programs for teacher education. The publication, "Proposed Standards for State Approval of Teacher Education," is a project of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. The latest edition is dated February 1966.

Following up on this example, some states have decided to embark on what is now called a "program approval" approach. Instead of awarding certificates on the basis of college courses and credits, colleges and universities were encouraged to establish sound programs of preparation based upon rationale specified by the State Boards of Education. In Pennsylvania, program approval was initiated by the Department of Public Instruction during the year 1962-63.

"Program Approval is a systematic effort to improve teacher education programs. After an evaluation visit is made to an institution, those programs that are identified as being of high quality are granted Program Approval status. Conditions are also set which, when carried out, will result in Program Approval for the other programs. In this way we are able to do something *before* a person is ready to be certified instead of merely looking at his college transcript *after* he graduates. Program Approval allows us to do something about the *quality* of a teacher's program of preparation rather than merely checking, after the fact, to see if he has a certain *quantity* of courses and credits. Instead of depending upon non-professionals in Harrisburg counting credits on transcripts to determine whether a person is qualified to teach, a team of professionals, competent in particular fields, visits an institution, collects much information, and makes pertinent observations and recommendations to the Bureau of Teacher Education.

"Program Approval attempts to make a determination of the quality of the

total program that leads to a particular teaching certificate. Each program component is explored in some depth as concerns objectives, organization and administration, faculty, curriculum, resources, and student achievement. Furthermore, Program Approval is specifically designed to make certain that *each* program through which a person might pass to become a teacher does in fact contain *all* of the elements that a person should have in order to be able to teach in the best school systems in the Commonwealth.”

I have seen many examples which indicate to me that this system has been successful in our State. I see particularly where the music departments are much more aware of their responsibilities in turning out competent teachers than they were just a few years ago. I find more personal involvement with the candidates today, as Department Heads are asking whether this person is really equipped in every way to stand before the boys and girls of our State. Does he really know his music theory? . . . Is he psychologically adjusted to meet the emotional needs of a junior high school music teacher? . . . Does he have any personal habits which are undesirable for a person who is charged with teaching young people? . . . All such inadequacies and any others are now recognized as being a major responsibility of the degree-granting institutions. There is general agreement that the program approval process has resulted in better teachers.

However, I see as a problem, the necessity for non-certified people, such as teachers from other states, who must now have their preparation evaluated by a teacher training institution, which may or may not be willing to accept such credits for certification purposes. Because of the need to become attached to a college, I am already beginning to see a great deal of “shopping around” by teachers with dubious credentials, looking for a college that will accept them.

To improve the program approval procedures, I believe that the subject matter specialists should become more involved at the state level in formulating guidelines for the evaluation of the various programs. Evaluation of a program should deal largely with the *products* of the program, the graduated teachers who are reflecting the education that they received.

I believe that leadership is needed on a national level, perhaps from this organization, in clearing up the ambiguities which exist in the certification regulations when considering the employment of foreign teachers, whether on exchange or some more permanent basis. I likewise

believe that there must be some national guidance on the unique problems we face in the hiring of professional musicians.

Perhaps no one system alone can have all the answers. Perhaps there need to be alternative methods of certification for special or unique cases. Especially in the arts we have many professionals who become interested in one way or another in becoming teachers. Under the suggestions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Titles I and III, as well as other Federal projects, schools are urged to employ musicians and artists. It is a real problem for these schools to be able to deal with such professionals. On the one hand, they can be valuable, and could fill needed gaps in the fine arts program of the school. On the other hand, the State frowns upon the hiring of non-certified personnel and in some cases, even penalizes the school in its reimbursement, for the hiring of such people.

Recently the *Reader's Digest Magazine* carried an article by a would-be English teacher whose bitter complaint is that in a day of teacher shortages she has not been able to secure a license to teach, even though she has experience, ability and the desire to be of service. It is time that we come to grips with this matter. In Pennsylvania, as well as in some other states, we have provided for the employment, on a part-time basis, of art and music teachers who have been able to pass a written examination and have exhibited performance proof of their ability. The hiring of approximately 40 instrumental teachers by this procedure has been of immense help to the Philadelphia Public School System. The people who are most concerned about this procedure are music educators themselves, who are worried, perhaps not without cause, that music teaching may be done in the public schools by people who would not have to go through the same rigors of a four-year preparation program that they had to undergo.

As broadly educated people, I am sure that you are used to looking at both sides of any question. While I have recognized problems of our process of certification, I would also like to call to your attention some of the dangers that are inherent on this newer road as well. Educators have been struggling for generations with the question of how to develop a successful teacher. Fortunately, the *Reader's Digest* article in question now has supplied us the answer in only seven digested lines.

"He needs intelligence, information and commitment. He needs to be poised, imaginative, compassionate, and generous minded. He should care for and understand the young. It helps if he has a sense of humor and a flair for dramatics."

While it is a certainty that present certification methods do not guarantee success along these lines, neither does the licensing of performing artists or liberal arts graduates make such a guarantee.

During my stay in the U. S. Army, I was introduced to a little pouch of powder, which when immersed in a cup of hot water gave me instant coffee. This phenomenon has become so much a part of our American way of life that occasionally my wife slips over on me a serving of instant mashed potatoes. It used to take time to prepare a good dish of mashed potatoes. We are intrigued with the stories of girls who are discovered in soda fountains and become instant movie stars. The Horatio Alger stories whereby a person through his own diligence and perseverance could climb from "rags to riches" is old fashioned and obsolete. Today our youngsters want instant Utopia and are achieving it through LSD and other ways they haven't yet told us about. Parenthetically, I fear that we may be certifying some of these very people into our Fine Arts Departments. Our educators are making every attempt at instant education, teaching college math in high school, algebra in third grade, and reading at the age of two. The cry has been that if Einstein had wished to teach physics in our public schools, he would have had to take 24 hours of education courses first. The obvious answer to this dilemma is "instant certification."

We have been working for several years with a so-called Einstein clause, as I described earlier. Artists and musicians who pass a fairly simple written test and can prove that they are artist performers are given a letter of certification by the State Superintendent of Schools to teach part-time in the public schools. In the three years that I have been testing applicants, we have *not* been overwhelmed by Einsteins. We get many people who otherwise could not earn a decent living. We have had artists literally without portfolio, who could not even enter the freshman class of most art colleges. We get musicians who do play but do not know how or why. There is no problem certifying real artists or real teachers. The problem is with the borderline cases who are not talented professionally to perform nor to teach.

Strangely enough, those whom we do not pass are very indignant, not because they are no longer able to help young people, but because "I need the post and the income that it brings." Of those that we have certified for part-time work, I have not heard a word of *why* they want to help youngsters, nor of what plans they have to *improve* themselves. After certification, the next question invariably is, "How do I

get to be placed on public school retirement?" The next demand is for full salary, full increment in the salary schedule and full reimbursement to the school from the State. We are not flooded with applications from Andrew Wyeths and Eugene Ormandys and probably never will be at \$4800 a year.

It seems to me that if one only need be an artist or a musician to be certified, we are not far removed from the "good old days" when in order to teach you needed eight years of grade school and a couple courses in normal school. The point must be made again — standards of certification should not be altered merely to remedy a shortage of teachers. Our students deserve better than to be taught by frustrated performers, by people looking for a job "to fall back on." I, for one, have heard enough talk of "backward-falling" teachers. I have found that frustrated performers often turn out to be very frustrating teachers. Our children deserve to be guided by people who are convinced that the biggest contribution they can make is to share their love and enjoyment of music with boys and girls.

The trend in the thinking about permanency of certification today is also changing rapidly. To quote Dr. Harold Orendorff, Dean of the Fine Arts at the Indiana University of Pennsylvania, "This process should be a continuing one. Permanent certification is unthinkable."

Because of the constant development of new ideas in teaching and learning processes, the need to learn more subject matter and the use of new teaching media, I believe we all agree that a teacher should continuously be updating his preparation. I return to the idea that *quality* teaching should be the means of determining standards for certification. This means that we must identify the behavior of good teachers, determine how and where the teacher can be trained in the use of such behaviors and then see to it that this procedure is followed somewhere before or during the student's practice teaching. It means that we must determine what the beginning teacher should be like and what he should be able to do.

The word "competency" has been referred to by many states. Probably the most complete statement of teacher competency in music has been written into the Kentucky Music Education Guide. I would like to quote a few lines from it.

"The teacher of music needs an understanding of the scope of a total school program, the ability to function as a member of the total faculty team and

depth of understanding of learning processes based upon a knowledge of children and how they develop. In addition, he must have the following special competencies;

- (1) sensitivity and critical awareness of the elements of æsthetic musical performance.
- (2) Musicianship through performance,
- (3) functional command of the piano,
- (4) ability to teach singing *and* instruments,
- (5) ability to teach and conduct ensembles,
- (6) knowledge of the structural elements of music,
- (7) understanding of the history and literature of the Fine Arts and Humanities,
- (8) ability to develop a comprehensive program of music based upon sound philosophy and concepts basic to music learning growth and development,
- (9) ability to evaluate music materials in terms of quality and educational value,
- (10) willingness to lead in community cultural development."

This is quite a list! I think it illustrates the need for the development of the whole person, especially in regard to his æsthetic awareness. I think this should go a long way toward assuring the people of Kentucky that their children will have competent and sincere music teachers. And, if you consider the ten points just mentioned in the light of our earlier discussion concerning bringing of artist performers into the classroom as teachers, they may well illustrate the difference between a *certificated* music teacher and the specialist who may be permitted to teach in one certain field.

Some of you no doubt perked up your ears at the suggestion in the list just read, that the teacher be able to teach vocal and instrumental music. I know that in some of our states, it is possible to obtain a certificate in one field or another. For instance, in Wisconsin it is possible to obtain a certificate for elementary vocal music only. In that same state there is now a movement to certify public school piano teachers for those schools that want to have piano classes.

In the State of Pennsylvania, we hold to a broad preparation in music. For instance, a music teacher certified in Pennsylvania must be prepared to teach vocal and instrumental and general music at both the elementary and secondary level. I believe there is good and sound reason for continuing this requirement, even though some of our colleges and many of our teachers and students feel otherwise. I believe that in order to keep the standard of music high, it is essential that all music teachers

know and appreciate the contribution of both the vocal and the instrumental programs and that they appreciate the problems of each. I believe that the teacher must have a broad background to insure flexibility, to allow for maturation and changes in interest. In reorganization into larger school districts there are more positions of *real* music supervision being established and these need to be filled by good administrators who are cognizant of a well balanced program.

I believe that post graduate work, preferably after some teaching experience, is the time to specialize in whatever field the teacher has by that time decided upon. Our larger school districts have not necessarily resulted in more narrow and specialized jobs. In many of them, the same amount of teachers are trying to meet the needs of the larger system, resulting in shifting of responsibilities almost yearly. In our State we have the largest amount of public secondary school children enrolled in general music and music appreciation classes of any state in the country, in 1966, numbering 431,500. It is necessary for us to require broad preparation for people who need to be competent teachers of general music, music appreciation, as well as the newer courses in related arts, humanities and world cultures.

McNeil Lowery, Director of the Program of the Humanities and Arts for the Ford Foundation says, "About 80 percent of the students in the departments of *music*, theater and visual arts are going to be teachers at one level of the educational system or another."

What about the attitude prevalent in many Music Departments toward music education programs in the same school? . . . If a university professor of music has any faith in himself, any pride in his work, any sense of passing his interest and ability to the younger generations, what is the reason that he should speak about music education in deprecating terms? . . . Is he not also an educator? . . . Certification, as I said is only part of a very complex situation. What is the role of the artist in society? . . . Is he an interpreter of the passing scene, a professional performer, using the tools of his art to give creative expression to his feelings? Or is he really a teacher of other students in the arts? . . . and what is the role of the university in the preparation of musicians? . . . Is it really to produce practicing performers or is it to produce musicians who are also teachers? Has the role of the university changed to that of a vocational training school as a result of absorbing music conservatories? It is easy to becloud the larger issues that maturing music education must face by

merely searching for practical answers to personal problems. I am sure that in the process of finding answers to these larger issues, we will also find solutions to the very practical questions of certification that I have outlined here today.

THE SPECIALIZED CURRICULUM AND ITS RELEVANCE

JOHN A. FLOWER

*Dean, College of Fine and Professional Arts
Kent State University*

The gathering of technical institutes, conservatories of music, manufacturing technology, theatre groupings, galleries, and so on under the ægis of the university is a uniquely American phenomenon. This emerging pattern of organization contrasts sharply with that of Europe and England where clear-cut distinctions have always been made between that which should be appropriate for the university curriculum and that which should belong in the professional school, the trade school or the conservatory. The dichotomy between "training" and "educating" as mutually exclusive realms of teaching is a legacy of Europe, Britain, and indeed relates to the aristocratic image of the university as opposed to the plebeian posture of the trade school. Specialized accreditation emerged and continues to evolve with the growth of curriculums which teach skills and techniques in addition to basic knowledge.

While our heritage of education remains, changes in the structure of higher education in this country as compared to the continent continues to evolve. An increasing dialogue emerges concerning the inter-relationship of the concepts of educating and training. Because of the ever-wider spectrum of social responsibility assumed by colleges and universities, and because of the jarring impact of technology on curriculum, educating and training inter-relate as they never have before.

It is in this context that the specialized schools and departments, always concerned with facets of technical training, identify themselves with the university. The working relationship is not an easy one. Conventional academic bureaucracy does not lend itself well to the teaching of individual skills, be they in industrial technology or in music. Concepts, understandings, literatures, are best approached from a teaching posture which is not the same as that which is effective in teaching

specialized techniques, many of which emerge out of highly individualized talents. In many specialized curriculums, brains and motivation on the part of students are not enough, but the x quantity of particular talent must be present and must be identified. The fact that in many categories of specialized curriculums the talent required may well be of a non-verbal sort, tends further to alienate the specialized program from the mainstream of the university.

This is where the strains appear in the university family relationships. If universities are anything, they are word oriented. Sit in on any faculty council meeting, whether it concerns parking or the curriculum (not uncommonly in that order) and the university's heritage of words become instantly obvious.

Categories of understanding are easily promulgated for the traditional grouping of curriculums, English, Philosophy, Literature, Law, etc. These disciplines are word oriented and everyone feels comfortable in dialogue. The specialized curriculums in the arts and the technologies, on the other hand, are not necessarily word oriented. Their practitioners feel comfortable enough among themselves, or their students, but when they move into the university marketplace where ideas are vigorously exchanged, and where the medium of exchange is words, they feel discomfort and real frustration. Words are not the basic vehicle of expression for art and technology. Meanings as they relate to art and technology are much harder to describe in words than in the substance of the art or technology itself. It isn't that technicians are bashful when it comes to talking. My experience has been that professors of painting tend to be as or more verbal than professors of English, perhaps out of necessity. The point is that the English professor expresses ideas about his discipline directly. Words are his tools. The painter is at a communicative disadvantage. Words are not his tools. Paint and brushes are. He teaches as much by exemplifying as he does by talking, and you cannot go into a committee meeting with palette and brush. Words are only the faintest glimmer of the reality of his art.

Art and technology are latecomers into the family of the university, which is not noted for rapidity of change. This is understandable. For one thing, universities are the repositories of the accumulated ideas and concepts of centuries. These concepts must be guarded. This is truly a sacred trust. The instrumentalities which have grown up as protective devices around the concepts are not sacred as are the concepts themselves,

but sometimes concept and device get mixed up in the eyes of the faculty committees. These committees sometimes sidle up closer to the academic devices than to the concepts the devices are protecting. Herein one can discern nice inconsistencies. Professors of late have tended toward liberalism. Given the sociology of our day this is probably all to the good. But such liberalism usually refers to everything but the professor's own curricular bailiwick. When he enters this realm he more often than not becomes the archest of conservatives. The protections surrounding this realm are constructed so as to screen, winnow, and sometimes parry innovations which indicate a posture or direction too uncomfortably disparate from that which traditionally exists.

Here is where traditional academic bureaucracy works to the disadvantage of the arts and technology. Credit hour bookkeeping, faculty load criteria, student admissions procedures, scholarships and the thousand and one processes making up the mystique of academic bureaucracy have for the most part been built up around the traditional humanistic disciplines forming the core of the university. They work nicely. But this traditional bureaucracy does not necessarily support technology and the arts. As yet universities have not learned how to handle the apparent mavericks making up these new members of the academic family. Scholarships are an interesting case in point. The process of recruiting student string players for the college orchestra can be compared, almost directly, with the recruitment of athletes. Nationwide, however, collegiate string players do not enjoy currency on campus comparable to athletes, albeit they are making remarkable progress. When a Heisman Trophy is struck for student concertmasters, college string programs will have come of age.

The meaningful relationship of art and technology, its relevance to society at large, is another problem. This approaches the core of the matter of art and technology in the curriculum. The achievements of technology speak for themselves and require rather little interpretation. The question of relevance is not so much one of immediately obvious achievement, but of the ultimate human value that this technological achievement may promulgate and symbolize. The relationship of the humanities to technology thus becomes immediately obvious, and their mitigating qualities become a matter of concern which approaches crisis proportions, given the impact of technology on society. It is not a question whether or not humanities relate to technology, but how. The curricular modus will probably evolve that techniques and conceptualiz-

ing are not mutually exclusive, but complementary. Training and educating can merge.

The arts present an enormously more difficult problem at the university. Rather than consciously trying to improve the environment, the arts symbolize, in some cases mirror society. At best, art enlightens and illuminates. At worst, it can degrade. Sometimes its quality is difficult to get at in a literal sense. At times literalism would destroy its meaning. Always its perceptrs must be tuned in at the proper wave length. The non-verbal aspect of much art, thus, is of central concern.

Recognizing the verbal heritage of the university, and recognizing that this heritage is reinforced by the characteristics of our culture, artists at the university often tend to go it alone. Not only are they misunderstood, they can be their own worst apologists, particularly when they extend the area of misunderstanding by self-conscious rebellion against conventional social mores. The dilemma is further intensified by the fact that today's world makes the artists just as insecure as their compatriots among laymen. They are just as confused in the melee of social and technological change as anyone else, and the artist may not be absolutely sure upon which stylistic peg to hang his hat. The result has been a welter of styles without comparison in the history of art.

Small wonder then that today's artist has a way to go before he is brought into the total university family in spirit as well as by contract.

National associations concerned with the arts and technology can be of great help in these matters. Those concerned with technology can profess a concern with value as much as with technique. We can no longer afford to be clinically objective. Ethical statements relating to meaning and to value should appear alongside published presentations of technical progress. By so doing, relationships between the humanities and technology will begin to show some highlights. The developing and refining of our ethical and value judgments become as important to technology as the fact of technology itself.

In like manner national associations concerned with art can help in the uncommonly difficult problem of defining and of explaining art and its relevance to society. Art is supposed to speak for itself, and indeed the legacy of the greatest art can only do so. But an ongoing civilization must produce its own styles, relevant and pertinent to its own day and age. There is simply no question that the contemporary artist of today,

as a relevant, accepted, and self-fulfilled member of society, has rougher sledding than his counterpart of generations gone by. It is not altogether a question of economics. Today's affluence has mitigated this, in part at least. It is a question of being a part of the mainstream. Of being needed. Sometimes he symbolizes our aspirations better than anyone else. Our society needs the artist. No great society has ever existed without the presence of great artists. But our American society is not absolutely sure where they belong today. There is no societal middle ground for the artist, as there is for members of other professions. An artist, unless he is a teacher or in commerce, tends either to be on the bottom or on the top. This lack of opportunity for stepwise ascent, with some reasonable predictability of recognition of worth if the worth is there, is devastating.

Herein national associations can provide aid and assistance by assuming the role of explainer. This job of explanation is difficult and ideally should not be necessary, but the fact remains that it is. By their help in so doing, one more step will be taken in the evolution of a coherent society.

FUTURE ANNUAL MEETING SITES

THE FORTY-FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
WILL BE HELD AT THE
STATLER-HILTON, WASHINGTON, D. C.
25-26-27 NOVEMBER 1968



THE FORTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
WILL BE HELD AT THE
STATLER-HILTON, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA
24-25-26 NOVEMBER 1969