PROCEEDINGS
THE FIFTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING

National Association of Schools of Music

NUMBER 72 APRIL 1984

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF
SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

59th PROCEEDINGS OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

Dearborn, Michigan
1983

COPYRIGHT © 1984

ISSN 0190-6615

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
11250 ROGER BACON DRIVE, NO. 5, RESTON, VA. 22090

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

CONTENTS

Presentations

Quality, Accountability, and the Accrediting Community
Richard Millard 1

An Introduction to NASM: Purpose and Philosophy
Robert Glidden 10

The Operations of NASM
Robert Werner 19

The Development of Program Visibility
Gerald Lloyd 24

The Value of Music Consortia
John F. Sawyer 30

Opera and Musical Theatre Training: The NASM Project and Beyond
Elaine Walter 32

Human Biology: Basic Science for Musicians
Frank R. Wilson, M.D. 39

Computer-Assisted Instruction in Music: What Managers Should Know
James F. McCarthy 52

Issues in Piano Pedagogy: High School Credit for Performance Instruction
Jean Hull 56

Issues in Piano Pedagogy: Standards for Private Teachers
Elvina Truman Pearce 62

Issues in Piano Pedagogy: Degrees in Pedagogy
Marienne Uszler 67

Music Executive Success
Robert L. Cowden 75

A Process for Fiscal Decisions
Gary Behm 98

A Process for Fiscal Decisions
Wilber Elliott 101

A Process for Fiscal Decisions
Richard V. Evans 107

The Precollegiate Training of NASM Students
Robert Freeman 109

The Precollegiate Training of Musicians
Kalman Novak 113

The Plenary Sessions

Minutes of the Plenary Sessions 117

Report of the President
Thomas Miller 120

Report of the Executive Director
Samuel Hope 124

Reports of the Regional Chairmen 128

Report of the Committee on Ethics
Joe B. Buttram 133

Actions of the Accrediting Commissions (as approved by the membership)

Report of the Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Institutions
Robert Bays 134

Report of the Community/Junior College Commission
Arno Drucker 134

Report of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Report of the Commission on Graduate Studies
Bruce Benward
Robert Werner 135

Officers, Commissioners, and Staff of the Association 138

QUALITY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND THE ACCREDITING COMMUNITY

RICHARD MILLARD
Council on Postsecondary Accreditation

We are at a rather crucial junction not only in the history of higher education but of education in general. The issue of educational quality which always has been important has become the central educational issue of this decade—not just for the educational community but for the wider political community as well. It is somewhat ironic that quality should become the key national educational issue at the very time the federal government has tried and is trying to cut back on federal funds for education. There is some danger that concern with quality could become either a diversion for reducing effective support of education or a code word for return to a simplistic elitist tradition. However, that quality should be *a* if not *the* central concern of the educational community is clear—and that has not always been the case. From this standpoint the renewed emphasis on quality and the fact that it has become everybody's business is welcome.

In contrast to the 1980's the primary emphasis during the 1970's tended to be on access and equity. Although progress has been made, we clearly have not yet reached the goals of access and equity. However, not only those of us in the academic community but the public at large have come to recognize that equity without quality or at the expense of quality is chimerical. To provide or to offer access primarily to second or third rate programs, schools or postsecondary institutions is to provide neither equity nor quality. Equity without quality is a contradiction in terms and only tends to perpetuate inequalities on a continuing basis.

We have been deluged with reports over the past two or three years on the sad state of education. To date they have been primarily focussed on the schools. The one of these reports that has received the most attention is that of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk* (April, 1983). Its major thesis is that "the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people" (p.5). While again the primary emphasis is on the schools, the report notes the growing complaint of "shoddiness' not only in "our schools" but also in our "colleges" (p.11). In fact, a special task force of the Commission is currently bringing together material on postsecondary education. Whether this will be as negative in relation to higher education as *A Nation at Risk* is to elementary and secondary education has yet to be seen but the probability that it will be complimentary is not high. The report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Control of the Campus*, (Washington, D.C., 1982), not only noted quality problems on campuses but cited accreditation in particular as failing to enhance quality. While the majority of Americans (68.1%) still consider the quality of higher education in this country good or excellent, according to a recent report released by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (News Release, October 3, 1983), this majority represents a decrease of 4.9% over the previous year and is not an occasion for concluding that all is well in the halls of academe.

It is not my purpose or function to assess the adequacy of the various reports nor to evaluate their recommendations. It is, however, important to note that we are in a period in which the natural forces of competition among colleges and universities, if we are not careful, are likely to push some institutions in the direction of attenuating rather than strengthening quality. In the light of variable enrollments and fiscal pressures, the need for warm bodies to pay tuition, to meet full-time equivalent funding ratios, even to survive, constitutes temptations to lower standards to obtain and retain students. These pressures are likely to increase.

It is equally important to note that the increased concern about quality has highlighted demands for accountability in higher education. This includes the accountability to students for the quality of programs offered; accountability to state and federal governments for effective utilization of public resources to achieve educational objectives; accountability to business, industry and service organizations for the quality of graduates employed; and accountability to the general public for the integrity of the higher educational processes. To these should be added a growing concern for accountability of the professions to insure through education and continuing competency of members of the professions.

Traditionally it is the accrediting associations, both institutional and professional or specialized, which have served as the guarantors of higher and professional education. They constitute the academic and professional communities' primary communal self-regulatory means of quality assessment and enhancement. They must be front and center in any serious discussion of quality assessment and enhancement. Since they consist of their member institutions, programs, and professional associations, when their members are under attack or suspected of not maintaining quality levels commensurate with public expectations so are their accrediting associations. In fact, they may be more so, for if quality is suspect or suffers, the question becomes why the accrediting associations have not done more about it.

Criticism of accreditation is not new. It has always had its critics. The range, variety and intensity of these critics is in a sense a tribute to its importance. Loss of or failure to gain accreditation can be an extremely serious affair. It can spell life or death to an institution or program. Some of the criticisms have had and have validity, others not. Since the early part of this century accreditation processes and standards have gone through an evolutionary development and will continue to do so. Today, for example, far more emphasis is placed on program and institutional objectives, on results, on outcomes and on value-added factors than was the case earlier. On the whole, accreditation has served the academic and professional communities and the country well. It has adapted to the relative independence and diversity of higher and professional education in this country and is committed to the concept of peer review as essential to quality assessment. And yet because it is based on self-regulation and peer review it is always subject to suspicion that it can be self-serving, more concerned with preserving the status quo of the institutions or programs which are its members than with the quality of education offered, or more concerned with the narrow interest of a profession than with the quality of preparation for professional practice in larger institutional settings.

Given the current problems, stresses and concerns about quality and accountability, the crucial questions become: are the accrediting associations adequately performing their functions? Can they be counted on to continue to do so and to improve effective and reliable quality assessment? To whom are they accountable and what assurance is there that they are acting in the interests of students and the public in protecting and enhancing quality? For the sake not just of individual accrediting associations, but the future and integrity of the accrediting community and of the process of accreditation, it is essential that these questions be answered. In fact, I would insist that not just the integrity of accreditation is involved but more fundamentally, given the self-regulatory character of accreditation, the integrity of higher and professional education is at stake.

It is not my purpose simply to appear as an apologist for accreditation. It has and continues to have its weaknesses. It would not be true to say that all accrediting associations, whether institutional or programmatic, perform equally well or with the same levels of insight. There are tensions within accrediting associations, among accrediting associations, and between accrediting associations and the institutions and programs they accredit. There are also tensions between accrediting associations and practitioners in their fields, between accrediting associations and institutional executives both individually and collectively, and between accrediting associations and government agencies both state and federal. Finally, there are tensions between public and even academic perceptions of what accrediting associations are about and what they really do. A number of these have created and do and will under some circumstances create disruptions, with a negative impact on the effectiveness of accreditation. However, no one ever promised any of us a tension free life. The important thing is what we do about them. The tensions create the conditions or opportunities for their own resolution and have in fact brought about evolution and change within accreditation to date.

What I would like to suggest is that if the accrediting community is to continue to serve and to enhance its essential function as the self-regulatory communal approach to quality assessment and enhancement effectively in the face of the tensions and the rising concern for quality, there are at least two basic issues, or fundamental recognitions that are essential.

First, it seems to me that we need to be clear about what it is we really mean by educational quality. Without this it is extremely difficult to specify what either we or institutions or programs are accountable for or even what we as accreditors are doing. As already noted, quality can be and is often used as a code word for a whole series of things, such as: some ineffable characteristic which one recognizes but cannot specify; a return to basics (whatever they are); an appeal to tradition; what everyone agrees upon (whoever everyone is); what the "best" institutions do; a reinstitution of elitism; and on and on. To review the philosophic debates about the meaning of quality would require an extended seminar and probably would not serve our purposes. I would suggest that in the context of educational programs and institutions, quality is not that difficult to define. If it were ineffable, each person's perception would specify quality for him and discussion would be at an end whenever two people disagree. Nor can quality be equated with what the "best" institution is or does. Such a conception does not do justice to the variety of legitimate educational objectives various types of programs or institutions are designed to meet and the appropriate expectation that, regardless of type of program or structure, each program and type of institution should achieve maximum quality.

Within the educational context it seems clear that quality basically relates to the achievement of appropriate educational objectives and to the effective utilization of resources in doing so. An institution or program with confused or unclear objectives, that does not know what it is trying to accomplish, has no clear basis for assessing what it is doing or how it might improve. But, equally, an institution or program with clear and appropriate objectives but without the resources to achieve them or with resources inappropriately utilized in relation to achieving them, is also deficient in quality. Such a conception of quality of educational programs and institutions equates quality with achievement in kind. Far from being an abstract formulation, it provides a context for development of standards, for assessment and enhancement of programs, for effective planning and achievement and does so for institutions, programs and even segments of postsecondary education without doing violence to legitimate diversity of educational needs at all levels in a complex society.

Effective utilization of resources to achieve appropriate educational objectives, I would submit, is the basic concept of quality on which accreditation is based. It provides a framework for accountability both of programs and institutions and of accrediting associations. Further it has a series of implications not all of which all accrediting associations perhaps fully recognize. First, it means that standards are not or should not be rigid quantitative formulae based upon what the "best" programs or institutions do, but are judgmental conditions of effective fulfillment of functions. Here the National Association of Schools of Music has been a leader. For example, as your *Handbook* states, in relation to libraries the critical question is not the member of volumes or items in the music library but the adequacy, relevance and utilization of the music library and its collection in support of the music curricula and their objectives.

Second, this concept of quality as achievement in kind, clearly underlines the dual function of accreditation not just as quality assessment but also as quality enhancement. Quality is not a matter of plateaus that quickly become valleys but of successive approximation to effective fulfillment of functions, thus of enhancement if quality is to be maintained.

Third, it underlines the fact that adequate assessment cannot be a matter of looking at process alone or results alone but at the process—results continuum, while at the same time recognizing that alternate processes may lead to equivalent results.

Fourth, in an interesting way it forms the basis for recognizing the different yet complementary functions of institutional and professional accreditation. Institutional accreditation is primarily concerned with the question of how effectively the institution as a whole and in its parts utilizes its resources to achieve its appropriate educational objectives. These objectives are either developed by the institution itself or, in the case of public institutions, at least in part by the state through legislation or the appropriate state agency, one would hope, in cooperation with the institution. Professional accreditation has an additional dimension. It obviously is or should be concerned with the objectives of the particular professional program and the relation of these to institutional objectives, but it also is concerned with the objectives of effective preparation for professional practice as determined not only by educators but by practitioners and professionals within the field. This is essential if professional education is to be responsive to developments in the field and public concern with competent professionals. An institution is under no obligation to offer education in any particular professional field, but if it does its integrity is as much at stake in the adequacy of the professional preparation of students for that field as it is in anything else it does. In seeking professional accreditation an institution does not give up its autonomy but takes on the obligation to meet reasonable standards related to professional as well as institutional objectives. What is called for are common educational objectives that are congruent with the general objectives of the institution and of professional education. This means respect for the institution on the part of the accrediting association and respect for the integrity of the profession on the part of the institution. Unfortunately, at times, both institutions and accrediting agencies have lost sight of this and its basis in the concept of quality itself. If both institutions and accrediting agencies are in fact to be accountable, it is crucial that the key issue be quality, not turfdom.

A second essential issue fundamental to accreditation's fulfilling its self-regulatory function of quality assessment and enhancement lies in clear recognition of its communal character. Each accrediting association is a community of institutions or programs and, in the case of specialized accrediting associations, professionals and/or practitioners. It is first of all accountable to that community including and perhaps particularly to its student members. The fact that accreditation is communally self-regulatory does not mean, however that it is self-serving. The communal judgment as represented through the accrediting process may and in some cases must be critical, even negative, in relation to particular institutions or programs which are not effectively utilizing their resources to achieve appropriate educational objectives. If this were not the case the accrediting association might be a mutual admiration society but it would not be a self-regulatory process concerned with quality assessment and enhancement. Part of its viability and importance lies in the recognition not only that individual institutions or programs can and should be strengthened through the process, but also that weak, shoddy, or submarginal institutions and/or programs reflect negatively upon the academic community and/or the profession as a whole. Major external attacks or criticisms, particularly when justified, undermine not only educationally sound objectives but the community and/or profession as well. Thus it is in the interest, not simply the narrow self-interest, of the academic and professional communities concerned and to students and the public to maintain and strengthen the sense of community in the self-regulatory activity.

This also has a number of implications in institutional or program and accrediting association relations. It means that the institutions or programs should accept major responsibility as integral parts of that community and should be encouraged to do so by the accrediting association. The institutions or programs have a basic responsibility to insure that the accrediting process and its objectives are clearly understood on their own campuses. In addition, institutions and programs should internalize the process so that the self-study, the peer review, and the accrediting recommendations become an integral part of their own self-evaluation and planning processes. They should take an active part in the affairs of the association or agency including providing site visitors. But, in turn, the accrediting associations have two fundamental obligations: first, to respect the uniqueness of the institution and its programs as a community and the relation of program objectives to institutional objectives; and second, to insure that site visitors are adequately educated in their functions and can distinguish between applications of formulae and substantive achievement of program, institutional and professional objectives.

The individual communities of the various accrediting associations are in turn part of the larger self-regulating community of accrediting associations. It has become progressively clear that weaknesses in any part of that community are damaging to the community as a whole and its members individually. Attacks, whether justified or not, on any part of the community have a carry-over effect on other associations. It is far too easy not only for the public but even for parts of the academic community to generalize from concern that a particular agency is perceived as weak, as arbitrary, as impinging upon the prerogatives of the institution, or as more concerned with professional aggrandizement than with the quality of education, to the claim that accreditation is any or all of the above. One only has to look at the broad generalizations in the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching report *Control of the Campus* for some rather striking examples. I would suggest that unless we can continue to strengthen the self-regulatory activity of the accrediting community and the communal approach to matters of common concern, the future of accreditation may not be very bright and this just at the time when the functions of accreditation are most crucial to the integrity and future of the academic community as a whole.

It was and is to facilitate such communal self-regulation and communal approach to matters of common concern that the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation was created and exists. Just as accrediting associations are made up of institutions, programs and professional associations so the Council is composed of, in fact is, the recognized accrediting associations and national higher education organizations concerned with accreditation. It has three primary objectives. The first, as integral to the self-regulatory process, is to recognize accrediting associations on the basis of demonstrated need and specified standards relating to accrediting policies and practices. The second is to serve as a national focus and voice for accreditation in cultivating a broad understanding of accreditation and interacting with other organizations, including state and federal governments, on matters concerning accreditation. The third is to provide services to the accrediting associations, postsecondary educational institutions and the public by assisting in improving the general accrediting processes as well as the policies and practices of recognized accrediting associations, facilitating coordination among accrediting associations, and encouraging, sponsoring, and conducting research related to the understanding and improvement of accreditation. The Council through its Assemblies and Board constitutes a forum for dealing with issues of common concern, for development of common policy, and for matters affecting two or more associations, including interagency cooperation. The National Association of Schools of Music has played and does play a prominent role in the Council. Samuel Hope is immediate past chairman of the Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Bodies. Dean Robert Glidden is a member of its Board and its immediate past chairman.

I do not intend to give the impression that the Council is without its tension, even problems. Given the number of divergent accrediting associations (50) and the national postsecondary educational associations (7) involved, there are legitimate differences of opinion among specialized accrediting bodies, among institutional accrediting bodies, among national postsecondary organizations and of these with each other. What the Council provides is a means of dealing with these communally, of getting the areas of differences as well as agreement on the table, and of working toward their resolution, and thus of strengthening both the accountability of the accrediting community to the larger community and of increasing the sense of community in accreditation as we deal with the crucial issues of quality in higher education. I would suggest that the alternative to the Council at this point is chaos and increased vulnerability of every accrediting association to pressures which, regardless of the rhetoric, have neither the interests of accreditation nor quality at heart.

The issues with which the Council is currently dealing are issues that affect every accrediting body and which no single accrediting body in most instances can fully resolve in isolation. These include:

1. Encouraging interagency cooperation not just in terms of joint or sequential reviews of institutions and programs but also in areas of complementation and mutual cooperation in policy development and practice;
2. Developing a conceptual framework for dealing with issues of validity and reliability of accrediting standards, criteria, or essentials;
3. Exploring the matters of disclosure and confidentiality as these relate to the integrity of the accrediting process on the one hand and public responsibility and accountability on the other;
4. Working toward a more adequate statement of accrediting associations and institutional rights and responsibilities in the accrediting process;
5. Attempting to develop a common data base or common data bases for institutional self-study and various agency reporting requirements thus reducing multiple requests in different forms for the same information by institutions for different accrediting bodies;
6. Developing in cooperation with state higher educational agencies a more effective and less redundant means of assessing long-distance learning via the new technologies.

These are exemplary rather than exhaustive. We are continuing to work with the states and the federal government in defining more clearly the role of accreditation as it relates both to state and federal concerns.

We are, I believe, at a critical phase in the history of higher education and of accreditation in this country. We have noted the tensions and the concerns expressed by the public and the academic community. Quality and accountability have become the primary issues of this decade. While the focus of that concern at the moment may be elementary-secondary education, it also applies and is shifting to include higher education as well. Essentially, what I am suggesting is that if not only the accrediting community but the larger higher education community are to meet the challenges, are to be accountable, and are to preserve and enhance institutional and program integrity and quality, two issues are of paramount importance. The first is to clarify what we mean by quality and act on the basis of that definition. Only in this way can we make sure that the term ''quality'' is not being used to promote ideological concerns rather far removed from real concern with educational quality. The second is to recognize and enhance the sense of community in self-regulation both within accrediting associations and among them. There obviously are other matters or issues of importance. But these are fundamental. We need to know what we mean by and what we are looking for in quality and we need to recognize that if its assessment and enhancement are in fact to be self-regulatory in nature, this can only come about and be strengthened through a heightened sense of community and community action.

AN INTRODUCTION TO NASM: PURPOSE AND PHILOSOPHY

ROBERT GLIDDEN
Florida State University

A HISTORY OF THE ASSOCIATION

As a beginning to this general orientation session about The National Association of Schools of Music, it seems not only appropriate but essential to begin with a brief history of the Association—the reasons for its founding and some items of interest about its development over a period of nearly 60 years. The main sources for historical information are a doctoral dissertation by Carl Neumeyer, a "personal history" entitled *NASM—The First Forty Years* by Burnet C. Tuthill, and, of course, the *Bulletins* and *Proceedings* of the Association. Carl Neumeyer, of Illinois Wesleyan University, served the Association as a regional chairman, as editor of the *Bulletin* for several years, as treasurer beginning in 1964, and as president from 1970 until his death in 1972. Burnet Tuthill served as original treasurer and then as secretary, spanning a period of 35 years, from 1924 until his retirement in 1959.

The National Association of Schools of Music was founded in 1924 for three primary reasons: (1) the need for agreement about appropriate ethical standards in music schools; (2) the need for standardization of entrance and graduation requirements; (3) the need for betterment of conditions of music study. While we today occasionally encounter difficulties or disagreements about ethical matters, they usually involve scholarship offers or late offers of employment to faculty members at other institutions. However, the situation in 1924 was rather more serious. In an address to the Association at its meeting in 1962, Earl V. Moore, then chairman of the Commission on Curricula and dean of the School of Music at the University of Michigan, quoted NASM's first president, Kenneth Bradley, in remarks delivered at the silver anniversary of the Association in 1950. Bradley had written (*Bulletin No. 51*, p. 17):

> Fifty years ago there were some really fine schools of music in the United States. Some were unattached conservatories and some were college departments. In both groups there were schools about which there is little to recall with pride. There were many commercial ventures called music schools which were really teachers' rooming houses. The purpose of these institutions was to attract private teachers, regardless of their merits, to teach in the conservatory, and be listed as faculty members. Teachers paid for this accommodation by giving a commission to the school for each lesson. Teachers set their own rates. Rivalry was intense and not always ethical. Rates were generally higher than students could pay. This led to a racket called "partial scholarships."

Burnet Tuthill (Tuthill, p. 2) referred to a discussion at the original meeting on "business ethics, centering primarily in Chicago with its several conservatories engaging in a cut-throat type of competition."

The need for standardization of entrance and graduation requirements is understandable, if for no other reason than to facilitate transfers from one institution to another. It should be remembered that many of the early schools were independent conservatories, and their methods of record-keeping varied considerably. Furthermore, there were some leaders of the time who felt that conservatories should offer "academic study" (meaning general education) in the curriculum for the Bachelor of Music degree, and others were concerned that some colleges and universities were reluctant to offer credit for applied music study. Thus, the forging of a rather more standardized definition of the Bachelor of Music degree was an important purpose of the pioneers of NASM.

Before what is now considered to be the first annual meeting of the Association, in October 1924, a preliminary meeting was held in Cincinnati as a result of correspondence between Burnet Tuthill, then of the Cincinnati Conservatory, and Charles N. Boyd, of the Pittsburgh Institute. Others present were Bertha Baur of the Cincinnati Conservatory, Kenneth Bradley of the Bush Conservatory (Chicago), John G. Hattstaedt of the American Conservatory, Arthur Mason of the Louisville Conservatory, and Edwin Stringham of the Woolcott Conservatory of Denver. They invited 36 institutions to send representatives to the first annual meeting of the new Association, most of whom were from independent conservatories of music (and of which number only a handful remain today as independent conservatories). Sixteen institutions were represented at that first meeting in October of 1924, and another eight indicated interest but could not be present. One of the major actions of the first annual meeting was the decision to seek financial aid from the Carnegie Corporation for the initial years of the Association's operation (Neumeyer, pp. 55–56). Carnegie responded favorably and granted $7500 for the first two year's operation—that was followed by another grant in the same amount. Thus, the Carnegie Corporation funded the instigation of the National Association of Schools of Music to the extent of $15,000, a rather healthy sum in the 1920's.

NASM's accreditation activities began in 1928, when it was agreed that applicants for membership should be visited (Tuthill, p. 5). By this time standards for the Bachelor of Music degree had been adopted. They were simple and direct by today's standards (Tuthill, p. 4):

> At least 18 hours and not more than 30 hours of academic study; 48 hours of music theory, composition and history; not more than 48 hours of applied music and any remainder of the total of 120 hours to be elective. The voice majors were allowed a slight option to substitute language work for advanced theory.

The first publication of proceedings from an annual meeting were those for the tenth annual meeting, held in December of 1933 at the Cornhusker Hotel in Lincoln, Nebraska. That meeting having been exactly 50 years ago, I thought it might be interesting to quote several items from it. First, the Association, in its first decade, had grown to 76 institutional members, of which 41 were represented. The actions of the Commission on Curricula were rather stern in several instances. One institution was suspended for failure to live up to minimum requirements, and another resigned rather than change its degree requirements to conform with those set forth by NASM for the Bachelor of Music degree. The secretary reported in the minutes that while it had seemed that the Association had plenty of money, over $8500 had been impounded by the closing of a bank in Pittsburgh. (Some of those funds were later recovered, but approximately $3500 was lost.) The budget for 1934 estimated income at $1500, of which $240 was to go into reserve. A motion was passed at the meeting to the effect that: "The use of any outside agency in the solicitation or giving of introductory free lessons is frowned upon by the Association."

The depression years were difficult. Burnet Tuthill (p. 36) reports that:

> Officers of NASM, in order to carry on our business, had to advance their own funds, if any, to keep the wheels moving. In the old files was a letter from the secretary to the treasurer pleading for a check for about $54 because his own bank account showed a balance of $5.47! At one point the secretary had advanced more than $700 of his personal funds to finance NASM operations.

Then, during the 1940's, NASM was faced with a problem of inflation and was forced at the end of that decade to increase institutional dues from $25 to $50 per year. About this, Tuthill (p. 37) reports that "Among the then 192 members, only one refused to accept the increase and as a consequence, resigned its membership." During the war years annual meetings were not held. It should be remembered that at that time NASM annual meetings were held over the Christmas holidays (between Christmas and New Year's), and the government requested that no large group meetings be held in order to relieve holiday travel congestion. Also during this period it became necessary to forgo on-site visits to schools for the purpose of reaccreditation. That practice had continued through the 30's, although it is not clear as to how systematic the scheduling was. On-site visits for accreditation were not resumed until the mid-1960's.

It is interesting to note that NASM was concerned about and involved in recommendations regarding federal government policy as early as 1941. The minutes of the 1941 annual meeting, held only three weeks after Pearl Harbor, reflect how Howard Hanson stressed the importance of support for higher status of the musician in the Army, suggesting that the Association and individuals write to Chief-of-Staff Marshall, and that Dean Earl Moore encouraged all to write to a brigadier general who was chief of the morale branch, "urging the use of trained men to serve in posts appropriate to their abilities." (*Bulletin No. 16*, p. 18).

On-site visits for purposes of accreditation were revived in the 1960's. President Thomas Gorton (University of Kansas) recommended in his president's report to the annual meeting in 1962 "that we move rapidly in the direction of a regular program of on-campus reexamination of member schools. Evaluation by self-survey reports alone has serious limitations and few other accrediting associations rely on this technique alone." (*Bulletin No. 51*, p. 14). The next year, President C. B. Hunt, Jr. (George Peabody College) appointed a Development Council, with Tom Gorton as chairman, and that Development Council recommended not only "the institution of a regular program of revisitation of member schools on a 10-year cycle," but also "the appointment of a full-time executive secretary." (*Bulletin No. 52*, p. 63). The Development Council made the same recommendation in a more formal manner the following year (November 1963), establishing November, 1965, as the target date for establishment of a full-time secretariat. The same Development Council presented the plan for the present structure of NASM, which includes a Board of Directors made up of regional representatives. The same report recommended the beginning of a revisitation program in 1965–66. Thus, in many respects, the "modern era" of NASM can be said to have begun with the work of Tom Gorton's Development Council in the early 1960's and with implementation of its recommendations by the mid-1960's. Warren Scharf was the first executive secretary (1965–67) followed by David Ledet (1967–72), myself, Robert Glidden (1972–75), and the present executive director, Samuel Hope, 1975–present.

In one final word about NASM's history, you may be interested in its growth pattern. The Association began, you will recall, with 16 schools represented in 1924. By 1934 that number had grown to 76 members. The number of institutional members in 1944 was 147, 221 in 1954, 275 in 1964, 429 in 1974, and will reach 538 in 1984.

ACCREDITATION IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

In considering NASM's present role as an accrediting agency it may be helpful to have some perspective about accreditation in higher education generally. First, it is important to recognize that this is the only nation in which accreditation of programs in higher education is voluntary. Most nations have ministries of education which establish curricular standards, admission and graduation requirements, and perhaps some operational procedures as well. Thus, the opportunity that we have to determine such matters within the community of higher education should be regarded as a very special one. The governance of accreditation, if that is the correct term—"coordination" may be more appropriate—resides in two bodies, one governmental and one non-governmental.

The non-governmental "coordinator" is the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, which is made up of a balance of representation from all of the various constituencies of accreditation in higher education: institutions themselves, institutional accrediting bodies, specialized accrediting bodies, and the public. There is too little time here to provide a history of the origin of COPA, but I will say with some pride from personal involvement that COPA has made great strides toward improving communication and cooperation among the various types of accrediting agencies and the diverse community of institutions in postsecondary education. COPA serves as an accreditor of accreditors, giving official recognition to those accrediting associations that meet its criteria for operation in the field.

The other group that recognizes accrediting bodies is the Office of the United States Secretary of Education through the Eligibility and Agency Evaluation Staff. The federal government's role in monitoring and recognizing accrediting agencies began in the early 1950's with the need to determine how institutions should be determined eligible to receive federal support through such programs as the GI Bill. Since that time, of course, the federal government's role in funding various aspects of higher education has increased, and so its role in determining institutional eligibility has not diminished. At some times in the recent past there has been conflict between COPA and the U.S. Office of Education staff, COPA having felt that the federal government encouraged proliferation of accrediting agencies by recognizing more specialized groups than necessary. However, at the present time a very good spirit of cooperation exists between COPA and the Eligibility and Agency Evaluation Staff of the Secretary of Education.

There are several types of agencies and associations conducting accrediting activities. Most people are familiar with the regional accrediting associations—the New England Association, Middle States, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the North Central Association, Northwest, and Western. These associations of schools are recognized accreditors of institutions as a whole in their respective regions in the nation. However, there are several other insitutional accrediting bodies that function on a national scope: the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, the National Home Study Council, the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools, and the American Association of Bible Colleges. These groups deal with types and levels of educational institutions that are not always familiar to those of us from more traditional colleges and universities, but they serve a very important role in assuring quality education at the postsecondary level for thousands of people.

NASM is, of course, a specialized accrediting body in that our scope is limited to the accreditation of music programs. We do, in a few instances, serve as an institutional accreditor for independent schools and conservatories of music that are not eligible for regional accreditation. In the Association's early history these schools were a major part of our constituency, but today NASM serves as institutional accrediting agency for relatively few institutions, most of those being newer, non-degree granting schools. Most of the early conservatories which still exist as independent institutions have applied for and been accredited by the appropriate regional association. As a specialied agency, NASM is one of 37 recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. Of those 37, seven are quite large, accrediting more than 500 programs each. NASM is in this category, along with the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation, the American Dental Association, the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, the National League for Nursing, and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Others, such as those in optometry and veterinary medicine, accredit fewer than 25 programs each.

In understanding specialized accreditation, and in interpreting some of the criticisms it receives, it is important to recognize that there are significant differences among specialized accrediting bodies in their sponsorship or structure. NASM is, as you know and as its title implies, an association of schools. The same is true of the National Association of Schools of Art and Design, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, and a few others. Most specialized groups, however, are arms of associations of individual members from a profession, or councils formed by several individual-membership groups representing a profession. For example, professional associations such as the American Bar Association, the American Dental Association, the American Library Association, and the National League for Nursing, have accrediting commissions that are but a small part of the total activities of those professional associations. And some, engineering and teacher education being two good examples, are accrediting councils formed by a number of groups, some with institutional members and some with individual members, from within their professions. If we were to have such a structure in music we would have accrediting commissions that were made up of representatives from groups such as the College Music Society, the Music Educators National Conference, the American Musicological Society, the National Association for Music Therapy, the National Opera Association, perhaps the American Federation of Musicians, the American Symphony Orchestra League, the American Society of University Composers, Chamber Music America, et al. While NASM has worked closely with most of these groups in recent years in the establishment of standards and guidelines, I think you can imagine how difficult it would be to carry out the accreditation function with equal participation from all. Visiting teams, for example, would probably have to have one representative from each group. And we think it is expensive now! That is the situation faced by some of the specialized agencies, however, and one of the reasons why institutions get so exercised about the costs and demands of specialized accreditation.

NASM PHILOSOPHY

One of the charges I have been given for this presentation is to provide a brief and general statement about NASM's purpose and philosophy. Our purpose is stated very simply in Article II of the Constitution, which states that the purposes of the Association shall be:

1. to advance the cause of music in American life and especially in higher education;
2. to establish and maintain minimum standards for the education of musicians while encouraging both diversity and excellence;
3. to provide a national forum for the discussion of issues related to the purposes.

That statement of purposes goes far in explaining the philosophy of the Association, but Article III, which has to do with "Powers," is perhaps even more revealing as regards the relationship between the Association and its member institutions. Article III states that, "It is understood that all decisions of the Association bearing on the policy and management of schools of music are to be advisory in character." That simple statement speaks to several issues. First, accreditation by NASM is completely voluntary and has always been so (with the possible exception of a few cases in which institutions which hold no other accreditation rely on NASM's recognition to determine their eligibility for participation in federal assistance programs). Second, it has been the attitude of NASM throughout its history that our chief function is to be of service and assistance to institutions in their efforts to improve music instruction. Further, the statement about "Powers" reflects very clearly the reality that progress is made through persuasion rather than through dictatorial mandates. While it is essential that the accrediting commissions of the Association enforce the standards that have been agreed upon, it is appropriate that an institution's membership may well be resigned if interpretation of the standards causes demands to be excessive in a given situation. NASM has made and continues to make every effort to work with institutions in meeting standards by giving a reasonable amount of time for change to occur, realizing that termination of affiliation will probably result in the institution's making no change at all.

NASM accrediting standards have developed a great deal over the years, mostly becoming more specific, but, it is to be hoped, without becoming more constrictive. As standards are modified or as new standards are written, they reflect a balance between ideals and actual practice. In recent years at least, statements have been determined only after consultation and opportunity for comment from the entire institutional membership and with participation by appropriate professional groups. We have a long history of cooperation with the Music Educators National Conference, the Music Library Association, and the National Association for Music Therapy, and particularly in the early years, with the Music Teachers National Association. More recently, we have worked with professional associations representing opera, chamber music, engineering, jazz educators, and others, in establishing standards for newer degree programs. In almost all cases, of course, compromise has been necessary, but the result has been standards that reflect actual practice and which represent ideals for quality programs.

Finally, I have been asked to comment about NASM's management structure and the avenues of access to that structure available to the membership. Broad policy issues in the Association are the purview of the Board of Directors, which comprises a representative from each of the nine geographic regions (elected by the membership within each respective region), the four officers of the Association elected at large, the chairman of each of the accrediting commissions, also elected at large, and the executive director. The Board of Directors meets annually, immediately preceding the Annual Meeting and again on the final day of the Annual Meeting. Any changes in standards or guidelines, bylaws, or other matters affecting overall policy must be approved by the Board of Directors before being brought to the membership for a vote.

The Executive Committee has responsibility for implementing the policy recommendations of the Board of Directors and for conducting the business of the Association. The Executive Committee also has the responsibility for appointing an executive director and prescribing duties and compensation for the executive. The Executive Committee comprises the president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, the chairs of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Graduate Studies, and the executive director. The Executive Committee meets during the Annual Meeting, and also for a period of approximately four days in February of each year.

The accrediting commissions have responsibility for reviewing applications for membership and for reaccreditation of institutional members. The Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Graduate Studies each comprise seven members elected at large and a public consultant appointed by the president; the Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Institutions and the Commission on Community/Junior Colleges each have 3 members, also elected by the membership at large. The two designated consultants also serve with these Commissions, one with each. Action of the accrediting commissions must be ratified by the Board of Directors. However, while in some respects the activities of the Commissions, particularly their interpretation of standards, is in a sense "monitored" by the Board of Directors, the Commissions function relatively autonomously from the Executive Committee and the Board of Directors.

Opportunity is provided at NASM annual meetings for institutional representatives to meet with members of the Executive Committee and the chairs of the Commissions. Regional meetings at the Annual Meeting also provide opportunity for the membership to express its views. The primary reason for the meeting of the Board of Directors at the close of the Annual Meeting is to hear reports from each of the respective regional chairmen regarding comments, concerns, or recommendations that were presented in their regional sessions.

I hope this overview has been helpful. If any one part of it should be emphasized or reiterated it is that NASM exists to serve and assist its member institutions. As one of the oldest and largest specialized accrediting associations, we can take pride in a long and steadfast commitment to an important cause, that of the furtherance of music in higher education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

National Association of Schools of Music. *Bulletin No. 1*, January, 1934.
—*Bulletin No. 16*, March, 1942.
—*Bulletin No. 17*, March, 1943.
—*Bulletin No. 51*, February, 1963.
—*Bulletin No. 52*, February, 1964.
Neumeyer, Carl Melvin. *A History of the National Association of Schools of Music*. Unpublished Mus. Ed. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1954.
Tuthill, Burnet C. *NASM—The First Forty Years*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Schools of Music, 1973.

THE OPERATIONS OF NASM

ROBERT J. WERNER
University of Arizona

The operations of the National Association of Schools of Music are those activities that provide the basic support for the professional development of programs and individuals charged with administering these programs in member schools and the profession as a whole. In reviewing these various activities I believe it will be helpful to categorize them and even though some are obvious I will attempt to describe a complete listing so that you are aware of the full scope of the operations provided by the National Office.

PUBLICATIONS

Each year NASM publishes at least two general publications: The *Directory* which lists all accredited members of the association along with individual members, all degree programs accredited and those given planned approval. The other publication is the *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting* which includes the major presentations and the official business actions of the association at each annual meeting. Biennially NASM publishes the *Handbook* of its accreditation standards. This becomes the basis for all commission action and is the official agreement among the members of the association that provides the basis for the standards that it sets for professional programs.

NASM also publishes several brochures which include the *Careers in Music* brochure published in conjunction with MENC and MTNA. They also publish brochures describing the specialized accreditation process in the arts disciplines and another pamphlet defining the baccalaureate degrees in the various arts disciplines. NASM has also published several books on specific subjects such as the *Chamber Music Report, State Arts Agencies and Professional Training Institutions*, and *Public Radio Stations and Music Training Institutions: A Guide to Cooperation.* The association will soon be publishing *The Education and Training of the Singer/Actor* and it is considering a similar report on symphony orchestras which is now in the planning stage.

In addition, there are two *Monographs On Music in Higher Education*, one dealing with conferences on "*The Education of the Performing Musician*" and "*The Graduate Education of College Music Teachers*" and the other monograph is on "*The Education of the Music Consumer.*" These are made up of the proceedings and papers of forums held by the Contemporary Music Project. In addition, there is the *The List of Books on Music*, suggested holdings for a basic music library in higher education. And if you want even a more complete review of publications NASM publishes an *Annotated Bibliography of NASM Publi-*

cations containing a subject and author index to articles appearing in their various publications from 1934 to 1976. All of these provide reference and support to professional program development. In addition, mailing labels are available at a modest price to all NASM members.

DATA COLLECTION

Recently NASM has broadened its procedure for data collection and entered into an agreement with the other three arts accrediting agencies housed in the National Office and the International Council of Fine Arts Deans to develop the Higher Education Arts Data Services project known as HEADS. Last month you probably received the first annual questionnaire for this project which will be the basis for an extensive statistical base of information concerning the amount of support for the arts in higher education. It will provide the same kinds of information only with a much broader perspective than was formerly available from the annual publication of NASM, *Music in Higher Education*. This annual report will also provide the basis for a national source of information on the arts in higher education. In addition, the association has gathered information on specific subjects such as the recently released *Music in General Studies*, a survey done in cooperation with the College Music Society and one which provided the basis for information used at the Dearborn Conference immediately preceding this meeting. Others are being planned and will become a regular part of the Association's continuing effort to provide a perspective of the profession.

ANNUAL MEETINGS

NASM holds an annual meeting in November of each year at a site selected by the Executive Committee and Board of the Association. Two general formats are used for these meetings alternating from year to year. On even numbered years the so called "Broadmoor" format is used which involves the development of three separate tracks in which each participant registers to follow one track throughout the entire meeting. These types of meetings allow for more detailed discussion in smaller sessions following general presentations of the broader issues. During odd numbered years the traditional format is maintained which involves a combination of interest group sessions, meetings by size and type of institution, regional meetings and workshops. This year's meeting is an example of the traditional format.

Topics for either type meeting are selected by the Executive Committee based upon recommendations from the membership, board and staff of the Association. Over the past several years the Association has attempted to address those areas that have been of paramount interest to our members such as National Arts and Arts Education Policies, Issues in Graduate and Undergraduate Curriculum, Music in General Education, Management in the Academic Setting, Technology and the Music Unit, and many more topics relevant to all aspects of accreditation. In addition, the annual meeting allows opportunities for open hearings on the drafts of standards and policy of the Association. It provides a forum for both the business and the development of NASM as a growing and viable professional organization charged with the accreditation of music programs in higher education.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Based upon member's interest and the approval of the Executive Committee the NASM staff has developed several special projects over the past few years. The most recent are the Chamber Music Project which resulted, as mentioned above, in a special publication on the scope and types of activities being undertaken in Chamber Music by the membership and the recent survey of Opera/Musical Theater activities which is soon to be published by the Association. The procedure used for developing these projects is to first appoint a committee to study a given area. Then to develop a survey that is distributed to the membership of NASM, which in turn results in the writing of a report for publication. Future plans now being considered call for special projects and reports on such topics as the Symphony Orchestras and a study of the training of composers. For each project area NASM has an extensive comment process whereby members of the Association and other interested parties are provided drafts of the reports and are allowed to comment prior to publication. This comment process is a very valuable part in shaping the results of the finished report.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The NASM office serves as both a national and international resource center for information. Members and other individuals interested in music in higher education in United States request information about activities in the federal government, foundations and all kinds of information in both the public and governmental sector. The office maintains an extensive library of materials and has the ability to be in direct contact with other associations to provide information requested. The national office also receives many inquiries from the general public regarding all kinds of matters in music in higher education, particularly from those who want copies of the *Careers in Music* brochure, the *Directory* or to answer questions regarding training in music as it applies to professional programs.

It would be appropriate here to call special attention to the dedication of the staff of the national office. Under the direction of the Executive Director, Samuel Hope and Assistant Director for Operations, Michael Yaffe, the staff includes Willa Shaffer, Administrative Assistant; Karen Moynahan, Staff Associate, and Martha Korver, Staff Assistant.

The annual meeting is the most graphic example of the attention to detail and professionalism that this staff provides, but in all aspects of its operations this staff is representative of the highest quality of Association management which provides most effective support to the membership and music in higher education as a totality.

REPRESENTATION IN OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

The Executive Director, the President and other members of the Executive Committee often serve on panels and boards of other organizations such as the National Music Council, The American Music Conference, the Ad Hoc Committee on Copyright Law and the Assembly of National Arts Education organizations, of which NASM was a founding member. These types of liaisons provide a strong position for NASM and support the importance of music in higher education in the considerations by both governmental and non-governmental organizations. Through the years NASM has earned the respect of its collegial organizations in both the arts and accreditation nationally and internationally.

MONITORING GOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES

Although NASM does not serve as a lobbying organization, the National Office staff does monitor the activities of the National Endowments, the Department of Education and other branches of government as they relate to areas that affect our members. In the *Report to Members* or by special letter, Association members are provided with information resulting from this monitoring process when it needs to be brought to their attention for suggested action. This monitoring has provided members with important information regarding contemplated governmental action and has also provided various branches of the government with information that has substantially changed their considerations and thus protected the interest of the members of the Association and music in higher education as whole.

ACCREDITATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT

The operations of our accreditation functions are extensive and thorough. The Executive Director remains active on various committees of the Council On Postsecondary Accreditation and the Council of Specialized Accrediting Agencies. He and the President regularly attend COPA meetings. NASM has also worked with the accrediting agencies in business and engineering to develop the joint standards in music/business and in music/engineering that now appear in the NASM *Handbook*.

REPORT TO MEMBERS

Six times a year NASM publishes a *Report to Members* containing general information about the Association's activities and other matters of interest to its members. This is the primary contact between members and the Association staff in regard to ongoing operation.

I hope this has given you, in outline form at least, a general indication of the scope and kind of activities that go into the operation of NASM. They are the means by which you as representatives of member institutions are able to develop your individual programs and by doing so to contribute to the quality of music in higher education in the United States.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM VISIBILITY

GERALD LLOYD
University of Lowell

At the time I received the invitation to present this paper I was in the middle of my third year as Director of the School of Music at Ohio University in Athens. Subsequently, I accepted appointment as Dean of the College of Music at the University of Lowell and now find myself embarking on the development of program visibility in a location new to me and quite the opposite of the rural area of Southeastern Ohio.

Recognizing that this subject can cause one to be tempted to have a "show and tell time" or a "dog and pony show," I believe my experiences toward greater program visibility at Ohio University provide concrete examples of increased program visibility as the result of a distinct methodology, or if you will, plan of attack! While these experiences may give the impression of representing a case study, the principles of methodology would be applicable to virtually all institutions and locales.

ANALYSIS OF BACKGROUND AND NEEDS

The School of Music at Ohio University is one of five units housed within the College of Fine Arts in a University which is the oldest institution in the Northwest Territory. The University is located in Athens, Ohio, a small city of 22,000 located in southeastern Ohio at the edge of the foothills of the Appalachian Mountains. A minimal amount of agriculture and coal mining represents the only economic strengths of the area with the exception of the University itself which benefits the few small industries and businesses in the city.

There exists a distinct town-and-gown environment and the resultant feelings of gratitude for the University's presence coupled with some tinges of resentment toward its seeming domination of community affairs.

For several decades, a handful of Athens citizens regularly attended concerts and recitals given on campus by the School of Music. No real growth in local audience support was underway and the typical audience distribution was 95% students and faculty and 5% local citizens. Since the campus is immediately contiguous to the downtown shopping area, and within walking distance of most of the residential areas, physical access to events was not a problem.

Three newspapers and four radio stations serve the area. However, no reviewer for concerts was available and editors of the newspaper felt no obligation to publicize the arts. While a minimal amount of classical music was broadcast over the University's public radio station, very little time was given to quality music programming and even less use was made of free public service announcements to benefit music events.

Gifts by local citizens or groups to the arts, music in particular, were extremely low and almost nonexistent. The record of scholarship giving, grant support, and deferred giving on the local level was very poor.

Program visibility on a state-wide level had suffered over the previous ten years due to three major factors. First, the assumption by the state legislature of several former municipal insitutions and the creation of others had made the original University in the State now one of thirteen others. Secondly, strict budget controls over departments and schools of the University had not permitted increases in funding for professional advertising, faculty travel, and convention activities by the School. Third, the isolated location of the University in rural Southeastern Ohio further compounded the problem of low funding and the highly competitive relationship among the other State universities and the numerous private and church related institutions.

Prior to my appointment as Director, the faculty had completed a mission statement which examined the mission and goals of the School in relationship to: 1) The obligations of the School to its majors; 2) The obligations of the School to the University at large; and 3) The obligations of the School to the Athens community, southeastern Ohio, and the State. In addition to specific recommendations for items 1 and 2, the statement addressed item 3 calling for: 1) the creation of a Preparatory Division; 2) a part-time position designed to develop and promote all forms of public relations, to assist in scheduling bookings for recruitment purposes, and to generally assist in the creation of a positive and attractive image of the School within the state and nation; and 3) an increased emphasis on outreach programming to serve its majors, and to provide cultural enrichment for the University, the community of Athens, Southeastern Ohio, and the State.

THE PLAN

To initiate discussion and the formulation of a master plan to improve local and state-wide program visibility I appointed a task force called the Public Mission Committee. The original membership of the committee consisted of five faculty members; two alumni; one undergraduate student; one graduate student; and two members of the Athens community. Each appointee had expressed strong personal support for greater community visibility for the School and had indicated a desire to work toward that end. My committee charge instructed the chairperson to concentrate on four specific areas of concern: 1) student recruitment; 2) community involvement; 3) alumni relations; and 4) promotion. To carry out the charge, the committee decided to sub-divide into four sub-committees. The membership of the sub-committees broke down as follows:

Student Recruitment
2 faculty and 1 undergraduate student

Community Involvement
1 faculty, 1 community representative, and 1 alumnus

Alumni Relations
1 faculty, 1 alumnus, and 1 graduate student

Promotion
Director, 1 faculty, and 1 community representative

Sub-committee chairpersons were appointed with the following responsibilities:

1. Call meetings; alert parent committee chairperson of agenda
2. Write weekly reports to parent committee chairperson
3. Invite appropriate resource persons to meetings drawing from at-large faculty; students; alumni, and community representatives.

Since I had urged immediate discussions and focusing on the efforts of the parent committee, a strict schedule of meetings was held throughout the Fall quarter with two meetings of each sub-committee per week and one meeting of the parent committee. All combined, the sub-committees and parent committee met nearly 90 hours during the first quarter of activity. The result of this intense concentrated activity was a listing of goals for the current and following year.

While numerous steps toward program visibility were taken as a result of the work of the Public Mission Committee during the first year of its life, numerous other possibilities and ideas continued to surface, and the parent committee requested the addition of several new community representatives for the next year.

The Committee recommended that additional persons be invited to participate with special emphasis on the addition of more alumni, community members, and students. To solicit suggestions on additional community representatives, I circulated a survey form among the faculty asking for recommendations of community people whose service would be valuable to the work of the Committee. About 50% of the faculty completed this survey, which was referred to the Public Mission Committee for study resulting in specific recommendations to me including the rationale for the selection of each person. A letter of invitation was sent to each person. Only one of the invited persons declined and this due to other time commitments being excessive. Seven additional community members now joined the Committee and each served on one sub-committee. The choice of people was purposefully diverse and included local businessmen, city and county officials, media executives, and general ''movers and shakers'' of the community.

I should digress for just a moment to stress the important role of the music executive during these early stages. It is somewhat the nature of the beast that the academic musician is often isolated from the business, politics, and social life of the community in which he or she lives. The responsibilities of teaching and performing occupy most of the musician's life with the little time remaining being shared with the family. Many do not have regular contact with the non-musician citizen except in the most tentative ways such as the person who pumps the gas, the supermarket clerk, or the newspaper boy and along with that rarefied existence goes a lack of knowledge or sometimes concern about local issues. It was interesting to note how few of the faculty members of the Committee even knew someone outside the University community. Along with this lack of communication often goes a smugness which encourages the musician to say "here is what we need from you in the community and this is what we are going to do for you."

From the very beginnings of my discussions with committee, I had to remind members that we were going to members of the greater community to ask what they would like to see us do for the community that we had not done? That, in many cases, the requests and suggestions would likely not be feasible or indeed seemingly frivolous to us professionals, but the important lines of communication which could open up by genuinely showing our desire to consider their ideas could be of great value to us in the immediate and distant future. It is perhaps at this juncture in the work that the music executive will find himself or herself caught between two camps of doubters: the faculty who may feel uncomfortable about how to communicate with these people in the community and the citizen who really wonders how serious we are about his or her ideas and concerns and whether or not this whole thing might be window dressing for what will become an appeal for money. Invitations to both faculty and citizens cannot be made simply by writing a memo or letter. Indeed, the time must be found to speak individually with each person before confirming the invitation in writing. Here is where the powers of persuasion must be fully utilized by the music executive. If you don't believe in the mission, no one else will!

OUTCOMES AND BENEFITS

The outcomes and benefits of two year's work by faculty, students, alumni, and community representatives were numerous. Most importantly, a healthy interchange of ideas among the group gradually caused suspicions to subside and some new friendships were established. Of major importance were the following:

1. A community representative, formerly an art major, volunteered to offer 10 hours per week to write news releases for the print media. This service to the School of Music continues now through the third

year and the resulting improvement in press both locally and statewide is vastly contributing to increased program visibility.

2. The establishment of a support group, the Friends of the Orchestra, which raises scholarship funds for orchestra members and helps defray touring costs.
3. The establishment of a regular series of broadcasts of faculty and student ensemble programs over the local public radio station with all costs assumed by the station.
4. Local funding from a private foundation to fund a special scholarship benefit concert.
5. Access to the public schools for concerts and clinics.
6. Identification of "movers and shakers" in the community who actively attend concerts and offer support in opening more doors in the community.
7. The establishment of a scholarship fund in the newly developed Preparatory Division to support needy students.
8. The creation of two School of Music alumni chapters in the State.
9. The publication of two alumni newsletters each year.
10. Financial support from the University alumni office to underwrite expenses in alumni activities.
11. Support funds for advertising in professional journals.
12. The establishment of two "satellite" locations in the county for Preparatory Division instruction.
13. A measurable increase in audience for orchestra, opera, and faculty recitals.
14. The identification of several community centered projects which continue to be developed.
15. An interest by the printed and electronic media in the activities of the School resulting in feature stories on faculty, special events such as workshops, and visits by guest artists.
16. The identification of one major donor and three deferred giving arrangements.

In conclusion, it seems to me the results of these efforts are valuable both for the immediate and distant needs of the School. Many immediate needs prohibited by the usual budgeting restrictions were addressed as a result of conveying needs through project oriented focus and the establishment of a continuing dialogue of interested community persons and alumni will continue to identify more support in ideas, audience, and funding in the years ahead. While any institution could expand its program visibility through this kind of effort and others, it is important to understand some of the personal traits and obligations of the music executive undertaking this plan to involve faculty, students, alumni, and community people. Things to consider include:

1. There are people in the community who may know more about its needs than you or the faculty.
2. You must sincerely believe that educational and service benefits to the community are an essential responsibility of a music school or department.
3. You must demonstrate interest in the community yourself and make it your personal effort to meet and know people in service organizations, county and city government and other leaders in the community.
4. Do your homework. Know special interests and projects close to the heart of community leaders.
5. Be willing to risk the possibility that some projects will not work.
6. Be flexible. The ideas, suggestions, and desires of some may not fit into your definition of "taste" but just might have inherent value to your mission and that of the School or Department you lead.
7. Do a thorough analysis of the background and needs of your local area and its previous relationship to the activities of your Department or School. Make a specific plan and methodology to define and focus measures you will undertake with clearly defined goals and objectives. Select committee members who have a desire to work hard for the project and show that important characteristic of flexibility. Build in a regular series of check points at which progress is reviewed along with the rationale of the next move.
8. Lastly, make the activity a major priority in your schedule which will call for many hours of conversations and committee meetings but, if successful, will bring measurable growth in the program visibility which is vital to the strength of your institution in the future.

THE VALUE OF THE MUSIC CONSORTIA

JOHN F. SAWYER
Blair School of Music
Vanderbilt University

Today, I would like to address the value of consortia to music units—how they can lend mutual support and how they can expand and enhance activities within music units.

The type of consortium to which I am referring is an association of individuals, organizations and/or institutions bound together by common interests, whether sharing resources (such as finances and equipment), providing a forum for the expression of ideas and concerns relating to a common cause, or serving as a clearing house through which events can be scheduled and coordinated. A consortium can provide a mechanism with which to build programs that are too large for a single organization to undertake. Consortia made up of institutions within the same locale can share common libraries, computer centers, programs and occasionally faculty. The linking of universities by computers in different parts of the country for the purpose of sharing information is already being done, and consortia among educational institutions are not uncommon today.

Among the advantages of a consortium is the opportunity to develop complementary programs within a limited system of resources. When a certain size is necessary for the development of a program in a single institution, a consortium can provide numbers. Another advantage is that foundations love and reward cooperation among arts organizations.

Nashville, with the second largest music industry in the world, has 12 music associations, approximately 85 recording studios, 225 music publishers, hundreds of ancillary businesses, 16 colleges and universities (8 of which have music units), and a symphony orchestra. Until 1977, there was little communication among the music industry, the symphony, and academic institutions. The scheduling of events and the sharing of ideas and concerns among these enterprises were practically non-existent. As a consequence, Michael Charry, at that time the conductor of the Nashville Symphony, and I decided to start the Music Consortium of Nashville. That first year, 23 organizations became members. To give you an idea of the diversity of the group, members included five college music divisions, the Nashville Symphony, BMI (Broadcast Music Incorporated), ASCAP (American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers), the Gospel Music Association, Grand Old Opry, Community Concerts, Opryland USA, NARAS (National Association of Recording Arts and Sciences), Nashville Songwriter's Association and many others. Monthly meetings were held, and representatives soon began to help one another find solutions to common problems.

The most significant project of the Music Consortium of Nashville has been the establishment of the W.O. Smith Community Music School scheduled to open in 1984. This school will provide private and group instruction for children from lower income families, utilizing the large community of musicians Nashville enjoys to form an all volunteer faculty. The School has a board of directors, a board of advisors, and is gaining community support even before the first student is taught.

In 1980, a consortium called the Nashville Music Association was formed for the purpose of informing the world that Nashville is not only the country music capital, but a city with a great diversity of music and musical talent. Today, only three years later, this association has 1200 members representing virtually all facets of music and the music industry in Nashville. The Nashville Music Association has proved effective not only in its primary mission, but also in many other worthwhile ventures. Recently, the Music Consortium of Nashville merged with the Nashville Music Association and became its Arts and Education Division.

If there are common interests among organizations and institutions, then I believe there is reason for forming a consortium. But starting a consortium is not the main difficulty—keeping one together is a mightier task. One problem is that among similar institutions, enlightened self-interest makes it difficult to agree on shared responsibilities, especially where money is involved. Institutions want to share their weaknesses rather than their strengths.

If you are going to organize a consortium, I have three simple suggestions:

1. Be sure that everyone feels continually benefitted by being a member.
2. Insist that only heads of organizations be representatives, and
3. Keep your meetings brief.

OPERA AND MUSICAL THEATRE TRAINING: THE NASM PROJECT* AND BEYOND

ELAINE WALTER
Catholic University of America

In this paper, I intend to focus on two basic issues: Curriculum Development and the Amplification of Formal Training with Professional Contacts for the purpose of career entry opportunities. As deans and department chairmen, we can identify some similar concerns with those administrators in the professional companies. At the same time some of *our* concerns are unique to the educational process and are dissimilar to those of the professional companies.

No one will dispute the growth of opera in this country during the last two decades. This is a billion dollar business with an audience which spends more on the arts than a like audience spends on sports. If you wish to review statistics on companies, productions, budgets, audience attendance and support, it is interesting to compare for example *the U.S. Opera Survey 1977–78*[1] in the November 1978 issue of *Opera News* with the more recent Opera America's 1982 *Profile.*[2]

The NASM study revealed that of the 405 responding institutions, 140 music divisions offer 197 degree programs with emphasis in opera/musical theatre training.[3] In those 197 degree programs, 3800 students were enrolled during the academic year 81–82. Further, and even more alarming, is that these same institutions reported that "less than 10% of their students are employed in opera/musical theatre professionally after graduation."[4] This statistic raises some serious questions: who are we training? Are our students competent to pursue this rigorous training? Are we as arts educators concentrating in the right directions? Are we educating far more students than professional opportunities exist?

We have the right and the responsibility to review and evaluate what we do and to strategize and experiment with new ways to achieve our curricula objectives and to creatively explore new resources with our professional counterparts in an effort to bring our qualified graduates into the professional arena. Thus, it is very appropriate and timely that during this period of rapid expansion in opera and musical theatre when economics and professional opportunities are at a constant ebb and flow, that we review the question of opera/musical theatre training and where necessary, initiate reforms and chart brave new directions.

---

*Editor's note: NASM will publish the Report of the Opera/Musical Theatre Committee, entitled *The Education and Training of the Singer-Actor*, in the Spring 1984. The Report contains the results of a survey of music training institutions about programs in opera/musical theatre, along with recommendations for future development. This paper is based in large part on the statements made in the Report.

Essentially, I believe we need to consider the following:

(1) Dialogue: Necessary between those who prepare and who hire;

(2) Curricula: Are we over-educating in some areas while under-educating in others? What areas can we afford to reduce in order to include other necessities? On the undergraduate level, this presents some real problems.

(3) Financial: How do institutions of higher learning continue to budget for this most expensive art form in the wake of reduced budgets, hiring freezes and escalating performance rights and royalties? Even for those schools who mount "quasi" opera with reduced sets and costumes and piano accompaniment, costs of opera production continue to increase.

Perhaps I might offer the following to demonstrate the similarities and differences with regard to our agendas as deans/department chairmen and opera company administrators. Let us take the opera production as one of the goals of our opera training program and as the primary goal of the professional company. The college or conservatory or university is concerned annually with the "right" opera, for the "right" singers, in the original language or in English or English translation, with orchestra or piano, in an *appropriate* facility conducive to the successful presentation of *young* voices, all within the proper *educational* setting. The professional company is concerned with the "right" opera for the "right" singers, in the original language or English, in fully mounted productions with orchestra, in an appropriate facility within a season of predictable box office appeal, with necessary outside funding and support, in cooperation with the media, all within the proper *professional setting*.

Further, both the educational institutions and professional companies have the responsibility to accurately project and remain within a given budget. We must demonstrate fiscal responsibility especially if we expect in the next year a renewed and hopefully amplified budget which will cover increased costs due to inflation.

Finally, and most importantly, we're both concerned with *quality* for quality *alone* constitutes our reason for existence and substantiates our arguments for support. As music educators we must begin to address these issues according to the priorities of our needs and the resources of our individual music units. Assuming an agreement on the need for curricula development and a review of objectives relating to the training of the potential singer/actor, I suggest that we must face some very real situations within our own colleges and universities and be prepared to attend to these with our faculties:

1. The 3800 students are enrolled in programs with opera/musical theatre specialties. Simultaneously less than 10% of the graduates are employed

in the profession. This suggests one or more situations: our graduates *cannot* enter the professional field due to their own inadequacies; our graduates *do* not enter the professional field due to gaps in their professional training; or, at the present, we are training too many for the profession. We must review our admissions policies. With the declining traditional age student population, are we playing the numbers game? Are we admitting undergraduates in voice who should be advised that they might do better in another major? Are today's freshmen entering with less music skills, less basic musicianship, less language experience and less ability for disciplined work. If so, what steps are we taking to counteract this movement and where and when do we begin to weed out those students who, after a respectable time, demonstrate they cannot achieve successful results at the undergraduate level. At the same time, *who* should make the God-like judgement that the undergraduate at age 20 may or may not "make it" in the profession.

Another situation exists today in our undergraduate voice curricula. All our voice performance *majors* are *presumed* as potential opera/music theatre performers. Outside of studio teaching and/or *minor* performance opportunities as a recitalist or soloist in oratorio or the like, the aspiring *performers* can only establish a career in opera/music theatre.

2. Another issue is the time factor involved with the training of the potential singer/actor. Due to the uniqueness of the voice as a human instrument, we cannot expect the same development as that of the pianist or instrumentalist. The voice is rarely developed by age 17; what we hear at entrance auditions is largely *potential* or worse, the badly trained or a abused voice. Further, we have the whole voice classification problem to deal with; is our potential tenor really a high baritone? And what do we do with the emerging bass voice which rightfully will not come into its own until years after the baccalaureate degree?
3. Once the potential singer/actor is admitted, we begin the costly and time consuming process of training the undergraduate through private lessons, musicianship classes, languages (both grammar, comprehension and vocal diction), history, style, interpretation, appropriate literature courses, the usual repertoire demands to be evaluated through juries and recital requirements, some basic drama courses and the usual liberal arts component. Finally, performing organizations and the opportunities for opera roles keep the voice major extraordinarily busy. There does not seem to be room for any curricula additions without some adjustments. But the question is: where do we adjust.
4. Languages pose a problem. We continue to demand language study while we continue to present more opera in English. The problem is that we demand a time consuming study and we do not utilize the study. Unless

we provide our students with some experience in roles in the original language, they fail to see the relevance of the study and they forget much of what they have learned. If we were to consider a reduction in language requirements in order to admit other necessary skills into the curriculum, then our graduates are not prepared to study and perform roles in the original language.

There's another component to this English versus original language question. In the area of campus productions, if one chooses to do opera in English translation, then performance fees can surely get in the way of the choice of opera which the college or university ultimately decides to mount. Are we making artistic choices based on the costs of performance rights and royalties? Also, it has been my experience that with a school of music and a department of drama, both with strong reputations and demonstrated achievements, that our music students do not get what they perceive as their needs, when they enroll in drama courses *in* the drama department. Discussions with colleagues at other institutions suggest that the same is true elsewhere. It may be that it is necessary for music units to create their own courses in drama, designed specifically for the needs of the singer/actor major. This realization comes at a time when our budgets are being held or cut back and hiring freezes are in effect.

In addition, we need to look at the orchestral possibilities when discussing an opera/music theatre major. I believe every effort should be made to incorporate the orchestra into the opera production. Our singer/actors need the orchestral experience and the experience of opera for our orchestral musicians is equally important.

5. The appropriate facilities for the presentation of educational opera is critical. Many campuses have multi purpose halls or utilize drama's theatre. Unless these facilities have been designed with music and more specifically voice in mind, frequently these halls are not satisfactory. Further, adequate scheduling of these shared facilities is often difficult. The ideal situation is the music unit's own hall.

We have acknowledged some concerns which relate specifically to undergraduate training in voice performance and/or opera/musical theatre. These concerns are particularly relevant as we attempt to deal with professional training and the liberal arts component which college and universities must consider. On the graduate level there is greater opportunity for curricula development in opera/musical theatre due to several significant and self evident factors: 1) graduate degrees allow for greater specialization; 2) basic skills are presumed to be already developed; 3) the aspiring singer/actor is entering a period of musical maturity i.e. vocal and artistic as well as physical maturity. There are other concerns such as financial: i.e. the institutional costs in support of an effective opera/music theatre program and the individual costs of adequately supporting the aspiring singer/actor during this training process. The problem of adequate vocal coaching is not addressed in this NASM document and this is a real concern with quality training and preparation for the profession. I am suggesting that few institutions have an adequate number of staff accompanists/coaches and this suggests that a parallel program in accompanying needs development on campuses considering an opera/music theatre major.

With all of the challenges cited above, I would like to offer some possible considerations which support the relationship between formal education and career entry. I speak now from my own experience; these practices have worked in my case and I offer them for consideration only not as answers or as models.

We have initiated and have an active relationship with several major opera companies and professionals in the field of opera. First, a dialogue is necessary. This is a continuous process. As a relationship develops, one can interact with the other. For example, with major companies close to our campus we know what minor roles need to be filled in the coming season and we begin to suggest singers for these roles. A mutual trust is built and we have access to the general managers of several major companies. Secondly, *bring the professionals to campus*. This important element can be developed in several ways:

1. *Master classes*. Annually, we bring singers, directors, opera conductors, coaches and agents to offer a series of master classes in role preparation and coaching, diction, interpretation, the audition process . . . all areas pertinent to career entry. Financially, we are able to support this in several ways: a) while these classes are free to our students, we open them to the public for a charge; b) frequently we arrange these classes at a time when these professionals are already in town for other purposes. Thus, we offer an honorarium; we do not need to pick up travel and hotel costs. In this way, we are able to present principal artists from the Met during the Met's annual tour to Washington; c) we have identified a patron who underwrites costs exceeding our income generated by the attendance of non-students.
2. *Utilize your successful alumni*. Bring them to campus for classes and performances. Those who are already principal artists with major companies or who are enjoying successful careers on the regional opera circuit enjoy returning to campus. It's a wonderful ego boost for them and your own students can readily identify with them.

3. *Develop a relationship with major audition/competition situations.* For example, know your Metropolitan Opera regional audition committee. Let them know what students you have who may be ready to consider these auditions. The committee will be enormously helpful and will offer guidance. There is no conflict of interest here as the committee does not do the judging. They are *as* anxious to locate new talent as we are to send them our best.
4. *Seek out professionals in your area who are qualified to serve as part time faculty members.* We are fortunate to have several on the voice faculty and one former principal artist of the Met teaches opera workshop courses successfully.

All of the above allow for an expansion of formal training to include vital contact and opportunities for entry to the profession. Without these contacts, we feel that we would be working in isolation and in a vacuum.

The presence of an independent professional regional company in residence at my institution has provided an enormous advantage to our graduates as well as to other young professionals. Through this company, we provide the young professional a platform through which opera is mounted under professional auspices, with a highly qualified artistic staff, through extended rehearsals in *repeated performances* (in which the singers can refine their performances), with the assurance of major reviews, before standing room only audiences which include the general managers of very major companies. This has insured the entry of our outstanding graduates into such professional companies as the Metropolitan Opera, Spoleto, the Vienna Opera, Glyndebourne, Boston, Baltimore, Washington and Miami.

Finally, and equally important is the development of a relationship with your local business community. They can and do serve as partners in the development of your programs in the arts. They can and do help you finance quality programs . . . which in turn you offer back to the community. A recent study (Business Committee for the Arts) reveals that nationally, businesses spent $506 million on the arts in 1982, a 32% increase over the previous year and this figure occurs in the same year when corporate pretax profits declined by 45%.[5]

It is possible for us to achieve our goals as directors of formal training centers in opera/musical theatre. If we apply the same creativity to the planning and development of the opera/music theatre program as we demand of ourselves as practicing musicians, I believe we can create successful programs which will enable more of our graduates to enter the profession.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Maria F. Rich, "U.S. Opera Survey 1977–78 Six Percent Solution," *Opera News* November 1978, pp 30–37.

[2] *Profile: Opera America and the Professional Opera Companies*. Opera America, 1982.

[3] "The Education and Training of the Singer-Actor." NASM draft document, 1983, p. 5.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

[5] "Art and The Big Guns," *The Washington Post*, 11 November 1983, p. C11.

HUMAN BIOLOGY: BASIC SCIENCE FOR MUSICIANS*

FRANK R. WILSON, M.D.

It is a great pleasure for me to be able to join you here today, and to share with you some thoughts I have had recently about that mysterious and sublime creature, the musician. As a preliminary, I need to show you one small window which looks in on the remarkable biologic machinery on which music making depends. There are a number of these windows, all getting bigger, and what they reveal is utterly captivating.

My own interest for several years has focused on brain mechanisms which seem to account for the refinement of muscular activity that permits the musician to improve control of the voice, or an instrument. It has been a consistent tendency of this study to suggest that one cannot truly appreciate music-making without taking into account its fundamentally physical character; when one looks closely at the well-trained musician, one sees an individual whose muscular prowess generally surpasses anything encountered on the athletic field.

At first glance, nothing seems more contrary than the notion that musical skills might be muscular in the same sense that traditional sports skills are muscular. Deep within our collective memory is the imprint of the bespectacled, frail and passive kid recognized instantly as being "musical". Having been impressed at an early age with the heroic mythology of the locker room, the word "muscle" evokes for us images of strength, speed, force and combat. We all know about biceps, triceps, deltoids and "pecs", but whoever heard of somebody having a knockout set of abductor digiti quinti minimi, or a breathtaking flexor pollicis brevis? Musicians themselves have sometimes fallen prey to this notion that bulk is what counts in the muscle department. It is a popular and colorful notion, and false.

I suppose it was about six years ago, when I was still a normal neurologist, seeing patients and minding my own business, that I took an interest in this subject. My daughter, then twelve years old, had been studying piano since the age of five, and was preparing Chopin's *Fantasie Impromptu* for a student recital. I would guess that most of you here are familiar with this spirited and brilliant work, and know full well the degree of technical facility at the keyboard it requires. As I stopped for a moment to see how things were going, I happened to look at her hands. And, as I watched, I was arrested by a childlike question that just popped into my head; "How in the world does she make her fingers go so fast?" I still don't know, but I certainly have developed a new perspective on the learning process.

---

*Editor's note: This speech makes reference to several slides, which are not available in this printed version.

Of course, interest in the physical basis of musical skill is not new. The pianists among you will know of Otto Ortmann's classic monograph, *The Physiological Mechanics of Piano Technique*, which was published in 1929.[1] The book contains an extensive bibliography, and under the section titled "Physiology of Piano Technique" there are no less than 73 references, of which eight were published before 1890. But these early, diligent efforts were largely unnoticed until recently; as Ortmann himself said, "when these books are found in the teacher's library at all, too often they still have their leaves uncut."

Given the long history of institutional boredom they seem to have generated, one might wonder why these concerns not only remain alive, but appear to be attracting more and more attention. The answer, I think, has three parts. First, biologic science has become more accessible as it has advanced, possibly because television has made it so photogenic. Second, we observe that elite athletes have become the subject of intense study in performance-oriented laboratories specializing in exercise physiology, skills research, and sports medicine. And there seems to have been a good deal of useful information for the athletes as a result of this work. Finally, we are all paddling around in what has been called the age of information, with no refuge from the din of the futurists and megatrenders insisting that to be parochial is to perish. And so a forty year old neurologist goes for his first piano lesson, and music educators and musicians hunger for news about the right side of the brain. I don't know what all this interdisciplinary potboiling will bring us to, but if it counteracts our general tendency to be complacent, there may be some value to it.

Just to let you know how far out of hand things can get, I recently made the quiet suggestion that it would be interesting to bring together a few biological and behavioral scientists, some doctors and some musicians, to see what the common ground of our interests might look like. In less than three months a full scale national conference had come into being, with an agenda of nearly five full days covering such topics as brain mechanisms in human hearing, biomechanics of the larynx and the hand, the psychophysics of time and pitch perception, treatment of medical problems of musicians, and so forth.

Intermixed with all of this scientific stuff, so that we won't lose our way, will be an equal share of the teaching experience of internationally prominent music educators who have used a physical equation successfully during their teaching careers.

What all this adds up to, I think, is the promise of some very exciting research into musicianship from a slant that will be new and possibly very helpful to musicians, because as we are able to say more about the physical and mental capabilities and skills on which music making depends, I think it inevitable that the teaching and of course learning of those skills could be improved in important ways.

This afternoon, we will take a look at the muscle, or *motor control,* system, only one facet of the neurologic system that underlies musical development and proficiency. While this is only one component of an exceedingly complex biologic system, it seems to me to have a rather special role in the organization of behavior. This is because virtually everything we experience in life depends in some way on a transformation of brain activity into muscular activity. Our thoughts and ideas, and our specifically intended movements, come about because of an incessant flow and interchange of information within the central nervous system, whose goal is the regulation of our body as it interacts with the outside world. The motor control system of the brain is its hub, brought to life by the continuous influx of information from other parts of the brain, and whose goal is to turn thought into action. And because we are mobile rather than inert creatures, what we learn of the world around us is controlled by our dynamic relationship with our environment. That is to say, we are not passive collectors of information about the world. We are explorers, and what we know of the environment is the consequence of the way we plan and execute our contact with it. We see formed images only because we move our eyes, we actively tune our hearing mechanism to respond preferentially to sounds we wish to detect, and we form a mechanical or kinesthetic sense of the world by moving through it. If we were inert from the time of birth, we could not extract enough information about the world to form the faintest glimmer of an idea about it. The mind does not come into being, or grow, without movement.

Let us begin with a simple consideration of the musical instrument itself. The musical instrument, as you know, is simply a resonant object, which the musician must manipulate or strike or alter aerodynamically so as to produce some sort of sound. The sounds become music, as opposed to just noise, when they are formed into patterns of notes whose pitch, rhythm, intensity and harmonic quality are controlled by the musician. The human voice is itself a musical instrument when it is controlled in this way. The great majority of instruments are controlled by skilled movements of the hands, and some by the cooperative efforts of the hand and muscles of the face and mouth. Let's look at a hand—this happens to be a famous one. It's a plaster cast of the hand of Franz Liszt, probably the best known of the piano virtuosi. It looks simple on the outside, but underneath it is an intricate and compact machine made up of muscles, nerves, bones, joints and tendons, engineered to permit an unlimited variety of movements. It's a bit like this machine, smooth and plain on the outside, more complicated on the inside. When the musician is operating his machine, the external movements visible to the audience may be simple, or quite complex, but underneath there is a fabulous machine at work responsible for the final result. And I might say that the Maserati is just a toy in comparison to the hand. You can leaf through the owner's manual and get a reasonably good idea of what sort of performance the car will give you. There is no comparable manual that will inform you about the kind of performance a particular hand might give you; since it is operated by the brain, it is trainable, and it will continually reshape, refine and improve its own performance depending on the experience, training and goals of its owner.

Of course, when we refer to the hand as being "trainable" we are really referring to the muscles responsible for its active movements. So we need to take a look at some of the properties of this end of the neuromuscular system. Muscle is a specialized tissue in the body whose essential function is to change its length. When it is at rest, it just sits there; when it is activated, or turned on, it gets shorter. Obviously, a muscle has to be attached to something at both ends to get anything done. In the body, one end of the muscle is usually attached to a bone, and at the other end to a second bone, with a joint, or moving surface in between. It looks like this. Now you can see what happens when the muscle is put to work. As it gets shorter, the angle between the two bones changes. You'll notice here that there is also another muscle on the opposite side of the two bones; that's so that you can put things back the way they were when you started. When the muscle underneath shortens, the bone at the end moves down. Now, although this illustration shows the simplest possible arrangement, the principle holds true that bodily movement always occurs because of a combination of muscular contractions and relaxations working in cooperation. Obviously, if all the muscles were contracting at one time, the only thing that would happen is that you would shrink. (One way to detect a performance given under tension.) And, in order for our movements to be effective, the brain and more precisely the motor control system, must regulate the degree of contraction and relaxation of every muscle participating in a particular move, at every instant, or exact control could not occur.

Just how does the brain make a muscle shorten, or contract? It sends a series of electrical impulses, like Morse code on a telegraph wire, down the spinal cord and then along a nerve attached to the muscle. When the coded message arrives at the end of the nerve, a substance is released which causes a very fast chemical reaction to take place in the muscle, and the energy stored in the muscle is used to cause its fibers to shorten. As a general rule, the more pulses sent to the muscle, the harder the pull. I should point out here that we usually think of a muscle contraction as being a sustained pull against an opposing force, but in fact there is a great range and variety of possible muscle contractions involved in bodily movements, and in some cases there are combinations of gentle and forceful, fast and slow contractions occurring simultaneously in the same individual.

In calling attention to the special nature of the human hand, and its capacity to acquire a repertoire of highly skilled movements, I think it appropriate to comment on the striking similarities found in the situation confronting musicians and another group of specialists in motor system development whom we normally refer to as athletes. Despite the stereotyped and mutually uncomplimentary notions you might encounter in football locker rooms or recital halls, there is very little to distinguish the serious musician from the serious athlete, apart from this: The musician concentrates on perfecting control of the small muscles of the upper extremities, or the orofacial and vocal apparatus, and of the respiratory apparatus. Also, the musician tends to be stationary while performing (there are exceptions) and monitors his own output largely through the auditory system. By contract, the athlete develops mainly the trunk, leg and upper arm muscles, has to change his position almost continuously in relation to others sharing with him a fascination over the behavior of an inanimate but lively object, and relies mostly on the visual system to monitor what is happening. In certain sports, most notably gymnastics and ice skating, and of course in ballet, the essential similarity of these physical disciplines becomes apparent. Proficiency and success seem to require, among other things, long periods of repetitious training in which countless hours are spent on drills and exercises which condition muscles and establish patterns and increasingly complex sequences of movements. These must be learned so well that they can be confidently and smoothly executed whenever needed, automatically. When the necessary moves have been mastered to a certain level of expertness, the athlete or performer moves to a sort of summit experience—live performance—during which the effort is made to perform flawlessly. During a sporting event, the athlete confronts a live competitor whom he must outperform if he is to win the contest. Although the musician is not generally perceived as being in a contest, there are occasions when this is literally the case, and in a concert situation there may be an unseen competitor, a sort of ghost, in the form of another musician who is remembered by the audience, or a critic, as having set a standard for the music being presented. The serious musician, although he is usually more concerned with communicating than with winning approval (or a real contest), is just as concerned as his counterpart on the athletic field with the quality of his or her own performance, and is equally subject to the effects of performance stress. The athlete has the advantage of knowing at the end whether he has won or lost; the musician, whatever the inner assessment may be, has to contend with the possibility that conclusions others reach may vary widely, or be expressed in unusual ways.

If we can refer to the musician as a ''small muscle athlete'', we can cite one aspect of his or her development and performance experience that seems to be strikingly different from that of the ''large muscle athlete'' in the majority of cases. This has to do with the effect of age. For the most part, musicians can look forward to continued refinement and maturation of their skills well beyond the age at which even the most durable football or tennis player has retired to the sidelines. Rubinstein, for example, claimed that he did not really begin to play as he wanted until he was nearly eighty. Still, as the horn players say, you do have to keep your chops in shape!

This is a drawing of the brain and I suspect most of you are familiar with its surface features. The two large masses of the brain, called hemispheres, are nearly mirror images of one another, and you are looking at the right half. In general, muscles on the left side of the body are activated by the right half of the brain and those on the right side of the body are controlled by the left half of the brain. The back part, which is on the left of this slide, is called the occipital cortex, and receives information from the eyes. The side part, that looks here like the thumb of a boxer's glove, is called the temporal cortex and it contains centers for receiving information from the part of the ear that transforms sound energy into electrical impulses. I might say that brain mechanisms in hearing have become one of the most active and challenging areas of research in the behavioral sciences within the past ten years. What the psychologists refer to as psycho-acoustics, and what neurologists refer to as central auditory processing, represent an area of intense and growing interest, and a specific area of neurologic research which is beginning to turn its attention to musicians. The slides that you are looking at now were given to me by Doctor John Mazziotta at the Brain Research Institute at U.C.L.A. and are interesting for two reasons. First, they hint at the kind of technology and scientific resources being brought to bear in the study of human brain function, and also suggest that to assign various aspects of our behavior to the left brain or the right brain may be a treacherous misreading of the "split brain" research. The picture that you are looking at represents an attempt to identify areas of the brain that become metabolically active during certain kinds of specific mental tasks. You are looking at an elliptical diagram generated by a computer, and it is as though you are looking into the brain from above. The reddish areas on the diagram represent areas of increased brain activity. In the diagram at the top left, the individual is more or less quiet and not working at any task. In the bottom left, the individual being studied is listening to a story being read to him. At the bottom right, the individual has been given a musical analysis task and is trying to identify some of the features of a melodic line. In this case, you can see the red area is in the right temporal lobe. However, this particular subject is a musically naive, that is untrained listener. When the same task was given to a trained musician the result is shown in the upper right hand diagram and here you notice that both the right and left temporal lobes become metabolically more active. Thus in the musician, somewhat more complex brain operations are involved in processing musical information. This finding fits very well with other observations that have suggested that musicians hear and listen to and analyze music in ways that are entirely different from methods used by non-musicians. The suspicion is that musical experience changes the way the brain handles sound information. And please notice that I say suspicion, because we are probably at least a hundred years away from proving that this is really the case. Now in this slide we are looking at a vertical section through the brain, taken in the center of the region that I referred to as the motor control system. At the top of the slide, in other words, at the outer edge of the brain, is an infolding of the surface of the brain's cortex which is called the central sulcus. A special feature of this region of the brain is that cells which directly activate muscles are located just in front of the infolding, and cells which receive information about muscle and joint position are located just behind the fold. The significance of this arrangement is that the part of the brain that has final say over muscle movement will know what the muscles and joints are doing at every moment, and can match that information against command signals that are meant to change muscle activity. This area of the brain is one of the few places where you can find a sort of map of the body. Some years ago, Doctor Wilder Penfield and his colleagues at the Montreal Neurological Institute discovered that a very weak electric stimulus applied to this part of the brain will cause muscles in various locations in the body to twitch. In other words, you can see by direct observation what part of the brain activates specific muscles. The map simply shows that part of the body moves as you stimulate one point at a time, over the whole motor strip. And the map is extremely interesting when you consider what musicians do. The map shows that this section of the motor control system gives special priority to the small muscles of the body. In fact, there is almost an inverse relationship between the size of muscles and the amount of brain in this region associated with their actions. An anthropologist looking at this map would probably conclude that this is the brain of an animal for whom the muscles of the hand, throat and mouth have become extremely important.

Inside the brain there is another area we need to know about. This is a group of structures called the basal ganglia, and they are the pie-shaped gray areas near the center. They are known to have a great deal to do with regulating the cooperaive efforts of groups of muscles, especially in relation to the adjustment and maintenance of body posture. Think for a moment of the movements of the fingers of a violinist, or a saxophone or flute player, controlling the pitch of the strings of the instrument or the movement of the valves. Not only are the fingers moving, but the upper muscles of the arm are also holding the hand in a proper position so that the fingers can do their job. You can complicate the problem even further, by asking that the musician march as well as control the instrument simultaneously. No matter what else is going on in the body, whether it is standing still or moving, it is still necessary for the brain to control the relationship between the hands and the musical instrument. The basal ganglia are now thought to have the principal responsibility of controlling body posture and maintaining the correct position of our arms so that our hands can be used most effectively.

Underneath the hemispheres is the cerebellum. Although we are still not completely certain how it works (translation: we haven't got a clue!), it is clear that the cerebellum cooperates with other elements of the motor control system in regulating the smoothness and timing of muscular contractions—obviously two qualities extremely important for musicians. It is particularly interesting that in humans a major portion of the cerebellum assists in the regulation of movements of the arms and hands.

In order for us to see why it should be necessary to have a large section of the brain set aside just for assisting with the timing and smoothness of muscular contractions, we have to stand back a bit and consider how the system works as a whole. When brain scientists first began working out the details of the motor control system, they reasoned that any movement had to begin with an idea, or the intention to move the body in a particular way. The brain, through the motor strip, would then send a series of coded messages through the spinal cord to the nerves attached to particular muscles. This would cause a movement to begin. The eyes, the nerves in the skin, muscles and joints would begin reporting back to the brain immediately how things were going, and adjustments would be made along the way as necessary to complete the move as intended.

It turns out that this scheme is correct, but incomplete. It doesn't explain how the body can make movements of the kind necessary to control a musical instrument during fast passages, because there simply isn't time to get information back and forth in the nervous system in order to make corrections if the move isn't exactly on target. So there has to be another way to explain how the brain manages to control these very fast movements.

The first important clue to understanding fast movements was provided by a physiologist named Paul Richer over eighty years ago. In 1895, he took photographs of the thigh muscle during a kicking motion. When he studied these films, he noticed that the muscles were not contracting or pulling during the entire course of the move. Now I don't have his photographs, but you can see the same kind of movement in this picture of someone preparing to throw a baseball. The movement starts with a single burst of activity or contraction in the muscles, which launch the limb forward. The muscles in this case then relax, while the limb coasts through the rest of the move. At the end of the move, opposing muscles will provide a braking action so as to stop the swing as it nears the end. Because of the obvious similarity to the way a bullet is fired from a gun, this has been called a ballistic move. It is now recognized that all fast, and all highly skilled muscular movements, whether they are fast or not, occur because of a very special system of control used by the brain and muscles. This means that virtually all of the movements used by musicians in finished performance are of this type. The unique characteristic of ballistic movements is that before the movement actually begins, a set of control signals to all of the muscles involved has been worked out in advance, and are sent from the brain in a single package before the move actually begins. Since there is only limited ability to modify control signals, and virtually no chance to correct mistakes after the move has begun, everything has to be absolutely right from the very beginning.

It is now believed that the cerebellum assumes the enormous responsibility of regulating this advanced programming of command signals to muscles when they must operate in long sequences with precision control. There has been a great deal of speculation among physiologists about the exact way the cerebellum works together with the rest of the motor control system to coordinate skilled muscular movements. The most current thinking is that we learn how to make complicated moves out of simple, building blocks, which we assemble over a long period of time in a trial and error process. We make corrections and improvements as we go along, based on our knowledge of the results of our efforts. This smoothing, reshaping and refining of muscular skills requires the participation of the cerebellum, whose job it is to make muscular activity automatic when the task is one we will be doing over and over again. Operating the gear shift on your car, and tying your shoe laces becomes second hand because of this special contribution of the cerebellum. And so does playing a musical instrument. It is interesting to me that so many people feel they can't play an instrument, or sing, because of a lack of "talent". This may sound like heresy, but I'm not so sure that musical ability is comparable to red hair or green eyes—that is, more or less a fixed gift. Another way of looking at it is that the human brain has such phenomenal resources for refinement of motor skills, that the diligent and motivated individual will continue to improve so long as he or she exploits that musical potential of the neuromuscular system. The non-musical tends to regard the accomplished musician as having supernatural or freakish powers, not realizing that it is interest, training and time far more than talent or freakish powers that separate the non-musician from the musician.

The process by which the cerebellum contributes to musicianship is, in concept at least, disarmingly simple. The cerebellum is situated so that it can monitor all the messages sent to the muscles, in a sort of "wiretap" arrangement. As it does this, it pays particular attention to repetitions. In this process, it is preparing to take over any job we wish to make automatic. At any point in this process, when we are satisfied with the results and feel confident in a new skill, the cerebellum will actually assume the responsibility of controlling these automatic movements, thus freeing up higher centers in the brain for other tasks. The motor system physiologists refer to this transition as a shifting from current control to a ballistic strategy. It is as if the conscious mind is saying, "I'm tired of slaving over the details, now let the cerebellum do it." And the conscious attention of the musician shifts from the mechanical details of performance to the aesthetics. As it turns out, this is a good thing, because the cerebellum may be no more than simply a closet full of computer software and "subprograms" of movements, but it is a real star at running the motor system when speed, smoothness or refinement are essential. The conscious, reflective and critical part of the mind, by contrast, has a rather lumbering and wordy approach to running the muscles. You can see the difference between these two systems dramatically in the case of a musician who starts thinking about the mechanical details of what he is doing during a performance. When the conscious brain steps in and tries to take over, everything slows down, tone control becomes erratic, timing irregular, and notes tend to appear out of sequence. The musician may become intensely aware that his hands are shaky, perhaps cold and moist, and the muscles slow and stiff. That is not his imagination—both the smoothness of the control system and the responsiveness of the muscles are different when the conscious brain overrides the cerebellum.

I think it would be useful here to quote the Nobel Laureate physiologist Sir John Eccles, from a paper on this subject which was published in 1977:

> "We can say that normally our most complex muscle movements are carried out subconsciously and with consummate skill. The more subconscious you are in a golf stroke, the better it is, and the same with tennis, skating or any other skill. In all these performances we do not have any appreciation of the complexity of muscle contractions and joint movements. All that we are conscious of is a general directive given by what we may call our voluntary command system. All the finesse and skill seems naturally and automatically to flow from that. It is my thesis that the cerebellum is concerned in this enormously complex organization and control of movement, and that throughout life, particularly in the earlier years, we are engaged in an incessant teaching program for the cerebellum. As a consequence, it can carry out all of these remarkable tasks that we set it to do in the whole repertoire of our skilled movements in games, in techniques, in musical performance, in speech, dance, and so on."[2]

So far we have seen that muscles are arranged in groups along with bones and joints, and that a great variety of movements are possible because of the anatomic arrangement of these structures. We have seen that the muscles contract because electrical impulses travel through nerves that connect muscles to the spinal cord. In the brain itself, there is a blending of messages coming from the eyes, ears, the skin, muscles and joints. The basal ganglia and the cerebellum cooperate with the motor strip to make decisions about which muscles should contract in what combinations and in what order. The command signal must also specify how much each muscle must contract, how rapidly, with what force, and for what length of time. Simultaneously the brain must relax those muscles which would offer resistance to the desired move, and sometimes activate them at the end of the move to provide a braking action.

I think you'll agree that's a tall order. But it's not all, because we've left out one very important problem, concerned mostly with what we have called ballistic movements. You will recall that with this type of movement the instructions had to be worked out in advance, because there was no time to make corrections once the move had begun. Although this sort of advance programming works very effectively, it has one drawback. No two pianos are the same, and a key will occasionally stick on the best instrument. In other words, we live in a changing world, and the amount of muscular contraction required to accomplish a specific task may vary considerably depending on the circumstances in which the job is carried out. Furthermore, the mechanical properties of the muscle itself may change for a variety of reasons. For example, when the hands are cold the muscles become mechanically stiff and do not contract as quickly as when they are warm. If you don't believe this, ask anyone in a marching band who does half-time shows for night-time football games; no matter how carefully the signals have been worked out in advance, it's no good if the instrument doesn't behave as it is supposed to, or the muscles are not responding normally; you recall this slide I showed you earlier, illustrating the signal being given to the muscles to contract; in the extreme case of difficult conditions and muscular unresponsiveness, it doesn't matter what the signals are saying; performance is not going to be quite the same.

Astonishingly, even this sort of problem has been provided for. It is a bit too technical to explain here in detail, but each muscle contains a minute sensing system, called the muscle spindles, which are capable of making very small last second adjustments in the responsiveness of the muscle to signals sent from the brain, according to conditions in the muscle at the time the signal actually arrives. In a very real sense, the spindle system works exactly as Neil Armstrong's small computer aboard the Eagle worked during the landing on the moon. In the final few seconds of the landing, when the lag in radio transmission time made it impossible for the computers on Earth to solve the final landing problems, this small computer on board the lunar lander was able to handle the job. The same thing happens when a finger playing a fast passage hits a key with unexpected resistance—the pressure necessary to correct the touch will be fine-tuned by the spindle mechanism through a final adjustment in muscle force moving the finger to its target.

Having been through all this, I think it would be well to suggest how much we take for granted in finished musical performance by showing this page from the cadenza of Rachmaninoff's Third Piano Concerto. Every one of those black dots on the page is in fact a set of instructions to a whole group of muscles in the pianist's arms and hands, to press particular keys on the instrument in specified groups and sequences, at a particular rate, and with individual variations in force and duration. At performance tempo it takes about 450 seconds to get from the top left hand to the lower right side of the page. And, incidentally, while all this is going on, the pianist is also obliged to pay attention to the behavior of a sizeable orchestra and someone waving a stick just to his left. How many times will the artist have played this piece of music, and how many others before it over the years, before a critic will nod in appreciation and perhaps bestow the modest compliment, "not bad".

At this point, I would like to recall for you that I began this presentation with a hopeful prediction: That a better understanding of the musician's physical makeup might help musicians and music teachers in their efforts to improve at least some aspects of musicianship. Let me give you now the example of what I had in mind.

Isidor Philipp, the great piano teacher, wrote while he was at the Paris Conservatory about rehearsal strategy, and said this about speed: "Too much stress cannot be laid upon the usefulness, the necessity, of slow work. Stephen Heller's motto was: 'Practice very slowly, progress very fast.' And Saint-Saens said: 'One must practice slowly, then more slowly, and finally slowly.'" Confirmation of these dicta comes from the work of motor system physiologists, in my opinion. During the early stages of learning and memorization of a musical work, and I am not speaking only of works for the piano, one is engaged in a process of automatizing some aspects of a sequence of carefully ordered discrete movements; this is what must be done if they are to be made "ballistic" or capable of being run off at appropriate tempo in an error free manner. The evidence now seems very compelling that the musician is at this stage working to pre-program these supremely refined movements in the cerebellum. And two things can be said about the process that validate what Philipp and the others asserted about practicing: First, whatever is automatic in the movement sequence becomes established through repetitions that are executed with consistency. If practicing takes place at a pace too fast for accurate execution, the musician will probably end up with more than one version of the performance, any one of which may present itself in public according to whim. The second thing about the process that can be said is that done properly, it really does produce reliable performance; practice one version faithfully, and that's the one you will have for the stage. Therefore, it is probably wise to refrain from strict memorization until you are satisfied that you know how you want the finished product to sound; failure to heed this warning will place you among the unhappy swarms of tennis players and golfers struggling to change a stroke or a swing that was learned incorrectly. The cerebellum is entirely non-judgmental, and assumes that any movement sequence which is being repeated is a candidate for automatization, or ballistic programming. It will do this job efficiently and durably, with the result that bad habits and good habits become equally difficult to eradicate.

Well, of course, I haven't told you anything by way of a didactic principle that you didn't already know—I've just thrown a fancy biologic hypothesis at you, as an example of the possible benefits of a smattering of biologic science in the studies of serious music students.

I think there are a number of additional issues in motor learning that may be of greater interest to musicians. For example, is there some clue from this work that will help unravel the passionate mysteries surrounding that quality of playing referred to as "touch"? Is it true as Sir James Jeans claimed 50 years ago that there is no measurable difference between a tone produced by the human hand and one produced by an umbrella tip? What can be said of the validity of mental practice—playing the music in one's head, away from the instrument—or other so-called imaging techniques? And, what can research in human skills offer to the victim of stage fright?

For me, perhaps the most interesting question of all has to do with hearing. Put simply, since we know that finished musical performance at the mechanical level is almost completely automatized, and very little can be done to alter the character of a note once it has been released, what precisely is the function of hearing, either in the learning process or during the finished performance? At the beginning of this talk, I indicated an area of research that was beginning to draw me toward the laboratory, and this happens to be it.

Obviously, time does not permit much exploration of these questions this evening. I do not pretend to have the answers, but I do believe, and would urge you to consider this as worthy of serious discussion among yourselves, that there is enormous potential for studies in human skills as part of the research and pedagogy in music education.

I would like to conclude with these thoughts about music and music-making. Humans, in all the animal kingdom, are special physically because of the exceptional control we have over the muscles of our hands and of the mouth and face, and because of the bonding of these gifts to our powers of communication.

Beyond the purely physical realm, we all have dreams, and a quality that defies definition, which we call spirit. Musicians have created a discipline and a world in which these unique human traits can flourish without restraint, since one can never exhaust the possibilities for reaching deeper into the soul of an instrument, or the music written for it; nor are we ever likely to lose our need or desire to communicate with one another musically.

As you know, we are still not sure what the word music really means, any more than we are sure what the brain is, and I'm not sure you will ever get a definition of music that satisfies you. But, I'm beginning to suspect, at least in a metaphysical sense, that the brain *is* music.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Ortmann, Otto, The Physiological Mechanics of Piano Technique, New York: E. P. Dutton, 1929.

[2] Eccles, Sir John C., "An Introduction-Selection Theory of Learning in the Cerebellar Cortex," *Brain Research*, Volume 127, 1977, pp. 327–352.

COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION IN MUSIC: WHAT MANAGERS SHOULD KNOW

JAMES F. MCCARTHY
Western Michigan University

Managers who have the opportunity or desire to acquire computers for their schools could be excused for feeling a bit intimidated. They face what must look like a complex and seemingly chaotic field, where even monthly periodicals cannot track changes quickly enough to keep their readers current, and where records for new and unintelligible jargon seem to be broken daily. Yet this job stripped to its essentials is a simple one to describe: its goal is to identify the computer equipment and programs (hereafter "hardware" and "software", respectively) necessary to perform certain curricular tasks, and to obtain them at a reasonable price.

While it is true that a few schools have purchased computers because it seemed like the thing to do, or because a rival school of music just bought some, it is the purpose of this article to describe a rational, goal-driven process for dealing with the complexities of computer acquisition. It is aimed primarily at managers who have little or no first-hand experience using computers, but who have some idea of how computers can be used in a variety of settings within a school of music.

The first step in the process is to identify which curricular areas would most likely benefit from computer assisted instruction (hereafter CAI), and then define the instructional objectives for that area. Defining ear-training objectives, for example, is a matter of determining what skills the students should have at the end of an aural comprehension course. Perhaps the easiest way to do that is to inspect the content of tests administered over a term, or the items in a comprehensive final examination, if one is given.

The next step is to gather information about the software and hardware that is available. More time-consuming than difficult, this generally involves making arrangements to observe CAI operating at sister institutions in your area, attending conferences where programs are demonstrated, etc. At this stage you should be interested more in enumerating options than in making detailed analyses, in gathering data with a rake but not examining it with a microscope.

The first decision, an important one, needs to be made here. Music CAI is delivered in two kinds of vehicles. One is done by means of a "timesharing" or "mainframe" computer, a relatively large device that is housed in a special climate controlled room, and which communicates concurrently with many remote users by means of cable or telephone lines. The second type of computer is the more familiar microcomputer (Apple, Commodore, IBM PC, etc.) that acts as a "stand-alone" device, one that is dedicated to a single user and does not normally communicate with more than one person at a time.

Each type has its advantages and disadvantages. Music CAI on some mainframes is enormously powerful and sophisticated. Mainframes have the ability to keep extensive records on student achievement, to perform analyses of those records, and even to decide what material will be presented next to a student. With such input devices as terminals with touch-sensitive screens and high quality synthesizers for sound output, they represent an impressive system for providing CAI in music.

Mainframes have disadvantages as well. They have a fixed capacity that allows a certain number of users at any one time, and when that number is reached, others must wait until someone leaves the system before a new user can be accommodated. When the computer is at or near capacity, its response time degrades, often to an annoying extent. Even more annoyance is engendered when the system "crashes" or shuts down unexpectedly. But the mainframe's severest disadvantage is probably its expense: for most schools of music, the high capital costs of equipment or yearly rental fees exclude mainframe CAI from further consideration.

Many of the large computer's disadvantages are the microcomputer's advantages. The cost of micros has fallen steadily while their power has continued to grow, until they are now affordable to most schools of music. Their response time is fast and invariant, since they serve only one student at a time, and because they are owned and not rented it is quite possible that programs for them can be developed or modified to suit a individual school's curricular needs or practices. The micro's disadvantages are related primarily to their memory size or lack of it. They generally have space for keeping only rudimentary records of student achievement and are unable to perform the sophisticated analyses necessary for the complete computer control of instructional presentation. This disadvantage is expected to diminish as the cost of manufacturing electronic components continues to decline. In fact we are already seeing microcomputers both with relatively large memory capacities and reasonably low prices, and the line between mainframe and micro is likely to become somewhat indistinct in the next few years.

Most schools of music will take the microcomputer branch of the path because of costs. If you do, the next step in the process is to perform a thorough evaluation of the software available to you. That task has been the subject of many articles in professional education journals, and rather than replicate them, this one will address a few important issues more or less specific to music CAI.

1. The software/hardware combination shouldn't put bad sounds in a student's ears. It is quite possible to find inexpensive programs or hardware that will generate wildly out-of-tune notes, large amounts of harmonic

distortion and noise, or any combination of those. There is, for example, a newly available music composer program (its author, a teenager, was the subject of an article in a weekly news magazine) that has received a fair amount of attention recently for its clever and easy method of entering notes in a score and hearing them played back. Its sound, sadly, is remarkable only for its ugliness and errors of intonation, and this single attribute will disqualify an otherwise attractive program from further consideration. All this doesn't mean that digital recording quality is necessary; what's needed are tones that are both accurate and pleasing.

2. Don't expect a microcomputer to be a substitute for teachers or teaching. Virtually all of the music software available now is of the "drill and practice" variety, and these programs lack the intelligence to examine subtle clues embedded in student responses and set upon them. Instead, they mostly function as patient feedback devices, willing to emit some variation on the words "Right" or "Wrong" as long as the student is willing to keep responding to trials. That, of course, is not teaching but drill, and no matter how it is packaged, its essential nature is conserved. That should not be construed to mean that drill is an unimportant component of learning, although it is fashionable just now to denigrate the role of drill in CAI. But drill is what a learner does *after* a teacher has provided some guidance and suggestions regarding effective learning tactics, not before. Schools that ignore this principle are likely to see more negative than positive outcomes as a consequence of computer acquisition.
3. Be sure that the content of software you acquire is consistent with your curricular practices and your faculty's musical and pedagogical biases. A tonal recognition program that forces the students to respond with solfeggio would be incompatible with a curriculum whose text and teachers use only scale degrees. Similarly, a melodic dictation program that generates rhythms and tones by a random selection process might be anathema to a music theory staff that tries to teach students to recognize and remember meaningful patterns within a melody. It is always better to choose software that fits your needs than change a curriculum to accommodate software.
4. It should be clear now that the software is always chosen before the hardware, since it is primarily the program residing within the computer, and not the computer itself, that is central to what the computer can do. While this point seems obvious, the practice of doing it in the reverse order is, strangely enough, all too common in the public schools.

After the software and hardware is chosen, a number of administrivial details remain. First, the number of machines needed to handle student demand must be computed. That figure may be determined by the following formula:

$$\text{Number of computers} = C \cdot \frac{\text{N STUDENTS} \cdot \text{N HOURS}}{\text{ROOM HOURS}}$$

Where

N STUDENTS = The number of students who will use the computers each week.

N HOURS = The number of hours per week a single student will need to use the computers.

ROOM HOURS = The number of hours per week the room housing the computers will be open, and

C = an empirical constant, usually 2.

Suppose, for example, a school wished to provide CAI to 50 freshmen in its aural comprehension classes. If the faculty responsible for teaching those classes were to estimate that each student would need to spend approximately three hours of drill per week, and if the room in which the computers were located was open 50 hours a week, then

$$\text{Number of Computers} = 2 \cdot \frac{50 \cdot 3}{50} = 6$$

As you can see from the formula, finding a location that is open 100 hours per week will reduce the hardware costs of the example given by 50% (Your library, of course, is such a location.)

Finally you will need to consider security arrangements to protect the equipment from theft. Losses occur in two ways. The first is the "walk-away" in which a piece of equipment (e.g., a disk drive) is slipped into a briefcase and carried out the door. The second kind of loss, the after-hours burglary, is usually catastrophic since all or almost all of the equipment can be lost. While perfect security is never possible, there are precautions you can take to reduce the chance of theft. The walk-away can be deterred by tying the devices to a table or carrel with metal straps or a complex system of hidden nuts and bolts. The idea behind this is to make an attempted removal during normal hours both obvious and time-consuming, and therefore risky. After-hours security may be helped by erecting barriers (steel doors and frames, interior hinges, dead-bolts, etc.), but the best protection is probably a motion-sensing device that triggers an alarm in a surveillance center or security office.

In summary, if you identify instructional objectives, become informed about software and hardware choices, make decisions about programs and equipment that are driven by curricular considerations, and handle myriad details, are you finished?

No. Now you need to find the money.

ISSUES IN PIANO PEDAGOGY: HIGH SCHOOL CREDIT FOR PERFORMANCE INSTRUCTION

JEAN HULL
National Piano Foundation

As Project Director for Public School Credit/Released Time for the National Piano Foundation Education Advisory Board, my role is one of objectivity, to ask questions and report facts. For this presentation, the first appropriate question is:

What is the National Piano Foundation and its role in relation to high school credit for performance instruction?

Established in 1963, the National Piano Foundation expanded its activities in 1977 by the formation of the Education Advisory Board. The Board was directed to plan projects assisting musicians, preschool through college and beyond, to advance the Foundation's three purposes:

1. to promote participation and enjoyment of music through keyboard instruction.
2. to raise professional standards.
3. to teach broader musicianship through the use of innovative methods and materials.

Keyboard teachers, who teach independently, were targeted to receive assistance and encouragement.

Information gathering became one of the Board's functions. Lists have been compiled indicating institutions that offer pedagogy degree programs at bachelors, masters, or doctoral levels. It was discovered there is a need for information on state and local regulations governing public school credit for performance instruction and the certification of the music teacher giving this instruction. To answer this need, Public School Credit/Released Time was established as a project. Research is carried on through music teachers organizations, state departments of education, schools, and individuals throughout the United States. The facts obtained are compiled and published annually in *The Review of Public School Credit and Released Time for Private Music Instruction*[1] This Review has become an established resource for study by individuals and groups when preparing a proposal for credit in public schools.

Who supports credit for performance instruction?

The Music Teachers National Association has supported its affiliated state and local association's efforts to secure or maintain programs allowing credit for performance instruction. A flow of information on credit programs was organized when public school credit was identified as a high ranking concern by the MTNA Independent Music Teachers Forum. To provide a word of explanation regarding the Independent Music Teachers Forum, this program was initiated within MTNA, a little over ten years ago, to investigate the role of the professional Independent Music Teacher, their problems, advantages, and practices, with regard to both economic and pedagogical standards. The goal has been to improve the Independent Music Teacher's professional situation. Through surveys, it was determined that public school credit and certification are high ranking concerns and these two concerns are interrelated.

The American College of Musicians, the sponsors for the National Guild of Piano Teachers, has been working for public school credit by writing supportive letters and supplying information to help its teachers who take the initiative with local schools. This organization reports that, each year, several hundred performances by students in the Guild auditions are accepted for New York state credit towards high school graduation.

There is a record of support and cooperation by public school administrators when music teachers associations present proposals requesting programs for credit. In 1974, *High School Credit for Private Music Instruction, a Summary*[2] was prepared for the National Council of State Supervisors of Music to review the relationship between music teachers in the private studio and state departments of education, particularly in terms of high school credit for private instruction. The summaries of nineteen states were listed.

How long has public school credit for performance instruction existed in the United States?

There is a history of transcript credit for performance instruction for over sixty years. In the schools of New York state, private music study has been recognized as a legitimate phase of secondary education since the early 1920s. Pupils have been allowed to earn credits toward the Regents high school diploma by taking private music lessons from qualified teachers who are not necessarily connected with the faculty of a given district. As early as 1920, the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction approved a plan for the certification of private music teachers for the purpose of allowing high school credit in private music study under an accredited teacher. In the early years of the plan, instructor qualifications and examinations for instructor accreditation were handled by the Office of Public Instruction. From 1955–1977, the Washington State Music Teachers Association was authorized by the Washington Superintendent of Public Instruction to act as the accrediting agency for Independent Music Teachers. Other states who have had the most comprehensive relationships between the state departments of education and Independent Music Teachers are Florida, Louisiana, Missouri, and Texas. Florida, Missouri, New York, and Texas have a syllabus, published by the state department of education, to provide guidelines for performance instruction.

How many states are showing interest at the present time?

Eighteen states have provisions for credit.

Thirteen states have been active in negotiations with state school boards within the past two years.

Fourteen states have indicated interest at the local level.

What are the advantages?

To the school district, credit for performance instruction:

- is cost free, offers relief to today's reduced school budgets.
- offers music electives.
- develops accompanists for high school music groups.
- strengthens school bands, orchestras, and vocal groups.
- provides opportunity for the gifted/talented.
- gives emphasis to music in the community.

To the student, credit for performance instruction:

- recognizes the student's efforts by providing transcript credit that can be reviewed for college admission.
- offers incentive for greater effort and continuation of lessons.
- creates a positive effect on parents and peer groups, the school is the student's focal point and school recognition has great significance.
- provides a course of study and specific goals to develop skills for personal satisfaction or to further and explore a career in music.

To the teacher, credit for performance instruction:

- gives recognition of the significant contribution made by the Independent Music Teacher to music education.
- brings an awareness of the qualified Independent Music Teacher to the public through certification approved by the local school district.
- brings a closer relationship between the public school music teacher and the Independent Music Teacher.

What are the problems and have solutions been found?
Problem:

The local school district is autonomous. Proposals for credit, adopted by a state board of education, have to be approved and implemented by the local school district. Some schools feel threatened by such proposals. Their concerns are:

- the validity of the credit to be granted.
- the possibility of opening the door to other disciplines seeking credit.
- the legal responsibility of local school boards to provide private lessons for a child who cannot afford lessons.
- the vulnerability of the school music positions if credit is available from outside sources.

Solutions:

Local school officials have been persuaded to take a more positive attitude when:

- letters requesting support were written by parents in the community.
- endorsement was given by local organizations and schools in the area.
- information was provided reviewing representative established credit programs in other states.
- specific student requirements and implementation procedures were recommended.
- scholarship programs were established for underprivileged children.
- music was reaffirmed as an art and cultural force, recognized as a discipline that is regarded as an essential part of the school curriculum.

The principle of the utilization of community resources is gaining acceptance. Also, public school teachers and Independent Music Teachers have been discovering projects of mutual interest that have established a working together relationship. Independent Music Teachers are learning to determine the local school districts' goals and relate to them.

Problem:

Teacher certification is a problem at both the state and local levels. Some states require a music education degree for the certification of the teacher of performance instruction for credit. Teachers with degrees in applied music are reluctant to return to school for the required music education credits. They are pressing for acceptance of degrees in applied music or music degrees with an emphasis in pedagogy.

Solutions:

Teacher certification by MTNA and its state affiliated associations is becoming recognized and accepted. MTNA state affiliated associations are presenting their certification plans to MENC state affiliates for review. Recently, in the states of Washington and Kentucky, endorsement of the state music teachers association's certification plans was given along with approval of their programs for credit.

Attention is being directed to piano teacher training by the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy through its biennial meetings and reports of studies made by appointed committees.

Problem:

In some areas, approved state plans for credit have not been supported at the local level by Independent Music Teachers, students, and parents because:

- teachers, students, and parents are not always aware of the advantages in receiving transcript credit for performance instruction.
- high school students who could benefit from a credit program are in the minority due to the high drop out rate at the elementary and junior high levels.

Solutions:

Music teachers associations are making an effort to create an awareness and appreciation for credit programs by conducting surveys to determine interest and support by its membership, also student and parent cooperation.

Recognition, not credit, given from kindergarten through eighth grade, has been found to sustain interest until credit can be given in high school. A program giving recognition at the lower grade levels has been successful for ten years in Edina, Minnesota where achievements are entered on the student's school record. An annual two week *Festival of Music* given in the schools provides opportunities for performance that earn peer recognition. The number of teachers and students participating in the program in Edina is comparable to the total participation in some states.

What are the conditions when there has been success in implementing programs granting credit for performance instruction?

Credit recognition is dependent on stimulation by an active, dedicated individual, or group of individuals, usually Independent Music Teachers, working cooperatively with their counterparts and administrators in the public schools. Once such a partnership is formed between the school and the Independent Music Teachers, everything is possible. Any barriers are usually attitudinal, not legalistic.

Why have efforts for credit for performance instruction continued to persist?

Objectives that inspire perseverance to gain transcript credit are:

- Performance instruction given in the private studio should be regarded as an extension and supplement to the high school music program.
- Performance instruction given in the private studio provides the kind of musical foundation required by college schools of music. The student's

preparation to meet college entrance requirements should have transcript recognition.

- College schools of music depend on performance instruction given by Independent Music Teachers for the preparation of music students for college study. There should be certification, approved by the school district, to recognize teachers with training to teach performance instruction.
- Certification to teach performance for credit, approved by the school district, would give support to high professional standards. It would also create a more positive situation in independent music teaching that would be attractive to qualified musicians when choosing a profession, especially the college graduate seeking employment.

This information has been presented as a composite of the reported thoughts and actions of individuals and groups in music teachers organizations and public school systems. It reflects a growing interest and consideration being given to high school credit for performance instruction.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Review of Public School Credit and Released Time for Private Music Instruction,* compiled by Jean Hull, Chicago: National Piano Foundation, 1983.

[2] *High School Credit for Private Music Instruction, A Summary,* prepared by Lloyd Schmidt, National Council of State Supervisors of Music, 1974.

ISSUES IN PIANO PEDAGOGY: "STANDARDS FOR PRIVATE TEACHERS"

ELVINA TRUMAN PEARCE
Music Teachers National Association

MTNA NATIONAL CERTIFICATION—ITS ORIGIN AND PURPOSE

MTNA, which was founded in 1876, now has a membership of approximately 20,000 teachers including concert artists, faculty members of colleges and universities, and independent teachers of applied music. One of the organization's most important programs is the teacher certification plan which is closely related to the subject of standards for private teachers. Perhaps the first issue that should be addressed is what *is* MTNA certification and what is its purpose?

MTNA's National Certification Plan is a program designed to:

1. provide professional recognition for teachers of music who have fulfilled specific academic and musical criteria and have, in addition, demonstrated a high level of pedagogical competence in the certified area;
2. publicly identify such individuals;
3. motivate the teacher to maintain professional growth through established guidelines for certificate renewal based on study, performance, leadership, and other professional activities.

Although many college and university teachers participate in this program, its primary purpose is to recognize the *independent* music teacher who is often similarly well-schooled and qualified to provide a high level of musical instruction in the area in which certification has been granted. The majority of these certified teachers have an earned degree—usually a Bachelor of Music degree with a major in the area of certification—but non-degreed teachers may also qualify for MTNA certification on the basis of successful completion of a series of comprehensive examinations in the areas of music theory, music history and literature, pedagogy, and performance, prepared and administered by MTNA's National Certification Board.

Before becoming more specific about the present status of MTNA certification and its relationship to standards for private teachers, it might be well to say a few words about the history of this program. MTNA's first discussion of the need for a certification plan to benefit music teachers—most particularly, *independent* music teachers—is recorded in the minutes of its seventh annual meeting which was held one hundred years ago in 1883. This resulted in MTNA's creation (within its own professional framework) of an "American College of Musicians" whose purpose was to upgrade standards and certify the competence of its members. Examinations were prepared and given in piano, voice, violin, organ, strings, and theory; officers and a Board of Directors were elected and empowered to award an *associate*, a *fellow*, and a *master* level of certification to those passing the examinations. Within a year's time, one hundred, twenty-nine of MTNA's five hundred, seventy-five members became charter members of this new "college".

Although this first *national* plan for certification gradually faded away, it is recorded that at least eight state affiliates developed workable certification plans of their own between 1890 and 1920. In 1953, the national organization once again activated a certification committee which prepared a Model Plan for states wishing to develop their own certification plan, and by 1963, twenty-six of the thirty-nine state affiliates had such plans in operation.

In 1965, a newly-formed Certification Board began work on a National Certification Plan to be based on an earned degree (or its demonstrated equivalent), with a major concentration in an area of applied music, and in 1967, the completed plan was formally adopted. Subsequently, the plans of forty states were evaluated by the National Certification Board and candidates from states whose plans were approved became eligible to apply for national certification. In 1968, approximately 2,000 national certificates were awarded.

In 1980, certification plans from all fifty states had been approved by the National Certification Board and consequently, certification for independent music teachers by a national certifying agency became a reality for the first time in history. In 1982, a second level of certification called the Master Teacher Certificate Plan was incorporated into MTNA's certification program, and during 1983, still a third level of certification—the Associate Certification Plan designed to correlate with degree requirements resulting from a two-year college program—was developed and added to the program. More specific details about the history of MTNA certification may be found in the *MTNA National Certification Handbook*[1], and also in the book entitled, *A Centennial History of MTNA* by Homer Ulrich[2].

CERTIFICATION—AN ELABORATION ON ITS PURPOSE

In elaborating further on the purpose of MTNA's certification program, several points should be considered—first, the distinction between the college faculty teacher and the independent teacher of music. It seems apparent that in general, the public assumes that individuals who are employed on the staff of accredited colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher learning, are qualified both musically and pedagogically to perform their teaching responsibilities in accord with the profession's highest standards. Thus, persons seeking a qualified music instructor would most probably not feel the need to question the credentials of such a teacher. College faculty status also provides a professional image that is generally acknowledged by one's colleagues and the public alike. In summary, it seems reasonable to assume that an individual who obtains employment on a college faculty enjoys, by virtue of this position, adequate professional prestige and certification of his or her credentials.

But what about the teacher without such an institutional affiliation—the *independent* music teacher? Assuming that such an individual's educational background and experience provide a level of competence on a par with that of the college faculty teacher, how can such a teacher obtain a similar level of professional status and public recognition? And how can the public—particularly those seeking a qualified music instructor for a child—locate such a person, especially in communities where access to a college faculty instructor is not possible?

It is apparent that a viable certification program for the private teacher would serve such a public in its search for qualified teachers. It also seems reasonable to believe that such a program could assist with pointing up and also elevating the professional standards by which the work of these individuals is judged. The need for more definitive and upgraded standards seems particularly apparent in the area of teaching which involves the traditional young music student (the "average" boy or girl as opposed to the gifted, future music-major type) in his or her formative years of study. The high drop-out rate among such students after only two or three years of study seems indicative of a need for a re-evaluation of standards and an improvement of teaching skills. Parents also need to become better informed about the concepts and skills their child should be acquiring in order to become musically literate and perform with both competence and enjoyment. They should also be able to seek and find a teacher whose preparation and skill is sufficient to produce the desired results.

The expansion of pedagogy offerings in college music programs—particularly those which include supervised teaching of children—should have considerable impact on upgrading the quality of pre-college level teaching. Graduates of such programs who become independent music teachers suggest another valid reason for the existence of a national certification program such as MTNA's—namely, to provide a registry for teachers entering the profession whose educational and musical backgrounds, enhanced by specialized pedagogical training, do, indeed, meet the highest professional standards.

As mentioned previously, MTNA's certification program not only recognizes a teacher's preparation and competence but also provides, through its renewal program, incentives for continued professional growth. Eligibility for certificate renewal every fifth year is based on in-service education, public performance by the teacher and/or students, leadership activities, and other types of professional involvement such as writing, composing, lecturing, etc.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF CERTIFICATION AND A PROGNOSIS FOR ITS FUTURE

Proceeding to the present status of MTNA's national certification program, it should be noted that although the plan has been in effect since 1968, a period of fifteen years, it still appears to be relatively unknown to the public-at-large which perhaps stands to benefit most from its existence. Educating a nationwide audience to the existence and validity of such a program would obviously be a monumental undertaking. The MTNA National Certification Board continues to address itself to what is needed to assist with better acquainting the public with this program. In so doing, the following five issues assume priority:

1. An allocation of funds sufficient for underwriting a national publicity campaign. (It is probably obvious that the type of large-scale funding that would be needed to market the concept of certification on a national basis is simply not possible in a non-profit, professional organization such as MTNA. Hence, most of the public relations work that is done must be done by the members themselves at the local level. On two occasions, the organization, along with its certification program, was mentioned in articles appearing in two different national magazines.[3,4] Needless to say, more frequent coverage of this sort in non-musical and well as in music journals would be a great boon to the program.)
2. Finding more effective ways to distribute to the public the existing certification literature printed by MTNA so that those seeking qualified music instructors may be made aware of the purposes of certification and of how to locate a certified teacher.[5,6]
3. Knowledge and support of MTNA's certification program by members of other professional music organizations such as the Music Industry Council, the National Piano Foundation, the College Music Society, the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy, NASM, MENC, etc. (We were particularly pleased when last year, Sam Hope, NASM's Executive Director, agreed to read and evaluate the *MTNA National Certification Handbook*. Needless to say, we were also most appreciative of the opportunity to participate in the 1983 annual NASM meeting.)

   Appropos of support for the MTNA national certification program by other professional music organizations, mention might be made of the Washington State Music Educators Association which has officially endorsed the Washington State Music Teachers Association's recommended program of applied music credit for high school students studying with MTA-certified teachers. To publicly identify those teachers who are eligible to participate in this program, the MEA organization annually publishes a list of all MTA state-certified teachers in its state magazine.

4. Knowledge and support of MTNA and its certification program by college and university teachers of music who are involved with pedagogy instruction—particularly those who are in a position to advise graduates about opportunities and programs related to a career as an independent music teacher.
5. A fifth need is for more widespread participation in the certification program by MTNA members themselves. We would strive to motivate those members who are already certified to take a more active part in publicizing the certification program at the grassroots level. And we would similarly strive to encourage qualified teachers who have not yet become certified to become active participants.

The future of MTNA's national certification program will undoubtedly be greatly affected by the five factors discussed above. As far as the present status is concerned, the fact that between twenty and thirty new certified teachers are being added to the roster each month is reason for optimism. In the meantime, those who have been involved with the continued development and administration of the certification plan during the past fifteen years continue to visualize the long-range effects of such a program as a means for raising standards, for educating the public to a better understanding of what these standards *should* be, for providing a more professional image for the teacher of music—particularly for the *independent* music teacher—and finally, for publicly identifying the truly qualified members of our profession.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *MTNA National Certification Handbook*, Seventh Edition, Cincinnati: MTNA, 1983.

[2] Ulrich, Homer, *A Centennial History of MTNA*, Cincinnati: MTNA, 1976, pp. 156–165.

[3] Paananen, Donna M., "A Parent's Guide to Music Lessons", *Better Homes and Gardens*, September, 1977.

[4] "Music Lessons Your Child Will Like", Washington, D.C.: *Changing Times, the Kiplinger Magazine*, September, 1977.

[5] "Choosing a Music Teacher", Cincinnati: MTNA, 1982.

[6] *The MTNA Directory of Nationally Certified Teachers*, Cincinnati: MTNA, 1983.

ISSUES IN PIANO PEDAGOGY: DEGREES IN PEDAGOGY

MARIENNE USZLER
National Conference on Piano Pedagogy

THE HISTORY AND PRESENT STATUS OF PIANO PEDAGOGY IN THE COLLEGE CURRICULUM

The American piano teaching profession is a large one. How large may never be known. Legions of neighborhood teachers cannot, and do not, claim identity as professional music teachers. Until 1980, no standard, certifying the professionally competent private teacher, had achieved national acceptance.

It is equally true that the number of visible members of this profession is also large. Independent piano teachers active at local, state, national levels (usually through professional organizations), university/conservatory keyboard faculty, clinicians and adjudicators, authors and publishers of educational piano music—those who constitute this more visible group—are most aware of the great number of private teachers who are unidentified.

All of these active groups are eager to influence present professional standards. They also share a common interest in the education of those who will continue to represent this profession. Many, therefore, are actively engaged in helping to stimulate, and participate in, that teacher training process.

In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the American piano manufacturing industry attained technical superiority and commercial success. In *A Hundred Years of Music in America,* W. S. B. Mathews states proudly, "Piano construction is the one department of musical achievement in which American invention, enterprise and genius has outdistanced all old-world effort."[1] Mathews further claims that at the time he writes, 1889, Americans manufactured 85,000 pianos yearly.

The publication of piano methods was also a highly successful enterprise. Nathan Richardson's *New Method for the Pianoforte* appeared in 1859. By the beginning of the last decade of that century, Richardson's estate had realized over $100,000 in royalties. It is hardly surprising, therefore, to note that during these same decades piano teaching became a cottage industry.

The uncounted legions were flourishing. Mathews presents a contemporary account. ". . . the larger number of teachers in the country . . . are imperfectly qualified for their work. . . . the profession has been full of people undertaking a class in music without experience in teaching or adequate technical preparation therefor, (sic) merely as a pastime, or as a ready means of earning money for a brief period. . . . Superficiality and temporality are the two vices of the profession below the higher walks of it.''[2]

Mathews notes the beginning of change and improvement, however. He credits three causes: 1) better professional education (at the time this meant a more substantial balance of theoretical, historical, and performance components); 2) the formation of the Music Teachers National Association; 3) the formation of the American College of Musicians. The implications of this observation are pertinent in the present context.

The first third of this century witnessed the rapid development of class piano programs. These programs were designed for use in public school classrooms, not in individual studios or schools of music. Piano classes were taught either by elementary school teachers with a modicum of keyboard training or by pianists with a modicum of teacher training. By the third decade of the century the latter situation predominated.

Authors of methods and materials designed for these programs were individuals whose expertise resulted from training in peformance *and* education (Raymond Burrows is a good example) or by teams representing areas of piano performance and music education (McConathy, Schelling, Haake, and Haake who produced the Oxford Piano Course in 1928 are an obvious illustration here.) Burrow's own education, joint attendance—in the nineteen twenties and thirties—at the Institute of Musical Arts (later Juilliard) and at Teachers College Columbia, underscores the dichotomy still present in the professional education of the musical performer in these decades.

The focus of the materials designed for class piano programs was a striking indication that goals for piano study were changing. Playing the piano as a means of self expression was not necessarily linked to playing in a recital. Use of instructional techniques evolving from insight into more current learning theories required a new kind of teacher training. Pedagogy classes needed to introduce student teachers to educational psychologies from whence these theories issued.

It is hardly necessary to point out, however, that those involved in these class piano and teacher training programs were not the ''legions.'' The uncounted were, for the most part, the untouched.

From the thirties through the mid-sixties there was particular interest in exploring and developing techniques related to teaching a group. This aspect claimed attention since it was the feature most notably different from the one-on-one lesson that was familiar and prevalent. In some quarters this apparent concentration gave rise to an assumption that the scope of pedagogy courses and the concern of pedagogy teachers was limited to a study of group teaching procedures. This assumption may have accurately expressed the interests and activities of specific individuals within the field. But it is far too restrictive an association, either historically or currently.

Interest in training the pianist to teach as well as to perform slowly began to be reflected in the keyboard curricula of universities and professional schools. It is difficult to document exactly where and how piano pedagogy courses and programs evolved since no extended investigation of this process has been undertaken to date. It is clear, however, that institutions with vital music education programs were active in the development of performance curricula with strong pedagogy components.

Raymond Burrow's pedagogy teaching and curriculum building at Teachers College, Columbia coincided with the time that music education in that school was guided first by Peter Dykema, later by James Mursell. Of the team that produced the Oxford Piano Course, Haake and Haake were on Northwestern's piano faculty, McConathy chaired its music education department. These examples are easiest to cite since each is represented by a body of teaching materials generated by those active in the programs. They were not, however, the only institutions moving in such directions in the middle decades of this century.

The 1953 NASM national meeting included a panel on the subject of the private music teacher. This panel discussed the desirability of establishing a curriculum to prepare musicians for careers as such. Two speakers placed teacher preparation in broad context. They pointed out that private teachers produced potential consumers of music as well as future music teachers or artist performers and argued, therefore, for certification either by state departments of education or by state professional associations. One speaker declared that a specific curriculum for educating the private teacher was both undesirable and unnecessary. Allusion was made "to the supply of fine private teachers we are now turning out."[3] The influence of "Educationalists," it was feared, would put "jacks-of-all-trades" in private studios.[4]

The fourth speaker referred to a personal survey of ten representative NASM schools where pedagogy programs were in operation. The study revealed, among other things, that all these schools included observation and student teaching as an important part of the program. It was further claimed that "twice as many schools offer courses in piano pedagogy as in any other (pedagogy) field."[5] The ten schools surveyed were not identified.

At its 1956 meeting, NASM was presented a four-year B. M. curriculum with a teaching major in applied music prepared by an MTNA committee established for the purpose of supporting certification of the private music teacher. The four-year teaching major in applied music was considered a substantial aid to that end. One NASM speaker underscored the importance of this major, relative to the influence of the private music teacher, by offering the following statistics: 5,801 teachers of music in NASM schools; 55,000 music teachers in public schools; 150,000 private music teachers. (All figures were 1956 estimates.) Both panelists, one of whom was the (then) current president of MTNA, urged support and adoption of this curriculum by NASM. Subsequent official action on the part of NASM relative to this curriculum is unclear.

These panels and proposals indicate that there was extensive national concern in mid-century for both the standards of private music teaching and means whereby to raise and acknowledge these standards. It is also evident that by this time some schools had already activated pedagogy programs at the undergraduate level. The substance, location, and number of such programs, however, is difficult to determine.

Some stimulus and leadership in the training of piano teachers came also from educators not directly linked to universities or professional schools. These were educators who had developed new teaching materials, particularly for the beginning levels of piano instruction. In clinics and workshops throughout the fifties and sixties, such educators furthered the process of teacher training by suggesting and exhibiting effective teaching procedures in the demonstration of their own materials. Those attending such sessions and workshops were, for the most part, in-service teachers who either did not have degrees, or whose professional education had not provided adequate or practical training in pedagogy. Contact was thus being made with some of the uncounted legions.

In the sixties and seventies, the piano teaching profession became increasingly aware that it had the energy, as well as the responsibility, to insure that teacher training came before, rather than after, the obtaining of a degree. Individual members of keyboard departments in many schools of music began to concentrate their teaching in the area of pedagogy. Development of activities meant additional courses (particularly those relating learning theories to performance), inclusion of observation of teaching, and, to a lesser degree, directed student teaching.

By the seventies, schools were offering majors in pedagogy at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Such majors bore assorted titles: major in piano pedagogy; major in group piano pedagogy; major in performance with a pedagogy emphasis; major in music education with a piano pedagogy emphasis; concentration in piano pedagogy and literature—to list only those in more general use.

In some institutions these programs developed at the graduate level, often relating group teaching techniques to the environment of an electronic piano laboratory. In other schools, the pedagogy major grew from close, or closer, interaction between the college piano department and a preparatory division. These latter programs developed at undergraduate and graduate levels, though not necessarily at both in each institution. A very few institutions were developing doctoral programs in the training of pedagogy teachers.

Pedagogy teachers became more confident of the strength and value of pedagogy programs. The number of these teachers increased as did their visibility. Through informal contacts with colleagues in other schools, pedagogy teachers sensed that they were moving in similar general directions, although within separate spheres. They needed only to develop a collective identity, to organize.

In January, 1979, a national meeting was quietly advertised. No one knew who would respond, how many would gather to probe and discuss ideas related to piano teacher training. Over eighty people struggled through Missouri snow to do so. They also resolved to meet again.

Advertising for the October, 1980 meeting included a call for papers. Papers were to deal directly with some aspect of piano teacher training. Over 50 were submitted, 15 chosen for presentation. This time 224 assembled to listen, discuss, and plan the next meeting of the National Conference on Piano Pedagogy.

As an outgrowth of the second conference, and prior to the third, committees were formed to explore the varied concerns of the group and, if possible, to suggest plans that would result in action as well as express collective interest. The chair of one of these committees stands before you today.

The committee's purpose is two-fold: 1) to establish curricular guidelines for a piano pedagogy major at both undergraduate and graduate levels; 2) to facilitate communication and consultation with NASM and other professional organizations concerning these guidelines.

The committee submitted the results of its first discussion to the entire Piano Pedagogy Conference. Over 320 were in attendance in October of 1982. This presentation was partly expository. Conference members needed to know what the NASM Handbook already contained concerning pedagogy components of performance degrees. The committee also offered its interpretation of NASM's statements. Interpretation, in this context, meant only that the committee specified course and program content that might be subsumed under general, broader headings. A full report was published in the Conference Journal at the same time that it was submitted to NASM. Other organizations—MTNA, MENC, and the National Piano Foundation—were sent copies of the same report.

Interested response from these organizations suggested the idea of a joint meeting in March of this year. At this meeting were representatives of all aforementioned groups. It was agreed that publication of a handbook containing guidelines and supportive information might be helpful as a resource document to complement NASM's own statements concerning the piano pedagogy major.

At the request of NASM, first attention was to be given to the undergraduate degree.

The preparation of the Handbook is well under way. The portion of the Handbook thus far completed deals only with the undergraduate major and has already been reviewed by the Pedagogy Conference Committee, and by representatives of NASM, MTNA, MENC, and NPF. Comments and suggestions from these groups are now being considered as the committee moves toward the preparation of the final copy.

The Handbook contains five sections. The first is a history of piano pedagogy showing its emergence as a field of specialization arising from equal influences of the normal school, university, and conservatory systems. The second section presents five case studies of varied and effective programs. The third and fourth sections outline similarities and differences of these programs and recommendations for course content based on the comparative study. The last section lists three sets of questions—one set each directed to the pedagogy teacher, the keyboard department, the administrator—that seek to provoke a self-study of the piano pedagogy major in individual contexts.

The Pedagogy Committee will subsequently work to assemble curricular guidelines for the piano pedagogy major at the Master's level as a development of its recommendations for undergraduate studies. This matter is expected to be the committee agenda for the October, 1984, National Pedagogy Conference.

Jacques Barzun, writing about music in American life in 1955, confirmed the mid-century observations by music administrators already noted—that "despite . . . private and public schools, music education is still carried on by the private teacher."[6] The number in the uncounted legions is less today than it was one hundred years ago or when Barzun made his statement. In the piano teaching profession, however, it still represents the majority.

Unfortunately, private teachers are those most likely to be in the recycling business. Many teach as they have been taught—using the same methods, pieces, pencils, and metronomes that shaped and defined their own early musical world. A more inclusive and substantial pedagogical education will provide pianists with *incentives*, as well as techniques, for breaking that cycle.

Whether or not this inclusive and substantial education is interpreted to mean that a *major* in piano pedagogy is implemented at a particular institution may be best left to the discretion of that institution. Arguments in support of electing to provide this major have considerable urgency and practicality.

> An institution which knows that the majority of its baccalaureate recipients do not pursue graduate studies may regard the offering of a pedagogy major to be the most effective means of equipping its graduates for their roles in the music profession.

> The cause of the independent music teacher in seeking professional recognition may be supported and enhanced by a specific degree and major which testifies to the pedagogical, as well as the performance, training of its recipient.
>
> State school systems that require a degree in music education for teachers certified to offer performance instruction for credit may find it easier to acknowledge the instructional competence of a performer with a major in pedagogy. This may be especially true if the professional training provides supervised student teaching as part of the curriculum.
>
> A program which concerns itself with the preparation of those who provide performance instructions for the less advanced (as well as the incipient professional), attracts students in addition to those making their first "run" at professional music training. Some of the "legions" may see a path, both worthwhile and non-threatening, by means of which they may fill in the missing pieces.

These are important considerations. They affect varying groups of people in ways that touch their aesthetic as well as their bread-and-butter lives. Yet there remains a sensitive (some would say thorny) question. If the largest percentage of those obtaining performance degrees do, in fact, spend the largest percentage of their professional lives teaching—at whatever level—should not the performance degree itself provide substantive pedagogical training, including supervised student teaching? Why a separate major?

The National Conference on Piano Pedagogy neither suggests nor hopes that all schools of music establish piano pedagogy majors. Its concern is to stimulate and assist quality education for each pianist. That education should be musically comprehensive as well as vocationally practical. Guidelines, such as those in the forthcoming Handbook, are intended to urge and support both of these ideals.

If pedagogy majors exist or are in the process of being established, substance and content of the programs ought to meet reasonably similar standards. The awarding of degrees with this major should indicate similar achievements. Guidelines and statements of standards will assist this process of definition and acknowledgement.

Schools interested in reassessing the performance curriculum with the intention of providing better developed pedagogy experiences for *all* keyboard majors may also be aided by guidelines. Statements of standards help to distinguish essential elements from those which are supportive and enriching. Ways to balance and adjust an existing curriculum may then be easier to determine. Reasons for doing so may also seem more compelling.

The independent music teacher deserves recognition and wishes to earn it. The professional education of that teacher should make such possible. There is no need to worry about future legions if those of today are offered both motivation and opportunity to help themselves.

FOOTNOTES

[1] W. S. B. Mathews, *A Hundred Years of Music in America*, Chicago: G. L. Howe, 1889, p. 327.

[2] Ibid., p. 537.

[3] *NASM Bulletin* Number 35, 1954, p. 14.

[4] Ibid., p. 14.

[5] Ibid., p. 16.

[6] Jacques Barzun, *Music in American Life*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956, p. 53.

MUSIC EXECUTIVE SUCCESS

ROBERT L. COWDEN
Indiana State University

INTRODUCTION

At the outset I wish to express my thanks to the higher education music executives and academic officers from degree granting institutions who responded to the questionnaire that formed Phase I of this study. In addition I wish to express my appreciation to the fourteen music executives who were the subjects of Phase II of the study and who allowed me to come to their campuses for a two-day period, who arranged for interviews with faculty members and their immediate supervisors and who served as superb hosts. I am indebted also to the Indiana State University Research Committee who provided partial funding for the pursuit of this project.

PHASE I

A summary of the annual listing of administrative position changes as published by the National Association of Schools of Music for the period 1977–1981 reveals a total of 319 persons listed as "new" music executives or music executives with "new" positions. With some 438 institutions listed in the 1981 issue of *Music in Higher Education* as granting at least the bachelor's degree, one wonders about the apparent high turnover among leaders of music units in degree-granting institutions.

Purpose

A purpose of this study was to determine the reasons for turnover among music executives (may be called chairmen, deans, directors, heads) in NASM degree-granting institutions.

A further purpose was to discover the personal and professional qualities of music executives who had held their positions for five years as of May, 1982.

Procedures

When the 319 names mentioned earlier were placed in institutions, it was found that 273 institutions were represented, i.e., 273 degree-granting NASM institutions sustained at least one change in music executive leadership in the period 1977–1981.

Letters were sent to "Chief Academic Officers"—with some follow-up reminders where necessary—at these institutions with a request that they indicate the reason(s) for the change in music leadership which occurred at their institutions. They were further asked to check the type (public, private) institution they represented and the size of the music major population.

Letters and identical questionnaires were sent to Music Executives as well as to Chief Academic Officers at 219 institutions where no turnover of musical leadership had taken place in the period 1977–1981. The questionnaire contained 25 statements about music executive behavior. The respondents were asked, "To what extent are these items important in the success of music executives?" An open-ended item inquired as to "the most important and most positive characteristic about this music executive that has made him/her successful is . . ."

Findings

Turnover:

Responses were received from 222 Chief Academic Officers in institutions where a change in music executive had taken place—a response rate of 82% (222 ÷ 273).

Reasons given for change and frequency were:

Deceased	5
Terminated	9
"Nudged" out	27
Finished term	30
Retired	37
Moved	37
Chose to return to teaching	50
Other	27
	222

The most common reasons for "other" were: went to a position outside education, promoted, retrenched, combined music with another department, "acting" became "regular," and failed the review process.

The distribution by size and type of institution was as follows:

	Number Reported	Total	Percent
Public			
1–100 Music Majors	37	47	79
101–200 Music Majors	37	81	46
201–400 Music Majors	29	57	51
401 + Music Majors	18	37	49
	121	222	

	Number Reported	Total	Percent
Private			
1–50 Music Majors	56	75	75
51–100 Music Majors	15	62	24
101–200 Music Majors	19	45	42
201 + Music Majors	11	34	32
	101	216	

The "number reported" are actual responses by Chief Academic Officers. The "total" is the number of NASM institutions in that category as listed in the 1981 edition of *MIHE*. The percent is a figure determined by dividing the number of institutions who reported a change by the total number of institutions in the category.

The total number of institutions that experienced change was 273 or *62% of all NASM degree-granting institutions during the period 1977–1981.*

It should be noted that the institutions with the smallest number of music majors in each category (public 1–100; private 1–50) were the ones reporting the highest turnover of music executives—79% and 75%, respectively. It should also be noted that responses were not received from 18% (n = 51) of the respondents. Thus, the *real* numbers and *real* percentages can only be higher than those reported.

No Turnover

Responses to the questionnaire were received from 162 Music Executives (74%) and from 149 Chief Academic Officers (68%).

Respondents were asked to check the relative importance of statements about Music Executives on a five-point scale:

1—unimportant
2—possibly important
3—important
4—very important
5—indispensable

The means for the two groups are reported along with the F Value associated with mean differences, the significance level of F and a correlation coefficient which compared the responses between the music executive and the academic officer from *the same institution.*

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

The Music Executive	ME	CAO	F	SIG of F	P
1. is willing and capable of working with superiors for the benefit of his unit and its members.	4.7	4.5	9.077	.003	.009
2. sets a good example for his faculty.	4.2	4.1	.170	.680	.240
3. has flexibility to meet changing situations.	4.4	4.0	15.865	.000	.114
4. considers all sides of an issue.	4.4	4.0	31.277	0	−.076
5. solves problems well within the unit.	4.2	4.2	.259	.611	−.085
6. is efficient.	3.9	3.7	4.746	.031	.052
7. demonstrates high professional standards.	4.3	4.3	.114	.735	−.003
8. observes democratic procedures where appropriate.	3.9	3.7	11.291	.001	−.053
9. makes decisions which, overall, are to the advantage of the entire unit.	4.4	4.0	27.003	0	.001
10. exerts leadership for achieving departmental objectives.	4.3	4.3	1.848	.176	.127
11. keeps abreast of current activities in the discipline.	3.7	3.8	1.008	.317	.125
12. is prompt in meeting deadlines for reports and other information.	3.8	3.6	1.424	.234	.079
13. is honest in dealing with people.	4.8	4.6	6.897	.009	−.260
14. is determined to have his/her way when knowing he/she is right.*	2.4	2.4	.097	.756	.086
15. communicates well verbally and in writing.	4.0	4.3	8.914	.003	.041
16. is accessible to faculty and students.	4.1	3.8	6.522	.011	−.035

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE—Continued

The Music Executive	ME	CAO	F	SIG of F	P
17. acts deliberately, as opposed to precipitously or out of anger.	4.2	4.1	.525	.469	−.165
18. encourages new approaches, programs, and courses.	3.9	3.8	.160	.689	−.010
19. assigns responsibilities to faculty in the area of their expertise.	4.0	3.8	10.370	.002	.083
20. holds high musical standards and enforces those standards throughout the department.	4.1	4.2	.792	.375	.060
21. is a capable mediator.	4.1	3.9	4.719	.031	.077
22. plans carefully before any action is taken.	4.1	3.9	7.885	.066	.069
23. informs students and faculty in the unit of matters affecting them.	4.2	3.9	10.617	.001	.079
24. is effective in disciplining his/her faculty members.	3.3	3.3	.976	.324	.131
25. seeks out, listens to, and utilizes feedback.	4.2	3.9	10.150	.002	−.097

*On the advice of a statistician this item was included as a "check" question.

Reliability

Internal consistency of the questionnaire was tested using the Cronbach Coefficient Alpha. For Academic Officers' response the coefficient was .905; for Music Executives .902. A factor analysis of Academic Officer responses shows factor #1 (Success) with a 32 percent explained variance; the same factor analysis of Music Executive responses shows a 30.9 percent explained variance.

Observations/Questions

1. The turnover among music executives in a five-year period of 62% seems high yet it is not known whether this is higher, lower or equal to other disciplines in higher education.

2. The most popular answer for turnover among music executives as given by the academic officers was "chose to return to teaching."
3. When one combines the answers "terminated", "nudged out", "retrenched", and "failed the review process" (part of "other"), 40 appear to have left the music executive position under less than desirable circumstances. Still more may be in that category but are hidden in "moved", "retired", "chose to return to teaching", or "finished term".
4. The turnover rate was highest among institutions with the smallest music major population—both public and private. An isolation of responses from these two groups shows that all reasons received some responses but "returned to teaching" and "finished term" were reported most often.

   Several questions arise from this finding:

   Are the positions, in institutions where the music major population is small, which include teaching loads as well as administrative responsibility *really* the most difficult in the profession? Do they represent "stepping stones" to positions with more administrative responsibility? Are the frustrations typically too much? Is longevity just not expected—or perhaps even desired? Is there a revolving-door syndrome of "now it's your turn to do it?"

5. Of the twenty-five success factors listed the one rated highest by Music Executives was "honesty" followed by "willing and capable of working with superiors for the benefit of his unit."
6. Interestingly enough the factor rated highest by the academic officers was likewise "honesty" followed (likewise) by "willingness to work with superiors."
7. The statement which produced the highest correlation between the music executive and the academic officer at the same institution was: "sets a good example for his faculty."
8. An open-ended question invited the Music Executive to identify the characteristic that in his/her opinion contributed most to his success. The most frequently mentioned items were: fairness, honesty, good working relationships with constituent groups, mutual respect for students and colleagues, hard work, patience, high standards, high energy level and management ability to maximize the potential of people and resources.
9. An identical question invited the academic officers to respond in a similar way. The most frequently mentioned items were: leadership, sets high professional standards, cooperative spirit, artistic ability, fairness, energy level, hard work, and commitment.
10. A combining and reducing of the responses of both the Music Executives and Academic Officers at institutions where the Music Executives

had been in place for five years to most-often underscored characteristics revealed the following six qualities to be of preeminent importance: good working relationships with people, cooperative spirit, fairness, honesty, sets and maintains high professional standards and leadership.

Assumption

Perhaps I should mention at this point that there is no assumption on my part that the reasons for leaving the music executive post are "bad," per se, or that it is wrong for someone to want to leave music administration. There is an underlying feeling, however, that frequent change is not good for department and institutions in that it minimizes any likelihood of long range planning. Short terms of office, or the expectation of short terms, may encourage decision making based on the immediate effect rather than the long term consequences or benefits a few years down the road.

PHASE II

Introduction

The second phase of the project took place in the Spring of 1983 and involved visits to fourteen campuses where the music executive had been in office for five years. Criteria for choosing the institutions included the desire for variety in size, character, and support base. Eight of the institutions were private; six were public. They were located in nine different states. No claim is made that the sample was random.

On each campus I held five structured interviews; two hours with the music executive (four were chairmen, three were directors, five were deans and one was a head), one hour with the music executive's superior (six were deans, three were provosts, four were vice-presidents, and one was a president), and one hour each with three faculty members. Faculty members were selected by the music executive with only a request from me that they be persons from three different subgroups within music.

Music Executive Responses

The first question put to the fourteen principal subjects were "How and why did you become music executives?" Answers varied on the "how" part from a gradual experience with functions that required organization to a gravitational pull to leadership roles to receiving a mandate from faculty and the upper administration. Some stated that their first experience with music administration was more by accident than by design. It was often a matter of being in a certain spot at a certain time and appearing to be the logical choice.

As to the "why" several referred to challenges they saw, feeling in themselves the need for change, having their appetites whetted by satisfaction received in problem solving and recognizing in themselves a more generalized interest in music as opposed to remaining specialized. The most often heard comment, however, had to do with a sense of idealism—a feeling that "I believe I can make a difference."

I was curious about the music executives' perceptions of themselves and the factors that they felt contributed to staying power in their current positions. Typical comments included "I feel I can set and achieve realistic goals", "I get results with upper administration", "I do work quickly that others depend on", "I've received good protection from above—you're a moving target in this business", "I take my job seriously but not myself", and "the up and down relationships are solid—lines of authority have always been followed." By far the most frequently heard comments related to people—constituent relationships that were solid, mutually respectful and supportive. As one music executive put it, "I ask for advice, I'm honest at all costs, and I try very hard to be sensitive to people rather than manipulative of them."

The satisfactions of the music executive position fell largely into three categories. One was problem solving. The persons interviewed generally felt satisfaction in working with a problem and seeing it through to a successful solution. Another was students. Immense satisfaction was expressed in seeing student successes: acceptance into graduate schools and the establishment of successful professional careers in performance and/or teaching. Most often mentioned was the thrill of hiring faculty members and seeing them grow and develop into solid contributors. A great deal of pride in the accomplishment of faculty members was expressed. One man derived great pleasure from being the catalyst that enabled faculty members to work together in rewarding artistic and musical projects.

The music executives expressed frustration about an inability to get decisions from others, the repetitiveness of academe, and insufficient time to respond to requests; most frustrating, however, were concerns about money and faculty. All the subjects in this study had dreams—dreams which could be translated into reality if the financial resources were there. To be sure, the problems were more severe on some campuses than others. But as one person put it, "problems become larger than life when there isn't enough money to meet our basic needs, let alone to fulfill the dreams which could so enhance our quality." The second principal area of frustration was faculty—recalcitrant, incompetent, unhappy faculty who are destined to be on our teaching staffs for years to come; persons who retired two years ago but are still drawing their pay checks. "It is frustrating", said one person, "to see fractured personal relationships that don't seem to mend and to see colleagues who are living in the past and who have no idea what is going on in the world of music." "I am distressed", said another, "at seeing faculty members who are cloning themselves but don't seem to know it." Still another expressed frustration at his inability to convince his colleagues that he was indeed working for them. "For some", he said, "no matter how much I do, it isn't enough."

A variety of responses was heard to the question, "what is your philosophy of music administration?" Some expressed the need for keeping music as the central force in the unit. Others said they tried to keep in mind always that before a decision is made *everyone* who is involved must be consulted including those with only a "perceived" (by them) involvement. Much was said about creating an atmosphere that is conducive to making music, working together, and learning about the musical art. The most common creed expressed was "hire the best that you can and then let them go."

Some music executives saw themselves as more democratic than autocratic; some the reverse. Some said that they were either or both, depending on the circumstances. Other adjectives that the subjects applied to themselves were: patient, open, improvisatory, objective and aggressive. By far the most often expressed descriptions here were low key, informal, casual and unpretentious.

Controlling the time demands represented a severe problem for all the subjects in this study. Often I heard in answer to the question, "How do you control the demands on your time?" "I don't. I just work longer than anyone else." The evening demands for concerts, recitals, and social functions control the lives of these persons as do meetings and appointments which are nearly impossible to control. Some have efficient secretaries who help protect parts of days. Some take days off to work at home. Some find an excuse to get out of town although a price is paid when returning. Others try to keep their doors closed at certain times. Most of the subjects make lists of things to do so that when a few minutes are available, a task can be found to fill the time.

A dissertation by Lenore Schmidt completed in 1982 at Florida State University entitled *The Nature of The Music Administrator's Work: Three Public University Case Studies in Kentucky, Virginia and West Virginia* has something to say on this point. Schmidt found that brevity, variety and fragmentation characterized the activities of the administrators she studied as 75% of all their activities took less than nine minutes. Eighty-three percent of total administrative contact time was devoted to meetings. The pace of the workday was steady, she found, with trivial and important activities randomly juxtaposed.

"Are you able to maintain currency and credibility as a teacher, musician, or scholar" was another question. Seven said "yes"; five said "no" and two were hesitant to respond either way. Many expressed a frustration about this and said they wanted to be careful not to appear to be competing with faculty members.

The fourteen subjects in the study have had a collective wealth of experience. They have seen music executives across NASM come and go so I was interested in their perceptions of why music executives held their positions for a relatively short period of time. Some mentioned things such as an unwillingness to put egos aside, antagonistic relationships, a discovery that the commitment required in many cases causes one to leave his own area of expertise, pressures from above and below, a practice of rotating chairs, a feeling of mental and physical fatigue from overwork, a move to formal evaluation and reactions in a personal way to criticism. Most often mentioned were feelings of frustration which cannot be lived with and a lack of financial resources to do what should be done. One music executive said, "The very quality you want in a teacher will cause an administrator to self-destruct in two years."

Few of these administrators have had any formal training to be music executives. Some have attended workshops or institutes for one or two weeks in the summer, some have taken courses in graduate school that they felt had been helpful, one attended an extensive six-week course for higher education administrators one summer, and still another held a year-long A.C.E. internship.

Schmidt, in her doctoral dissertation, examined the graduate curricula of 323 institutions that offer graduate programs in music. She found that only 24 of these institutions offer graduate work dealing with some aspect of higher education administration and in 18 of the 24 institutions, the work in music administration was limited to only one course. She also examined ten doctoral dissertations that had topics pertaining to music administration and did an extensive literature search as well. Her conclusion was that "in-depth training for music administrators through graduate programs is assessed as virtually non-existent."

I was curious as to what personal quality these music executives felt they possessed that was of most help to them as an administrator. Among the twenty distinct qualities mentioned in decreasing order of frequency were: personableness, approachability, verbal and written communication skills, energy level, sense of humor, and integrity.

"What are the pitfalls that you have fallen into that you would warn others about?" was another question. Frequently mentioned were loss of temper, trying to keep everyone happy, hiring friends, and acting on the advice of a committee when it should have been rejected. The most often response, however, to this question was that of delaying a tough decision when you know it is going to be a negative one for the receiver. "Although you have to wait long enough to be sure all the evidence is in," said one, "delays generally exacerbate the situation and make the 'No' tougher to deliver."

I would describe this group of subjects collectively as enthusiastic about their jobs and about the effect they felt they were having on the musical education of young people. Twelve said emphatically that music administration would be a part of their career path if they had it to do over again. Two were less sure.

The most difficult decisions as identified by the subjects fell into two categories: people and money. Often these were intertwined. The personnel decisions began with employment and continued through probation, tenure, non-continuation and termination. Faculty evaluation and the distribution of merit money were mentioned, as tough decision areas. In addition the decisions as to the distribution of institutional financial resources were also expressed as difficult.

''How do you motivate faculty to change and to grow?'' was asked. Some responded that most of the motivation they used was *ex post facto*: publicizing achievements, offering private and public commendation and rewarding with merit pay. Others responded that they sent faculty members information about professional opportunities, provided time and money for research projects, encouraged involvement in professional associations, and awarded sabbaticals. One person commented, ''At our institution the faculty members push each other. I really don't have to do much.''

Concerning significant accomplishments of the past five years, reference was made to curriculum, physical plant, improvement in the quality of performance, and scholarship money. However, the most often mentioned accomplishment by far was in the improvement of the faculty body through additions of high quality and the growth of those already on board. A great sense of pride was apparent in the achievement of faculty colleagues and as one person put it, ''These people will be making an impact on young lives long after I have departed the scene.''

The evaluation of the music executive on these fourteen campuses is handled in different ways. On some campuses there is yearly effort to assess competency and on others it occurs every five years. On some it is very informal and is handled strictly from above while on others it is highly structured requiring input from faculty, students and alumni. On one campus when the chair is being evaluated for the second time (each term is three years), a search committee is automatically formed. It may or may not function but it is in place to go into action should the determination be made that a change is necessary.

What about the relative importance of musical and administrative abilities? None of the group was willing to down-grade musical abilities. In order to hold faculty respect you must have paid your dues as a musician, teacher, and scholar was an often-expressed thought. The faculty must know that *you* know how it feels to be on stage or in front of a class. Further, you must recognize musicianship in others if you are to make informed judgments. You have to be able to converse intelligently on musical matters with colleagues as well as with those outside music. But the concensus was that administrative skills are a *must* if you are to survive. Or as one person put it, ''I don't know of any music executive who has lost his job because he wasn't a good enough musician.''

Is music administration creative? Most assuredly and emphatically "yes" said all subjects. Problem solving is creative. Getting an idea and seeing it through to realization—conceptualizing and then actualizing—is creative. One person commented, although I suspect others might agree, that he was most creative when he was out of town.

QUESTIONS ASKED OF BOTH FACULTY MEMBERS AND ACADEMIC OFFICERS

The first question put to faculty members and academic officers was one that called for a description of climate within the music unit. While some remarked that there were tensions, most of the interviewees used such terms as congenial, amiable, positive, optimistic, and mutually respectful.

What about leadership style? How would you characterize the modus operandi of the music executive? Academic officers commented about their music executive's working for concensus wherever possible, and about their aggressiveness without being confrontational. Most said their music executives were characterized by democratic rather than autocratic behavior. One said, "He's really adept at picking the right issues to fight about."

It was clear from the answers to this question that a variety of styles was in evidence at the fourteen institutions. Some faculty members characterized the music executive as more nearly autocratic; far more perceived them as near the democratic end of the continuum. "Low key" and "casual" were frequent descriptors but so was "he has a flair for the dramatic." "He uses reasonable persuasion" was frequently heard.

Another question asked the interviewees to be a part of a search committee to seek a replacement for the music executive and to consider their standards in the categories of education, teaching experience, administrative experience, personal qualities and professional standing.

Twelve of the academic officers felt that an earned doctorate was essential and one even said that it must come from a prestigious institution. Two felt that the doctorate was not vital. Among faculty, thirty felt the doctorate was essential; twelve did not. Those who said that the doctorate may not be essential usually *did* say that a record of professional accomplishment *was* of importance.

There was a great spread of answers as to the amount and kind of teaching experience that was necessary to be seriously considered for the position of music executive at the fourteen institutions. Although the academic officers insisted that there was no specific number of years and that the quality of that experience was much more important than the quantity, the most frequently heard response was 5–10 years in higher education. Some felt that the person should have achieved tenure somewhere and one said that the person should be acceptable to the faculty as a full professor in his area of specialty.

Faculty members in general felt that the teaching experience should have been broad, some feeling that pre-collegiate level teaching was a decided plus and others emphasizing that the experience should have been at the undergraduate as well as the graduate levels. Many commented that they wanted a person who had a commitment, even a passion for teaching.

The diversity of response to the question of administrative experience reflects the difference in size and types of institutions visited. Academic officers wanted to see evidence of experience in directing and dealing with people in a variety of settings. They also looked for a record showing increasing responsibility along with evidence that the person capable of learning quickly on the job. Responsibility as associate chairman or chairman at another institution was the most often mentioned specific level of responsibility.

Faculty members were concerned that there be evidence of leadership in other positions but were often uncertain about specifics. Some felt that the career path should show an upward curve. Most would look favorably on department headship elsewhere with an area chairmanship or coordinator as being minimal expectations.

A key question for faculty was whether the person had been able to manage people and programs successfully in an academic setting.

In answer to the question of personal qualities, skills in interpersonal relationships were mentioned most often by both faculty and academic officers. Concerns were expressed that the person love people and music—that the person be a decent human being. As one academic officer put it, "It doesn't matter how good a musician/scholar you are, the *personal* relationships will make or break you." Other qualities mentioned included sense of humor, tough mindedness, ability to communicate, honesty and integrity, and high energy level. Academic officers often spoke of wanting a person who had broad vision and an interest in the institution as a whole. Some spoke of needing someone who had a "tolerance for ambiguity."

Although it was generally expected that the person would have standing in his sub-group in the profession—that his/her name would be known by other theorists or pianists as the case might be—it was nearly unanimous that this was the least important criterion of judgment. Some commented that if the person were young, they would have to see the potential for professional growth, involvement and recognition; if older, then there should be a clear record of success. Most said they would look at involvement in professional associations and seek evidence of quality and achievement in their previous employment.

Faculty Responses

Faculty were asked if they would want a fine teacher, performer or scholar as the next head of their music unit. Seventeen said "Yes"; fourteen said "No"; the rest were in the "maybe" or "not necessarily" category. Those who said yes generally took the position that the leader is a role model for faculty as well as students and he should be visible doing whatever he does. Those saying "no" generally said that we're hiring him/her to run the department, not to conduct, perform or teach. The institution must come first and the person's career second. All agreed that the person should have "paid his dues" and should at one time have been very good as a teacher, performer, or scholar—else how will he recognize quality in those he must evaluate?

They were also asked whether the person to head the music unit should or should not come from a particular sub-group in music (theory, performance, music education, e.g.). Isolated and disparate responses were heard as follows: "We must have a performer here", "I personally prefer a music educator", "there is no way we could have a person from jazz head our department." Eighty-four percent, however, said "no", it really doesn't matter the sub-group in which the person was educated provided the person has broad interests in and knowledge about music, understands what is involved in the teacher, learning and performing of music, and doesn't show favoritism to any segment of the music unit.

"What does the music executive at your institution do that is most successful?" The six most popular responses were: he listens, he is accessible, he can make decisions, he shows a great understanding of issues, he is honest in his dealings, and he handles money well. Other frequent references were to his ability to articulate needs and his capacity for hard work.

A slightly different question asked faculty members to think in ideal rather than real terms and to indicate what they felt were absolutely essential qualities for a music executive. The number one response here was *vision*—the person should be able to see into and project the future. "We need to know where we're going and how we're going to get there," said several. Next came a requirement for musicianship and the ability to recognize it in others. Then came fairness and leadership. Several mentioned problem-solving ability as essential. One person said, "I know of students who go to the administrator with one problem and come out with two—the second being that the administrator is perceived by the students as not caring. We don't need this."

Academic Officer Responses

Academic Officers were asked if they had feelings about the reason for turnover among Music Executives in higher education. Some described *any* leadership position in higher education today as tough and that turnover in general was seen as a serious problem. "The rewards make it not really worthwhile", said several. "People get in the wrong jobs—ones where they don't fit," said one dean, "and adversary relationships develop which cannot be ameliorated." Another said, "If you make a mistake, there are those who won't and don't forget and they are out to get you from then on." Discouragement with finances and burn-out were also mentioned, in addition to the observation that people see their professional expertise slipping away and they want to return to the faculty before it's too late.

"What is there in the resumé of a person applying for a position in music administration at your institution that causes it to stand out in your eyes?" Many of the answers centered around the personal qualities that could be discerned. Others wanted to see the kinds, levels, and complexities of administrative experience. "What has been his involvement with groups of people?" was a question of one vice president. "Have they performed very well in a previous position of responsibility?" "Is it evident they are a good judge of character?" "Do they know people broadly?" were commonly asked questions. Several spoke of looking for a mentally healthy person, one with a good self-concept and still others of trying to find evidence of a service motive in a person's life. It was admitted that not all of these items could easily be deduced from a resumé, if at all, but more likely would come from follow-up phone calls.

I asked the academic officers what their criteria were for evaluating the success of the music executive at their institution. The five most often heard responses are posed as questions:

1. Does he push me to find resources for the music unit?
2. Is he willing and able to live within the constraints imposed and yet make the unit the *best* it can be?
3. Do grievances get to me very often?
4. Are the wheels running smoothly?
5. Is he able to identify goals and objectives and then accomplish them?

To the question, "What are the incentives and rewards you offer your music executive?" One vice president said with candor, "There aren't any; I don't know why anyone would want to do it". Several felt that salary was an incentive on their campuses and others offered money to support the music executive's own personal development as well as travel money for professional meetings. Still others said they could only offer encouragement, moral support and positive reinforcement.

As mentioned earlier the Schmidt study concluded that there was no such thing as a training program for music administrators. I asked the academic officers that, if there were such a program, would they be supportive of the idea and of their music administrator—or a future one—participating. Eight of fourteen said flatly "Yes." The remainder of the responses ranged from qualified "yes's" to an observation that, "in my problems with heads, a training program wouldn't help," and "if you have to teach administration to someone, it's too late." Several felt that internships, if a person had some real responsibility, could be very useful. Others felt that the inclusion of case studies and problem-solving exercises in a training program would be helpful to new administrators. Several commented about the viability of learning from someone who has been through the ropes—who has had to cope with problems and who has solved them. "It's a great waste," observed one provost, "to have people making mistakes when a workshop experience or short class would have given him or her the answers or at least the techniques that would have led to the answers." It was felt by those who supported the idea of a training program that short, highly focused experiences in the summer were probably best and some feeling that continuing involvement for more than one year would be desirable.

The final question of academic officers was, "How do you assess the comparative difficulty of the music executive's job with the job of comparable academic administrators?" (You need to remember that at some institutions it was a *department* of music being compared to a *department* of English, e.g. while at others it was a School of Music being compared to a School of Business or a School of Arts & Sciences and at others music was being compared to other units in a fine and performing arts configuration.) Ten academic officers responded that music was *more difficult to administer than any other academic unit.* Four said that it was more difficult in some ways but less difficult in other ways. When asked about the reasons for the difficulty of managing the music operation the academic officers responded: it is more complex, there is a great diversity of offerings and activities, there is a public responsibility, energy is spent in recruitment, you're dealing with great egos and fragile personalities, and time commitments outside the normal day are enormous. One dean said, "music just doesn't fit academe—it is not just a series of three-hour courses taught in a lecture fashion to 40 students and evaluated by paper and pencil tests. Music is simply hard to interpret to the academic community."

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The music executives in this study came to their positions of leadership through varied paths. Many commented about a kind of gravitational pull and in most cases they were identified by peers and/or superiors early on as having leadership and management skills as well as proclivities.

They all expressed an enjoyment of people, a sense of realism punctuated by idealism, a satisfaction in seeing goals accomplished and a sense of fulfillment in dealing with challenges and problems.

Styles of operation differed greatly from predominately democratic to predominately autocratic; from a literal open-door policy to more controlled appointments with physical space and a secretary separating the music executive from the public; from low-key informality to a more formal approach in dealing with people.

A common denominator obvious to me was that these music executives held a vision for the future—a sense that their departments and schools could be even better than they now are. Not all faculty members nor academic officers interviewed, I should say, were aware of the vision held by the music executive.

Many agonized about their status as musician/scholar/teacher and expressed frustration at their inability to remain on the cutting edge of their discipline because of the unrelenting demands of their jobs. One lamented that it had been several years since he had learned a new piece of music in his area. Others seemed to accept the facts as they were and realized that, if they were once again to become full-time faculty members, some retraining or at least updating would be necessary. Others, on the other hand, still maintain an active role as teacher, performer, or conductor.

In spite of frustrations with people and money, heavy work loads, and demands from several constituent groups, this sample of music executives was optimistic and goal oriented; expressed a love for their jobs and fulfillment in small as well as large victories; possessed a resilient spirit and a feeling that what they were doing was creative, challenging, and worthwhile.

Faculty members were concerned most of all with the personal. "The successful music executive," I heard repeatedly, "is concerned with me as a person. He is one I can trust, one I can talk to, one who sympathizes with me, one who empathizes with my problems. He is one who helps me when I need it and lets me know where I stand with him. He can be both friend and an adversary but on the day after we have had a disagreement he can speak to me in a friendly manner because the disagreements are professional not personal. He is willing to stick his neck out for us so that we can have more resources or hold a more favored position on this campus. He lets me take the credit when I've done something noteworthy and his sense of self is secure enough that he can remain in the background. He consults widely with me and my colleagues so that we really *do* feel we are a part of the action. He is able to make decisions in a timely way so that the tough ones are not drawn out unduly. I assume that he is a good musician and can evaluate this quality in others but the *key* is his skill in interpersonal realtionships."

Academic officers said, "I want the music executive to head off problems before they become crises. He must have canny perceptions about people and sense their needs. I want to know that he stands for excellence both in everything he produces as well as in what the department displays. I want to know he is respected both on and off campus for what he knows, for what he does and for what he is. The job is a tough one, as are most leadership positions in higher education today, and I am eager to provide whatever support I can so that he can be successful. As a person removed from the music mainstream I need to be reminded of what is going on, what resources are needed and how my role can complement the success formula. While I have to make major decisions involving resources for many disciplines yet I still want to reward the areas where I am convinced that excellence is a way of life."

A good deal of this paper has been about the subject of leadership. The writer Robert Townsend asked, "How do you spot a leader? They come in all ages, shapes, and conditions. One clue: the true leader can be recognized because somehow his people consistently turn in superior performances." Tom Haggai on a radio show aired February 18, 1980 said, "People consider you a leader if you have something they need or can take them where they want to go. They are sponges, listeners, solicitors, and planners. They sense they are servers. The higher they rise the more conscious they are of serving the needs of their employees for these employees have brought the leader to his heights and are the indispensable key to further progress." Warren Bennis, former president of the University of Cincinnati and now on the faculty of the University of Southern California was quoted in the April 25, 1983 issue of *U.S. News and World Report* as saying: "while managers concern themselves with doing things right, leaders focus on doing the right thing. They all have compelling vision, a dream about their work. They are highly conscious at all times of what they want. Leaders share an ability to communicate and align people behind them, and the upshot is that those who work with them feel significant, they feel empowered."

And so I found it to be on my visits to fourteen campuses in the Spring of 1983.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the report just given I offer a proposal that the National Association of Schools of Music as the organization most concerned about and most interested in music executives establish an institute for music administrators which would take one week during each of two summers with follow-up sessions for one day before the annual NASM meeting the following November.

It seems to me the problem is clear. The overall turnover rate of music executives in four-year degree-granting institutions was 62% from 1977–1981. This percentage does not account for the large list (the largest in six years) of new music executives that was published in the fall of 1982 nor the list that came out in the fall of 1983. The Schmidt dissertation reveals that there is no such thing as a training program for music administrators; thus a vacuum exists.

On the assumption that there are things about running a music department that can be taught, that there are people with expertise that can teach them, then I propose that NASM be the force to bring people together in an environment where learning can take place.

Many music executives learn "on the job." If they are bright, have good instincts, and possess success qualities, in time they come out on top, or at least survive. There surely is a better way. I believe that a carefully planned program with a variety of topics leading to problem solving activities could be extremely beneficial.

Instructors could certainly come from administrative posts both in and out of music but I believe they should be from a variety of types and size institutions represented by NASM membership.

Since there are many factors that are common in the operation of academic departments, there may be virtue in combining efforts with other art areas, with the social sciences, or with other segments of academe in order to generate a larger audience for the summer experience. There may be a ready-made instructional setting on some campuses to which we could attach ourselves.

This could be an expensive undertaking so perhaps foundations would need to be approached to help underwrite costs. I found considerable support among the fourteen academic officers with whom I spoke for such a project—support that included offers to pay expenses and fees for the music executive who would participate. But of course the experience would have to be of top quality in order to be worthy of that support. The instructors would have to be instantly credible in order to attract a group of participants and at the same time cause academic officers to want to help finance the experience for their music executive.

I do not forward the proposal of two weeks over two summers with one-day follow-ups the following November because I feel it is optimum. I *do* think it is the most practical kind of expectation for people who are extremely busy, have many responsibilities and have difficulty getting off-campus for extended periods of time. The four meeting times provide intervals for reflection, growth and experimentation with ideas which I believe would be exceedingly helpful. Assignments between sessions could include among other things the writing of case studies for problem solving at the next session.

Given the facts of life in higher education today there may be nothing anyone can do about the turnover rate of music executives. But perhaps we *can* do something that will help new music executives "hit the ground running" as well as help those already in their jobs who want to be refreshed or stimulated by new ideas and new approaches.

APPENDIX A
MUSIC EXECUTIVES INTERVIEWED

Institution	**Music Executive**
Anderson College	Dale Bengtson
Belmont College	Jerry Warren
Eastman School of Music	Robert Freeman
Ithaca College	Joel Stegall
North Texas State University	Marceau Myers
Oberlin College	David Boe
Southern Methodist University	William Hipp
Stetson University	Paul Langston
University of Florida	Budd Udell
University of Illinois	Robert Bays
University of Northern Iowa	Ronald Ross
University of South Carolina	William Moody
University of Tennessee at Chatttanooga	Peter Gerschefski
Wheaton College	Harold Best

APPENDIX B
ACADEMIC OFFICERS INTERVIEWED

Institution	**Academic Officer**
Anderson College	Robert Nicholson
Belmont College	James Stamper
Eastman School of Music	Richard O'Brien
Ithaca College	Lois Smith
North Texas State University	Robert Toulouse
Oberlin College	James Powell
Southern Methodist University	Eugene Bonelli
Stetson University	Denton Coker
University of Florida	Joseph Sabatella
University of Illinois	Jack MacKenzie
University of Northern Iowa	Thomas Thompson
University of South Carolina	Chester Bain
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	John Trimpy
Wheaton College	Ward Kriegbaum

APPENDIX C
FACULTY MEMBERS INTERVIEWED

Institution	Faculty Members
Anderson College	Greta Dominic
	Mark Murray
	Larry Stafford
Belmont College	Linda Ford
	Paul Godwin
	Richard Shadinger
Eastman School of Music	Samuel Adler
	Richard Grunow
	John Maloy
Ithaca College	Steve Brown
	John Covert
	Pamla Gearhart
North Texas State University	Newell Brown
	David Haerle
	George Papich
Oberlin College	Richard Miller
	Daniel Moe
	James Hepokoski
Southern Methodist University	Robert Anderson
	Thomas Tunks
	Herbert Turrentine
Stetson University	Robert Fort
	Charles McKnight
	Paul Phillips
University of Florida	Phyllis Dorman
	John Grigsby
	John White
University of Illinois	Sandy Berry
	David Peters
	Thomas Ward

University of Northern Iowa	Emil Bock Keith Johnson Ronald Johnson Margaret Merrion
University of South Carolina	James Copenhauer Charles Fugo Gordon Goodwin
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga	Danette Littleton James Stroud Peter Temko Donald Zimmer
Wheaton College	Florence Avery Stephen Cushman Ellen Thompson

A PROCESS OF FISCAL DECISIONS

Gary Behm
Eastern Montana College

Among the most difficult tasks facing the music administrator in higher education today is the development, organization and management of an effective fiscal policy. Put simply, it is generally the responsibility of the departmental administrator to develop, propose, generate, and effectively manage a budget that is somehow adequate to the needs and expectations of the department or unit.

The problems inherent in this task are formidable. Underlying rationale and strategies must be developed and articulated to both define and support the proposed budget. Decisions, consistent with stated rationale, must be made concerning the relative levels of support for various programs within the department. Justification must be made to upper level administrators responsible for the allocation process within the larger unit of the total system. Once approved, the budget must be organized into some clear, coherent bookkeeping system, dispersed to appropriate faculty and staff, and monitored on a periodic basis.

This yearly ritual has far-reaching effects on all of us. The problems exist in large and small schools alike; in both public and private institutions. The source and availability of funds may vary, but the problems inherent in the process are similar. The degree that we are able to identify and solve these problems affects not only us, but our entire program and department.

The department of music at Eastern Montana College is presently involved in the development and implementation of a new fiscal policy designed to meet our changing needs, both present and future. To help clarify and define this project four distinct, yet interrelated stages of the fiscal process have been defined.

1. Development and articulation of a rationale
2. Assessment, planning and allocation of implied resource needs
3. Dispersal and management of allocated resources
4. Evaluation process

Implicit in this design are three important factors. First, the rationale is the basic element of the design. Second, the design is a continuous process. None of the elements exist in isolation; the process must flow through the entire design. The third, and possibly most important factor, is that the design is not a closed structure. Since the evaluation process is used to suggest modification and changes that ultimately affect the rationale, the design itself takes on a cyclic structure.

The rationale, then, must be the first priority in the development of an effective fiscal policy. It must be designed to be comprehensive and flexible, and since it will be the primary tool in the development of a justification for fiscal requests, it must be based on educationally sound and accepted principles. The rationale under proposal at Eastern will hopefully fulfill these qualifications. Our rationale, put simply, states that the primary generating forces in the allocation of resources are departmental educational goals and objectives. In other words, resources are allocated primarily on the basis of expected educational outcomes. This rationale attempts to accomplish a fiscal design based on the current educational management system known as *Management by Objectives*, which states that "outputs (results) are the only claim upon the resources of the organization, and outputs (results) are the only justification for approving, modifying or abandoning programs of action."[1]

Once departmental goals and objectives have been identified and defined it is possible to look with clarity at the planning and allocation process. In a very real sense, departmental goals and objectives are the starting point in the fiscal process. Once expected outcomes have been identified, and recorded, it is possible to "work backwards," assessing and assigning needed resources to various programs. If planning and allocation are extensions of our goals and objectives, then they are, in reality, simply the process that identifies resource needs relative to the realization of program and course expectations.

The next phase of the fiscal design, the dispersal and management of resources, is a function of rationale and planning. Accurate record keeping is important to the effectiveness of the entire process. It is important to realize, however, that this phase of the process, while often the most visible, must be simply a means to an end. It is tempting to start at this point, planning resource allocation on the basis of bookkeeping systems. It is not, however, an effective means of accomplishing instructional and educational goals.

The final phase in our fiscal design is the evaluation process. The evaluation is intended to examine and measure effects that given resources have in the accomplishment of stated goals and objectives.

There are at least three questions that must be asked in evaluating the fiscal plan:

1. Given our expectations (goals and objectives), how effective were allocated resources?
2. Given actual, perceived outcomes (results) are available resources and expectations appropriate and realistic?
3. Given available resources, are expectations realistic?

Answers to these questions can suggest changes and modifications in both the planning and allocation of resources and our statement of goals and objectives.

It is this function of the evaluation process that makes the fiscal plan a continuous, cyclic process.

In summary, I would like to say that the fiscal process must be an ongoing operation—involved in every phase of departmental structure. It cannot be viewed as a separate and isolated entity—it must be sensitive and ultimately accountable to the ongoing instructional and educational process in the department. It is, in a real sense, an ultimate reflection of our educational and instructional priorities.

FOOTNOTE

[1] Arthur X. Deegan and Roger J. Fritz, "*Management by Objectives Goes To College*, University of Colorado, Division of Continuing Education, 1975, p. 29.

A PROCESS FOR FISCAL DECISIONS

WILBER ELLIOTT
Boise State University

Funding for higher education in Idaho is presently under scrutiny by many people. The legislature, the taxpayer, the parent, the student are all attempting to find better means of funding the public education system. In our state, the basic concept has always been a "free education for all Idaho residents." With the double digit inflation, the 1% initiative which passed in Idaho in 1979 (California Proposition 13), and the general economic problems in the country, Idaho is now beginning to look at possible changes in both its funding sources and processes. State law does not allow tuition to be charged in Idaho at State Institutions. As a result, special fees have been added by the individual schools to help offset some of the increased costs in non-academic areas.

Tuition is now being considered by the legislature and has become a political football. A formula is also being considered that would call for ⅓ of the cost of education to be paid for by the students with ⅔ of the cost being covered through state support. Estimated per student cost per year for higher education at the undergraduate level in Idaho is $4,506.00.

Proper fiscal decisions must be based on good solid planning. Both organizational (long range) goals and operational goals must be present in order to properly plan budgets. The University at large must have well formulated organizational goals while the smaller units will be involved primarily in developing operational goals. The organizational goals must reflect the organization's behavior; that is, provide direction and reason upon which actions may be based. These organizational goals serve a variety of purposes:

1. provide standards in order to judge success
2. define needs and priorities
3. define the nature of relationship between the University and society
4. serve as a source of legitimacy
5. define the clientele to be served

A mission and mandate document has only recently been revised by the State Board of Education which redefines the organizational goals for the system of higher education in the state and in turn, each University. This document places "primary emphasis" responsibility for certain academic areas at each state institution. (Performing Arts—Boise State University)

At the school or department level the goals are more operative in nature than organizational. Decisions on resources, course curriculum and personnel are often the responsibility of different individuals or are made by committees.

The criteria used to make these decisions often varies with each individual or committee; thus, operational goals may also vary.

Operative goals are often determined by the constraints on ongoing activities of the department. Continuity and stability of these constraints are important in order to provide direction to the organization. Major constraints are:

1. State Government/Board of Education
    a. mandates
    b. directives
2. Faculty
3. Federal Policies
4. Other Universities
5. Local community
6. Alumni, Parents
7. Students
8. Technology

Each unit must identify the internal and external constraints that affect it, then incorporate these in the development of the operating goals. We must then identify the function and means to accomplish these goals. Example:

1. If the function is research, the accessibility of library and other resource materials must be present such as computer data bases.
2. If the function is undergraduate teaching, the professors must be in the classroom.

The development of the organizational goals and the ability to accomplish those goals are a pre-requisite to budgeting.

Higher Education in the State of Idaho is funded by the State through a Board of Education. This board is common to both public schools, K–12, and higher education. Following a lump sum allocation from the legislature for higher education, allocations are made to each institution based on a two level funding formula. This formula is weighted as follows:

	Group I	**Group II**
Lower Division	1.0	1.5
Upper Division	1.6	2.8
Graduate I	2.6	4.5
Graduate II	2.5	5.0
Specials	1.5	not applicable

Concern has been expressed with this formula in the following ways:

1. The formula is inconsistent with institutional planning and budgetary practices. Planning is done on a departmental or discipline basis. Student programs will vary because of differing requirements among schools and disciplines. Utilizing similar disciplines as a basis for funding would also help facilitate accountability.
2. Some academic programs require a higher level of support than the present formula, which utilizes two groupings, will allow. Of necessity, high enrollment classes have had to be used to offset the actual instructional cost. The formula should reflect what "should be".
3. The formula does not reflect the cost difference between undergraduate and graduate programs in some disciplines. Example: The discipline of Education is a medium cost undergraduate program while it is usually considered a low cost graduate program.
4. A major concern is that the formula reflects historical funding needs and not present institutional responsibilities or enrollments.

A four level funding formula has been proposed, low to high, I to IV. Music and the arts are considered to be in the Level III (medium-high) funding category. Area IV are Health related programs. The proposed formula was based on a study made of ratios utilized in seven different states across the country. The following are formulas proposed for consideration:

COST WEIGHTING FACTORS IF BASED ON DISCIPLINES

	Group I	**Group II**	**Group III**	**Group IV**
Lower Division	1.0	1.3	1.6	3.2
Upper Division	1.5	1.9	2.5	3.2
Graduate	3.8	3.1	6.2	5.0

Cost Weighting Based on Majors (FTE)

Lower Divison	1.0	1.25	1.34	1.57
Upper Division	1.32	1.82	2.10	2.54
Graduate I	1.84	2.47	4.01	2.44
Graduate II	—	3.42	4.59	—

Upon receipt of the fund allocation from the State Board, a further division is made to the various Colleges within the University. Budget allocations for each school or department are determined by the Dean based upon (1) number of baccalaurate degrees awarded, (2) Student FTE generation, (3) FTE faculty and (4) the areas contribution to the core curriculum of the University.

Departmental budgets are divided into three categories:

1. Salaries—faculty and staff
    a. full-time
    b. part-time (monies allocated to the department for hiring of part-time faculty to cover classes or private teaching overloads on specialty instruments).
2. Operating Expenses (See page 7 for breakdown).
3. Capital Equipment

When determining budgets, a "rule of thumb" states, salaries should be no more than 75–80% of a departmental budget (BSU Music-salaries 90%).

Salaries are recommended by the Dean after consultation and input from the department chairmen. The legislature develops a framework for salaries by determining percentage adjustment average for all State Employees. Each University is then allocated a lump sum of monies for use in salary adjustments. From these funds, Promotions and Advanced Degree salary adjustment monies are taken off the top. The remaining monies are then allocated to the Dean for distribution throughout the College according to the formula or recommendations determined previously.

When preparing the overall budget for the department or school, we must determine the *fixed* costs and *variable* costs and then allow for an inflation factor. Two methods of budgeting are commonly used—*PPB* (Planning, Programming, Budgeting) and *Zero Based* (identify function and project costs based on various levels of service). Zero Based budgeting demands accountability. When preparing a budget, the figures used must relate to the operative goals previously determined.

When planning a budget, income resources must be carefully considered. Outside income must be built into the request from the institution. Possible income sources are:

1. Endowment—often dedicated
2. Donations—dedicated or general
3. Grants—dedicated or special projects
4. Student Fees—usually dedicated
5. Fund Drives—dedicated or special projects
6. General Funds—usually allocated from the University for general institutional use.

Certain large projects or equipment purchases should be considered as separate items so they can be detached from the basic request.

In the preparation of the budget at the department level a line item format is utilized with the following steps for each area or activity being used:

1. Evaluate each activity or area to be considered for resources. A description of their current operations along with the long range plan for each is needed with objectives for the coming year and a review of the overall effectiveness of the program.
2. Obtain a record of the expenses for the past two years, anticipated capital outlay needs and present year expenditure estimates.
3. Consider any planned changes envisioned for that area in the coming year—expansion, reduction, elimination, etc. Explain and justify the recommended changes and prioritize them.
4. Recommend amounts for each activity or area.
5. Prepare alternate plans based on 5%, 10% reduction in allocations requested.

Following the completion of the budget request it should then be submitted to the Dean for his recommendation to the central administration of the institution and then final submission to and approval by the State Board of Education.

The 1983–84 budget for the music department is broken down as follows:

Monies Available			100%
Salaries		80%	
Capital Outlay		5%	
Faculty Travel		2%	
Operating Expenses		13%	
Fixed cost-Telecommunications	8%		
Office expenses	13%		
Instructional	25%		
Recruiting/Advertising	19%		
Special Events	13%		
Maintenance/Repair	13%		
Miscellaneous	13%		

Of course, if any of the above percentages vary a great deal, adjustments must be made in other areas. For example, if salaries are 90% of the total monies available, your capital outlay, faculty travel and operating expenses will be radically altered to a mere 10%.

When requisitioning monies from the allocated budget, our system encumbers all funds prior to moving to the purchase order stage. In this way no accounts can be overexpended.

It might be of interest to look at the data comparing the costs/credit hour within some of the departments of the College of Arts and Sciences. These data were determined by taking the credit hours generated and dividing them into the total departmental budget.

Fall 1983	Music	$164.67
	Physics	$122.79
	Art	$120.87
	Math	$ 98.31
	Social Work	$303.23

The cost/credit hour in music for the past six years has been:

Fall 1978	Music	$164.21
Fall 1979	Music	$161.51
Fall 1980	Music	$131.18
Fall 1981	Music	$186.34
Fall 1982	Music	$177.72
Fall 1983	Music	$164.67

As enrollment fluctuates from year to year, the averages fluctuate because the allocated budget is based on the estimated enrollment, not the actual enrollment.

A PROCESS FOR FISCAL DECISIONS

RICHARD V. EVANS
Whitworth College

People may say nice things about what we do but budgets tell us what they really think. Regardless of what is said at commencement or in glowing testimonial dinners, budgets tell what an institution's priorities really are. How then are fiscal decisions made? Budgets of the past, the present and projections into the future should be taken into consideration in order to understand the budget process. From an analysis of past budgets the following questions result:

1. Which programs get the most money and best facilities?
2. Who is subsidizing whom?
3. Which units have the highest and lowest student-faculty ratios?
4. Which units are hiring the most and cutting back the most?
5. What innovations are being introduced and with what resources?
6. What is happening to the library?

These are but a few questions to be asked in order to get a picture of an institutional philosophy.

In preparing a budget for a department and for careful future planning Tucker lists the following questions which an administrator should ask.

1. What is the probable retirement date of each faculty and staff member?
2. When will any faculty members be eligible for tenure evaluation: For an "up or out" review?
3. Which faculty members will become eligible for sabbaticals in the next five years and who will apply for them?
4. Which faculty members are likely to leave voluntarily within the next few years?
5. Given current enrollment trends and forecasts for jobs for graduates, what is the probability for change in the number of student credit hours generated over the next several years?
6. If program changes are planned for the next few years, are these likely to cause increases or decreases in enrollments?
7. When is the next department self-study due? When is the next professional reaccreditation scheduled?
8. Is the number of students who graduate likely to change? Will the department initiate new degree programs at existing levels? At different levels?
9. Will competition with other institutions prove detrimental? If so, when?

There are many budget philosophies. But the two most prevalent are:

1. Budgeting to support a program
2. Budgeting to support a unit of FTEs

A private school tends to enjoy the advantage of program budgeting. While private schools must have a critical mass of students, they are not entirely bound to the FTE. This is particularly true if there is a long range plan. Richman and Farmer describe this type of budgeting as "cost-benefit" budgeting. What benefits, prestige, favorable outside reaction, developmental aspects, even financial advantages can be gotten as benefits from such a system. Visibility for budget reasons alone can hurt the overall philosophy of a department, however. One can be trapped into expedient actions without regard for the overall departmental philosophy.

The process for fiscal decisions is facilitated when those making budget decisions have a comprehensive view of the total department program, explain themselves for the short-term, and articulate the goals of the long-range plan. Everyone should participate in budget planning and the wise administrator will involve everyone, yet be in a position to settle disputes when they arise.

SUMMARY

Fiscal decisions are processed best when there is a common knowledge of the past and an awareness as to where the department needs to be in the future. A comprehensive view of institutional priorities can be obtained by asking key questions and planning for the future. Cost-benefit budgeting is best used when budget planning is made according to program needs. Budgeting is a creative process. It reveals in a very tangible way the true goals and objectives of an organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Richman, Barry M. and Richard N. Farmer. *Leadership Goals and Power in Higher Education*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Tucker, Allan. *Chairing the Academic Department: Leadership among Peers*. American Council on Education, 1981.

THE PRECOLLEGIATE TRAINING OF NASM STUDENTS

ROBERT FREEMAN
Eastman School of Music

Because NASM has always focussed primarily on the training of musicians at the collegiate level, it seems perfectly natural, from one point of view at least, to explore briefly the kind of preliminary training desirable for those students whom we hope to see matriculate at NASM schools. Indeed, there exist three important studies of which I am aware—two during the last fifteen years from the University of Michigan and one from half a century ago from the Eastman School of Music—which explore the comparative validity of varying predictors for success among students enrolling at Eastman and at Ann Arbor.[1] All three studies come to similar conclusions. They indicate that if one compares such measures as performing ability, cognitive intelligence, aural memory, and motivation, the capacity for aural memory appears repeatedly as most important in predicting a student's chance for completing the curriculum and taking his or her degree. Given the amount of time and money we all spend in determining a student's performing ability and scholastic aptitude, abilities with whose development the primary and secondary schools are also especially concerned, this conclusion, it seems to me, should bring us up short. If aural memory is so important in the development of musicians, why is so little done about it?

To avoid misunderstanding, it would be wise, I think, to begin with a definition of aural memory. With those words it is my intention to indicate the abilities to write down what one hears and to hear, without recourse to performance, what is written down. These abilities are, I believe, absolutely fundamental for anyone who would be involved in music. How is one to compose if he cannot hear in his imagination what is being written down? How is one to perform, except in the most mechanical fashion, if one cannot remember how the piece is to sound? How can any scholar possibly comprehend the materials he studies in a library if he has trouble imagining what they will sound like? How can a conductor presume to give guidance to those performing under his direction if he is unable to compare what is written in the score with the sounds that greet him at the first rehearsal? How, in fact, can a member of the audience be expected to perceive anything approaching the integrity of a piece of music if he is unable to discern when a phrase is repeated, when a melodic line continues in another instrument, or when a climax is prepared? Our continuing neglect of the centrality of aural memory to music seems to me like the situation of Alice in Wonderland—a state of affairs comparable, I believe, to the development of painters, sculptors, architects, musuemgoers, and interior design specialists in a hypothetical population 99% of whose members could be certified as legally blind.

In view of the foregoing, I believe that young children, certainly from the time they enroll in primary school, should be introduced to studies that assist the development of their aural memory. Jeanne Bamberger of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Kenneth Wendrich of Bowling Green State University* are among those who have published studies suggesting how this might be done. In Bamberger's view and my own, the development of aural memory is closely related to the development of cognitive intelligence, necessitating as it does the need for imagining through reflection both the simultaneous sounding of two or more tones and the unfolding in time of two or more musical lines. Ken Wendrich would persuade us that any infant between the ages of six months and three years who is not actually deaf can be taught to match pitches. According to the results of Ken's research, still in progress, young children whose imaginations have not been systematically stimulated, aurally, by the age of four, begin to lose that sensitivity. If that is so, it seems likely that important progress for the musical receptivity of the population as a whole could be made were we to begin early, and persistently, on the development of the aural memory capacities of our youth. I recognize that to accomplish that we would need a generation of teachers themselves not yet trained.

Lest you imagine that my concern with aural memory has become monomaniac, let me indicate what I take to be other disiderata in the preparation of collegiate music students. Too much attention is presently given, I think, to the ability to play individual pieces. It is not that I am eager to see individual pieces played sloppily or matters of basic technique neglected, but rather that I believe young people should be exposed to as broad a repertory as possible. Young pianists should not focus for two years at a time on a single Beethoven sonata but should be familiar with several at least. They should focus not on a single Chopin etude and a polonaise, as is too often the case, but on several categories of Chopin's piano music. Students should not be prepared with repertories that focus exclusively on the 18th and 19th centuries. Because we are, after all, but sixteen years from the onset from the 21st century, I believe it is high time that precollegiate students be exposed early to studies of 20th-century music. It is very useful if precollegiate students are given some opportunity, under critical guidance, to compose, first brief works in the styles of earlier composers, later perhaps, if proper instruction is available, in original styles. Students should be exposed wherever possible to the performance of works for instruments and ensembles other than those in which they normally concentrate. They should learn to perform not only as soloists but in ensembles. And they should learn to perform music at sight, even if they are keyboard players and singers!

---

*Editor's note: Professor Freeman is speaking generically about the works of Professors Bamberger and Wendrich. For complete information about their works, contact Jeanne Bamberger, Department of Music, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139 and Kenneth Wendrich, School of Music, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH 43403.

It will be objected by some, I suppose, that it is impractical to provide skills of the kind just outlined for many young musicians. Partly, instructors are not available to teach those skills. Partly, it is difficult to predict, when a young person is ten or twelve, what the chances are of his actually becoming a professional musician. Let me submit in this context that a great many students matriculate at NASM schools who are woefully deficient in what is here outlined, and who spend as a result an important aspect of their undergraduate years working hard to learn materials which could much more easily have been mastered a decade earlier. Nor is there any harm, I think, if those future attorneys, physicians, and engineers who will form tomorrow's audience, performing music only avocationally, to master before college skills of the kind at issue here. Such skills are, after all, vital to informed listening, and thus to musical advocacy which will be badly needed if NEA and the State Arts Councils are to fulfill the role in the years ahead that professional musical institutions will need in a period of continuing inflation. Skills of the kind here at issue are in any case, it seems to me, much more valuable to our musical society as a whole than is the ability to perform from memory, after a fashion, two or three pieces—or to take part in the victory of an all-state ensemble. Relevant, too, in this connection is the fact that the focussed attention necessary for musical practice and performance is not often sought after by young children. If parents find it important that those who have still not entered junior high school spend regular and often unwelcome hours of musical practice, why not see to it that the long-term outcome of those hours is a more positive one, both for the students themselves and for music generally?

What is here proposed seems, I know, a revolutionary pedagogy. I do not believe it to be so. Bach, Beethoven, Schumann, Brahms, and Leonard Bernstein would all have been admissible as performers, I think, to most NASM schools. But with those skills each of them would have brought others, more important in my judgment for their own futures and for music. I believe that we should refocus our attention in the precollegiate years on the development of those skills. To do so would, in the end, make possible more rapid and sustained musical progress, and on a broader front, after those students had begun their work in college.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Stanton, Hazel Martha, *Prognosis of Musical Achievement: a Study of the Predictive Value of Tests . . . in Eastman School of Music Students*. (Rochester, NY: Studies in Psychology, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester, Vol. I, No. 4, 1929).

Stone, Michael Horace, *A Study of the Relationships Between Selected Variables and the Differential Academic Achievement of Freshmen in The University of Michigan School of Music,* University of Michigan Ph.D dissertation 1969 (University Microfilms 6918116).

Dudd, John Edward, *The Prediction of Success as Defined by Graduation Grade Point Averages, Graduation, and Music as an Occupation of Freshmen Enrolled in the University of Michigan School of Music in September, 1962: A Longitudinal Study in Admissions,* University of Michigan Ph.D. dissertation, 1978 (University Microfilm 7822889).

THE PRECOLLEGIATE TRAINING OF MUSICIANS

KALMAN NOVAK
Music Center of the North Shore

I represent a rare breed: the Music Center of the North Shore is one of only 12 schools that have been accredited by the Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Schools of NASM (In another arena, on the other hand, we are not quite so rare: there are now exactly 100 of us who belong to the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts.)

Perhaps the term, "community music school," needs defining—but I'm not sure that it's really possible since it embraces such a broad gamut, ranging from a few studios borrowed from a church parish house, serving 100 or so students, to a multi-branched operation with 3,090 or so students, from a $50,000 budget to one of $1.5 million. Let me quote from the membership directory of the National Guild:

> "[Community music schools are] non-profit, non-degree-granting schools, offering high quality instruction in music, dance, drama [and/or] the visual arts. [They] include conservatories, preparatory departments, divisional schools, social service centers and community schools, many of which trace their roots to the settlement house movement of the early 1900's. These schools are now a potent force in non-degree arts education, serving an estimated 80,000 students in regular and in contractual programs.
>
> "In response to the demands for their services, a majority of these schools have expanded into satellite operations, extension programs and projects in cooperation with public schools, museums and other cultural organizations. They provide fully qualified, professional faculties committed to artistic and educational excellence and offer their students a comprehensive curriculum designed to meet the needs of people of widely differing ages, ability and economic background.
>
> "The primary purpose of these schools is to provide low-cost instruction to all who seek it, whether for personal enrichment or for the development of a special talent."

As Dr. Freeman has pointed out, community music schools are not entirely isolated, functionally speaking, from their degree-granting brethren. Certainly, many of the better prepared freshmen entering into professional training at the collegiate level have come from community music schools where they have benefited not only from superior instrumental training but also from courses in musicianship (which I define as the ability to hear what one sees and to write down what one hears), theory, chamber music and/or sight-reading.

This fact was highlighted, incidentally, by the outcome of the Arts Recognition Talent Search conducted last year by the National Foundation for Advancement in the Arts. Four of the finalists in music, chosen from well over a thousand applicants, were designated as Presidential Scholars; three of these four were students at community music schools. Two of the three were students at community music schools which are members of NASM (Music Center of the North Shore and Community School for the Performing Arts), and the third was a student in the preparatory division of an NASM school (the Conservatory and Schools of the Arts in St. Louis). All three of these schools are also members of the National Guild of Community Schools of the Arts.

Dr. Freeman has reminded us that the colleges and conservatories of music are not the place where superior musicians are created. Indeed, every director or dean of admissions scours the countryside for accomplished young people who, after four or more years of additional enrichment and concentrated experience, may be able to make his own significant contribution in the areas of performance and teaching at the highest levels.

Now, up to this point, I have made little mention of an uncounted number of schools which are not members of either the National Guild or NASM. These are the extension, community or preparatory divisions of degree-granting schools of music. The reason they are uncounted is that there is, as yet, no organization designed for their membership. Eleven of these divisions are now members of the N.G.C.S.A. Certainly, many more would be welcomed and, in fact, would benefit from the active sharing of information and from the various Guild programs that would be available to them, but the National Guild requirement for community orientation and adequate scholarship funds for families in need would preclude membership for many.

There was, just once, a coming together of these schools at a conference convened in Rochester, N.Y. by Vincent Lenti, Director of the Community Education Division of the Eastman School of Music. What was astonishing about this conference was the high level of attendance: representatives of 83 schools, including a goodly number of independent community music schools, coming literally from coast-to-coast, enjoyed a stimulating three-day exchange of ideas and sharing of problems. The conference proved, to me and to many others, that there needs to be an ongoing vehicle for communication between these centers of community-oriented providers of high-level musical instruction.

It does seem to me that NASM is overlooking a significant responsibility towards the community divisions of its member schools by not making provision for these divisions to become accredited along with their parent institutions. Admittedly, a degree-granting member is not likely to be too enthusiastic about having to pay a second membership fee for its community division, but a special procedure, which I will outline in a moment, might be devised to ameliorate that obstacle. It does seem to me ironic that non-degree-granting schools are submitted to extensive and intensive scrutiny before accreditation but that the community component of degree-granting schools is ignored, since it is only their *degree* programs that are examined. This means that no examination of the quality of the community offerings is made and that there need be no minimum standards, as far as NASM is concerned.

I would propose a simple remedy for this anomaly: First of all, a collegiate member could submit its community program (whether called "Preparatory," "Extension" or "Community") for listing in the NASM directory; this would require, perhaps, an extra member of the evaluation team to visit the campus prior to institutional admission or at the time of regular review. Secondly, a nominal surcharge could be added to the parent institution's annual membership fee—$50.00 regardless of size or category?—in order to avoid a special financial burden. I would hope that initiating this procedure might soon result in a significant increase in the number of non-degree-granting members; I feel a little lonely when I attend a "meeting by type and size of institution"—the number that are around to attend could quite easily hold their meeting in a booth at the nearest bar! Please note that at one such meeting at last year's conference the attendees formally voted to recommend consideration of just this kind of an accrediting procedure.

I would hope, too, that through this procedure NASM members might be encouraged to take their extension programs more seriously. I am afraid that in many cases they are simply a vehicle for providing for extra income for faculty members, particularly of instruments like the oboe, the bassoon or the harp, the students of which are usually in short supply. Sometimes they are seen as a place to find practice students for practice teachers in connection with a pedagogy program. And sometimes they are a means for making greater use of facilities and thus providing some extra income for the department. Instead, they should be viewed as an excellent vehicle for improving the general level of pre-college instruction, to the benefit of collegiate programs everywhere.

What a pre-collegiate program can *not* be expected to do for its parent institution is to feed students into the degree program. A successful high school senior usually needs to change both his teacher and his place of residence when he graduates. If he is at an advanced level he probably needs a new challenge, no matter how eminent or capable his teacher has been, and he certainly needs the opportunity for personal growth which getting away from home provides. Therefore the value of a preparatory division to its parent school can not be measured selfishly in terms of the students it feeds into the degree program. Clearly, however, the general increase in numbers and quality of preparatory programs will provide *all* collegiate programs with a larger pool of better qualified candidates for admission.

At its meeting in Philadelphia last week, the National Guild admitted twenty new members, thereby achieving a 25% growth. I think this reflects a growing awareness of the need for community-based *organized* musical instruction. I hope that NASM members might become participants in this movement. The result can only be a great boost in the standards of instruction everywhere, a concomitant boost in the quality of students coming into professional training and, finally, an improvement in the quality of musicians going back into the communities to teach, to play in ensembles, in orchestras and as recitalists, and to keep live music alive.

MINUTES OF THE PLENARY SESSIONS

FIRST GENERAL SESSION
SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1983
1:00 P.M.

The opening session of the 59th annual meeting was called to order by President Thomas Miller who called on Robert Bays to lead the Association in the traditional singing of the National Anthem and the Hymn of Thanksgiving.

President Miller welcomed and recognized the officers or staff representatives of colleague organizations who were attending the meetings: Edwin London, representing the American Society of University Composers, Donald Thulean for the American Symphony Orchestra League, Arthur Tollefson and Robby Gunstream for the College Music Society, Paul Lehman and John Mahlmann for the Music Educators National Conference, Frank McGinnis and Mariann Clinton for the Music Teachers National Association, Gene Wenner for the National Foundation for Advancement in the Arts, and David DiChiera and Martin Kagan for Opera America. Also introduced were the officers of the Association and others seated on the podium.

The keynote address to the Association was delivered by Richard Millard, President of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. These remarks are printed elsewhere in the *Proceedings*.

President Miller next welcomed as a group the music executives who were new to the Association as of this meeting. Members of the Association responded with applause.

Mr. Miller reported action taken by the Board of Directors granting honorary membership to Robert Briggs, former Secretary, and Lawrence Hart, former Chairman of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies. The membership again responded with applause.

Robert Werner, Chairman of the Commission on Graduate Studies, was called on to present the reports of the four Commissions. Actions taken by the Commissions are printed elsewhere in the *Proceedings*. A motion introduced by Mr. Werner to adopt the reports was seconded by Frederick Miller and passed with no audible dissent.

President Miller identified new member institutions and extended a welcome to the representatives of these schools who were participating in an annual meeting for the first time.

Mr. Benward was recognized to present the annual report of the Treasurer. He introduced a motion for acceptance which was seconded by Robert Blocker and passed by the Association with no audible dissent.

Mr. Hope was recognized to introduce staff members of the National Office who were in attendance: Willa Shaffer, Karen Moynahan, and Michael Yaffe. He also expressed appreciation to the various organizations hosting receptions for the membership.

Legislation proposing various changes to the Handbook was placed before the membership with the announcement that the changes carried the endorsement of the Board of Directors. A motion to approve was introduced by John Suess, seconded by Robert Griffith and passed with no audible dissent. President Miller recognized and extended thanks to James Hause who was responsible for local arrangements for the meeting.

Morrette Rider was recognized to inform the membership of and encourage participation in the meetings of the ISME which will be hosted by the University of Oregon in July, 1984.

Harold Luce was recognized to present the report of the Nominating Committee. Nominees to office and to membership on the commissions were introduced. It was also announced that the Board of Directors had selected James Miller as Chairman of the 1984 Nominating Committee with Charles Boyer and Louis Ball as members. The complete list of individuals on the Nominating Committee can be found elsewhere in the *Proceedings*. The membership was reminded of the procedure for adding nominees to the ballot through the write-in procedure.

President Miller urged the membership to participate in the hearings on a revised code of ethics and also the hearings on graduate education. Mr. Hope announced that due to mail delays, the deadline for submission of institutional annual reports on the new HEADS forms had been extended to December 19th.

The General Session was recessed at 2:12 p.m.

SECOND GENERAL SESSION
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1983
11:30 A.M.

Mr. Miller declared the session open and delivered the annual report of the President, which is printed elsewhere in the "Proceedings".

Joe B. Buttram was recognized to give the report of the Ethics Committee. Mr. Buttram outlined progress to date on a revised code of ethics. He reported that the committeee had met to consider a charge brought by one member institution against another alleging a violation of the code. It was the determination of the committee that the institution be cited for non-compliance. Mr. Buttram moved acceptance of the report which was seconded by Frank Little and passed with no audible dissent.

Mr. Hope was recognized to present the annual report of the Executive Director. Mr. Hope amplified on sections of his written report previously distributed to the membership and printed elsewhere in the *Proceedings*. He invited the membership to write with comments on the annual meeting.

Mr. Miller recognized persons who were completing terms of office: James Miller as member of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies, Theodore Jennings as member of the Community/Junior College Commission, Joe B. Buttram as Chairman of the Committee on Ethics, Jess Casey as Region 7 Chairman, Jerry Warren as Region 8 Chairman, and Paul Mansur as Region 9 Chairman. The membership responded with hearty applause.

Mr. Luce, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, introduced again the candidates for election to offices and commissions. The election was then conducted by written ballot.

The second General Session was recessed at 12:10 p.m.

THIRD GENERAL SESSION
NOVEMBER 22, 1983
11:30 A.M.

The session was called to order by President Miller who recognized each of the Regional Chairmen. The reports of the Regional Chairmen to the Association are printed elsewhere in the *Proceedings*.

The President announced the results of the election:

Treasurer: Frederick Miller
Chairman, Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Institutions:
    Helen Tuntland Jackson
Community/Junior College Commission: Robert Blocker
Commission on Undergraduate Studies: Marceau Myers, Morette Rider,
    David Tomatz
Commission on Graduate Studies: Donald McGlothlin, William Moody
Committee on Ethics: Donald Bullock
Committee on Nominations: Robert Cowden, Georgia Ryder

The concluding session of the 59th annual meeting was adjourned at 11:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
David Boe, Secretary

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

THOMAS MILLER

I wish to thank you for the honor and confidence you have bestowed upon me by electing me your President for the next three years. I hope that I shall be able to provide the leadership necessary for this Association as we plan for the future. I will try to be responsive to the concerns of the membership and will give of my time and energies to the extent it is possible to do so.

Today I would like to speak about some of the challenges of the future.

First is the challenge to specialized accreditation. We in America have a unique form of accreditation—voluntary accreditation. In other Western nations accreditation is a function of a State or Federal bureaucracy. In this country all accreditation is voluntary, even the recognition of agencies by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation is through voluntary application and review. Yet, there are constant challenges to this historically proven system. For example, COPA President Dick Millard referred yesterday to the report entitled *Control of the Campus*[1] which takes a broad brush stroke in attacking all specialized accreditation.

Even though there will always be generic criticism of accreditation, NASM's positive achievements through accreditation are clear. NASM has and will continue to be dedicated to the preservation of quality education in music in higher education. At the same time NASM is dedicated to maintaining and protecting the diversity of education in music available in postsecondary institutions. This association embraces non-degree granting schools, junior colleges, free standing conservatories, independent schools of music, as well as college and university departments and schools. This diversity must be protected.

The very nature of voluntary accreditation is a unique process, the first step of which is an institutional study requiring a thoughtful local assessment of resources as they relate to the mission of the institution. The second step is peer review in which trained evaluators conduct an on-site visit and review programs, facilities, and other resources. Finally, there is a review by the Commissions, members of which are elected by this membership. No other system of accreditation relies so heavily upon peer review.

NASM's dedication to this process and to the voluntary system of accredtation has led us in recent years to assist in the development of the National Association of Schools of Theatre and the National Association of Schools of Dance. Historically, we have worked with the National Association of Schools of Art and Design. In this way each discipline can maintain its own identity but be part of an umbrella of arts accreditation in higher education. As your President

I am dedicated personally and professionally to the preservation of our system of voluntary accreditation and peer review.

Second is the challenge to professional education at the Baccalaureate level. This is an interesting challenge because the two pressures being exerted are 180 degrees apart. The first of these is the renewed emphasis on more general studies and fewer professional studies at the baccalaureate level. Ernest Boyer, Chairman of the Carnegie Commission recently denounced narrow careerism and vocationalism in higher education at the expense of more general educational studies and approaches, which seems to lump all baccalaureate education together, making no distinction between "professional" and "liberal arts" approaches. The other end of the pole is the pressure exerted by state boards of education and teachers unions for more professional education courses for teachers. The problem is more complex because in many areas highly unionized teacher forces have gained control of boards of higher education; thus, the problem is compounded both on and off campus with regard to required curricula for teacher certification of our music education graduates.

NASM was a pioneer in developing standards to provide a broad liberal education for professional artists. Our *Handbook* reflects this concern even to the present. In addition, we have maintained that it is important to preserve for students the choice between a professional baccalaureate education or a liberal arts education. Thus, the Association recognizes two diverse degree programs each with its own meaning: the Bachelor of Music as the professional degree and the Bachelor of Arts in Music as the liberal arts degree. Furthermore, we have insisted that education at the baccalaureate level in music is not merely training, but development of those skills for a fruitful, well-rounded life. We believe that for qualified students professional education in music at the baccalaureate level is just as viable as any major in any liberal arts curriculum.

In responding to these challenges, NASM has occupied a position of national leadership in the accreditation community. We have provided a forum for the discussion of these concerns and issues along with the preservation and advancement of standards. NASM is well respected as the professional leader for music in higher education. The good work of Bob Glidden, former chairman of the COPA Board, and Sam Hope, as former Chairman of COPA's Assembly of Specialized Accrediting Agencies, has served the Association well in gaining this recognition.

The third challenge is the challenge to educate students beyond our music majors. We have done an exceptional job in providing professional education in music. Our colleges, conservatories, universities, and schools are now thought of as a major training ground for professional musicians, both instrumentalists and singers. No longer are we required to defer to our European counterparts.

However, without an educated group of listeners and amateurs our high achievements could go for naught.

Thus, over the years NASM has concerned itself with development of music in general education. A revised Standards and Guidelines statement on the subject grew out of the 1978 Broadmoor meetings on music in general education. That statement now is in Appendix A of the *Handbook*. Additionally, several years ago we began planning with the College Music Society for a joint conference on music in general studies. This conference has just been completed here at Dearborn prior to the beginning of these meetings. Along with CMS we have realized the critical need for educated audiences and skilled amateurs in our society. While in its largest dimensions music in general studies lies outside the realm of our accreditation function for professional music programs, we have been and continue to be, a strong force in bringing about positive developments in this vital area.

The next challenge is to create bridges to the professional performance community. If NASM is to gain recognition for our accomplishments with the professional performance community we must establish a relationship with that community on an equal basis. In this line our cooperation with Chamber Music America resulted in the Chamber Music report which you all received last year. In addition, at these meetings our Opera/Musical Theatre project is reaching its culmination. This project represents a new level of cooperation with Opera America and other national opera organizations. It will result not only in a report similar to the Chamber Music Report but also in the development of accreditation standards and guidelines for education in opera and musical theatre at our institutions.

At these meetings we are also holding some feasibility hearings to determine the direction for a project on the training of symphony orchestra members and conductors. This is being done in full partnership with the American Symphony Orchestra League. We hope it will result in an important report to the profession as well as to the membership of this association.

NASM, NASAD, NAST, NASD, and the International Council of Fine Arts Deans have recently cooperated in a number of policy development areas. The first of these is the Higher Education Arts Data Service. We expect the data from the HEADS project will provide a very strong foundation for policy development. Secondly, this consortium has developed the policy statements which are the subject of hearings at these meetings, "Higher Education in the Arts", and "Arts Education: Beyond Tradition and Advocacy." These are but beginnings in an attempt to follow up the report of the President's Commission on Excellence in Education and the College Entrance Examination Board statement about preparation in the arts for matriculation to college.

Finally in this area, we are cooperating with the leadership of the Music Educators National Conference, the Music Teachers National Association and the College Music Society to develop an agenda of common concerns on education in music in the United States. We look forward to the results of our discussions in this regard.

In closing let me emphasize that next year is the 60th anniversary meeting of the Association. Appropriately enough it will be held in our nation's capital. I hope that you will take pride in the maturity and leadership position of our Association and exhibit that pride at the 60th Anniversary Meeting in Washington, D.C. next November.

Let me thank you again for the opportunity to serve the Association. I hope that I will be able to serve it well. Thank you.

FOOTNOTE

[1] Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Control of the Campus*, Washington, D.C., 1982.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SAMUEL HOPE

Since the 1982 Annual Meeting in Seattle, NASM has continued its traditional activities centered in accreditation and assistance to member institutions. The Association has also moved in new directions to increase its services to members and its effectiveness in national discussions concerned with education and culture.

NASM ACCREDITATION: STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES

The new format for self-study instituted in November of 1982 has improved the accreditation process for institutions, on-site visitors, and the Commissions. The format gives greater emphasis to institutional evaluation of strengths/weaknesses and to projections about programs to be accredited.

The Association remains committed to providing all possible assistance to institutions involved in self-study. Extensive workshops have been held on this subject in Dallas, Seattle, and here in Dearborn. Additional efforts focused on assessment are planned for future meetings.

NASM has continued to revise, clarify, and develop its standards statements. This year has been no exception with activity centered on standards for degrees in opera and musical theatre and Master's degrees in music therapy. We are in the early stages of projects on undergraduate degrees in pedagogy and an expansion of standards for doctoral degrees in music. Discussions about these topics are scheduled for this Annual Meeting.

Management of the accreditation process is the primary function of the National Office. We are pleased with the increasing sophistication and efficiency of our processing system for accreditation materials. Most institutions are planning accreditation activities more than a year in advance, thus providing a situation conducive to the best accreditation service.

NATIONAL ACCREDITATION ISSUES

During the past year, the accreditation and higher education communities have continued to discuss ongoing issues and concerns. The reorganization of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation has improved the opportunity for dialogue and common resolution of issues.

A study produced by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching entitled "Control of the Campus" was extremely critical of specialized accreditation. However, after initial press coverage, the report has received little serious attention. A committee advising the U.S. Secretary of Education about the report recommended that it be shelved.

The accreditation community continues to work with such issues as confidentiality versus public accountability, mechanisms for analyzing the effectiveness of accreditation, and the impact of new technologies on accreditation.

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS: ARTS AND ARTS EDUCATION

NASM monitors federal activity in cooperation with other organizations concerned with education in the arts. Federal activity in arts education remains minimal and focused in the provision of arts experiences for the school-age population.

Beginning in November of 1983, the National Council on the Arts—the national advisory body to the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts—will begin discussions concerning K–12 arts education. It remains to be seen whether these discussions will lead to new directions for the Endowment. The political infrastructure supporting experiences rather than disciplinary study is well entrenched in the arts council movement. We will keep the membership informed of developments.

Our major progress this year involved work with the National Conference of State Legislatures. NCSL's Arts Committee accepted and published our recommendations for additions to their proposed items for state action on arts education. These recommendations involved support for specialist arts teachers and sequential curricula at K–12 levels and for professional training programs in institutions of higher education.

HEADS PROJECT

The Higher Education Arts Data Services project has occupied much of our attention during 1982–83. HEADS represents the statistical base of our policy efforts at local and national levels for the remainder of this century.

The music portion of the HEADS project replaces the former NASM Annual Report. In three or four years, longitudinal compilations from the HEADS project will be available for institutions involved in the preparation of self-studies. This should provide increased opportunities for qualitative assessment in the self-study process.

In addition, HEADS will provide all of us with an improved picture of music in higher education and its contribution to the cultural life of our nation.

PROJECTS

NASM continues its involvement in a variety of projects. During 1983, our project on chamber music was published. Our opera/musical theatre project is in its final stages with publication expected early in 1984.

These efforts have opened new avenues of understanding between NASM and professional presenters in chamber music and opera/musical theatre. Of course, neither of these projects would have been possible without the splendid cooperation of the NASM membership.

NASM and the American Symphony Orchestra League have just begun a project on the training of orchestral musicians and conductors. Completion of this study is projected in 1985: it will be the most comprehensive review of the subject ever undertaken and should have positive ramifications for orchestral managements and boards as well as for music training institutions.

NASM is also engaged in a program of public information about issues important to the music community in higher education. Two documents resulting from this initiative have been the subject of Open Hearings at this meeting. In most of these projects, NASM is cooperating with the other arts accrediting agencies and with the International Council of Fine Arts Deans. Our purpose is to provide unified statements for the information of policy-makers unfamiliar with the contributions or points of view of the arts in higher education.

The Association continues its work in a variety of other projects such as revisions to the Code of Ethics, music in general studies, and graduate education in music. During 1984, preparations for the Sixtieth Anniversary Meeting of the Association will involve additional project activity.

NATIONAL OFFICE

The National Office processed some 250 applications for Commission action in various categories, provided support for Association and committee meetings, managed development of the HEADS project, compiled and edited NASM publications, and answered hundreds of telephone and written requests.

Our staff—Michael Yaffe, Karen Moynahan, Willa Shaffer, Marti Korver, and Liz Traylor—deserve special thanks and commendation for their outstanding work on behalf of the Association and its membership. Although it may seem to some that we are only slightly smaller than the Pentagon, the Association's work in all its variety is carried forth with competence, style, and good humor by these people.

Of course, the staff could not be effective without the gracious and continuous cooperation of the NASM membership. The smooth, diplomatic professionalism of the representatives of member institutions maintains a posture for the Association which is widely admired. The traditions of volunteerism so important to accreditation and to cultural development are amply exemplified in the work of the Board, the Commissions, and the Executive Committee, and in the spirits of all those so ready to say yes when called upon for service of any kind.

The NASM National Office welcomes you whenever you are in the Washington, D.C. area. We are located near Dulles International Airport, about 25 miles from downtown Washington. We ask only that you write or telephone before coming.

We also welcome your inquiries and suggestions by letter and telephone. Please never hesitate to advise us of ways the Association may be of assistance.

REPORTS OF THE REGIONAL CHAIRMEN

REGION ONE

Region One met on Monday, November 21, 1983 at 10:00 a.m.

Discussion during the business portion of the meeting centered on (1) revisions to the Code of Ethics and (2) the dues increase. It was noted that the quality and scope of the Washington reports from the Executive Director were "on the mark" and greatly appreciated. Following the brief business meeting, we turned our attention to the central topic of the meeting—"The Music Unit: Dealing With Change Creatively".

The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Louis Clayson
Chairman

REGION TWO

The Region Two business meeting dealt primarily with the election of Wilma Sheridan of Portland State University as Vice Chairman. Ted DeCorso who has occupied that position stepped down from his position of Music Department Chairman at the University of Alaska and resigned his Region Two Vice Chairmanship.

Papers on the subject "The Process of Fiscal Decisions" were presented by:

Richard Evans of Whitworth College
Wilber Elliott of Boise State University
Albert Shaw of Western Washington University

Professor Shaw read a paper prepared by Gary Behm of Eastern Montana State College who is ill and not in attendance.

James Sorensen
Chairman

REGION THREE

Region Three held its annual meeting at 10:00 a.m. on November 21. Two new member institutions were welcomed:

Fort Lewis College—Ralph Downey
University of Nebraska—Omaha—Roger Foltz

During the brief business meeting, a proposal was made by James McCray that Region Three institutions cooperate in sharing visiting artists and in providing opportunities for members from Region Three schools to present exchange performances. Music executives were asked to complete a form which Professor McCray provided indicating their interest in this project.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a program concerning the application of a laser video disc system to the teaching of music theory, music literature, and music appreciation. Larry Peterson, from the University of Delaware, with the assistance of Edward Schwarz made the presentation. After a period of discussion, the meeting was adjourned.

Donald McGlothlin
Chairman

REGION FOUR

Following a brief business meeting, Vice Chairman Milton Schimke chaired a presentation and discussion of the topic "The Pre-College Training of Musicians." Presenters were Robert Freeman, of the Eastman School of Music, and Kalman Novak, from the Music Center of the North Shore. There was a wide-ranging discussion of the topic, and an informal poll of those present revealed a significant interest in the possibility of including consideration of the "preparatory" or "community music" discussions of member institutions in the evaluative process where they exist, and on a voluntary basis.

Frederick Miller
Chairman

REGION FIVE

The Region Five meeting was called to order by Dale Bengtson, Chair. The agenda was distributed.

1. The Chair gave greetings to music executives from Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan. Members from other regions were also welcomed. Members were encouraged to make input on NASM proposed policy papers and topics for the Washington meeting in November, 1984.
2. The Chair opened nominations for the Region Five, Vice-Chairman to fill the unexpired term of Fred Jackisch for one year. Larry Christopherson of Capital University was elected.
3. Our invited guest speaker was Dr. James McCarthy, from Western Michigan University. His topic was "Computer-Assisted Programs in Music".

F. Dale Bengtson
Chairman

REGION SIX

1. The Region Six Meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. on Monday, November 21, by Chairman Joel Stegall.
2. Minutes of the Spring Meeting, held March 12, 1983 at Montclair State College, were read by Secretary Dan Patrylak.
3. The membership was reminded of the 60th Anniversary meeting set for Nov. 1984, and the Spring Regional Meeting to be held at Syracuse University, March 10, 1984.
4. Suggestions for meeting topics were solicited.
5. The program was titled "Dealing with 'Difficult' Faculty." Dr. Ernest Kramer, practicing psycho-therapist and professor of psychology at the University of Detroit, presented findings from a study of music faculty in regard to faculty burnout. Panelists responding were: Robert Blocker, Gerald Lloyd, Suzanne Roy and Donald Mattran.
6. Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Joel R. Stegall
Chairman

REGION SEVEN

Meeting was brought to order at 10:03 a.m. by Jess Casey, Region Seven Chairman. Last meeting's minutes were approved as submitted and circulated. Next year's meeting in Washington (60th Anniversary of NASM) will use "Broadmoor" format. The three topics and Sunday workshops were outlined by Chairman Casey. Additional workshop topics were requested. The Nominating Committee for Region Seven, (John Upchurch, Chairman, Grier Williams and Bob Wolfersteig members) presented the following slate:

Steven Winick, Georgia State University, Chairman.
David Lynch, Meredith College, Vice Chairman/Secretary.

These were elected unanimously.

Robert Blocker then chaired a panel discussion dealing with "Beyond the Music Building: Music in Society."

The following made presentations:

1. William Hipp, Univ. of Miami; "The Music Unit and Linkages with the Community."
2. James Hammann, Central United Methodist Church in Detroit; "Church Music Programs and the Music Unit."
3. Barry Auman, Parks and Recreation Department, Greensboro, N.C.; "Municipal Governments and the Music Unit."

A question/answer/comment period concluded the meeting.

Steven Winick
Secretary

REGION EIGHT

The Region Eight meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. Monday, November 21. The Chairman welcomed regional representatives and guests from other regions and reminded them of opportunities for input into the program content of future annual meetings.

The report of the nominating committee was presented by Joe Buttram, committee chairman. Professor Buttram recognized Russ Schultz and Gene Black as members of the nominating committee. Ballots were distributed and collected.

The program topic, "Alternative Curricula, A Second Look", had been suggested by members of the region in a survey taken earlier in the year. A panel of executives was enlisted from institutions which have been engaged in "Alternative Curricula" for several years. The panel was composed of: Ted Crager, University of Miami; Ron McCreary, University of Southern Mississippi; and Ferris Ohl, Heidelberg College. Chairman Warren served as moderator.

Each panel member made a short statement concerning the status and overall effect of "Alternative Curricula" on the total music program. The remainder of the session was devoted to questions directed to the Panel from the members.

At the conclusion of the program, the results of the election were announced. The new officers are: Wayne Hobbs, Western Kentucky University, Chairman; Roger Reichmuth, Murray State University, Vice-Chairman; and David Williams, Memphis State University, Secretary.

Jerry L. Warren
Chairman

REGION NINE

The members of Region Nine expressed appreciation to Sam Hope and the National Office for excellent service in reporting regularly on happenings in Washington, D.C. which affect our mutual concerns.

Officers elected for the next three years are:

Harold Luce, Texas Tech University, Chairman
Lyle Merriman, Louisiana State University, Vice Chairman

Wendell Evanson, Henderson State University, Secretary

Prof. Edwin London presented a paper dealing with problems and suggested solutions to matters of security and safety for music buildings, equipment and personnel. A lively and profitable discussion ensued.

Harold Luce
Vice-Chairman

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

JOE B. BUTTRAM, *Chairman*

The Ethics Committee at this annual meeting of NASM held two open hearings for the membership for the purpose of considering revisions to the NASM Code of Ethics and certain Related Materials in the Rules of Practice and Procedure. The comments of the membership were dutifully recorded and submitted to the Executive Committee of the Association.

The Ethics Committee met and considered, also, the charge of one member school against another; in this instance, it was the decision of the committee to cite one school for non-compliance with the NASM Code of Ethics.

More routinely, three complaints were received in the National Office since the November, 1982, meeting. In accordance with procedure, these complaints required no action by the Ethics Committee.

Finally, the Ethics Committee elected for Chairman next year, David Swanzy, of Loyola University, New Orleans.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON NON-DEGREE-GRANTING INSTITUTIONS

ROBERT E. BAYS

Chairman Pro Tempore

After positive action by the Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Institutions, the following institution was granted Non-Degree-Granting Institutional Membership:

Moody Bible Institute

Two progress reports were accepted from institutions recently granted Non-Degree-Granting Institutional Membership.

After positive action by the Commission on Non-Degree Granting Institutions, the following institutions were continued in good standing:

Blair School of Music
Dick Grove School of Music
Westchester Conservatory of Music

Final Approval for Listing for new programs was granted one institution.

Action was deferred on an application for Final Approval for Listing by one institution.

REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGE COMMISSION

ARNO DRUCKER, *Chairman*

After positive action by the Community/Junior College Commission, the following institution was continued in good standing:

William Rainey Harper College

Three institutions were granted Plan Approval for new curricula.

Action was deferred on one application for Plan Approval and Final Approval for Listing.

Membership was revoked in the case of one institution.

COMBINED
REPORT OF THE
COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

BRUCE BENWARD, *Chairman Pro Tempore*

AND

REPORT OF THE
COMMISSION ON GRADUATE STUDIES

ROBERT J. WERNER, *Chairman*

A. Associate Membership

After positive action by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Commission on Graduate Studies, as appropriate, the following institutions were granted Associate Membership:

Emory University
Fort Lewis College
Harding University
Longwood College
Saint Mary's University of San Antonio
University of Nebraska, Omaha
University of Wisconsin-Superior

Action was deferred on applications for Associate Membership from four institutions.

One application for Associate Membership was denied.

B. Promotion To Full Membership

After positive action by the Commissions on Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, as appropriate, the following institutions were Promoted to Full Membership:

Clarke College
Columbus College
Curtis Institute of Music
Newberry College
Radford University
University of Arkansas, Little Rock
University of Santa Clara
Whitworth College

William Paterson College of New Jersey

Action was deferred on applications for Promotion to Full Membership from four institutions.

Progress reports were accepted from seven institutions and acknowledged from four institutions recently granted Promotion to Full Membership.

C. Renewal of Full Membership

After positive action by the Commissions on Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, as appropriate, the following institutions were continued in good standing:

Belhaven College
Bluffton College
Brigham Young University
Centenary College of Louisiana
Central Missouri State University
Central Washington University
College of Wooster
Iowa State University
Jacksonville University
James Madison University
Manhattanville College
Midwestern State University
North Dakota State University
Ohio University
Oklahoma City University
Ouchita Baptist University
Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College
San Francisco Conservatory of Music
Seton Hill College
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
Southern College
State University of New York College at Potsdam
Tabor College
Texas Wesleyan College
University of Evansville
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis
University of New Hampshire
University of the Pacific
University of Southern Colorado
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
University of Texas at Austin

West Chester State University

Action was deferred on applications for Renewal of Full Membership from thirty-one institutions.

Progress reports were accepted from nineteen institutions, acknowledged from eight institutions and refused from one institution recently granted Renewal of Full Membership.

D. Probation

Eight institutions were placed on probation.

E. New Curricula

Plan Approval for new curricula was granted in forty-six instances, deferred in thirty-seven others.

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

Applications from two institutions applying for Plan Approval were denied.

Final Approval for Listing was granted in sixteen instances, deferred in two others, denied in one instance.

Plan Approval and Final Approval for Listening were granted in seven instances, deferred in six instances, and denied in one instance.

Officers of the Association for 1984

President: * Thomas Miller, Northwestern University (1985)
Vice-President: * Robert Glidden, Florida State University (1985)
Treasurer: * Frederick Miller, DePaul University (1986)
Secretary: * David Boe, Oberlin College (1984)
Executive Director: * Samuel Hope (ex-officio)
Immediate Past President: * Robert Bays, University of Illinois (1985)

Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Institutions

* Helen T. Jackson, *Chairman*, Hochstein Memorial Music School (1986)
Stephen Jay, Cleveland Institute of Music (1984)
Jon Petersen, Interlochen Center for the Arts (1985)

Community/Junior College Commission

* Arno Drucker, *Chairman*, Essex Community College (1984)
Robert Blocker, Baylor University (1986)
Merton Johnson, Del Mar College (1985)

Commission on Undergraduate Studies

* Charles Schwartz, *Chairman*, East Carolina University (1985)
Harold Best, Wheaton College (1985)
Maureen Carr, The Pennsylvania State University (1984)
William Hipp, University of Miami (1984)
Helen Laird, Temple University (1984)
Paul Langston, Stetson University (1985)
Marceau Myers, North Texas State University (1986)
Morrette Rider, University of Oregon (1986)
David Tomatz, University of Wyoming (1986)

Commission on Graduate Studies

* Robert Werner, *Chairman*, University of Arizona (1984)
Paul Boylan, University of Michigan (1984)
Robert Fink, University of Colorado (1984)
Robert Freeman, Eastman School of Music (1985)
Donald McGlothlin, University of Missouri, Columbia (1986)
William Moody, University of South Carolina (1986)
Robert Thayer, Bowling Green State University (1985)

Public Consultants to the Commissions

Robert Dupuy, Austin, Texas
Sharon Litwin, New Orleans, Louisiana

Regional Chairman

Region 1 * Louis O. Clayson, California State University, Sacramento (1985)
Region 2 * James Sorensen, University of Puget Sound (1985)
Region 3 * Paul R. Swanson, Nebraska Wesleyan University (1985)
Region 4 * Milton Schimke, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire (1984)
Region 5 * Dale Bengtson, Anderson College (Indiana) (1984)
Region 6 * Joel Stegall, Ithaca College (1984)
Region 7 * Steven Winick, Georgia State University (1986)
Region 8 * Wayne C. Hobbs, Western Kentucky University (1986)
Region 9 * Harold Luce, Texas Tech University (1986)

Committees

Committee on Nominations
  James Miller, *Chairman*, University of Northern Colorado (1984)
  Louis O. Ball, Carson-Newman College (1984)
  Charles Boyer, Illinois Wesleyan University (1984)
  Robert Cowden, Indiana State University (1984)
  Georgia Ryder, Norfolk State University (1984)

Committee on Ethics
  David Swanzy, *Chairman*, Loyola University (1984)
  Donald Bullock, Western Michigan University (1986)
  David Meeker, Ohio State University (1985)

National Office

* Samuel Hope, Executive Director
  Michael Yaffe, Assistant Director for Operations
  Karen P. Moynahan, Staff Associate for Accreditation
  Willa Shaffer, Administrative Assistant to the Executive Director
  Martha Korver, Staff Assistant

* Board of Directors