

PROCEEDINGS
The 69th Annual Meeting
1993

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF
SCHOOLS OF
MUSIC

PROCEEDINGS
The 69th Annual Meeting
1993

NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION OF
SCHOOLS OF
MUSIC

Copyright © 1994
ISSN Number 0190-6615

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
11250 ROGER BACON DRIVE, SUITE 21, RESTON, VA 22090

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

CONTENTS

Preface	v
Principal Address	
Higher Education and a Public Agenda: Danger or Opportunity? <i>Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.</i>	1
The Music Unit and Its Students	
Admissions and Orientation <i>Kenneth R. Raessler</i>	7
Artistic, Intellectual and Personal Development <i>Larry Alan Smith</i>	11
“By God, You Better Know Isorhythms!”: A Time for Change <i>David Tomatz</i>	16
Future Curricular Issues	
Music and Its Interrelationships: Introductory Remarks <i>James Sorensen</i>	23
Too Many Musicians—Too Many Notes? <i>Greg A Steinke</i>	26
Music and Its Interrelationships <i>Arthur R. Tollefson</i>	42
Composers and Performers: Expanding the Paradigm <i>Robert Sirota</i>	47
Encouraging Interdisciplinary Thought <i>Peter R. Webster</i>	50
Achieving Integration and Synthesis <i>Lynn Wood Bertrand</i>	56
Achieving Integration and Synthesis <i>Colin Murdoch</i>	68
Performance Studies: Standards and Efficiency	
Performance Studies: Standards and Efficiency <i>Robert Thayer</i>	75
Performance Research Since 1984 <i>Richard Kennell</i>	84
Teacher Education in the Evolving Accountability Context	
Who Is Accountable—We Are <i>Robert J. Werner</i>	97

Repertory Issues of the 1990s

Repertory Issues of the 1990s <i>Mellasenah Morris</i>	101
---	-----

Open Forum for Smaller Music Units

Loads for Administrators and Faculty <i>Eugene Holdsworth</i>	107
--	-----

Loads for Administrators and Faculty at Smaller Institutions <i>Birgitte Moyer</i>	112
---	-----

Future of the Church Music Curriculum

A Survey of NASM Schools Offering a Curriculum in Church Music <i>Louis Ball</i>	119
---	-----

The Future of the Church Music Curricula <i>Sr. Teresita Espinosa</i>	122
--	-----

The Future of Church Music Curricula <i>Kenneth W. Hart</i>	128
--	-----

The Future of the Church Music Curriculum: An Evangelical Viewpoint <i>Edward A. Pierce</i>	132
--	-----

Church Music Curricula: A Pluralist Approach <i>Charles Webb</i>	135
---	-----

Meeting of Region Two

Music Therapy: A Growing Edge of New Music Professions <i>Charlotte Kroeker</i>	137
--	-----

Meeting of Region Five

Confidentiality in Promotion/Tenure Decisions <i>Robert L. Cowden</i>	143
--	-----

Meeting of Region Six

The Impact of Current Educational Reform on Higher Education <i>Natalie L. Ozeas</i>	153
---	-----

The Plenary Sessions

Minutes of the Plenary Sessions <i>Helen Laird</i>	161
---	-----

Report of the President <i>Frederick Miller</i>	166
--	-----

Report of the Executive Director <i>Samuel Hope</i>	172
--	-----

Reports of the Regions.....	177
-----------------------------	-----

Report of the Committee on Ethics	
<i>Ronald Ross</i>	185
Actions of the Accrediting Commissions	187
Addendum: 68th Annual Meeting	
Creating New Cultural Symbols	
<i>Barbara Korner</i>	191
Officers, Commissioners, and Staff of the Association	199

PREFACE

The Sixty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music was held November 20-23, 1993, at the Westin St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco, California. This volume is a partial record of various papers delivered at that meeting, as well as the official record of reports given and business transacted at the three plenary sessions.

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

PRINCIPAL ADDRESS

HIGHER EDUCATION AND A PUBLIC AGENDA: DANGER OR OPPORTUNITY?

AIMS C. MCGUINNESS, JR.
*National Center for Higher Education
Management Systems*

I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you this afternoon. You should be complimented for your openness in having someone with my background and from an organization focused on management address you on topic of public policy. For some reason, I find myself being asked to “create the sound of hoofs” of the impending stampede of governors and legislators who are intent on trampling the academy unless it responds more visibly and forcefully to public demands. Unfortunately, the fear of being trampled often leads to paralysis, whereas what is needed is a sense that it is possible to act—to create new ways to reconnect the academy with the broader society.

Most of my professional life has been in “in-between” roles—in between the public and education. Bridging the gap between political and education leaders is a central mission of the Education Commission of the States, where I worked for the past 18 years. I specialize in governance issues and over the past decade have been involved, at least indirectly, in trying to resolve major disagreements about state higher education structures in at least 20 states.

My concern—and the issue on which I want to focus—is that the means on which we have relied over the past twenty years for bridging the gap between the public and the academy are in serious disarray and that the academy can play a central role in shaping new relationships appropriate for the next century. We need alternatives to the bureaucratic and largely mechanistic conceptions of accountability.

I would like to begin with a quick review of the trends that make fundamental change inevitable. I still find a few who think that the issue is just one of public relations: “If those politicians only knew what good things we are doing, they would give us more money and leave us alone.” But more and more presidents and people within the academy are coming to recognize that American higher education is faced with two stark realities:

- *Escalating demands for service*, particularly toward the kinds of students whom higher education has not served well in the past—minorities, adults, etc. And with the knowledge explosion and need for solutions to intractable issues, the demands for research and community service are also escalating.
- *Declining resources*. Even with economic recovery, it is highly unlikely that higher education will receive anywhere near sufficient resources to meet escalating demands. For some time, we have been receiving a declining share of the pie. In state governments, demands and mandates related to social priorities—health care, criminal justice and public school reform—coupled with widespread resistance to increased taxes, will mean a continuation of the decline in the proportion of state revenues going to higher education. We are reaching the limits to which tuition can be increased because of both its impact on commitments to equity and growing public anger about costs. And other sources—private philanthropy and corporations—are simply not adequate to fill the gap.

Faced with these realities, the academy has had basically four options:

- *To do more with less*. This is the most frequently cited goal but certainly the most difficult to achieve.
- *To do less with less*. In spite of the speeches about reallocation and restructuring, most institutions are following this option, with serious long-term effects on quality and access.
- *To take from others*. In the past few years, we have witnessed the demise of more than one university president or system leader who, in the view of the university community—especially the faculty—failed to squeeze blood out of a stone. With the state reeling from one budget crisis to another, with health and welfare benefits being cut and thousands of state employees being laid off, some university constituents still believed that somehow their needs to level up or maintain their salaries and program support to that of “peer institutions” outweighed all other societal priorities.
- *To generate new sources of income*. The most likely “new source,” especially in the public sector, is students in the form of direct (and sometimes hidden) increases in tuition and fees. Some increases are inevitable, but the danger is that these will take place more by policy drift than policy choice—with little debate about the impact on the state’s commitment to access and equity. And as I indicated earlier, hopes of filling the gaps from private sources are often totally unrealistic.

There are several complicating factors in the background. First, the resistance to change in higher education is formidable. Second, we have a “squirrely” political situation, about which I’ll say more in a minute. Third, the public is confused: it values higher education, thinks it is doing a good job, but it sees a lot of problems with it.

What can the academy do to bridge this public opinion gap? Before we can answer, it is necessary to review some recent history in state policy toward higher education. Right now we seem to be in a dangerous period with respect to state policy. For many within higher education, it may be like being “between dreams.” You’ve just woken up with a start from one nightmare and are afraid to go back to sleep for fear that the next dream may be worse.

The nightmare from which we may now just be emerging began in the 1980s, when, despite significant state funding increases for higher education, governors and state legislators were raising more basic questions than ever about quality and costs. By the end of the decade, virtually every state had enacted a mandate that public colleges and universities assess student learning. At first, the kinds of assessment called for were fairly soft. Contrary to what some had feared, most states rejected proposals that assessment results be reported to the government or the public or that they be linked directly to funding. Instead, states simply required institutions to show that in fact they had assessment programs in place and that they were using the information for improvement. In many respects, the stimulus for assessment shifted from the states to voluntary accreditation.

When the recession hit, beginning in about 1988 for some and later for others, as state after state faced incredible budget cuts, it was also increasingly difficult for state agencies to sustain the staffing necessary for aggressive implementation of the new accountability measures enacted just a few years earlier. In addition, the accelerating turnover in legislatures meant that few of those who were the architects of the so-called “new accountability” measures remained in office. It was not uncommon that a legislature enacted an elaborate accountability program and then by the time the first reports were due, the sponsors had left the scene or shifted to other issues.

So, as we approach the 1994 legislative sessions we face a curious—and potentially dangerous—situation. If anything, the new generation of state legislators and governors are more frustrated with higher education than their predecessors. The disconnect between the academy and the public is wider than at almost any time in nation’s history. The pressure on state legislatures to “do something” is stronger than ever.

But, in contrast to the 1985-1989 period, state officials appear to be less confident about what policies will really result in meaningful change. One hears an increasing number of state officials seriously questioning whether the voluminous reporting requirements resulted either in greater institutional attention to undergraduate education or in greater public accountability. A more ominous sign is that, in difficult economic times, state governments tend to revert to the most archaic, “19th century” management practices of line-item budgeting, centralized personnel and purchase requirements, and other features of micro-management. In spite of all the speeches, we may be “reinventing” government from the past rather than for the coming century!

My message is this: we seem to be in a eery period. We are in-between dreams. Will the next period be a nightmare? What can the academy do to lessen the chances that this will occur?

Over the past three years I led a project funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts that looked at the impact of state policy on improvement in undergraduate education. That project found, among other things, that there is a lot of “good practice” in higher education and, in fact, much more is known about “good practice” in undergraduate education than is implemented. Arthur Chickering and Zelda Gamson, for example, have identified such practices as high expectations for student learning, coherence in learning, synthesizing experiences, integration of education and experience, and active learning. But what is often missed is that these “good practices” are often thwarted by negative institutional cultures. As an illustration, a faculty member may want to use opportunities for student community service to complement classroom experience but will be discouraged from doing so by teaching load, the rigidity of the calendar, and the lack of institutional recognition of this kind of effort in the promotion and tenure process. In fact, university missions most directly connected to societal priorities—general education and service to external constituencies—are unlikely to be fulfilled unless supported by deliberate institutional incentives.

The project showed that approaches used in the past have been wrong in two respects. First, the overly bureaucratic, managerial approaches that we have used to address higher education issues—both at the university as well as in state policy—have *not* been effective in developing the organizational environments or cultures essential to support the academy’s commitment to key societal priorities. The very process of dividing problems into discrete pieces, dividing responsibility for meeting objectives, and then measuring performance on the basis of pieces rather than the whole—all these practices tend to splinter rather than reinforce responsibility for the whole.

Second, the modes of state coordination and governance and related accountability mechanisms that have evolved in the past twenty years are failing to bridge the growing gap between the public and the academy. The disconnect is not simply between the state and institutions. It is also between the public and the state. And it is very much a disconnect between what “experts” and the public feel should be happening. This is certainly a major problem in the nation’s school reform efforts. This is a society-wide issue, far beyond higher education.

And the problem is definitely not confined to the United States. All major industrialized nations are struggling with the conflicting pressures of rising demands and declining resources. The result is extraordinary tensions between government and the academy. In places as diverse as The Netherlands, the U.K., Sweden, Florida, Tennessee and Colorado, governments are experimenting with efforts to link funding for both research and teaching to measures of quality and performance.

The solution, however, is not to revert to some imaginary idyllic relationship that existed in the past when government was content simply to put the money on a stump and never ask another question about accountability. The academy must take the lead in shaping policies that *will* lead to constructive change and greater responsiveness to public priorities.

In conclusion, I’d like to suggest three constructive options:

1. New approaches to accountability can be helpful. What you measure is usually what you get. For each of your institutions, what conditions are essential to support the kinds of scholarship appropriate to your mission? Resources are certainly important, but the reality we all face, as I emphasized at the beginning, is that resources will not be the answer.
2. A debate about the future relationship between higher education and the state must begin with the assumption that both the values and priorities of the academy and those of the broader society are important and must be respected. They are not necessarily the same. Constructive resolution of differences will not occur if many within the academy persist in their view that autonomy is always good and government and public involvement are intrinsically bad. The challenge is for both the academy and the state to share responsibility for developing the means for both perspectives to be addressed and for differences to be resolved.
3. What we need is a “new compact” between government and higher education, framed with at least these elements:

- An informed public discourse about the *ends* that the enterprise should pursue, engaging all the major stakeholders from the general public, policy makers, students, parents and the academy. As Daniel Yankelovich has stressed, we need means for the multiple stakeholders to come to “public judgment” about the basic choices facing the enterprise.
- Clearer definition—in terms that the public will understand—of the conditions necessary to support change, and evidence of how current policies help or hinder those conditions.
- Good, small ideas about state policy. State legislatures *will* act. The issue is whether the actions will lead to long-term, constructive change. Lacking proposals, state officials will develop their own alternatives. In many cases, the need is not necessarily new policy, but more careful implementation of existing policies.
- New thinking about the governance structures and other means traditionally used for handling the communications between the academy and state government, and the academy and the general public. Much as reform in the K-12 system is emphasizing decentralization and much greater involvement of the public at the school-site level, higher education must find new ways to engage the general public more directly in the enterprise. This will require basic changes in the roles of state boards—from regulation and program implementation, to policy leadership and engaging the public in a debate about fundamental policy choices facing the enterprise.

As faculty members, department chairs and deans and presidents in schools and departments of music, you may feel that these issues are not your concerns. Or, you may, as I suggested earlier, be among those who see the dangers but feel powerless to do anything about them. The severity of the problems facing us in the next decade demand that all of us share responsibility for shaping the conditions under which these will be addressed. If higher education “hunkers down,” denies that it must change, is simply defensive when the public raises questions, and tries to withdraw within archaic conceptions of autonomy, the “sound of hoofs” will turn to reality and important values will be trampled. This need not happen. We are at a critical point between dreams. Whether the next phase is a nightmare or a period of renewal in the face of difficult times, will depend on whether the academy is successful in re-establishing relationships of trust and confidence with the public.

THE MUSIC UNIT AND ITS STUDENTS

ADMISSIONS AND ORIENTATION

KENNETH R. RAESSLER

Texas Christian University

Ah admissions! This word can bring about many thoughts and concerns regarding the respective music unit, its future, its present and its past. When we think of the past, we quickly realize that the admission process is directly responsible for many of the historical highs and lows in the music school. The present is the reality—this is where we are—and where we are now is directly related to the recruiting and admissions process which occurred in the past. The future, however, is the critical area because it is the only one over which we have any control. The recruiting and eventual admission of music students is truly our future, and this will eventually become our present and then our past. In case you may be inclined at this point to accuse me of double talk, let me assure you that this brief introduction is designed not to confuse you, but simply to emphasize the importance of the admissions process to the future success or failure of the music unit.

It is quite easy to generalize a great deal because of the many variables the music unit might be presented with by the admissions office in each university. Due to these variables and the great diversity of the music schools in NASM, I must confess to coming up with more questions than answers. Thus I have prepared a handout which lists the questions to be addressed, and these questions may be used for future reference during the discussion period following the two presentations.

I think that initially, the music unit must ascertain and establish precisely what kind of music school it is, or wishes to be, and then recruit accordingly. It is quite important to both the prospective student and the music unit to recruit appropriate students in an honest way and with integrity. Music units usually break into the following generic types (with many variations):

1. Liberal Arts—pre-professional
2. Liberal Arts with a professional emphasis, meaning that a bachelor's degree could be considered the terminal degree either in performance or in music education

3. Conservatory—Professional with a performance emphasis
4. Teacher training emphasis, where music education is the greatest thrust in the music unit.

One must then think about the admissions department of the university:

1. Is there good communication between admissions and the music unit?
2. Does the admissions department understand the type of a music unit housed in the university?
3. Is there a dual admission process—one where different standards are applied to students entering the music unit than to those entering the university-at-large?
4. Is the university a state or private school? Many times a totally different admissions philosophy exists between these two types of schools.
5. Is there an open admissions policy where a large dropout or failure rate is anticipated, or is it a closed admissions policy where the university supports the notion of dual responsibility of retention, embracing the student and the school?
6. Does the admissions department consult with the music unit during the admissions process? What is the level of communication? Is it a left-brained admissions department recruiting right-brained students? Obviously this could create an academic mess. On one hand this might be considered discriminatory but on the other, the student must be able to compete academically with his counterparts in other departments of the university.
7. Does the music unit have its own admissions department or is admissions generically apportioned throughout the university?
8. Is a music audition required? Is it acknowledged or considered by the admissions department? It may amaze some present here to know that there are schools that do not require or acknowledge the music audition as a part of the admissions process. Students merely elect music as a major much as they might elect history, language, or mathematics.

9. Does the university charge the admissions department with the responsibility of providing diversity throughout the student body? These diversities might include, among others:
 - a. Ethnic diversity
 - b. Cultural diversity
 - c. Geographic diversity
 - d. Religious diversity
 - e. Artistic diversity

10. What is the charge of the university to the admissions department with regard to music admissions versus a self-designed generic philosophy of admissions? Questions which must be addressed include:
 - a. Should all potential students be treated as one and the same?
 - b. Should artistically talented students receive special consideration?
 - c. How important are SAT test scores?
 - d. How important is rank in class?
 - e. How important is the academic GPA?
 - f. Is the proposed idea of the seven intelligences of Howard Gardner of Harvard University an admissions possibility of the future? They are:
 - (1) Verbal
 - (2) Mathematics
 - (3) Music
 - (4) Kinesthetic
 - (5) Spatial
 - (6) Interpersonal relationships
 - (7) Intrapersonal relationships

Finally, as a lead into the orientation process, where hopefully you will be provided with more suggestions rather than the many questions I have presented, there are a few issues which I believe have implications for both admissions and orientation. They are:

1. Realities of the job potential. Parents often speak to me of their concerns with regard to making a living after graduation from the university with a music major. How might we as a profession deal with this?
2. Should music education be thought of as an alternative, in case you do not make it in performance? Is music education still the ultimate insurance policy it once was?
3. If the student is undecided with regard to the major, should they be encouraged to begin as a music major and then drop out if that is really not the major for them—or should they enter a pre-major program with the knowl-

edge that if they eventually choose a music major, it will probably take a longer period of time to graduate?

4. What about the statements one hears batted about that music is a very desirable pre-med elective from the point of view of the medical schools? Is this actual or perceived?

In closing, I would be remiss if I did not encourage every music executive to be proactive in communicating with your admissions department so that a satisfactory and mutually beneficial music admissions philosophy may be established. Both entities must be educated on the needs and guidelines under which the other must work. I would also suggest that you make friends with the admissions office, offer to go on general admissions recruiting trips, and invite an admissions counselor to accompany you or members of your department on a recruiting trip. Finally, I recommend that you request that the admissions department appoint a certain person or persons who deal mainly with music admissions decisions so that this person may act as liaison between the two areas, understand the uniqueness of a music major and be able to speak knowledgeably about the music major and the music program on your campus, to prospective students, to the music department and to the admissions office.

ARTISTIC, INTELLECTUAL AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

LARRY ALAN SMITH
The Hartt School

The other day, I sat down and made a list of various issues facing high school and college-age music students at this point, late in the twentieth century. It was quite a long list, and it left me feeling that most of us and our institutions have a long way to go to meet the changing needs of our students. Social structures and values have now moved to entirely new levels of complexity. There are very real issues which affect virtually every aspect of a young musician's life. Many of these have existed for years, but the increased emphasis on individual rights and greater tolerance for diversity have intensified many of these topics—making them more prominent in the daily lives of all students.

Initially, I had planned to separate my list into the three categories upon which this session was built: things social, intellectual and artistic. However, the way in which these issues overlap makes such separations seem arbitrary.

Some examples: date rape, racial divisiveness, sexual orientation, diversity, AIDS, violence, not fitting in, financial worries, feeling lonely and being lonely, abortion, peer pressures, drug and alcohol abuse, mental illness, theft and vandalism—all of these are elements of American life in the nineties.

More come to mind: feeling like one can't measure up to some elusive standard, low self-esteem, poor grades, the pressure to do well, learning disabilities, fatigue, poor eating and sleeping habits, roommate difficulties, not being able to make connections between learned facts and practical life skills, stress, anxiety, sexual harassment, the pressures of competing, inferiority complexes, physical injuries, and fears that parents might be disappointed if stardom is not achieved.

Finally, there are the doubts one has about even being able to make a career in music.

Somehow, playing Beethoven's opus 111 starts sounding easy compared to making it through a 24-hour period.

How do they do it all? How did we do it all?

Most people in education would acknowledge that music students tend to be among the brightest and most committed students in a high school or on a college campus. In my mind, the discipline our profession requires is what makes a music student stand out.

The stereotype would indicate that a music student has his or her act together. We can work them as much as possible. They know no limits. Eighteen hours a day—no problem. Dish it out—they can take it.

And it's true—many can take it. They have to if they want to have a shot at making a career.

Regardless, I believe we have an obligation to deal with our students as individuals. We must look at the whole person—their talents, their strengths, their problems and their emotional vulnerabilities.

The question is—are we dealing with them in this holistic way?

Most institutions have established divisions of student affairs or student services. In a centralized manner, large and small establishments have created places where the students can go for everything from housing troubles to counseling services. The only problem is that this usually leads to situations where the music unit is excluded from the non-musical side of a student's life. This is dead wrong. Our students deserve more. They deserve our attention.

Are we prepared to make the commitment to do more? Are we willing to train faculty and staff members to be better listeners? Are we willing to change attitudes about the role of teachers? Are we willing to change the way learning and teaching are currently structured? Do we know our legal obligations as educational executives? Are we willing to be role models for those we lead?

The hardest part will be changing those who feel that teaching is some lofty calling disconnected from students and grounded in outdated traditions. How are we going to make some progress for our students?

At the moment, I take a very grim view of higher education. There are too many of us to begin with. Too many of our programs are the same. We are busy preparing thousands of people who will do little or nothing with their music. Of course, we always cover ourselves by saying that we must create audiences. The bad news is that one can create audiences in a variety of ways which don't involve being a music major and paying a tuition bill of fifteen to twenty thousand dollars a year.

It's as if we have an industry to protect—jobs to salvage. All we do, we do in the name of preserving our culture. Mostly, I think institutions and those who work in them are much busier preserving themselves.

Many university administrations are forced to view students as profit centers because of the economic realities of our time. Faculty feel underpaid and overworked. Staff members often resent the perceived low volume of work done by the faculty. Parents are paying thousands of dollars, and they rightfully expect the highest quality and best results that money can buy. Our communities are being pressured to give their support—especially their money. In the midst of all this, our students are trying to keep their heads above water as artists and human beings in training. I'd say education is in fine shape, wouldn't you?

What changes could we make to improve what we do for the development of our students? First of all, I would recommend that we re-examine faculty workloads. We should be able to find ways for faculty members to spend more time with their students. Perhaps it means spending less time overwhelmed with committee work and grading papers. Perhaps it means greater reliance on technology for many components of the music curricula. Perhaps it means breaking with the tradition of 12-hour loads. The very best teachers know that quality teaching usually requires vast amounts of time.

I would also hope that we might soon move away from awarding tenure in our institutions—especially with the lifting of the mandatory retirement age approaching. There are simply too many hidden dangers associated with guaranteeing lifetime employment—too many variables. Why should our teachers have a different expectation than those who work in the corporate world? I realize that this kind of talk frightens people. On the other hand, think of cases you know where students have come repeatedly complaining about a tenured faculty member who simply is not capable of getting the job done. Is this what our students are paying for? Is this the quality education most of our brochures boast about?

Responsibility shifts are needed. The general well-being of a music student must be tracked within the music unit. Those in student affairs must acknowledge the strong connections which music students feel with their music faculty. This should be nurtured rather than ignored. Taking this stance will require a strong commitment from everyone in the music unit. Attitude shifts will be central to making stronger connections between a student's musical and non-musical lives.

Institutions will have to become student-centered in action and not just words. If successful, music units will have regained some of the special qualities which disappeared when the apprentice system gave way to schools, colleges and conservatories.

In order to deal with a student's artistic and career development, there must be a greater emphasis on relevant skills—particularly those which give the student ways of earning a living. Pedagogical training would be a good place to start. Most

of our graduates will teach private students. Most of our private teachers are teaching without any training. Given the steady growth of the community music school movement and the reductions in public school music programs, it seems rather important for our students to attain some concrete pedagogical skills.

Another area for consideration is finding a way to teach the 96% of the population which doesn't have a clue that we exist or that what we love is of value. Connected to this is preparing our students to live and work in a world which is becoming extraordinarily diverse. To me, this doesn't necessarily mean playing diverse musics. Instead, it means knowing how to make what we love to play, sing or write somehow connect with people who are different from ourselves. This is a challenging issue to tackle.

It also wouldn't hurt to provide an on-going assortment of seminars on topics like dealing with performance injuries, knowing the business side of music, coping with stress and anxiety and seeing the wide range of music career options explored. Involving members of the faculty and staff in these discussions would do wonders as one works to change the paradigm of what it means to train young musicians.

Finally, what is the prognosis for change in our profession?

Economic pressures appear to be continuing, and that doesn't bode well for us. Deep-rooted adjustments in thinking are needed most during periods of change, but change can often be painful.

Social pressures will surely get worse for individuals and for society as a whole. The gangs which seem to be on the increase could well lead to sustained pockets of urban warfare. Racial divisions appear to be worsening, and the gap between the wealthy and the poor continues to widen.

The academic world should not be permitted to escape further significant changes. The casualties might be numerous. Large numbers of departments, schools and universities may be forced out of business if a fundamental redesign of our overall education system does not occur.

In a strange way, the music profession may be a place of hope. Using technology and communication, I believe it will be possible to expand the audience for all types of music. In large part, it will depend on the desire of the artist to communicate to a broader public in person and through aural and visual media. Let's not forget that the recording industry alone is a 25-billion-dollar-a-year industry.

And what about our students? Where do they fit in?

More than ever, their ability to succeed rests with us. Are we prepared to help them through their personal and artistic formative years? They need to know that their music unit really cares about their general welfare. It can't be simply that they play an instrument the music unit needs. It's not just a high SAT score or grade point average. Our actions must not be based on our need for them to pay the unit's bills.

They want and deserve personal attention. Increased contact with faculty and staff outside of prescribed class times quickly would become a very positive institutional trait. Reaching out and being concerned about their non-musical life, combined with innovative, practical and forward-looking curricular initiatives, would do wonders.

As I look back over my brief eight years as a music executive, I can recall numerous occasions when my intervention or the intervention of others from my music units made a difference. The problems have been varied, including many of the problems I outlined when I began this presentation. Assisting students with their personal problems has sapped enormous amounts of time and energy. There have been moments of heart-breaking sadness. There also have been moments of great joy.

If we really care about our students' social, intellectual and artistic development, we will, as music executives, accept the personal risks associated with working for institutional change. If we really care about our students' social, intellectual and artistic development, we will constantly examine what we are doing, how we are doing it and what impact it has on our students. If we really care about our students' social, intellectual and artistic development, we will focus on our students and not on the preservation of an industry which, more often than not, is out of touch with the world in which it exists.

“BY GOD, YOU BETTER KNOW ISORHYTHMS!”: A TIME FOR CHANGE

DAVID TOMATZ
University of Houston

Today we have been asked to think about and discuss what we teach the students in our charge to develop them, artistically and intellectually, as human beings (if we follow the 19th-century humanistic tradition) and as professional musicians and music educators. It is a time for us to consider our successes and a time to scrutinize the real world of music and what part we play in it. I strongly believe this is precisely the kind of discussion needed to begin a long, slow, and necessary process of reshaping philosophies, curricula, and practices which, I believe, should be more responsive to a diverse and pluralistic outlook on music. Make no mistake, the battleground for our future survival is a deeply philosophical one which asks some basic questions about what music is, and about our leadership role in the future.

The intent of this session is to stimulate discussion, so I want you to know up front that I think we have become intellectually far too narrowly focused on certain kinds of concert music designed for sedentary experience—people just sit and listen. It's as if we have given an official stamp of censorship to alternative kinds of music which, in truth, fill the marketplace. Somehow the rigidity of our thinking, which is reflected by our curricula, makes us more akin to keepers of the holy grail of European concert music rather than to true scholars and intellectuals who examine and interpret all music. This quote from a speech by Edith Borroff, “Coming to Grips With Who We Are,” defines our current status:

Most of us have been so indoctrinated in a superiority of European music and an inferiority of our own that the use of American music in our courses comprises the introduction of exotica, the hoisting of parenthetical examples upon a general view of music which finds them alien and unwelcome. We are handicapped not only by lack of knowledge but by a frame of reference which would keep us from using it even if we had it.

Before we get into what we are now teaching students, and what we should consider teaching students, I thought it may be useful to dwell on several important concepts about the nature of music.

The *American College Dictionary* tells us that music is “an art of sound in time which expresses ideas and emotions in significant forms through the elements of rhythm, melody, harmony, and color.” We know that music is an extraordinarily important language for non-verbal communication. Through it we share thoughts and feelings with others. Music is a form of entertainment. Music is a humanistic endeavor in which individual creativity represents some of man's high-

est achievements. It is, in and of itself, a thing of substance and value, quite apart from societal and intellectual implications. It can also be noted that music acts as a window through which we can peer to better understand peoples and remote cultures that have developed during this planet's history.

The work of Howard Gardner at Harvard has revealed that music represents an intelligence distinct and separate from the verbal and quantitative. Studies of brain function now taking place in Houston, in fact, support that position. Preliminary reports from these studies reveal that the mechanism that responds to music occupies a part of the brain not utilized for any other function. If further studies do, indeed, prove this, it is a startling revelation.

It is important to note that music is pervasive in every society. Where man has been, music has been made. There are no known cultures which do not have music. Findings in earliest cave dwellings and every anthropological study of a people indicate that music and music-making are part of human communication. Music is a way for us to express our joys and sorrows, to comment on our condition, to celebrate, to grieve, to worship, and to be creatively playful. How could anyone begin to understand the most ancient culture of the Australian aborigines without a basic understanding of their "songlines"? Are there any people we can truly understand without a knowledge of their music and its relevance in their daily lives? Can we say the same about ourselves and our own music?

When we comment on music in America today, it is a pleasure to report that it is alive and well. Music is all-pervasive, a part of our vernacular; it is one of the most powerful means of communication we have. And, throughout the world, American music has become the prevailing influence. Through our domination of the media—movies, television, recordings, MTV productions—in theater, churches, bands and schools, American music leaves its mark. It dominates a marketplace in which America has an extraordinary monopoly. Our musical styles, forms and idioms are imported by every other country in the world. They are copied and mimicked, ultimately becoming incorporated into each country's culture. Although politicians and statesmen may say that the concept of democracy is America's greatest contribution to the world today, a compelling argument could be made that America's music is, in fact, the most influential export.

In ruminating on American music, I ask you to consider the rich fabric of this art, a fabric containing such diverse elements as classical symphonic music, operas, chamber music, many varieties of church music, jazz and blues, rock, gospel, folk, movie music, TV music, Broadway music, country music, plain old Tin Pan Alley, and every conceivable combination of these styles. These all constitute the world of music, the products found in the marketplace, if you will, of music in America.

This session today is entitled "The Music Unit and Its Students: Artistic, Intellectual, and Personal Development." I have taken this to mean, "How are we responding to the realities of the musical world today?" From my perspective, it appears that there is a gigantic chasm, a huge dichotomy between music in America and music as taught in American colleges and universities. If music is communication, I think we are guilty of talking to ourselves. Let's look at the record, but first, let's look at our successes.

Through American colleges and universities we have achieved truly remarkable successes in the area of classical performance, both in developing more impressive technique and cultivating greater musicality in our young artists. In relatively few generations, American performers have come to have international ranking. The number and quality of instrumentalists and vocalists who are in demand on international concert stages are remarkable testimony to the success of our programs. One only need attend a single national competition, or an audition for a professional symphony orchestra, in order to recognize the extraordinary technical prowess of the products of our colleges and universities. A corollary success story for American music schools is the laboratory experience we give to our students in ensemble performance—in symphony orchestras, choruses, operas, bands and wind ensembles, various brass, woodwind and percussion choirs, and large jazz bands.

Our music education programs have produced successful teachers who have developed strong music curricula in the public schools, that is, in the public schools that are willing to spend the money to develop this unique intelligence in our children. Parenthetically, if music is a separate and distinct intelligence, comparable to the verbal and quantitative, how can we possibly deny this musical education to our children? For the most part, however, music education is performance oriented and often lacks a substantial intellectual perspective.

We continue to be tremendously successful in teaching the music theory and music history of our European forebears. The wonderful harmonic and contrapuntal principles of J.S. Bach, his predecessors and his successors into the 19th and early 20th centuries, continue to dominate the intellectual base of our curricula. Indeed, the scholarship revealing historical and theoretical minutia that is found in our most prestigious journals is breathtaking. Its irrelevance to music of today as found in the marketplace is equally astonishing.

To continue with the earlier question of the nature of music and our role in defining the study of music, I asked myself the question, "What is important to us in studying music?" I tried to think of a single source which could reveal our predilections and prejudices. It occurred to me that when we test entering graduate students in our music history and theory examinations, we reveal a great deal

about ourselves and what we think is important. We are saying that if you have received appropriate instruction for the past four years, and are prepared to move forward academically, this is the body of information you must have assimilated. Passing these tests is the mark of accomplishment for our students and for the success of our programs.

Because I have had the privilege of participating in a number of NASM accreditation visits, my bookshelf of self-studies is quite large. From some of the largest and most important American universities, representing, incidentally, three coasts and the middle, I gathered together a sampling of eight sets of entering graduate examinations. I won't tell which schools are represented, not in this litigious society, but I do believe that they are representative of a cross-country mind-set which continues to promulgate our Eurocentric concepts of classical music.

I can tell you now, there are some pieces of information which occur time and again, so they must be important, and others which never occur, so they must be unimportant. Crab canon, tone rows, trope, cantus firmus, organum (strict, free and melismatic), church modes, motets, madrigals, the Guidonian Hand, *idée fixe*, *verismo* opera, Florestan and Eusebius, and *Sprechstimme* are all vital, and, by God, you better know isorhythms. Important composers range from Leonin, Perotin, Dufay, Ockeghem, Gesualdo (he is really big, incidentally) to Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, and on to Schoenberg, Webern, Penderecki, Babbitt, and Cage. Analysis and theory problems almost always include a figured bass to be realized, a slightly chromatic melody to be harmonized, and analysis problems, always of classical composers ranging from the Renaissance through the other major historical periods, ending with some few contemporary scores, usually Webern or other serialists.

When we consider the fact that we count performance as a major area of study and achievement, it is startling to report that there was not a single question on or identification of a historically important performer or conductor. The vital relationship of the performer to the composer seems irrelevant. Information concerning authentic performance practice, which has currency in our classical concert halls and churches, is not found in any of these tests.

Mannheim, Paris, Florence and Vienna are meaningful to us, but apparently nothing musically important has happened in New York, New Orleans, Chicago, Nashville, Los Angeles, or Hollywood. Song writers abound on these qualifying examinations, and who would deny Schubert, Wolf, Brahms and Schumann their place in history? But there is no mention of Irving Berlin, Cole Porter, George Gershwin or Stephen Sondheim. Music theater, or opera, is also integral to these examinations, with composers such as Peri, Monteverdi, Rossini, Puccini, Verdi, Wagner, Berg and Schoenberg. But there is not a single Broadway musical or its

composer mentioned, and as for Hollywood's Henry Mancini, Miklos Rozsa, Jerry Goldsmith, John Williams, Dimitri Tiomkin, Elmer Bernstein, or the great genius Max Steiner, it's as if they never existed and no one ever heard their music. The history of the minstrel show is similarly unimportant in our lexicon.

You may be interested to know that there was not a single question about a jazz style, a jazz composer, or jazz performer. The same can be said of band music, rock music, country music, gospel and folk music, or any vernacular music. When it comes to musical analysis on the theory part of the examinations, you might think there would be one analysis problem from these eight schools dealing with innovations found in jazz, rock, swing, blues, or even *Star Wars*—you know, just for fun—but there wasn't.

This brings us full circle to our topic today, which I truly hope we can discuss at length. What are we teaching and what should we be teaching about music for the intellectual good of our students? For argument's sake, let's agree that we have excellent programs which are based on traditional Eurocentric values and that we have achieved remarkable success in caring for and promulgating these treasures. (To quote the venerable Edith Borroff, "We are doing an excellent job of training 19th-century German musicians.")

Two years ago, at this very convention in another session dealing with new art music, I suggested a market approach to new music. My argument was that if a piece is good it would ultimately be successful with performers and audiences, and people would come back to hear the work and the composer again. A composer's success would not be noted by his getting another grant, an academic promotion or a good review by a like-minded critic, but by the good old-fashioned way of commercial success. A friend and high officer in this association got up and asked if I was suggesting "pandering." I want you to know I am actually surprised to be invited back here today because I truly believe the issue is the same.

Over the years our schools of music have become museums which illuminate certain kinds of music and denigrate and/or deny the very existence of the entire marketplace of new ideas in music. Viewed in the perspective of a fast-moving, vital and lively musical world, where composers and performers are often one, or work closely together as in earlier periods, our schools have become anachronisms. Put another way, if our music schools ceased to exist tomorrow, would anyone notice?

Somehow we are in need of a jolt, a shot in the arm. Let me ask you to consider another interesting fact. We know that many professional symphony orchestras have failed financially and others are struggling. The same is true of our professional opera companies. Recital and chamber music series that are not underwrit-

ten by a college or university are diminishing or vanishing. On the other hand, there is a tremendous appetite and market for country music, rock and roll, Hollywood and Broadway scores, popular songs, various kinds of church music, and all the other vernacular musical idioms. The interesting fact is that all this commercially successful music is dependent on a constant flow of new music. Extraordinary creative energy and force are found in this marketplace. The symphony, opera and chamber music, on the other hand, are not dependent on new music, and, more often than not, achieve their only success by its avoidance. Parenthetically, these same classical companies often have their greatest success when they perform contemporary vernacular works on their “pops” series, which always seem to sell out.

As we look forward to the future in our various music curricula, are we intellectually honest when we continue to act as if there is only one kind of music, that being the art music which we produce? Who asked us to be the keepers of musical taste? What gives us the right to emphasize Milton Babbitt’s or John Cage’s historical and musical contributions rather than John Williams’ or Duke Ellington’s? The former communicate with a minute academic group, while the latter have actually spoken eloquently to millions, a level of communication which continues as with other great art. Are we so bound up in doing things the same old way, perhaps caught in an NASM bureaucratic vise, that we simply perpetuate our own existence and stultify the art we purport to revere? Are we cheating our students from understanding their real American musical heritage which is rich and varied? What can we do?

We can start by simply acknowledging the existence of all music as valid in the context for which it was written. We should want to know the intent of the composer. Let’s accept the fact that not all music is written for people just to sit and listen. When we know the intent of the composer, we should want to understand the technique or skills in putting it together. This is the analytical process. And finally, we should judge the integrity of the work, or ask, “How do the intent and technique work together?” At this point we can make our value judgement, and answer the question of esthetics predicated on the composer’s intent and his or her success in meeting that goal. If we can accept these few principles, then it would be a simple matter to broaden the scope of our theoretical studies and our historical and contemporary scholarly activity, and to liberate our students from the confines of our narrow-mindedness.

Today’s continuing chasm between the vernacular world and the art world must be bridged—and I believe it is now up to us to take a leadership role in making this change, to encourage our composers and scholars to rethink and retool in order to meet this challenge. We must find a way to maintain excellence without being almost totally Eurocentric in our approach. We must introduce more diverse

performance expectations from and opportunities for our students and to evaluate them appropriately. We must truly integrate all kinds of music into our theory and history sequences. Finally, we must integrate technology, which is a reality of modern musical life, into every aspect of our education process so that it is not simply an appendage but central to our thought processes. We must do all of this for the sake of our students, who are, after all, going out into the real world of music.

FUTURE CURRICULAR ISSUES

MUSIC AND ITS INTERRELATIONSHIPS: INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

JAMES SORENSEN
University of Puget Sound

The focus of this session dealing with curricular issues is on music and its interrelationships. Before hearing more specific comments on the issue, my colleagues and I have agreed that I should provide a general background on the thinking which we bring to the topic. A banner headline in a recent issue of the New York Times asked the question, "Too Many Musicians?" The ensuing article discussed the changes being made in curriculum at Juilliard in light of, among other things, dwindling jobs for graduates. Today, for many complex reasons, there are fewer opportunities for gainful full-time work in music than there are musicians who wish to be in the field. The potential for a full-time career as a soloist, or member of a symphony orchestra, or singer, or jazz musician, or studio musician, or church musician is simply not good for many. The same is true of a full-time career as a composer or university professor. Although a career as a K-12 music educator is more open, at least in parts of the nation, the setting is not as attractive to large numbers of undergraduates as it once was. The result of these circumstances is that many music graduates are either underemployed or working outside their primary field while awaiting a music career. Not only does this situation provide the potential for a level of frustration for music graduates, it also has the potential of depriving the society of an important cadre of leaders immersed in and loyal to the art. These facts provide significant challenges in the preparation of undergraduate music students.

If not to prepare people exclusively as full-time music practitioners, what then is the focus of the music curriculum, especially at the undergraduate level? Many, if not most, high-echelon business and government leaders as well as people in the professions have taken their undergraduate work in the liberal arts. The underlying motivation for doing so is to achieve an enabling background which develops the ability to communicate effectively both orally and in writing, to think logically and independently, to acquire an interest in perceiving how various branches of learning are interrelated, to gain an historical perspective, to gain perspective based on aesthetic symbolism, and to develop a personal system of values. These timeless skills, attitudes, and habits are viewed as basic for approaching the wide

range of endeavors which are undertaken by people in the contemporary world. Although the approach does not exclude training, it does broaden dramatically a concept of education. It is widely accepted that people today will have as many as seven different careers in their lifetime of work. It is difficult to predict vocations of the future and therefore to prescribe an education for those vocations. Several of the most critical endeavors in the contemporary world were not in existence when many people in this room were students. James Sloan Allen, vice president for academic affairs at the Juilliard School, commented on the subject in an article in the *American Scholar* (Spring 1992). He states, "Students deserve to be educated, not just trained, whether they are to have careers in the arts or not."

Areas of study which are traditionally viewed as the "primary" liberal arts disciplines include fields such as English, history, philosophy, and political science. It should be noted that students who pursue degrees in those areas do not do so to become practitioners, that is professional philosophers, professional historians, or professional political scientists. In my experience, this does not dilute the rigor of the academic programs, nor does it weaken the dedication of students to the discipline. If well designed, undergraduate music degrees, including both the Bachelor of Music and the Bachelor of Arts in Music, offer the same potential as the more "traditional" liberal arts disciplines. There is no discipline more basic to understanding the human condition than music. In his book *Art is Experience*, philosopher John Dewey states that continuity of culture in passage from one time and one civilization to another is conditioned by art more than any other one thing. In all undergraduate degree offerings, music can, and I would say must, affirm and firmly establish its place in the liberal arts tradition. There are those that will protest that the suggested broad concept of education in music will in some way compromise musical standards. To the contrary, the standards, including performance standards, can be enhanced.

How then can the music curriculum respond to this challenge? How can these goals be integrated into the various areas of music study, and how can courses in music be interrelated to accomplish the goals? The first presenter today is Greg Steinke from Ball State University. Greg has a background in music theory and will comment on the subject from that perspective. The next presenter is Arthur Tollefson from the University of North Carolina at Greensboro who has a background in music history and will broach the subject as an historian. Both Arthur and Greg are active performers and will approach the subject from that vantage point as well.

REFERENCES

- Allen, James Sloan. "Educating Performers," *The Key Reporter*, Spring 1992, pp. 5-9.
- Dewey, John. *Art is Experience*. Caprion Books, 1934, p. 327.
- Grimes, William. "Educating Musicians for Challenging Times," *New York Times*, June 2, 1993, p. 81.

TOO MANY MUSICIANS—TOO MANY NOTES?

GREG A STEINKE
Ball State University

Writer Mark Twain once said, “Retain of the past that which you may need in the future”; choreographer Agnes DeMille once said, “Living is a form of not being sure, of not knowing what is next, and the artist, before all others, never entirely knows”; and novelist Thomas Wolfe [of the 1930’s] declared in one of his book titles, *You Can’t Go Home Again*—“because home isn’t there anymore.”¹ These perceptions about our milieu characterize the dilemma in which we find ourselves today as musicians, educators, and administrators. I use these perceptions to set the stage of my discussion.

Too many musicians—too many notes? What a fanciful title! But I like it as a metaphor to tell my tale—composers are very inventive folks, as you well know! “Too many notes?” as the emperor remarks in *Amadeus*. Perhaps there are too many musicians, and I know there are too many notes, as I’ve contributed my share! This is a big topic—a full-scale composition as it were—and many movements made of many motives and phrases for today. But I think I will begin with some other perceptions/ideas to help get us going, because I think it indicates the big job that we may have ahead of us in trying to find these interrelationships within music. Maybe at best, all I can do is to point to problems or comments about the problems—the symptoms—with some possible solutions, but maybe not the solutions at all. I hope you can be comfortable with a somewhat “Zen” approach to the topic at hand. Richard Toscan in an article appearing in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* a couple of years ago, where he was discussing bachelor programs in theatre training, said that:

With the population that can justify no more than ten theatre training programs at the bachelor’s level, the United States has 132 and more are planned. A kind of wild free market economics drives the proliferation, with each new edition weakening all of its predecessors but further diluting an already infinitesimal pool of talented students.²

(One could easily read “music” here for “theatre”). This perhaps typifies a part of our music programs today, and maybe has led us to the problems that we are currently facing.

Here is another perspective from a whole different situation taken from an article in the *NARAS Journal*, “Resuscitating Art Music” by John Steinmetz, where he mentions the following:

Maybe one of the reasons that Americans have a hard time understanding the joys of art music is that many musicians can't see the joys either. Musicians often have difficulty perceiving the beauty in their own work.³

Comments like these tell me that there is some kind of problem going on in the way we are working in the training and education of musicians. But to go on—this time in an article by Roger Rideout appearing in the *CMS Symposium* discussing the German model in music curricula. Mr. Rideout mentions,

My contention is that the Jeffersonian and Whitmanesque democratic ideals of our country have continued to evolve in our century while our techniques in analyzing and evaluating music have not; nor have they ever addressed this perspective.⁴

And a little later on he says,

Also a curriculum based on this model does little service to future teachers who must confront society directly at its most elemental level.⁵

In yet another discussion, this one by Terry Miller, which appeared in the *CMS Newsletter* this past September under the title, "A Re-examination of the Mission of Schools in Music," Dr. Miller points out that perhaps we are operating under two extremes or paradigms in trying to seek our missions as schools of music. On the one hand:

The school's role is to assure the survival and the ultimate triumph of Western classical music; other kinds of music are viewed not only as inferior and unworthy of study but as potential predators.⁶

And on the other hand:

The school's role is to understand music in its broadest context including those of elite, folk, and popular cultures, worldwide, while making one unique tradition—Western classical music—the focus of study.⁷

And later on in the article, Dr. Miller goes on to point out that the tensions between these two points of view need to resolve toward the second one; otherwise, it will be very difficult for a school to really remain relevant in the '90s and beyond.

Where multi-culturalism and diversity have become watchwords, where multi-ethnic America is becoming less WASP, and where the elitism of a white European male past is giving way to the reality of our own time and place...any pretense that this music is the only important music denies the reality of American life and its cultural values. To use President Bill Clinton's phrase, we need curricula that "look like America" and prepare students to confront today's musical scene.⁸

Or put another way in Barbara Reeder Lundquist's "Message from the President" in the current *CMS Newsletter*: "We must...encourage our students to perceive themselves as members of a society who are articulate about their art and its role in the cultural life of the United States."⁹

The above are aspects of comments more or less related to music. If we move a little further afield there are some other observations to note which may also be factors to consider in our discussion of the interrelationships in music and any rethinking of the curriculum. Those of you who attended the annual meeting last year may remember the striking keynote speech of Dr. Jane Healy, when she presented an eloquent case for considering that young people growing up today have been shaped both physically and mentally in a different way by our late twentieth-century milieu. She said that because they have developed different "habits of mind" from those of us from yore, we perhaps need different teaching strategies and curricula to be able to effectively reach our current learning clientele. I would suggest from Healy that we have new minds and bodies to reach. Time doesn't allow exploring this further, but I would strongly recommend her book, *Endangered Minds*, to you for further study.

Reaching in another direction, I would like to point to the presentation made a year ago by Marilyn Taft Thomas entitled, "The Effects of Technology on Society and on the Education of Tomorrow's Musicians." Dr. Thomas points to the necessity of the composer, the music educator, the pianist, in fact all musicians, learning to effectively utilize the computer and recording technology as musical tools in their day-to-day work. She suggests the necessity of learning a whole new set of skills—many quite different from what you and I learned, at least originally—and that technology will all be intertwined with it. Further, musicians must learn to cope with the "perfect performance" from recordings and its subsequent effect on the concert hall. Will live performance eventually be outmoded? Because of the perfect performance, have we or are we rapidly creating a more discerning audience which demands a much more discriminating musician? Do we therefore need a revamped ear training methodology?¹⁰

Dr. Thomas also suggests that changes in communication wrought by our technology may have created an "impatient audience," which may have to be factored into the creative and recreative musical processes as we now know them—that concepts of balance, proportion, and repetition are rapidly changing with resultant expectations occurring within that audience. Thus we need to study more intensely music closer in time to us so we are better prepared to play tomorrow's music, whatever that music may be. From this perspective we can't continue to ignore, as many musicians now tend to do, newer works which demand extended techniques, circular breathing, multiphonics, interaction with electronics and elec-

tronic instruments, etc. So, Dr. Thomas suggests a kind of

music school in which the performer, the conductor, and the composer truly collaborate as a healthy part of the learning process—this type of school will be making a huge contribution to the future of music itself. We are a long way from seeing this happen in most of our educational environments.¹¹

Another important point to factor into the discussion is the issue of culture—note, I do not use the word “multicultural.” This has resulted from my reading of Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.’s recent book, *The Disuniting of America*. His book contains a highly illuminating discussion of cultural pluralism versus ethnocentrism and the resultant consequences of each. I recommend this book to you as well; it’s easily read in a short evening. Basically he sketches some convincing arguments that we’re tearing ourselves apart culturally (one could read musically as well) as a country over these two cultural points of view. He eloquently concludes that “belief in one’s own culture does not require disdain for other cultures.”¹²

Perhaps a few “one liners” may offer some possibilities or at least some glimpses about dealing with our cultural malaise, which ultimately has a bearing on our music curricula approaches—as quoted in Schlesinger from the History Department at SUNY, Brockport:

We insist that the curriculum not be used as an instrument that is primarily designed to redress past injustices, however real. It is, rather, a tool with which to pursue the truths about our common past.¹³

And later on, Schlesinger adds,

When every ethnic and religious group claims a right to approve or veto anything that is taught in public schools, the fatal line is crossed between cultural pluralism and ethnocentrism. An evident casualty is the old idea that whatever our ethnic base, we are all Americans together.¹⁴

(In that last sentence we might read “music base” for “ethnic base” and “musicians together” for “Americans together.”) Schlesinger later quotes William Raspberry, who observed, “The need is not to reach back for some culture we never knew but to lay full claim to the culture in which we exist.”¹⁵

In his chapter, “E Pluribus Unum?” Schlesinger says,

It may be too bad that white European males have played so large a role in shaping our culture. But that’s the way it is. One cannot erase history.

These humdrum historical facts, and not some dastardly imperialistic conspiracy, explain the Eurocentric slant in American schools. Would anyone seriously argue that teachers should conceal the European origins of American civi-

lization? or that schools should cater to the 20 percent and ignore the 80 percent? Of course the 20 percent and their contributions should be integrated into the curriculum too, which is the point of cultural pluralism.¹⁶

In his discussion on “The Battle of the Schools,” Schlesinger writes,

But would it not be more appropriate for students to be “continually” encouraged to understand the American culture in which they are growing up and to prepare for an active role in shaping that culture? Should public education strengthen and perpetuate separate ethnic and racial subcultures? or should it not seek to make our young boys and girls contributors to a common American culture?

One senses a certain inauthenticity in saddling public schools with the mission of convincing children of the beauties of their particular ethnic origins. The ethnic subcultures, if they had genuine vitality, would be sufficiently instilled in children by family, church and community. It is surely not the office of the public school to promote artificial ethnic chauvinism.¹⁷

Important to Schlesinger’s thesis are these statements:

History as a weapon is an abuse of history. The high purpose of history is not the presentation of self nor the vindication of identity but the recognition of complexity and the search for knowledge.¹⁸

Great artists, thinkers, leaders are the possession not just of their own racial clan but of all humanity.¹⁹

Diane Ravitch is quoted by Schlesinger from her article, “Multiculturalism,” saying, “Paradoxical though it may seem, the United States has a common culture that is multicultural.”²⁰

And to bring us back full circle with Schlesinger:

Let us by all means in this increasingly mixed-up world learn about those other continents and civilizations. But let us master our own history first. Lamentable as some may think it, we inherit an American experience, as America inherits a European experience. To deny the essentially European origins of American culture is to falsify history.²¹

I’ve gone on a little at length about this, but I hope this points to the importance of dealing with culture as we explore new interrelationships in music and the unusual possibilities we might utilize in trying to re-arrange the pieces needed to assemble a new curricular whole. In mentioning these various points I hope the resultant thinking will speak to another observation made by Lundquist in her president’s message that “rigid boundaries between music disciplines contribute to our malaise, creating insularity, defensiveness, and lack of awareness of possibilities in the development of knowledge in music.”²²

There's lots of "diversity" and many threads to follow in what I've just said. Allow me now to try to pull a few of these "diversities" together to help establish some possible pathways.

In the previously stated scenario, albeit sketchily, I seem to discover what many writers have alluded to in recent years, including perhaps most prominently Toffler in his book, *The Third Wave*, that what basically confronts us is a situation where most of us utilize 19th-century tools to solve 20th- and 21st-century problems. There lies a big problem. Further, we must take it upon ourselves to not be so beholden unto the Eurocentric models of culture but rather to look clearly to the models right in our own back yard. In the United States we still tend to approach our curricula as Eurocentric phenomena, but we must move beyond that if we are to create a truly new curriculum or even to have discussions about one. We must understand what's currently going on. Let's return to Mr. Rideout for a moment. As he closes his article he says,

As we enter the twenty-first century, it seems almost comical that we base our education training in "the beautiful in music" on a model of values, learning, and scholarship borrowed from the Enlightenment. We ally our curricula to an eighteenth century confidence in mankind's ability to determine absolute techniques of analysis that reveal the true line of historical development...We are teaching Newtonian physics in a world of quantum mechanics and relativity theory. We are arguing over the innovative variations of twelve tones and derivative techniques while the world outside our classroom dances to Thoreau's different drummer.²³

However, to bring me even more directly to the issue to address here (that dealing with music theory and performance), let's approach that with mention of an article that Jon Appleton of Dartmouth wrote about four years ago in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* under the title, "The College Music Curriculum: A Pressing Need of Reform," in which he said,

The music curriculum at most institutions of higher education is in pressing need of reform. It is based on a musical culture of which only remnants still exist, and has little relevance to music in the last half of the 20th century. In short, our approach to teaching in history, theory, performance, and composition of music, at all levels, is reactionary and of little value to either liberal arts students or young musicians with professional aspirations.²⁴

To guide me I am going to use as a model an article from the Yamaha *New Ways* publication, "Educating the Next Generation" by Douglas Jones, in which he discusses educational programs for audio engineering. Some of the things he has to say really apply to the way we are educating musicians now. Be they musicians going into audio engineering or otherwise, the model he offers may be a point of departure. He suggests first of all that audio professionals need to understand the people with which they work. Secondly, audio professionals need to

understand the technology with which they work. Also, audio professionals need to be versed in the perceptual or subjective aspects of the technology and be able to differentiate between the objective and the subjective. Audio professionals need to be well-versed in acoustics and the physics of sound and, lastly, the audio professional must be versed in aural aesthetics.²⁵ I believe Mr. Jones has outlined exactly the same skills that any good musician needs to have. There should be a way to reflect upon this and translate it into a more relevant type of curriculum for both undergraduate and graduate students. In coming to grips with these different aspects and finding a way of integrating them, we should (in a general sense) cover almost all aspects of what is involved in the training of a 20th- and 21st-century musician. The real challenge, of course, is how do we do that and how do we put it all together?

I could suggest an array of courses or some realignments at this point, but I'm not prepared to do that as I know I need to do more homework to guide that process, as I'm sure we all do. However, we must ultimately lay out what we expect as the end result for our students and in very specific terms. I think we've "committed," "task forced," "white papered," *et cetera* and bandaged our way long enough. Perhaps we should throw it all out, as Tofler suggests, and build a new structure suited to the task. We've done it to ourselves, so we should be able to salvage it for ourselves without having it imposed upon us by an outside entity. Let me leave it at that for now for you to fill in.

Perhaps these further thoughts from Dr. Lundquist might help start a process. She suggests, "Cross-style or genre performance competence is demonstrated by more and more students as they enter higher education."²⁶ With that as a starting point, ensemble experiences might offer some radically new possibilities. Further, she suggests that to break down the "rigid boundaries" mentioned earlier, one could perhaps use the musicology rubric to

provide a welcome general and safe categorical umbrella under which the rigid divisions that exist in some institutions between [the many academic music areas could] be re-examined. It is possible that a broader rubric will allow some regrouping and reorganization along lines that represent areas of mutual focus, interest, theories, literature, methodologies, and technology. Such considerations need not upset curricular applectarts. These processes need time, thought, and proactive—instead of reactive—decisions.²⁷

And lastly, she suggests that

perhaps it is necessary to admit fewer students in programs where the viability for positions in that area of specialization is limited." She continues by quoting

Joseph Polisi of Juilliard that “We have to be sure that every student admitted has the potential for some kind of life in the arts.”²⁸

However, it is one thing to suggest a new array or alignment of courses, but it’s quite another to have a faculty in place to execute it. Put another way, you can lead a horse to water, but can you make him float on his back! Time again doesn’t allow discussing the kind of faculty needed for this new curriculum and how to train them. However, I would entrust to your reading, as a start, two papers presented ten years ago, at the NASM Dearborn conference on General Music Studies in conjunction with CMS, which offer some perspectives on this issue: Elliott Schwartz’s “The Training and Retraining of College Music Faculty,” and Donald Funes’ excellent “Zen and the Art of Music Listening,” which encapsulates ideas about teaching music appreciation, via Pirsig’s *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*. I would also point to ideas I’ve presented in my earlier papers to this body in 1988 with “Towards A New Interdisciplinarity,” found in the NASM *Proceedings* for that year and in revised form in 1992 as “Zen and the Art of Musicianship,” which offer other possibilities.

But Funes does make some very good points: “We have the freedom, however, to choose an alternate path that seeks to discover how objects, ideas, processes and people are related and share common characteristics.”²⁹ And, “Teachers that act as agents for change must model openness and acceptance if they expect their students to change.”³⁰

I would be remiss if I did not mention Jamake Highwater’s book, *The Primal Mind*, as an important book if one wishes to have a better understanding of the function of creativity in the Native American world. It is a “must read” if you have interests in this area. Vine Deloria’s *God Is Red* is also excellent.

It has been interesting to me to also discover that one of my predecessors at Ball State, Dr. Robert Hargreaves, back in 1966 was even beginning to struggle with this issue when he presented a faculty lecture on “Toward A New Heaven and Earth, Reflections from Purgatory.” Although he was in a different milieu than we are today, many of the issues I’ve touched on were already troubling him even then. Now, almost thirty years later we are *really* struggling with these interrelationships, and we *must* find some new pathways.

Before calling it a “wrap,” as Bob Villa, our home improvement man, likes to say—and aren’t we after some “home improvement” here? also a coda?—let me also call to your attention the Arts Education Principle/Standards document recently presented by the Arts in Education Committee of the International Council of Fine Arts Deans in cooperation with the American Council for the Arts, which is consonant with my remarks in general and offers you yet another perspective.

At this point I wish to pick up and emphasize several ideas from the paper I delivered a year ago on “Zen and the Art of Musicianship.” I feel it’s worth repeating: “The solutions all are simple—after you have arrived at them. But they’re simple only when you know already what they are.”³¹ And that’s the task at hand as I see it. I would suggest from Pirsig that “the place to improve the world is first in one’s own heart and head and hands, and then work outward from there.”³² Hirsch would add: “Although the structure of a solution to the problem of [musical or artistic] literacy is straightforward, our tradition ensures that the political accomplishment cannot be correspondingly simple.”³³ But more than that, perhaps it’s time for a Copernican revolution in the arts—in music. There are lots of tools and ideas to use—we need to decide how to configure them. That’s for us all to decide. Perhaps we might take a cue from James Burke in making a few “Connections” with this marvelous teaching cornucopia we have. Maybe we should teach more like an informance rather than a performance. But, in the end, it is a future which is capable of creating new horizons for performance, musicianship, composition, historical studies and the music teachers of tomorrow. It is a future capable of confronting the creative use of technology and the arts and perhaps a whole new interaction of the arts in the lives of everyone. As tends to be in a time of change, there is a “window of opportunity” to contribute what we can to the music education of not only our majors but also to the student body and community in general.

Further, a thought I found as a frontispiece to Capra’s *The Turning Point*:

After a time of decay comes the turning point. The powerful light that has been banished returns. There is movement, but it is not brought about by force...The movement is natural, arising spontaneously. For this reason the transformation of the old becomes easy. The old is discarded and the new is introduced. Both measures accord with time; therefore no harm results... from the *I Ching* ³⁴

Perhaps this thought may help us feel comfortable that there is a way to learn to deal with all these many items of concern.

In closing—coda with variations?—let me leave you again with some thoughts from R. Murray Schafer’s “The Rhinoceros in the Classroom,” as found in *The Thinking Ear: Complete Writings on Music Education* as I am always wont to do:

Above my desk I have written some maxims for educators, to keep myself in line. They are these:

1. The first practical step in any educational reform is to take it.
2. In education, failures are more important than successes. There is nothing so dismal as a success story.
3. Teach on the verge of peril.
4. There are no more teachers. There is just a community of learners.

5. Do not design a philosophy of education for others. Design one for yourself. A few others may wish to share it with you.
6. For the 5-year-old art is life and life is art. For the 6-year-old, life is life and art is art. This first school year is a watershed in the child's history: a trauma.
7. The old approach: Teacher has information; student has empty head. Teacher's objective: to push information into student's empty head. Observations: at outset teacher is a fathead; at conclusion student is a fathead.
8. On the contrary a class should be an hour of a thousand discoveries. For this to happen, the teacher and the student should first discover one another.
9. Why is it that the only people who never matriculate from their own courses are teachers?
10. Always teach provisionally: only God knows for sure.³⁵

In the final analysis though, let's ponder a thought from Schlesinger wherein he indicates that all kinds of "histories" (read music) should be taught:

The purpose of history is to promote not group self-esteem, but understanding of the world and the past, dispassionate analysis, judgment, and perspective, respect for divergent cultures and traditions, and unflinching protection for those unifying ideas of tolerance, democracy, and human rights that make free historical inquiry possible.³⁶

I know, I know!— too many notes already! Well, forgive my Zen journey, but I hope it has been helpful in stimulating a few thoughts for this "early" session. I hope all these ideas may find their appropriate application within all our musical endeavors as teachers and musicians. From the closing of Funes' aforementioned article: "Each step of the journey should be joyous but there can be no final destination."³⁷ But as someone once said (I'm not certain who), any simple problem can be made insoluble if enough meetings are held to solve it. Let's not fall into that "gumption trap."

ENDNOTES

- ¹George J. Church, "America's Frightening New World of Work." *Time* (November 22, 1993), 39.
- ²Richard Toscan, "Point of View: Bachelor's Programs in Theater Training Do Not Lead to First-Class Acting Careers," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 26, 1989), A44.
- ³John Steinmetz, "Resuscitating Art Music," *NARAS Journal* (Spring, 1993), 46.
- ⁴Roger Rideout, "The German Model in Music Curricula," *College Music Symposium* 30/2 (Fall, 1990), 109.
- ⁵*Ibid.*
- ⁶Terry E. Miller, "A Reexamination of the Mission of Schools of Music," *The College Music Society Newsletter* (September, 1993), 3.
- ⁷*Ibid.*
- ⁸*Ibid.*, 3 & 5.
- ⁹Barbara Reeder Lundquist, "Message from the President," *The College Music Society Newsletter* (November, 1993), 10.
- ¹⁰Marilyn Taft Thomas, "The Effects of Technology on Society and on the Education of Tomorrow's Musicians," *Proceedings of the 68th Annual Meeting: National Association of Schools of Music* no. 81 (1993), 31-32.
- ¹¹*Ibid.*, 34.
- ¹²Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *The Disuniting of America, Reflections on a Multicultural Society* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1992), 136.
- ¹³*Ibid.*, 98.
- ¹⁴*Ibid.*
- ¹⁵*Ibid.*, 102.
- ¹⁶*Ibid.*, 122-23.
- ¹⁷*Ibid.*, 90.
- ¹⁸*Ibid.*, 72.
- ¹⁹*Ibid.*, 92.
- ²⁰*Ibid.*, 135.
- ²¹*Ibid.*, 136.
- ²²Lundquist, 10.
- ²³Rideout, 111.
- ²⁴Jon Appleton, "OPINION: The College Curriculum Is In Need of Reform," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (April 19, 1989), B2.
- ²⁵Douglas Jones, "Educating the Next Generation," *New Ways* (Fall, 1993), D6-7.
- ²⁶Lundquist, 12 & 11.
- ²⁷*Ibid.*, 10.
- ²⁸*Ibid.*, 12.
- ²⁹Donald Funes, "Zen and the Art of Music Listening," *Papers from The Dearborn Conference on Music in General Studies: CMS/NASM* (November 19-29, 1983), 28.
- ³⁰*Ibid.*, 29.
- ³¹Robert Pirsig, *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance* (New York: Quill William Morrow, 1974), 287.
- ³²*Ibid.*, 297.
- ³³*Ibid.*, 95.
- ³⁴Fritjof Capra, *The Turning Point* (New York: Bantam Books, 1982), frontispiece.
- ³⁵R. Murray Schafer, *The Thinking Ear: Complete Writings on Music Education* (Toronto: Arcana, 1986), 237.
- ³⁶Schlesinger, 99.
- ³⁷Funes, 29.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, James Sloan. "Educating Performers," *American Scholar*, Spring, 1992, pp. NA.
- Andersen, Kurt. "Spectator: The Death and Rebirth of Movie Musicals—Cartoons Yes, Humans No," *Time*, November 22, 1993, p. 69.
- Appleton, Jon. "OPINION: The College Curriculum Is In Need of Reform," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 19, 1989, p. B2.
- Astin, Alexander W. "Diversity and Multiculturalism on the Campus, How Are Students Affected?" *Change*, March/April, 1993, pp. 44-49.
- Attali, Jacques. *Noise, The Political Economy of Music*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985.
- Banks, James A. "Multicultural Education, Development, Dimensions, and Challenges," *Phi Delta Kappan*, September, 1993, pp. 22-28.
- Best, Harold M. "Music Curricula in the Future," *Arts Education Policy Review*, Vol. 94, No. 2, November/December, 1992, pp. 2-7. (This article was adapted from earlier ones appearing in the 55th and 64th *Proceedings* of NASM.)
- Beverly, Elizabeth and Richard Wightman Fox. "Liberals Must Confront the Conservative Argument: Teaching Humanities Means Teaching About Values," POINT of VIEW from *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 1, 1989, p. A52.
- Bloom, Alan. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987.
- Booth, Gregory D. "Reviews of Books" (*Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception*. Ed. by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987. 202 pp. and *Popular Musics of the Non-Western World: An Introductory Survey*. by Peter Manuel. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988. 287 pp). from *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 74, No. 3, 1990, pp. 439-445.
- Booth, Gregory D. and Terry Lee Kuhn. "Economic and Transmission Factors as Essential Elements in the Definition of Folk, Art, and Pop Music" *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 74, No. 3, 1990, pp. 411-438.
- Boyer-White, René. "Reflecting Cultural Diversity in the Classroom," *Music Educators Journal*, December, 1988, pp. 50-54.
- Brademas, John. "Growing Up Internationally: America Faces Global Realities," *Educational Record*, Spring, 1987, pp. 6-11.
- Burge, David. "College Music Programs: Progress Without Purpose," *The Instrumentalist*, March, 1989, pp. 23-29.
- Capra, Fritjof. *The Turning Point*. New York: Bantam Books, 1982.
- Cheney, Lynne V. "Multiculturalism Done Right, Taking Steps to Build Support for Change," *Change*, January/February, 1993, pp. 8-10.
- Ching, Michael. "Should we care if mom likes our music?" from Comment in *Minnesota Composers Forum Newsletter*, February, 1988, (unnumbered pages).

- Church, George J. "America's Frightening New World of Work," *Time*, November 22, 1993, pp. 32-39.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr. *God Is Red*. New York: Delta Publishing Co., Inc., 1973.
- Deutsch, Claudia. "What Art Can Teach Business," *New York Times*, September 8, 1991, p. F23.
- DuPree, Mary. "Beyond Music in Western Civilization: Issues in Undergraduate Music History Literacy," *College Music Symposium*, Vol. 30, No. 2, Fall, 1990, pp. 100-105
- Elbow, Peter. *Embracing Contraries, Explorations in Learning and Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Fernandez, Nohema, ed. *Toward the End of a Century: Minority and Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. CMS Report #8. Missoula, MT: CMS Publications, 1993.
- Fonder, Mark, ed. *The Ithaca Conference on American Music Education: Centennial Profiles*. Ithaca: Ithaca College, 1992.
- Funes, Donald. "Zen and the Art of Music Listening," *Papers from The Dearborn Conference on Music in General Studies*. CMS/NASM, November 19-20, 1983, pp. 26-29.
- Gaff, Jerry G. "Beyond Politics, The Educational Issues Inherent in Multicultural Education," *Change*, January/February, 1992, pp. 31-35.
- Greene, Elizabeth. "Proponent of Cultural Literacy Finds Disciples in the Nation's Schools," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 16, 1988, pp. A13ff.
- Grimes, William. "Educating Musicians for Challenging Times," *New York Times*, June 2, 1993, p. B1 & 6.
- Hargrove, William. "Come Blow Your Own Horn," *Newsweek*, December 14, 1992, p. 15.
- Hargreaves, Robert. "Towards a New Heaven and a New Earth, Reflections from Purgatory," *Ball State University Faculty Lecture Series*. Muncie, IN: Ball State University, November, 1966.
- Harris, Marvin. *America Now, The Anthropology of a Changing Culture*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981.
- Healy, Jane M. *Endangered Minds, Why Children Don't Think and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990.
- Heck, Thomas F., ed. *The "Music Information Explosion" and its Impact on College Teachers and Students*. CMS Report #9. Missoula, MT: CMS Publications, 1993.
- Heller, Scott. "Bloom's Best Seller Called 'Racist' and Elitist by Former SUNY Chief," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 20, 1988, pp. A11-12.
- Highwater, Jamake. *The Primal Mind, Vision and Reality in Indian America*. New York: The New American Library, Inc., 1982.
- Hill, Patrick J. "Multi-Culturalism, The Crucial Philosophical and Organizational Issues," *Change*, July/August, 1991, pp. 38-47.

- Hirsch, E.D., Jr. *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1987.
- Hobbs, Wayne. "Pattern and Sequence in the Undergraduate Curriculum," *Proceedings The 68th Annual Meeting*. Reston, VA: NASM, No. 81, June, 1993, pp. 113-123.
- Jones, Douglas. "Educating the Next Generation," *New Ways* (Yamaha Corp. of America), Fall, 1993, pp. D6-7.
- Keyes, Ralph. *Is There Life After High School*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1976.
- Klocko, David G. "Multicultural Music in the College Curriculum," *Music Educators Journal*, January, 1989, pp. 38-41.
- Lehman, Paul R. "TOWARD CIVILIZATION: How Can It Affect Music Education?" *Music Educators Journal*, January, 1989, pp. 22-27.
- Lentzner, Bennett, ed. *Arts Education Principles/Standards: An ICFAD Position*. International Council of Fine Arts Deans in cooperation with the American Council for the Arts.
- Lundquist, Barbara Reeder. "Challenge to Music in Higher Education," paper presented at CMS NE Regional Conference, Lafayette University, Easton, PA, 4/16/93, manuscript.
- _____. "Message from the President," *The College Music Society Newsletter*, November, 1993, pp. 10-12.
- Masters, Kim. "America's Culture Crisis, Audiences are deserting the concert halls to stay home with cable," *Washington Post*, (article undated and no page numbers; was passed around on our campus as an FYI; written late '92 or early '93.)
- McGinnis, Mark W. "Art Students Deserve More Exposure to Ideas, More Guidance, More Variety, More Options," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 10, 1988, pp. B1, B3.
- Miller, Terry E. "A Reexamination of the Mission of Schools of Music," *The College Music Society Newsletter*, September, 1993, pp. 3 & 5.
- Mortenson, Gary C. "But It's Not in My Job Description:" The Varied Roles of College Teachers," *Music Educators Journal*, May, 1988, pp. 26-30.
- Neusner, Jacob. "It Is Time to Stop Apologizing for Western Civilization and to start Analyzing Why It Defines World Culture," OPINION from *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 15, 1989, pp. B1-2.
- (Responses to Neusner)—"Ideology, Empirical Facts, and the Role of Western Civilization," OPINION from *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 8, 1989, pp. B3-4.
- Parakilas, James. "Teaching Introductory Music Courses with a 'More Comprehensive Perspective,'" *College Music Symposium*, Vol. 30, No. 2, Fall, 1990, pp. 112-116.
- Pirsig, Robert M. *Lila, An Inquiry into Morals*. New York: Bantam Books, 1991.
- _____. *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*. New York: Quill William Morrow, 1974.

- Postman, Neil and Weingartner, Charles. *Teaching As A Subversive Activity*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1969.
- _____. *Technopoly, The Surrender of Culture to Technology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992.
- Riddell, Richard. "Point of View: The University Once Thought It Could Develop Artists; Now We Know It Can't," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 22, 1989, p. A44.
- Rideout, Roger. "The German Model in Music Curricula," *College Music Symposium*, Vol. 30, No. 2, Fall, 1990, p. 104-111.
- Reimer, Bennett. "Music Education in Our Multimusical Culture," *Music Educators Journal*, March, 1993, pp. 21-26.
- Rogers, Michael R. *Teaching Approaches in Music Theory, An Overview of Pedagogical Philosophies*. Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984.
- Rouse, John. "Commentary: College must (im)prove its worth," *The Muncie Star*, October 10, 1993, p. 12A.
- Sandroff, Howard. "Sandroff on Technology, Teaching Across the Curriculum, Science & Music," *New Ways* (Yahama Corp. of America), Fall, 1993, pp. D-2-3.
- Schafer, R. Murray. *The Thinking Ear: Complete Writings on Music Education*. Toronto: Arcana, 1986.
- Schuller, Gunther. *Musings, The Musical Worlds of Gunther Schuller*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Schwartz, Elliott. "The Training and Retraining of College Music Faculty," *Papers from The Dearborn Conference on Music in General Studies*, CMS/NASM, November 19-20, 1983, pp. 13-17.
- Scott, Derek B. "Music and Sociology for the 1990s: "A Changing Critical Perspective," *The Musical Quarterly*, Vol. 74, No. 3, 1990, pp. 385-410.
- Schlesinger, Jr., Arthur M. *The Disuniting of America, Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1992.
- Sizer, Theodore R. *Horace's School: Redesigning the American High School*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1992.
- Small, Ann. "Music Teaching and Critical Thinking: What Do We Need to Know?" *Music Educators Journal*, September, 1987, pp. 47-49.
- Smith, Page. *Killing the Spirit—Higher Education in America*. New York: Viking, 1990.
- Smith, Ralph A. "The Question of Multiculturalism," *Arts Education Policy Review*, Vol. 94, No. 4, March/April, 1993, pp. 2-18.
- Steinke, Greg A. "Towards a New Interdisciplinarity," *Proceedings: The 64th Annual Meeting*. Reston, VA: NASM, 1989, pp. 11-24.
- _____. "Zen and the Art of Musicianship," presented at 68th Annual Meeting of NASM, Chicago, November, 1992, unpublished manuscript.
- Steinmetz, John. "Resuscitating Art Music," *NARAS Journal*, Spring, 1993, pp. 21-64.

- Stitgen, Stan F. "A Community of Support for Music Education." *Music Educators Journal*, March, 1988, pp. 31-34.
- Struble, John Warthen. "Survival Strategies for the End of the Millennium," Comment from *Minnesota Composers Forum Newsletter*, April, 1988, (unnumbered pages).
- Szulc, Tad. "The Greatest Danger We Face," *Parade Magazine*, July 25, 1993, pp. 4-5,7.
- Takaki, Ronald. "An Educated and Culturally Literate Person Must Study America's Multicultural Reality," OPINION from *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 8, 1989, pp. B1-2.
- Thomas, Marilyn Taft. "The Effects of Technology on Society and on the Education to Tomorrow's Musicians," *Proceedings: The 68th Annual Meeting*, Reston, VA: NASM, No. 81, June, 1993, pp. 29-34.
- Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.
- _____. *The Third Wave*. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1980.
- Toscan, Richard. "Point of View: Bachelor's Programs in Theater Training Do Not Lead to First-Class Acting Careers," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 26, 1989, p. A44.
- Wilkinson, Christopher. "Teaching the Cultural Diversity of America's Musics: Methods and Consequences," *Proceedings: The 68th Annual Meeting*. Reston, VA: NASM, No. 81, June, 1993, pp. 125-135.
- Wolff, Robert Paul. "The Closing of the American Mind," Book Review from *Academe*, September-October, 1987, pp. 64-65.
- Wong, Frank E. "Diversity & Community, Right Objectives and Wrong Arguments," *Change*, July/August, 1991, pp. 49-54.
- Yarbrough, Larry. "Three Questions for the Multiculturalism Debate," *Change*, January/February, 1992, pp. 64-69.

MUSIC AND ITS INTERRELATIONSHIPS

ARTHUR R. TOLLEFSON

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Throughout my administrative career, I have periodically been called upon by those less familiar with the workings of our discipline both to explain the design of a core undergraduate music major curriculum and to defend its legitimacy as a “primary” or “traditional” liberal arts discipline. Since even my most persuasive ritual evocation of music’s time-honored status in the medieval quadrivium occasionally fails to impress hard-nosed skeptics, I have recently taken to describing a music core as an integrated, tripartite amalgam of “mini-majors” in skill development (i.e. performance), quantitative studies (i.e. music theory), and history (i.e. music history). Such a description often assuages the anxieties of defenders of the liberal arts canon, at least momentarily, while simultaneously focusing attention upon the rich potential, if not absolute necessity, for integrative studies within music.

The idea of an integrative approach to the study of music can hardly be considered a novel concept these days. Well over a quarter-century ago, the Contemporary Music Project was evangelically espousing the principle of “comprehensive musicianship” throughout the land. A number of colleges and universities valiantly overlaid its integrative principles upon their core history/theory sequences and, in a few isolated instances, maintain such curricular structures to this day. In a vast majority of institutions, however, formal “comprehensive musicianship” curricula simply did not “catch on” or, where adopted, were ultimately unable to overcome a variety of impediments, most notably the understandably specialized educational backgrounds of most traditionally trained music faculty members.

In recent years, my activities as a visiting evaluator for NASM have afforded me the opportunity to observe both classroom and studio teaching throughout a broad spectrum of music institutions. Although I would take great delight in being able to report that, despite the paucity of *formal* “comprehensive musicianship” curricula in our college-level institutions today, dynamic, integrative approaches to the study of music are on the upswing, I unfortunately cannot. Most studio or classroom teaching I have observed, though often resplendent in its dedication, inspiration, and mastery of detail, misses opportunity after golden opportunity to holistically relate its specific task-at-hand to the rich breadth of our discipline; what could serve as a glorious reinforcement of music and its interrelationships more often than not falls far short of the mark.

Many music faculty members cite the course-oriented, relatively inflexible college curricular structure in this country as an inhibition to effective develop-

ment of integrative studies within any discipline or, for that matter, interdisciplinary studies themselves. Suggestions from the NASM office to members of this panel that we offer “practical suggestions about making connections that require minimum reshuffling of course work” exemplified this concern. Nevertheless, I submit that true progress for integrative studies within music depends most importantly *not* upon extensive curricular revision but upon a fundamental broadening of the pedagogical attitudes of teachers in classes and lessons already on the books. Given the extraordinary latitude afforded college teachers under the rubric “academic freedom” these days, most professors may approach a course’s subject matter from just about any integrative direction their intellect and conscience dictate.

As Dean Sorensen indicated, I have agreed to briefly address “music and its interrelationships” from my particular background as a performer and, while taking my formal degrees at Stanford, a student of music history. Since the term “music history” connotes different things to different people, certain working definitions are in order. In some circles, for instance, “music history” attempts to balance insights drawn from historical, often chronological, data with the study of the musical repertory itself; in other circles, one side of the equation often dominates. For many years, history and repertoire were almost exclusively represented through the Western European art tradition; recently, a more global view has become widely accepted. For many years, periods, genres, and, occasionally, composers defined the principal subject matter for “music history” courses; recently musicologists themselves have predicted a wholesale revolution in the delivery of such instruction within the next decade.

For our immediate purposes, let me define “music history” in as broad a manner as possible: the study of music’s background and literature from a global perspective regardless of a course’s pedagogical methodology or organizational structure.

In performance studios, the disparity between the status quo and a truly integrative approach remains enormous; some performance teachers still refuse to assist even occasionally in the preparation of any ensemble literature—orchestral, operatic, chamber—which transcends the “solo repertoire.” All this, alas, in an area where the potential for exploiting “music and its interrelationships” is so great!

Opportunities for breaking out of the “faster-slower, louder-softer” syndrome which has characterized so much performance pedagogy for so long abound for the teacher with even the most rudimentary grasp of our discipline. In relating to the area we’ve defined as “music history,” a studio teacher should, at the very minimum, ensure that his students are well aware of the most important biblio-

graphical tools which may inform his understanding and, in turn, interpretation of the repertoire being studied; to do less is to suggest to students the marginality of such concerns and, perhaps, even the ignorance of the teacher. Since the literature of a single composer in a single genre is almost always directly influenced by a much broader musical repertoire, a studio teacher in, say, piano could draw direct analogies between a slow movement of a Mozart piano sonata and one of the composer's operatic arias, between the "Appassionata" Sonata and Beethoven's symphonic scoring, between Debussy's pedaling and the textures of a gamelan orchestra. In ensuring that his students complement technical mastery with historical integrity, a studio teacher should demand that students respect appropriate period performance practices. The "composition" of stylistically appropriate cadenzas for a Classic-period piano concerto, for example, affords a student a unique opportunity to place his indelible, personal stamp upon the performance.

A few moments ago, I referred to the "understandably specialized educational backgrounds of most traditionally trained music faculty members" as an oft-cited impediment to the widespread adoption of "comprehensive musicianship." Although the anticipated rate of faculty turnover in a tenure-driven system such as American higher education may, at the very best, be described as "deliberate," I nevertheless remain relatively optimistic about the future makeup of the music professoriate. If we in higher education have indeed attained one of the nobler goals established by the founders of our D.M.A. programs many decades ago, that of providing performers formalized opportunities to harvest the abundant fruits of music scholarship, prospects for appointing a "new breed" of integrative performance studies teachers to our college-level faculties in years to come may be very bright indeed.

Although opportunities for ensemble directors to explore integrative approaches within rehearsals may appear somewhat limited, such opportunities should nevertheless be grasped whenever they arise. To be sure, ensemble members of all ages seem to generically distrust directors who "talk too much"; those conductors who primarily "say it with the stick" usually are more successful in maintaining an ensemble's attention, enthusiasm, and respect. Nevertheless, once an ensemble is "won over" and is "at one" with its director, that director has the immense power to ensure, in concise and often subtle ways, that ensemble members are aware of, at a minimum, a work's historical perspective and place of importance in the overall repertoire. In so doing, an ensemble director may reach in one "class" far more students than any single performance studies teacher may reach in an entire year.

Although one might assume that "music history" classes would be the natural habitat for integrative studies in music, such is not always the case. In recent campus visits, I have witnessed far too many situations wherein instructors simply read to an understandably bored, fidgety class from an often outdated text, seldom

offering to field questions and rarely interspersing pertinent aural examples into the “presentation.” Before you frame an erroneous stereotype, however, I should hasten to add that these “presentations” were committed by professors of all ages at all ranks.

Personally, I believe that the delivery of the history component in an undergraduate core music curriculum must take into account the proclivities, strengths, and needs of the overall program in which it is housed. Unlike a major curriculum in an undergraduate department of history, which primarily provides its students with a general background and perspective to, among other things, “avoid the mistakes of history,” the music history component in an undergraduate music major core amplifies the background/perspective spectrum to provide performers, composers, and teachers with many of those “connections” required to inform their professional judgments. In the vast majority of our programs, moreover, opportunities abound for the history teacher to relate directly to other aspects of the music program. Study repertoire for a given class might well be selected to include compositions being prepared by the school’s ensembles and/or slated for performance in the immediate community. Opportunities should be exploited to present live student or faculty performances of pertinent solo and/or chamber literature in class and, if the school embraces a performance emphasis, to frequently assess historical studies from the performer’s perspective.

If one accepts my aforementioned view of the core undergraduate music major as a tripartite amalgam of three “mini-majors,” it would seem that the recent educational trend toward a “capstone” experience in one’s undergraduate major might make *particularly* good sense in music. For music education majors, it has been convincingly argued that the student teaching semester constitutes such a “capstone.” For the liberal arts music major, a senior project more often than not requires synthesis within the discipline. For the performance major, however, the “senior recital” will explore interrelationships within music only to the extent that the student’s major professor has systematically explored such interrelationships in lessons throughout the student’s undergraduate study. Why not require, therefore, that a “senior recital” regularly be accompanied by a carefully prepared, intelligent, informative set of program notes—notes that must be approved in advance with the very same scrutiny that is applied to the recital permission “jury”? A student receiving a bachelor’s degree in any field has, supposedly, spent at least four years mastering certain basic liberal education skills, one of which is the ability to communicate effectively in writing. The attainment of a structured literacy is, after all, an important part of what distinguishes a baccalaureate degree holder in music from a performer who has, alternatively, simply studied privately with a teacher for four years.

In the early 1960s, an experienced university administrator said to me, “The musical world doesn’t need a lot more pianists—we already have plenty of them—what we need now are cultured pianists.” If, by the phrase “*cultured* pianists,” he envisioned pianists well aware of the rich tapestry of potential interrelationships within music, I think he “hit the nail on the head.” Now, thirty years later, as we consider future curricular issues within our discipline, the necessity of understanding and exploiting the warp and woof of that tapestry is more essential than ever.

COMPOSERS AND PERFORMERS: EXPANDING THE PARADIGM

ROBERT SIROTA
New York University

The arts world is changing. The academic world is changing. That giant sucking sound we have been hearing for the past decade is the sound of paradigms shifting in our respective disciplines. The relationship of the preparation of composers and performers to the study of other disciplines raises fundamental questions about the balance and substance of curricula, as well as the actual personal and professional goals and aspirations of students in music programs. While we recognize and often agonize over these questions, we and our faculties can be slow to change. This conservatism is not all bad, because we wish to ensure that the changes we make in our complicated and often overloaded curricula are intellectually and ethically sound, and truly address the changing needs and priorities of our profession, rather than simply responding to current market trends and fads. But change is upon us. The old models of what a performer is and what a composer is no longer match the goals and aspirations of many of our most gifted students. How can we broaden our curricula without losing the depth of instruction inherent in a good music concentration?

Let's examine the old paradigms for a moment. The dominant performance paradigm comes out of the 19th century. The instruments of choice are piano and the orchestral instruments, with top priority given to violin and cello. The aspiration is to become a prominent soloist in the great works, and to make a career playing solo recitals and concertos. For singers, the goal is to sing major roles on the opera stage, to sing with major orchestras and to give lieder recitals. We all know that these sorts of careers are granted to only a very few, and that even that number is dwindling. We tell this to our students, and we urge them to broaden their knowledge base, and to develop those skills and interests which will prepare them for other activities in the music professions. But that model of the performer as romantic hero is still there. It is an important dream that we ourselves are in love with.

In composition, the paradigm is often an early twentieth-century one. A "serious" composer is one who writes concert music for orchestra and chamber ensembles. He or she has works done by major new music ensembles, eventually winning significant grants and awards. Living and working in relative obscurity, the serious composer is known and deeply respected by a small circle of academic colleagues and cognoscenti, who periodically assemble in tiny but intellectually significant audiences to hear a first performance of a new work. Such concerts celebrate the composer's 60th, 70th, and 80th birthdays. When the composer dies, there are a number of festivals and recordings. When Schoenberg founded the

Society for Private Musical Performances in Vienna in 1918, he specified that “performances shall be in all respects private; that guests...shall not be admitted, and that members shall be obligated to abstain from giving any public report of the performances and other activities of the Society.”¹ He articulated a hermeticism that has defined the dominant culture in academic composition for most of the century. It wasn’t a good idea in 1918, and it is a disastrous idea now.

But, as I said, the arts world and the academic world are changing. This generation of students is far more open to new ideas about professional training than we were. I think that an important element in making formal music study more open to interdisciplinary relationships is to listen to our best students. In the area of curricular reform they are often way ahead of us. We have at NYU a fine freshman cellist who has a solid classical foundation, but has announced that among her career goals is to be a cellist in a fusion rock band. Towards that end, she is studying improvisation, music technology, and composition along with chamber music and orchestra. Other students wish to train as composers for film and television. Some instrumentalists are recognizing that they are more likely to play in theatre pit orchestras, or in commercial and recording settings than in symphony orchestras and string quartets. Some are interested in exploring the technical and business aspects of recording and production in addition to their applied major. Some singers wish to have intense training in dance and acting to better qualify them for work on the musical theatre and opera stage. This type of crossover activity is increasingly common. Many students are interested in developing a number of what Howard Gardner has labeled their “multiple intelligences.”² Focused and engaged, they bring fresh perspectives to their music study and raise important questions about how much interdisciplinary activity is appropriate and desirable in undergraduate professional training, and what impact this has on the competencies and standards in specific areas of study.

While I am by no means proposing that we make major changes in the current competencies, standards, and guidelines for our baccalaureate degrees in music, I would suggest that in many of our schools and departments, we need to find ways to promote and encourage inter- and intradisciplinary activities, which are increasingly recognized by our faculties and students as an important component of preparation for the current realities of professional life. This may indeed require some curricular reform, and certainly a broadening of options for students within current degree programs.

One important aspect of interdisciplinary study is the increased emphasis on collaborative activity. At NYU, we have both curricular and extra-curricular activities which involve composers working with choreographers, composers working with filmmakers and playwrights, and performers working with computer technicians. These activities are integrated into students’ experiences in various ways,

both curricular and extra-curricular. Composers work with choreographers from our dance program in a student-run club called Choreomuse. In addition to courses for composition majors on composing for film, the Department maintains a tape library of student composers who wish to be considered for collaborations with students making films. In the summer, I run a program called the NYU Composers Seminar, which works alongside our Tonmeister Recording Technology program. Using student performers, we follow the development of a work from conception through rehearsal to performance and recording. This kind of interaction among disciplines mirrors the professional world, and has tremendous benefits for composers, performers, and technicians. It is very important to explore the areas in which varied curricula can interact, and to encourage openness and experimentation in those areas. Special projects and productions can often be designed that genuinely fulfill curricular requirements, but which place the work in a broader context. Faculties should also examine the wisdom of some of their stylistic and repertoire limitations in requirements for recitals and projects. By far the most interesting and ambitious piece that I composed while an undergraduate at Oberlin was a full-length musical which was given an elaborate production on campus. I learned a great deal from working with the stage director, the production designers, and the playwright. It was, in retrospect, the most significant formative experience of my undergraduate years. I never showed it to my teachers, nor did they evince the slightest interest in finding out about it. That was then. This is now.

The nature and scope of inter- and intradisciplinary activities will vary with the makeup of each school and music unit. What is important is to recognize that we are being challenged by our evolving profession, and by the changing needs and priorities of our students to create coherent and practical linkages among related disciplines. The professional viability of today's performance major is greatly enhanced by a working knowledge of a number of musical styles and approaches, by the development of improvisational skills, by a knowledge of non-western music, by the ability to work with and understand computer-generated sound. Similarly, composers must conquer their hermetic approach and learn to collaborate, to give and take, to work in the theatre and the studio as well as the concert hall. These skills are strengthened through inter- and intradisciplinary activities, and we should work to provide resources and opportunities that broaden students' experience and knowledge, so that they are truly prepared for varied and rewarding careers.

ENDNOTES

¹Nicholas Slonimsky (ed.), *Music Since 1900*, 4th ed. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), 1307-1308.

²Howard Gardner, *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (New York: BasicBooks, 1983).

ENCOURAGING INTERDISCIPLINARY THOUGHT

PETER R. WEBSTER
Northwestern University

This is an exciting time to be a musician, particularly one who is engaged in teaching and scholarship. Part of this excitement is the continued growth in the number of fascinating and meaningful connections between music, other arts and the humanities as well as the social, behavioral, and physical sciences. It seems that every conference I attend, each new book I read, each multimedia software program I experience, and even most graduate student papers I evaluate these days—all have some interesting new connection between music and ideas or issues from another field. Some might suggest that this causes a lack of focus in music as art, but I contend that this is a natural result of our deepening understanding of music experience—music experience that is more than performance in a concert hall.

Of course, this broadening of music is often not understood by others outside music. While picking up some clothes the other day at my dry cleaners, the person behind the counter asked what I did for a living. “Teaching music,” I responded, knowing full well what was to come next. “Oh yeah, what instrument?” came the expected next question. After explaining that my principal performance medium is trumpet but that I really play less these days and work more on the academic side with computers and software, creative thinking research, and music listening, the person had that rather blank look followed by half smile that meant some confusion. Perhaps this is similar to the father I met recently whose son-in-law was getting a D.M.A. in trumpet. “Maybe you can explain it,” he said. “How do you get a doctorate in trumpet? Once you learn to play, what more is there?”

As we all know, there is a great deal more. For me as a college teacher preparing music educators, I still value the skill necessary to triple tongue and the ability to teach that to others; but I also know that it is vital that new teachers understand how to use technology musically to reach more children, how to recognize a visual learner versus a kinesthetic one, and how to understand the mental operations necessary to compose music. The trumpet player working on his D.M.A. might well need to understand the physiological variables that control breathing and lip vibration, the mental preparation for a performance, the life and times of Haydn, and possibly the way that a college class might best understand how to listen to music. Interdisciplinary knowledge helps us with these needs. Many problems in music we face each day can be helped by a knowledge of other disciplines. One important question for us at this meeting is how well our education system, especially our college curricula in music, prepares our performers, teachers and scholars in

music to use other disciplines. Another question is how well we, as college educators, encourage this in our classrooms, studios and rehearsal halls.

Let me take you all back to the time you first used a concept, methodology, or a general way of thinking *outside* music that helped solve a musical problem. I don't mean a required course in biology that you had to take because it was in the curriculum, but rather that time when you really found something in biology that helped to explain a musical problem. Maybe it was not a course of study at all, but you just went to the field of biology independently to help find some insight.

For me it didn't happen until the very last days of graduate school, hanging around the River Campus library of the University of Rochester trying to find a solution for how to assess creative thinking in music. It was here that I discovered the cognitive psychological literature on creative thinking and the writings of J. Paul Guilford and E. Paul Torrance. Paul Lehman, my adviser at Eastman at that time, encouraged me to continue this interdisciplinary adventure for my dissertation work. I encountered a great intellectual "rush" as I merged my work in music with the findings from another field. This excitement continues today as I read, think and write about the ideas of people like Howard Gardner, Robert Sternberg, and David Perkins in the context of music education.

Why did this happen to me so late in life? Might it have happened in some way in high school or perhaps during my undergraduate work? I think it might have if I had been taught to seek some insight on musical problems from other disciplines or from a more general body of knowledge.

LINKAGES FOR ENCOURAGING INTERDISCIPLINARY THOUGHT

Since my work involves teacher education in music, what follows is influenced by this fact. However, the spirit of what is noted here can be applied to the preparation of performers, historians, theorists, technologists, therapists, or other subdisciplines within the music enterprise. I provide below a set of linkages between important questions in music teaching and learning and support from other disciplines.

I present five sets of questions in Figure 1 that pervade all of my teaching and research. Each of these sets stem from a desire to better understand music, and each leads naturally to the exploration of other disciplines as a source of inspiration. The questions are posed on the left, and the related disciplines are included on the right.

Fig. 1. Questions and Related Disciplines

<p>Why is music so important?</p> <p>Why do we teach music?</p>	<p><i>Philosophy and Aesthetics</i></p>
<p>How do people think about and process sound as music?</p> <p>How do people think <i>in</i> and <i>with</i> sound?</p> <p>Does this change over time?</p>	<p><i>Psychology</i> Cognitive Perception Development</p> <p><i>Cognitive Science</i> Mental Representation Nature of Intelligence</p>
<p>How do we deliver the excitement and wonder of music to others?</p> <p>How do we engage people in active, participatory learning?</p>	<p><i>Educational Theory</i> Teaching Strategies School Organization and Reform</p> <p><i>Technological Development</i> Hardware/Software Application</p>
<p>How do we know that people are learning?</p> <p>How can we tell what variables effect learning?</p>	<p><i>Assessment</i> Traditional Non-Traditional</p> <p><i>Research</i> Quantitative Qualitative</p>
<p>What are the social contexts for learning?</p> <p>How are these contexts different from culture to culture?</p>	<p><i>Sociology and Anthropology</i></p>

The first set of questions focuses on the reason for our art and why it is so unique and powerful as a way of knowing. As we try to understand what we intuitively know, we make use of a long and distinguished literature in philosophy and aesthetics that goes back to the very beginnings of our culture. Psychology plays a vital role in the second set of questions, as I discovered during my time at Eastman. The more recent developments in cognitive science, itself an amalgam of many disciplines, offers enormous possibilities for the better understanding of music and its learning.

The third set of questions speaks to the issues of practice and application. The years of evidence about teaching strategies and the way we organize schools

becomes important for how we do our business. In recent times we have come to understand the role that technology can play in helping us both understand music better and teach it more effectively.

But how do we know that what we are doing is working? That is the focus of the fourth set of questions. Techniques for authentic research and assessment are important for music teaching and learning. Good examples of this for music teaching and learning include the profound effect of qualitative research and portfolio assessment techniques.

Finally, the fields of sociology and anthropology are playing more of a role today than ever before. Cross-cultural understanding of music and the societies that create it helps us understand our own music better and helps us become far better teachers, performers and scholars.

TEACHING FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY LINKS

Regardless of whether we are preparing teachers, performers, or scholars, good teaching encourages students to think independently. We must engage the imagination of our students by asking questions and encouraging individual discovery. We must view ourselves as partners in learning, not as sole purveyors of all knowledge. In doing this, our style of teaching must not dominate but stimulate. We must provide the climate for students to question and to investigate on their own.

How can we encourage our students to discover interdisciplinary support for better musical understanding? Here are a few suggestions that draw upon both curricula change and individual teaching:

1. Make an attempt to tie a related discipline naturally to music instruction. For example:
 - Encourage a flute player to find out how the instrument produces sound acoustically and how this knowledge might help playing.
 - Suggest that vocalists learn about vocal health and voice physiology as a way to better understand quality.
 - Discuss how patronage for Western art music has functioned in our society and how this might relate to other cultures.
 - Ask students to explain how the minds of children change qualitatively as they become older and how these changes might effect the way we teach music.

2. Encourage creative thinking in an interdisciplinary context by experimenting with cooperative learning. For example, teach a semester of music education philosophy or methods together with art education majors and encourage joint projects. (If it seems impossible to do this with regularly scheduled classes, try to organize special freshman seminars or junior projects.) The key here is not to have “team teaching” as much as to create teams of different students working on similar issues but from different perspectives.
3. Related to option 2, develop interdisciplinary courses that focus on a central music theme. For instance, using the music of the Beatles as a central theme, develop a cultures class that studies the changing times during the sixties and seventies in this country. Encourage students to complete semester projects that link the music to these changes.
4. Meet once a month (Friday brown bag lunches?) with music students taking courses outside the music unit to discuss how the content of these courses might help them to better understand music experience. Encourage students to transfer these ideas for themselves.
5. Use technology as a means for exploring new territory. Especially effective in this regard is the use of the Internet and its many on-line resources. Model its use in class. Encourage students to use it for information in databases and for communication with other students and faculty. Do what you can to expand the learning experience beyond the campus.

FINAL THOUGHTS

Music is changing and so is education. An outstanding music education can no longer be centered in one kind of music experience or restricted only to the music unit with an occasional course from another department just to “fill in” the schedule. As college educators and administrations in music, we know this. Perhaps it is time we tried to fine tune our curricula to reflect what we already know. This may require some new thinking about courses and course structure as noted above, but it also will require a change in the way we teach as well.

RECOMMENDED READINGS

- Bamberger, J. (1991). *The mind behind the musical ear*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Colwell, R. (ed) (1992). *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning*. NY: Schirmer. (Note: Nearly every chapter of this *Handbook* contains extensive references to research and conceptual writing outside of music which influence music teaching and learning. *Highly recommended!*)
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. NY: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1985). *The mind's new science*. NY: Basic Books.
- Hargreaves, D. (1986). *The developmental psychology of music*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Papert, S. (1993). *The children's machine: Rethinking school in the age of the computer*. NY: Basic Books.
- Sloboda, J. (1985). *The musical mind: The cognitive psychology of music*. Oxford: University Press.

ACHIEVING INTEGRATION AND SYNTHESIS

LYNN WOOD BERTRAND

Emory University

Having determined that integration and synthesis are desirable attributes or goals for most music programs, how do we go about adjusting or revising existing programs so that effective integration and synthesis can be achieved? To what extent is there a pedagogy of integration and synthesis? How much can be taught by example, through methodological approaches, and through project activity? What kinds of experiences and requirements can promote connections, integration and synthesis within the discipline, and between music and other disciplines? What specific goals seem realistic in the context of undergraduate education? The purpose of this session is to discuss the issue of integration and synthesis across the entire undergraduate experience, including both music and general studies. It will be helpful if we are able to identify issues to be considered as institutions develop goals for integration and synthesis, and identify ways in which to evaluate achievement of these goals. Given the present climate for reform in higher education and the signs which indicate that present curricula are not congruent with the challenges of our contemporary environment, it is an appropriate time to attempt to answer questions which have now been posed for a decade. I will try to incorporate many of the issues raised in the earlier two sessions.

The academic curriculum has become a main arena of cultural conflict because it is a microcosm of the clash of cultures and values in America as a whole. Not long ago decisions about what we ought to teach and what counted as “high culture” and “classical music” were circumscribed by a relatively homogenous group with a relatively common background. Today new constituencies—women, blacks, gays, immigrant groups from Asia and Latin America—are demanding a say in how we define high culture and “music worth teaching.” These are people on our faculties and in our student bodies—a less “canonical” faculty and student body implies a less canonical curriculum, a curriculum which is a debate, not a monologue. The combination of changing demographic patterns, which has made both our faculties and student bodies more diverse, and of unsettling new ideas, which challenge traditional disciplinary axioms, can no longer be avoided, and it is admirable that an institution such as ours has chosen to confront these issues in a forthright manner. I was speaking with a colleague just the other day who was complaining that there was now a whole other category of questions to be answered in NASM self-study reports—a whole section on integration and synthesis—and this person was wondering aloud how it would be possible at his institution to install yet another course in the already crowded curriculum. It was at this point that I decided what to say to you, which is what I said to him. This is not about adding a new course to address a new issue. It is not about the “live and let live” philosophy of curriculum which is responsible for the incoherence evident in

our curricula, which have been content to go on endlessly multiplying courses and subjects like boutiques in a mall²—the pluralist solution. This solution has created the very incoherence I spoke of—but equally at fault is the conservative reaction, that of superimposing a higher order, an order they like to call “common order,” but that is really only their idea of order. So the pluralist solution (everybody does his or her own thing) has been pitted against the conservative solution (everyone do the conservatives’ thing) and both have outlived their usefulness. Despite how antagonistic these solutions sound, they are really two sides of the same coin—one lets cultural and intellectual diversity proliferate without addressing the problems which arise, and the other ignores these same problems. Evasion or shut-down—neither tells us much about our problem, which is “what are students taking from our curricula which prepares them for the remainder of their lives?” The expansion of the student body to include large numbers of students from nontraditional backgrounds has been taking place at the very moment when the academic disciplines have become more wide-ranging and less restricted by traditional definitions. These students very often are able to give the instructor back what he or she said at a given time, but they have trouble with critical literacy: “framing an argument or taking someone else’s argument apart, systematically inspecting a piece of music or musical event, synthesizing different points of view, or applying a theory to disparate pieces of knowledge.”³ The confusion students feel when they are exposed to abrupt and unexplained discrepancies in assumptions as they move from course to course and classroom teacher to applied teacher and back again takes a special toll on those from minority backgrounds. No, we cannot teach “synthesis and integration” in a specially designed course. We can only acknowledge the differences in approaches and answers to questions and model a behavior which suggests that we ourselves have been through this process and are allowing our students the same opportunity to digest and filter and compare. And the truth is that it will affect *what* we teach, *what* we admit to the classroom. Many feel that admitting nonwestern elements or popular elements to the study of western music will dilute the effect of this study. Here we have to distinguish between studying a cultural form and uncritically taking it in. How are students to grasp the significance of the “high” versus “popular” distinction, or even the “Western” versus the “non-Western” distinction, and the value judgments associated with this, if they are not afforded the opportunity for comparative study?

It is possible that a student at your institution could go from a theory/analysis class which has just analyzed a Beethoven sonata in a typical, straightforward fashion to an applied lesson where it is either taught or implied that the same piece is to be considered as the “height of achievement” and to be interpreted in such a way to emphasize the unusual occurrences in the development section, to a history class which does not mention the piece at all in a lengthy discussion on Beethoven. The student receives either directly or indirectly, through what is both said and not said, three different views. Instead of encouraging him to simply

repeat each view back to each professor verbatim, the student ought to have a way to bring these views into dialogue, to know that each is valid and that each professor has arrived at his own view through the process of synthesis and integration. But the established curriculum encourages students to become cynical relativists who care less about convictions than they do about grades and careers. The disjunction inherent in most of our curricula is a powerful source of relativism. The classes and lessons and rehearsals being conducted on our campuses represent any number of potential conversations and discussions within and across disciplines. But students experience these as a series of monologues, and the conversations become actual only for the minority of students who are able to construct them on their own. It is little wonder that students feel that they must compartmentalize knowledge: become a proponent of high, Western art music in one course, admit the influence of popular elements in another, and perform recital pieces according to an interpretation which has now been handed on to them by their teachers. Conflicting views and ideas are fundamental to education. Defenders of Western art music would have no need to defend it if no one was criticizing it. Now this might be a fundamental conflict which is nonnegotiable, but we do not know that in advance, and to learn that this is or is not the case is not a worthless effort. We believe that we are making things easier for students by abstracting periods and ideas from their background and relationships with other periods and ideas. But in fact, we are making these same periods and ideas more difficult to grasp. Now I know that we cannot teach everything at once, in one class or lesson, and that things have to be isolated to learn, but this isolation does not have to preclude connections and relations.⁴ The introduction of alien elements into traditional curricula actually serves to illuminate them.

Reports from national educational organizations reaffirm "the central importance of liberal arts studies, studies which prepare for a life of learning as well as for a life's work."⁵ These same reports also emphasize that "curricular content must directly address not only subject matter, but also the development of the capacity for—and skill in—analysis, problem solving, communications, and synthesis."⁶ Any music curriculum in and of itself has all this: it requires verbal and quantitative skills, the ability to synthesize, organizational and human relations skills, and an understanding of cultural and intellectual diversity. It should be possible to introduce a multitude of analytical perspectives and extend into the scientific, religious, historical, linguistic, and social areas of learning as well. To accomplish this we must teach the importance of process as well as the final product. If we do not teach students how to learn and how to understand and judge what they have learned, we are simply teaching repertoire. No one denies the need for depth of understanding and learning, but depth which requires sequential learning and gradually more sophisticated understanding of the material (like the study of music) should also encourage an effort toward integration and synthesis of material. To ensure that students and faculty have the opportunity to integrate

knowledge from various disciplines, educational requirements need to be redefined and existing courses and methodologies adjusted to accommodate a more comprehensive approach to learning.

Demographic studies have recently revealed that the concept of the American melting pot has been seriously challenged and that, instead of a “melting pot” metaphor, some attempt must be made to describe the American social fabric more in terms of a mosaic of multiple cultures, of various ethnic communities which maintain a distinct cultural identity while contributing to the “national culture.” We are becoming more isolated from Western European traditions and more influenced by those of African, Asian, and Hispanic origin. Ethnic and cultural diversity are a reality, and music educators need to view this reality as an opportunity to expand our educational base to reflect the varied cultural resources of our society. Absolute isolation from Western art music would be rare, and rarer still would be isolation from Western popular music. For this reason the core of almost every undergraduate program in music in the United States is that of Western art music. But the students who are now actively partaking of this curriculum are increasingly a multiethnic group. If each music of the world contributes to the definition of its own culture, surely we as music educators must do something to ensure that the knowledge and experience our students take from our classrooms are reflective in some way of our multiple cultural society and admit both the advances of technology and the experimental directions of the expanding Western art music repertory.

In 1989 the College Music Society published a report of a study group on the content of the undergraduate music curriculum and listed the following as “What the Music Student Needs to Know”:

(1) a working knowledge of American musics—their history, literature, and sources in art and vernacular traditions; (2) an awareness of the pluralistic nature of most musical traditions—including Western art music; (3) an understanding of various music cultures from many perspectives—their value systems, logical relationships, grammar, structure, notations (if they exist) and, within their contexts, the relationship of music to other arts, religion, philosophy, and human values; (4) an ability to make music by performance, improvisation, and composition, and preferably in more than one tradition; (5) an ability to perceive links and connections—by means of comparative studies—that synthesize and extrapolate information gained from different disciplines and specialties; (6) a familiarity with technology and the ability to consider the electronic age in aesthetic and humanistic, as well as scientific and mathematical, terms; and finally (7) an understanding of the political, social, and economic factors which affect the arts disciplines in the United States and the rest of the world, in order to make informed decisions as performers, listeners, composers, consumers, and/or patrons, taxpayers, and voters.⁷

“Without a knowledge of the language of the...arts, we see less and hear less. Without some experience in the performing arts, we are denied the knowledge of disciplined creativity and its meaning as a bulwark of freedom and an instrument of social cohesion.” This quote comes directly from a report entitled “Integrity in the College Curriculum,” and it is interesting that the word *integrity* is used in this title. Integrity—behavior in accordance with a strict code of values, moral or artistic—and integration, the incorporation of diverse elements into a well-ordered system or society whose behavior is based on similar standards: both derive from the Latin which means whole, complete, not fragmented. Let us not teach our students that fragmented knowledge is normal and acceptable, that it is enough to know only a specialized field. Even if that specialized field is mastered, if no effort is made to gain some effective control over it, integrating it, perhaps even making some small contribution to it, then the mastery remains incomplete, fragmented.

A look at the history of education reveals that schools in a democratic nation are most supported when there are international, national, or local tensions that threaten the survival of political, economic, or spiritual beliefs. Kennedy gained support for the National Defense Education Act to a large extent because of the country’s belief in a missile gap, and Johnson’s extensive educational and social reforms were enhanced because of the perceived Russian threat to the United States. But what of our future? The place of music in the future will depend upon its priority in a world order. The world economy has entered a new phase. Although for a while now, assistance has been directed toward central and eastern Europe at the expense of Third World nations, schools in both the Second and Third World are being restructured. Whether music will be a part of the curriculum depends upon world, and specifically American, leadership, the philosophy of education, and the priority given to music in a well-considered plan.⁹ Music curricula must evolve a compelling set of experiences compatible with our evolving pluralistic culture and our colleges’ and universities’ value systems. Many will state that their institution turns on fiscal considerations, so we must ask the question, “Are music curricula affected by the fact that money is a dominant factor in the culture of our universities?” The truth is that “the state of the economy and the support of music instruction have historically had little relationship.”¹⁰ In times of financial crisis in America (1837-38, the last decade of the 19th century, the Great Depression of the 1930s) new music programs were initiated, music camps thrived, new music texts were published and purchased, and there was general improvement in performance. The 1980s, a period of affluence for schools, however, were not noted for the quality of their music programs. More important than fiscal consideration is the consideration that many music curricula are being constructed on incoherent philosophies, “those based on aesthetics and the uniqueness of the musical experience.”¹¹ It is true that music learning ought to make a unique contribution to the quality of life, but more importantly, it must contribute to the educational core of an institution in the same manner as other subjects. It must be

matched to the progressive educational movement of the institution and of society. We can no longer depend on lucky matches, but must promote those music programs which have value on the basis of their contribution to society. University music faculties resist change, arguing that better professional training (making students better musicians) will solve the problems of disintegrating public school music, lack of performance opportunities for trained musicians, shrinking audiences, and the lack of appreciation for formal, live performance. This is the search for facts to justify present programs—vindication, not investigation. Instead we might make better progress and accomplish more within college and university systems if we were engaged in searching for ways to integrate the music curriculum itself and to synthesize what is learned through the music curriculum with what is learned in the whole educational process. Rather than waste time defending music curricula which are not important in an economic system, state clearly that a music curriculum which resonates with society and its needs is of critical importance in moral education. Provide administrators with evidence that the music curriculum relates to the overall education of every student, that it contributes to the broader, collective base of knowledge necessary for our students to function in society, that while music students are developing skill and expertise in their chosen area, they are also learning the larger artistic context of that skill. Assure those interested that the context of music education is not only the institution, but American society and world society as well. Once music administrators have made a case for the music curriculum in a contextual manner, then specific directions can be presented in such a way that they will be perceived as worthy of support because they contribute to the whole educational process.

Some institutions have made efforts to integrate the arts disciplines through a “related arts” approach. Usually this implies that students are requested to compare a variety of creative works in detail and to examine in an inclusive way the culture through which these works were created. While most everyone would agree that there is no substitute for a thorough, rigorous training in a single discipline which produces technical mastery and in-depth knowledge in a specific area, it is also our responsibility as music educators to bring about greater communication among the arts disciplines. If one of our objectives is to make the arts, and in particular, music, accessible to the public and to raise the audience level of artistic sophistication, some institutions may wish to consider a “related arts” approach as a supplement to traditional approaches which include appreciation courses and studio and performance classes. One institution, Northeast Missouri State University, has had measurable success with this approach and defines its approach as such:

The student is exposed not only to a single discipline, but to several—music, art, architecture, theater, and, on occasion, commercial arts such as design, fashion, and advertising—in order to bring about a better understanding of the role of the arts, both individually and collectively, in culture. The related arts approach also seeks to point out commonalities and differences among the various arts and to

examine their reciprocal influences. With this approach the student is taught to think not only as a creator, but as a consumer of the arts as well. The intended result is the empowering of students to become more creative, knowledgeable, and involved in shaping the artistic tastes of the population as a whole.¹²

As to the question of pedagogy in a related arts course or courses, there would appear to be a great deal of choice. Some institutions have utilized the team-teaching approach successfully; others have found it to be too cost-prohibitive and constraining to the autonomy of the professors involved. Other institutions have preferred the single-teacher approach with recourse to resource teachers who are available to make presentations in their area of expertise. And Leon Karel and Ira Schwarz, in their book *Teaching the Related Arts: A Guide to Education in the Arts*,¹³ identify nine various approaches to the subject matter. Six of them may be regarded as contextual as they exhibit some external common denominator: chronology, geography, ethnocentrism, political systems, social groupings, and economics. The other three approaches are called elements and structures, aesthetic principles, and the psychology of creativity and expression, and all presuppose some basic knowledge of the terms used to describe a work of art. The idea behind all of these approaches is that students learn equally from both similarities and differences exhibited by the different art forms, and that they are engaged on both the cognitive and affective levels. It is probably too often true that students in traditional music appreciation classes are able to list characteristics of Stravinsky's *Le Sacre du Printemps*, compare it to other musical works of Stravinsky and the period, and make some statement about its historic importance, but the same information could be elicited by asking the student to discuss the profound asymmetry that was the essence of several artistic works from 1910-1914. A question such as this allows the student to relate music, theater, choreography, visual art, stage design, costuming, etc. to a single element.

The concern with student evaluation on both the cognitive and affective levels is discussed in detail by Benjamin Bloom in *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals*. Bloom¹⁴ defines the cognitive domain as divided into six hierarchical classes (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) and the affective domain into five classes in hierarchical order (receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization by a value or value complex, integration). It would be worth asking ourselves how many of our students in our courses and applied music lessons get past the level of analysis to synthesis and evaluation and past responding to valuing, organization and integration.

The "related arts" approach is one way in which some institutions have hoped to achieve a measure of synthesis and integration particularly for the general student. With a renewed interest in "interdisciplinary" and "cross-disciplinary" courses it might even be so successful that "core requirements" would include such a

component or that institutions would encourage a final project which required a degree of synthesis and integration on the part of the student and professor.

For music curricula in and of themselves, achieving synthesis and integration is both easier and more difficult. It is easier because the commonalities and elements of the various branches of music are bound to be more apparent when one is looking for them, but it is more difficult because music professors tend to be passionately involved in their area of specialty. There is great temptation, especially at the more advanced level of learning, to barricade ourselves in our studios or classrooms and deal in-depth with single subjects or single approaches. It is also difficult for many faculty members to accept that the discipline itself has changed, as has the patronage system for the arts. You have heard in the previous two sessions some ideas for achieving a degree of synthesis and integration in music curricula. To recap and add to the list:

1. Double majors—combining music with other fields of study
2. Courses which introduce foreign elements. Surveys of Western music which also introduce music of other cultures in a comparative way.
3. Syllabi comparisons within departments or divisions to identify points of overlap or points of difference. Students can learn as much from differences as they can from commonalities.
4. Development of resource individuals outside music who are committed to similar ideals of integration and synthesis.
5. Introductory classes which require students to seek out other arts examples which illustrate certain points or elements discussed.
6. Making teaching more like an informance than a performance.
7. Capstone experiences, senior projects, senior recitals, and student teaching as vehicles for synthesis and integration.
8. Introduction of the analytical, cognitive component into applied teaching.
9. Applied studio portfolios.
10. Listening carefully to our students. Colloquies which have conversation, not lecture, as their agenda.
11. Changing the role we play as teachers—we do not have all the answers.
12. Encourage interdisciplinary exploration which has at its heart a musical problem.
13. Use what students already know, what is popular, to build a bridge to what you want them to know.

In 1985 a study was funded and supported by the American National Theatre Academy, The Lilly Endowment, and the UCLA College of Fine Arts. The findings of this study were published in a monograph entitled *The Maturing of the Arts on the American Campus: A Commentary*.¹⁵ Some of the findings are particularly interesting as we attempt to deal with our topic today. For example, this study

found that the scale and the mission of the individual institution are of paramount importance in discussion of curricula and the administration of those programs. It was generally agreed that the arts in higher education had become, for the most part, an integral part of the academic scene and were in a maturing process which put their future in the hands of the arts leaderships on campus. The future of the arts in higher education lies in the hands of its educational and artistic leaders, along with those professionals in the arts who will find common cause with those on campus. Higher education must continue to define and clarify its role in the arts. For example, its work as patron, producer, teacher, researcher, and policy-maker needs constant attention.

Other findings which have direct bearing on our subject¹⁶ can be listed:

1. The university is a patron of the arts.
2. The university must define its role in the arts.
3. There is not a major discontinuity between the arts and technology.
4. New technologies have never hit the arts with such an impact as they have today.
5. The university is not generally interested in the commercial arts, but in the "advance guard."
6. The arts are in the service of the community. They have a social responsibility as taught in the university, e.g., national policy.
7. The "skilled amateur" may be the key "product" of the arts in higher education.
8. Conventional 19th-century Ph.D. research in the arts is dead. Performance theory, anthropological oriented research is alive. Research in the arts must be re-defined.
9. Understanding what one is doing precludes "the empty technique" and focuses on the audience.
10. Humanizing the arts is the responsibility of the artist.
11. Individual differences must be recognized and dealt with.
12. The effect of the "marketplace" on academic matters is a fact which cannot be shrugged off. The relationship of the artist with his audience is a vital one for the artist and our society today.
13. In light of the "economic crunch," fund-raising and reallocation of funds is a major problem to be met.
14. The chair of an arts department has dual responsibilities: educational and artistic leadership.
15. An "Institute of Advanced Study in the Arts" is a must for major research universities to provide extra-departmental growth, a place where inter-

arts efforts, experiments and studies of all kinds can develop in an arts environment where power is vertical and hierarchical.

One can see from the variety of studies completed and documents produced, that questions posed by the major educational institutions and foundations are all, to one degree or another, concerned with the curricular issues of synthesis and integration because they describe that part of the educational process which is so hard to define. But, really, is it not true that the instructor *is* the curriculum? If in my teaching I do not empower my students to achieve mastery and creative control—integration—of the subject matter, I fail. And if I as an administrator do not support and facilitate efforts of faculty to do the same, do I not fail in a larger way? For seventy-some years music departments and schools of music have imitated other academic disciplines in order to be accepted. Well, we are now accepted and it is now expected that music departments stand up to the academic conditions as a fully tenured member of the established institution. This means that we must become a place where student and faculty musicians thrive, and to do so we must pay attention to the call to be more interested in each other and each other's work. This includes our colleagues and students in our own department, those in the other arts departments, and the rest of the university as well. We must listen to the emerging view that "art for art's sake" is dead, or at least dying, and that musicians must now respond to the community. The musician who becomes more engaged with his own environment—artistic, social, economic and political—will be the one that not only survives, but flourishes.

A national organization such as NASM can help music administrators with strategies (changing philosophies, recruitment procedures which support new philosophies, defining quality and excellence, and attaining certain degrees of collegiality among faculty), but actual tactics and implementation (curricula, personnel, budget) will vary greatly from one institution to another. Two factors become of immediate importance to any music administrator thinking about curricula issues: understanding the mission of the institution and the role music can play in such, and understanding that scale is a critical factor in the way in which music can work on individual campuses. If the mission of the department of music does not resonate with that of the institution, we may as well be shouting in the wind. If the catchwords of the day in your institution are "inter-relatedness, cross-disciplinary, multicultural," etc. and you are talking about professional training, standard repertoire, excellence in performance traditions well established, you may tune your audience out. This is not to say that one should abandon these things, but that one should make an effort to show how music by its nature crosses lines and is related to other arts and society in general. Erza Pound has said, "Music begins to atrophy when it departs too far from the dance; ...poetry begins to atrophy when it goes too far from music."¹⁷ We do not, I think, want to be perceived as atrophied. It is therefore important that we are constantly aware of the educational concerns

of our institutions and that we become real players in a game which in recent years has become much broader. We need to understand the mission of the place, and scale has, of course, a direct bearing on this understanding. If an institution is going to field performance groups, an optimum size of student body and faculty must be maintained and performance studies balanced with other studies.

The music administrator is of utmost importance in the search for, and support of, synthesis and integration in the music curriculum. If you as an administrator believe in such synthesis and integration and it resonates with your institution's educational goals, then you will become the facilitator of such as you support faculty efforts and engage in discussion with others about the educational process. If your institution is, on the other hand, clear about its goals which do not overtly support or require such synthesis and integration, then such things will either not be accomplished or they will, of necessity, have to be accomplished in a smaller arena. I would hope, however, that conservatories, schools of music, and departments whose mission is to train professional musicians do not succumb to splits *within* our discipline. I do not believe that there are incompatible, fundamental differences of function or method between composers and musicologists, between theorists and performers, or between dancers and cellists. All musicians need to make music and to encounter it and its related arts.

In summary I would say that the starting point is to know and understand what is meant by integration and synthesis, and to discover if such ideas are consonant with the mission of your institution. Only then can you initiate dialogue with faculty and students and find the best way to achieve some measure of these things on your own campus.

ENDNOTES

¹Gerald Graff, *Beyond the Culture Wars* (New York: W.W. Norton, Inc., 1992), p. 8.

²*Ibid.*, p. 10.

³Mike Rose, *Lives on the Boundary* (New York: Free Press, 1898), p. 187.

⁴Graff, p. 100.

⁵*Music in the Undergraduate Curriculum: A Reassessment* (Boulder, Colorado: The College Music Society, 1989) CMS Report Number 7, a report of the study group on the content of the undergraduate music curriculum.

⁶William J. Bennett, "To Reclaim a Legacy: Text of Report on Humanities in Education," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Volume XXIX, Number 14 (28 November 1984).

⁷*Music in the Undergraduate Curriculum: A Reassessment.*

⁸*Ibid.*

⁹Mark Fonder, editor, *The Ithaca Conference on American Music Education: Centennial Profiles* (Ithaca, New York: Ithaca College, 1992), p. 121fl.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²John M. Lee, "A Related Arts Program: Its History and Future Direction," paper presented at *North Carolina Symposium on Leadership in the Arts*, Chapel Hill, September 1993.

¹³Leon Karel and Ira Schwarz, *Teaching the Relating Arts: A Guide to General Education in the Arts* (Kirksville, Mo.: Simpson Publishing Co., 1973), p. 16.

¹⁴Benjamin S. Bloom, et al., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain; Handbook II: Affective Domain*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1956-64.

¹⁵Jack Morrison, *The Maturing of the Arts on the American Campus: A Commentary* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1985).

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Ezra Pound, *ABC of Reading* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1934).

ACHIEVING INTEGRATION AND SYNTHESIS

COLIN MURDOCH

San Francisco Conservatory of Music

I.

I should begin by admitting to more than a moment or two of panic because the only piece I believe I have ever read that treats integration and synthesis adequately is Lincoln's *Second Inaugural Address*. You will recall that that address contains only five paragraphs.

So I searched for more reachable inspiration. In Ogden Nash I rediscovered a few favorite lines that perhaps you have heard:

There is something about a Martini,
A tingle remarkably pleasant;
A yellow, a mellow Martini;
I wish I had one at present.
There is something about a Martini,
Ere the dining and the dancing begin,
And to tell you the truth,
It is not the vermouth—
I think that perhaps it's the gin.

Martinis and curricula have commonalities. Too much of either can leave exceedingly unpleasant after-effects. Each can manifest elegance and subtlety. Perhaps the major distinction is long-term effect. Sipped in moderation, martinis have no long-term effect. "Education," however, as Mark Twain equipped, "may not be as sudden as a massacre, but long-term, it is just as deadly."

I trust that this session is concerned with the long-term effect of our profession's collective endeavor from the broad perspective of integration and synthesis.

II.

It is my privilege to have served for three years on the former Commission on Undergraduate Studies and then subsequently to have served for three years on the Commission on Accreditation. In retrospect, one of the several memories I have of this commission work is that there were many outstanding liberal arts as well as professional music curricula reviewed during those six years. Not one of these curricula, at least in my memory, established integration and synthesis as its pre-textual, philosophically defined, primary objective.

Allow me now to shift from the floor of NASM commission meetings to the floor of the first concurrent meetings of the American Musicological Society, The College Music Society, the Society for Music Theory, and the Society for Ethnomusicology. One product of these meetings, held in Vancouver in 1985, is the CMS publication you have, I'm sure, seen: *Fact and Value in Contemporary Musical Scholarship*. I will say that for years, I have every so often tortured my way through that document, and it is only recently that I have come to comprehend it as an intellectual mating dance in which there is a whole lot of dancing—but little, if any, mating.

Fact and Value in Contemporary Musical Scholarship begins with individual statements by the four presidents of the societies. Next, four different speakers offer responses to the opening statements on behalf of the four societies. Finally, the initial presenters respond to the responses to their initial presentations. I think you will agree that there is a tone of exasperation in President Phillip Rhodes's response to the response to his initial statement (at that time, Rhodes was President of The College Music Society):

[It was] pointed out that I was actually addressing the fact and value "of" scholarship rather than fact and value "in" scholarship...

What I had hoped to call for was the initiation of a dialogue among all the disciplines to consider some basic questions about the nature and purpose of our research. For example: what do we want to know; what do we need to know; why do we need to know it; to whom and towards what end are our efforts directed; what are the values that guide our scholarship; what topics have been overlooked or omitted; what is the relationship of scholarship to teaching?...

Some of my colleagues have called these questions naive. Others see them as sinister and some view them as perhaps revolutionary. Why are we so threatened by these questions? The whole point of asking them, or so it seems to me, is to find out what we can do together to better inform the larger picture of our collective efforts.¹

Phillip Rhodes had called for, in his earlier remarks, consideration of a system that recognizes and evaluates excellence in teaching as an equal partner to excellence in scholarship. Rhodes had alleged that the profession uses a language so highly specialized that disciplines within the profession are barely able to talk among themselves. He urges us to "sit down and discuss among ourselves the idea of a comprehensive research agenda for music in higher education that shares some common goals."²

Three years after the Vancouver conference, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges was also in the mood of integration and synthesis. The newly revised 1988 *Handbook of Accreditation* included a revised standard for general education that mandated an equivalent of two years in general education

and free electives for all baccalaureate degree programs offered under its aegis. Imagine this: in a nation whose system of higher education is perhaps best distinguished by its diversity, an entire region in which every baccalaureate degree program exhibits the same, predetermined curricular structure! This is not to challenge the intellectual merit of such a curricular structure, but what conceivable thought process could have led experienced educators to conclude that one—and *only* one—curricular design is *the* design that *all* baccalaureate students must experience? How, with what were undoubtedly the best intentions, could the objectives of integration and synthesis become so terribly obfuscated?

It is not my purpose to assail the Western Association, AMS, CMS, the Society for Music Theory, or the Society for Ethnomusicology, but Phillip Rhodes was right in a major way in 1985 when he suggested the need for a “comprehensive research agenda for music in higher education that shares some common goals.”³ Given what we know in 1993 about the state of professional music organizations, about music education in all levels, and, indeed, about education at all levels, Rhodes is even more right today. The need for integration and synthesis in our community is apparent as well as urgent. That NASM has identified this topic for this annual meeting in San Francisco says again how very fortunate the NASM membership is to be guided by leadership which finds its motivation in well-defined philosophic principle as opposed to special agenda.

San Francisco was also the scene last April 6 at which the Council on Post-Secondary Accreditation’s President Kenneth Perrin delivered an address to the COPA membership on the occasion of COPA’s semi-annual meeting. In this address, Perrin first describes a contentious relationship between the accreditation establishment and Capitol Hill. Quoting from an earlier address, Perrin then says: “While I’m obviously concerned about the attack on accreditation, I’m even more worried that the divisiveness within our own community may constitute the bigger threat to our collective future.”⁴ Perrin goes on to say, “Unless we truly make some substantive changes in the next three to five years, I’m not optimistic that...we can withstand another attack like the one we just experienced.”⁵

Well, Perrin called for substantive change. COPA, the accrediting association of accrediting associations, the association to which we would have looked for leadership in areas of integration and synthesis at presumably the highest level of principle and policy, will, as we know, be dissolved on December 31 of this year.

III.

In his article, “In Praise of Teachers,” American playwright Mark Medoff, perhaps best known for *Children of a Lesser God*, describes the experience of returning to his high school in order to speak to a drama class. Afterward, he asks if his

senior-year English teacher is still teaching at the school. In his own words, his meeting with Miss Roberts transpires as follows:

"I'm Mark Medoff," I tell her. "You were my 12th-grade English teacher in 1958..." And then this writer, armed with a message he wants to deliver in some perfect torrent of words, can't deliver anything more memorable than this: "I want you to know," he says, "you were important to me..." And there in the hallway, this slight and lively woman, now nearing retirement age, this teacher who doesn't remember me, begins to weep...Irene Roberts holds me briefly in her arms and through her tears whispers against my cheek, "Thank you." And then with the briefest of looks into my forgotten face, she disappears back into her classroom, returns to what she has done thousands of days through all the years of my absence.⁶

This story evokes the image of all those teachers who have shaped and do shape young lives in the eternity of Henry Adam's famous line. It is also a story that contains elements absent from standards of accreditation and absent from the goals and objectives of professional societies. I would respectfully suggest that perhaps in our zeal to be rational in the linear sense, to codify and delineate education in an academic sense, and to intellectualize beyond recognition certain things which are intrinsically emotional and nonverbal in their nature, perhaps we have lost the pulse of the higher calling of what it is we do. Perhaps we need to revisit and hold more precious the true meaning of what draws us together at this annual meeting year after year.

During the several hours yesterday and today that this interest group has been in session, we have talked much about change and difficult times. If I were an outsider visiting these proceedings, I might think that we are a bit self-absorbed. I might wonder whether we mistakenly believe that we are the first generation to have to square off against what has been described as a paradigm shift. If we are daunted by Internet, just imagine how daunted we would have been a few centuries ago by the printing press. Change in the form of paradigm shifts has always been with us, has it not? Finances have always been tight for most music units in higher education. It has always been difficult to earn a full-time living as a creative artist. We should worry less, I think, about whether we provide our students with the so-called tools and techniques of change. Our students are already there—we do not need to show them the way. What we should worry about a great deal, I think, is whether and how we teach our students to think.

"I want you to know that you were important to me" is not only a meaningful affirmation, it is perhaps, the only meaningful affirmation of sustained, long-term integration and synthesis. It is based upon years of shared and mutually cherished love of subject between student and teacher. It is based upon respect and trust, each of which has a profound life beyond the facts which were also undoubtedly conveyed.

If I were an outsider dropping in on these proceedings, I might also wonder about so many white males talking about issues of diversity. I might wonder how many of them work for or work with women in high places. I might wonder how comfortable our notions of diversity are with openly gay and lesbian people in high places. I might wonder, too, how our highly literate faculties are equipped to communicate with an immigration of all sorts of students for whom basic literacy is a challenge. I would respectfully suggest that for many of us, multiculturalism is not some futures concept; it is a reality of daily life. There are many institutions in this association that are years ahead of the people who are writing about this subject.

You will recall in my opening remarks an allusion to Lincoln. I have wondered often whether his magnificent talent as a writer derived not so much from his exceptional ability to think clearly and to articulate these thoughts succinctly, but from his transcendent ability while in the company of charged and complicated issues to elevate thoughts and ideas on the basis of an appeal to principle, conscience, and the human spirit. Consummate pragmatist as well as philosopher, Lincoln knew, in the final analysis, that an appropriate orchestration of life forces was essential to any long-term resolution of complicated life issues.

In the interests of achieving integration and synthesis in the undergraduate curriculum or, for that matter, in any other curriculum, I would respectfully suggest that we would be well served if we paused to re-examine the heartbeat of our purpose. If, in fact, our profession is music in all of its glorious iterations and the teaching of that music, would not our institutions and curricula be well served if they made room in their definitions for added sensibilities such as love of subject, joy of teaching, and appreciation of beauty? For concepts that resist easy and precise definition such as commitment and idealism? For qualities in students and faculty that resist easy assessment such as leadership skills, originality, and creativity? For change that contributes to instructional excellence, not change as a function of special interest? And on this day, the 30th anniversary of John F. Kennedy's assassination, should we not make room for hope and inspiration, without which the entire continuum of teachers teaching young people has no meaning whatsoever?

If and when our profession admits to such a philosophic center, I would respectfully suggest that it will be then and only then that integration and synthesis will have the potential for sustainable meaning. To reinvoke Ogden Nash, it is then that we will know what the tingle in our musical martini is truly all about.

ENDNOTES

¹Phillip Rhodes, *Fact and Value in Contemporary Musical Scholarship*, The College Music Society, 1986; p. 48.

²Ibid., p. 19

³Ibid., p. 19.

⁴Kenneth Perrin, "Accreditation at the Crossroads," The Council on Post-secondary Accreditation, April 6, 1993, p. 2.

⁵Ibid., p. 6.

⁶Mark Medoff, "In Praise of Teachers," *New York Times Magazine*, November 9, 1986, p. 72.

PERFORMANCE STUDIES: STANDARDS AND EFFICIENCY

PERFORMANCE STUDIES: STANDARDS AND EFFICIENCY

ROBERT THAYER

Bowling Green State University

It is my assignment in this afternoon's session to present a brief background as to why the topic of performance studies is on our annual meeting schedule, to suggest some problems, and to offer some hope regarding solutions. Although I pretend to speak neither for my co-presenter nor our moderator, it is my personal belief that this session will have been a success if at its conclusion everyone in this room is somewhat uncomfortable!

For each of the past several academic years it has become increasingly clear that our enterprise, higher education, is being affected by national and world events in ways that are more profound and potentially long-lasting than at any time in the memories of most of us. As recently as the elections of earlier this month we have again been reminded of some dominant themes in our social and political climate: we distrust our leaders, and we are hostile toward increasing—or even maintaining—public support of society's collective projects (translation: we don't want to pay taxes!). We are caught up in a struggle between short-term rewards ("Are you better off this year than you were last year?") and issues with far-reaching consequences: reducing the national debt, protecting the environment, promoting international trade, providing health care benefits for coming generations, determining how many human beings our planet can support, and deciding whether to build more and larger prisons or better schools.

These themes have direct implications for those of us in higher education, which is, after all, a long-term investment yielding few immediately apparent results. As music administrators, we are now all challenged, perhaps more severely than ever before, with the problem of setting priorities. With budgetary resources in, at best, a "holding pattern," what programs and curricula shall we retain? What new programmatic opportunities must we be prepared to seize? As faculty and staff vacancies occur, what changes in position descriptions should be made to reflect new demands? Above all, how can we best provide the optimal environment for learning?

I believe that all of us will agree that as administrators we have two major responsibilities: (1) to provide programs of the highest possible educational and artistic quality, and (2) to secure the resources to assure this quality.

Exactly what are music administrators' responsibilities with respect to the quality of applied music offerings? One means of answering this question is to examine commonly accepted professional standards. The *NASM Handbook* contains a number of helpful references. A handout available at the door provides a summary of curricular standards concerning applied music. It should come as no surprise to any of us that we have the obligation to offer intensive performance instruction by qualified faculty, evaluate faculty who teach performance, include assessment of the level of performance achievement in admitting students into professional degree programs, provide adequate facilities and equipment, and evaluate and maintain records on students' progress through the educational program. It should also be noted that we are responsible for assisting all of our students to develop improvisation skills, work independently on musical problems, and—at least for students majoring in performance and music education—receive orientation to and experience with the fundamentals of pedagogy.

As you know, ethical standards are also addressed in the *Handbook*. Each NASM member institution "shall impress upon its faculty and staff the importance of personal and professional integrity. This involves developing sensitivity to issues in...consumer protection."¹

The Code of Ethics of the Music Teachers National Association is more specific with respect to ethical practice as a standard of professional conduct:

- Members shall exhibit the highest standard of expertise by maintaining their professional abilities in their fields of teaching and performing.
- Members shall maintain and increase the prestige of the art of teaching and shall promote the teaching of music as a culturally enriching profession.
- Members are responsible for encouraging, guiding, and developing the musical potential of each student.²

As we reflect on changing priorities in the context of the standards of our profession, it is more necessary than ever before that we—as musicians, teachers, and administrators—apply all available analytical tools to an examination of every process in our enterprise. No aspect of our educational mission, programmatic offerings, and teaching materials and techniques can be permitted to escape the searching hand lens of our investigation. Since this search must include even the most sacred traditions of musical education, we must be willing to include a close

analysis of one of the musicians's most pervasive and basic instructional venues, the applied lesson.

Music administrators have a number of reasons to be vitally concerned with the quality of effectiveness of applied instruction. An all-too-obvious example is the increasing necessity on most campuses to review the status of every vacated faculty position. The costs associated with music programs are certainly well known to those upper-level administrators to whom each of us report. The traditional applied studio 1:1 model, while not the sole contributor to these costs, is a factor. Many of us have faced the challenge of explaining "applied music" and justifying its costs to a dean or vice president who has not had the advantages of an education in music!

The "efficiency" associated with the delivery of applied music instruction is an important consideration for administrators, faculty, and students alike. Of even greater significance is the quality of students' learning experience. Closely related to these issues are a variety of other topics. As one example, NASM standards for professional degrees strongly recommend that students not only learn to perform well themselves, but that they also learn teaching skills and acquire a knowledge of music literature. How can we most effectively make use of our resources—including students' time, energies, and tuition dollars—to combine these elements?

A number of other fascinating topics pertaining to applied instruction come to mind. For example:

1. Curricula for applied study: What do all students need to know? Can an effective course of study be developed by studio teachers? Can such a course of study be applicable to all students? What variations might be adopted to meet individual needs?
2. Technology: What technological developments have implications for applied instruction? Can technology help with skill development? Can it impart that cognitive knowledge considered the responsibility of the studio teacher? How can technology assist students with the acquisition of skill and knowledge outside of "lesson time"?
3. Group lessons: What successful models exist? How are the lessons organized under these models? Does creation of a structured curriculum (course of study) facilitate group instruction? How can a course of study be established so as to serve students at various levels (e.g., freshman through senior?) Are there examples of effective use of the "open studio" concept?

4. **Pedagogy:** Do successful models exist for combining the systematic study of pedagogy with applied instruction? How can the “guinea pig” stigma be avoided? How do students react to attempts to combine these studies?
5. **Teaching repertory:** What repertory should be studied? Should repertory be tailored to the individual student? If so, what factors should influence the choice (e.g., the student’s ability, interest, vocational plans)? What is an appropriate balance of “new” music, early music, transcriptions, music of cultural sources outside the Euro-American tradition? Is this balance the same for all media? What is an appropriate balance between solo repertory, etudes/technical studies, chamber music, orchestral studies, and other literature? Is this balance the same for all media? How much emphasis should be placed on literature that the student is unlikely to perform upon leaving the academic environment?
6. **Repertory study:** Do successful models exist for combining the systematic study of repertory with applied instruction? Is the group lesson venue appropriate for repertory study? If so, what structuring is effective? How do students react to attempts to combine these studies?
7. **Related performance skills:** Should the systematic study of such performance skills as sight-reading and improvisation be included in the applied music curriculum? Is such study appropriate for all media? What are the most effective means of including this study?
8. **Teaching techniques:** What information about learning theory is useful for studio teachers? How can teachers acquire this information? Are such techniques as “writing across the curriculum” useful in studio instruction? Can written assignments be effectively employed? How can teachers acquire knowledge about these techniques?
9. **Reinforcement of general musicianship knowledge and skills:** What responsibilities do studio teachers have to introduce and/or reinforce general musical knowledge? How can knowledge of notation, theory, music history, music literature, and musical form be enhanced through applied study? Can compositional skills be developed through applied study? How can productive communication be promoted between applied faculty and colleagues in other music disciplines?
10. **Testing and grading:** What are appropriate mechanisms for testing students’ achievement in applied music? What alternatives exist to traditional testing through jury examinations and required recitals? To what extent should applied music grades reflect present achievement as op-

posed to improvement and/or effort? What grading “curve” should be expected in applied music? What is the relationship between grading curves and student performance? What knowledge of assessment theory is desirable for applied faculty? How can such knowledge be acquired?

11. Development of students’ independence: What procedures are possible for increasing students’ analytical abilities, problem-solving skills, and artistic judgement? How can students be taught effective and efficient practicing techniques? In what contexts and to what degree should students be expected to exercise musical and pedagogical judgements? How can independence of students’ musical and pedagogical judgements be systematically achieved?
12. Faculty and student attitudes: How does tradition affect the willingness of faculty and students to engage in experiments with applied music curricula and teaching techniques? How can resistance be overcome? How can faculty development resources be effectively employed? How can students be persuaded of the merits of non-traditional applied music study?
13. Research materials: How can student use of resources such as books, periodical journals, and audio and video recordings enhance applied study? With what materials should applied students be familiar? Which of these are of universal significance and which are medium-specific? How can students be motivated to use these materials outside of the lesson period and then apply what they learn from them? How can these materials enhance students’ abilities to form critical judgements? How can students’ skills in performance-related research be developed?

These are only examples. I urge you to add your own questions to this list.

In a few moments my Bowling Green State University colleague, Richard Kennell, will share with you some very interesting research that promises to provide a framework for the kinds of investigation that we are suggesting. However, before Dick speaks, please allow me to provide some additional background information.

Some months ago, as Dick Kennell and I began our preparation for this session, one of our first strategies was to review the major theme of the NASM annual meeting of nine years ago. At the meeting, the topic area “A Research Agenda for Music in Higher Education” was considered in some depth. The purpose of multiple sessions on this subject was “to begin the process of identifying research needs of music in higher education for the remainder of this century and beyond,” with the primary objective “to generate ideas for the development of a research

agenda, including content and operations of research activity.” The need was suggested during these sessions for more philosophical work in the field of music. Roles for NASM were recommended with respect to research advocacy, the addition of research review guidelines to the NASM *Handbook*, dissemination of data and results, and clarification of principles of equivalency of performance with research. The final sentence in the topic area summary reads: “NASM’s continued concern, support, and endorsement of music research in higher education will assure the profession that in the decades of the ’90s and into the 21st century we will continue to chart our own course in our discipline.”³

One presentation at the 1984 meeting, particularly telling in light of today’s topic, was delivered by Clifford Madsen of Florida State University. In remarks entitled, “Developing a Research Agenda: Issues Concerning Implementation,” Dr. Madsen observed that research on applied music had, to that time, been especially limited. Listen again to his observations:

The general tenor of even some of the best institutions still evidences great pressures from the past: the tacit assumption prevails that the best, if not the only, way to study music is to apprentice with a master. This attitude in its *extreme* seems to be based on three assumptions: (1) rejection of another teacher’s worth, (2) religious dedication to one’s own abstract ideas and methods (which would change if tested through research), and (3) a firm belief that any student who does not produce from this inspired teaching is obviously untalented...

It seems that the way musicians pass on their applied art has not substantially changed in hundreds of years. Young Wolfgang was instructed by Leopold in much the same manner as applied music is taught today—one on one within an apprenticeship model. The essence of this model seems to rely on individual musicianship (craftsmanship) and the ability of the student to learn from the master.

The tremendous facility required for professional performance demands optimum efficiency. Much time is wasted when conflicting opinions, which could be tested experimentally, are argued and debated. This does not imply that Leopold Mozart was not a good instructor for Wolfgang; he obviously was. It does seem unfortunate, however, that some applied musicians continue not to recognize anything outside of “apprenticeship” in the study of applied music, and most aspiring musicians are not Mozarts. Many problems encountered in learning performance skills can be studied scientifically.⁴

As Dr. Kennell will momentarily discuss in more detail, a survey of some widely respected professional journals over the nine years since Dr. Madsen’s observations reveals that very few researchers have heeded the pleas of 1984. Several authors have underscored Clifford Madsen’s point:

One of the least investigated aspects of traditional music instruction is the applied lesson and its modes, methods and procedures. The private, individual study of an

“apprentice” student with a “master” teacher-performer has changed little during the past several hundred years.⁵

Although shrunken skulls or chicken blood are certainly not a part of applied music instruction, there is a mystery that often surrounds that applied studio. This issue peeks behind this veil of mystery as we fulfill our continuing goal of meeting the broad interests of all those involved in music teaching and learning.

After all, whether one conducts bands or choirs, teaches music theory or trombone, or administers large or small music programs, we all have experienced, first hand, music teaching and learning in the applied studio. In fact, applied studio instruction may be the single music teaching/learning experience that binds us all together.... We tend to believe the applied studio is the cradle of musicianship; it is responsible for inspiring, instructing, and preparing the world’s musicians. Yet precisely because we expect the applied studio to produce our finest performers, applied instruction is often shrouded in mystery:

- What happens in the applied studio?
- What makes an applied music teacher effective?
- How do applied music teachers gauge their success?
- How are applied music teachers and their students evaluated?

In spite of all we know about music teaching and learning, the applied studio’s instructional processes are often ignored in research.⁶

Theory and practice in applied music have traditionally relied on informal speculation, anecdotal evidence, and a cache of teaching methods handed down from one teacher-student generation to the next. The practice of applied instruction has tended to be idiosyncratic and based more on intuition than on a systematic examination of assumptions. While one-to-one music instruction has obviously been successful, additional systematic research could serve to identify its underlying principles, increase its efficiency and effectiveness, and provide a more complete understanding of the applied music process.⁷

A theme of all of these observations is well summarized in an earlier article by Radocy and Boyle: “The traditional weekly private lesson grossly ignores what is known about learning.”⁸

My recapitulation is simple and direct: The study of applied performance lies at the heart of the education of musicians, requires a significant expenditure of time and energy by every student in degree programs in music, and consumes a major portion of staffing resources. Although the field of applied music has a rich potential for important and useful research, relatively little attention is being paid even to informal experimentation, let alone formal study, in this central curricular component. Perhaps the high overall quality of applied teaching and the successes

generally associated with this means of instruction have lulled us into an unquestioning state. More likely, the traditional separation of scholars and practitioners, accompanied by a certain amount of mutual misunderstanding, even distrust, have stalled us. After all, our present-day music units, housed as most are in liberal arts colleges and multipurpose institutions, represent a blending of the European conservatory model and that of the solely “academic,” research-oriented university. In many of the institutions represented here today, we find certain divisions between those who “do” music and those who think, talk, and write about it!

Sadly, many undergraduate music majors are given little or no opportunity to engage in research, as traditionally defined, in the field of their major. Of more concern, many master’s-level music students perform, at best, only very limited research. And worst of all, a significant percentage of the graduates of our programs have no real understanding of the research process or its significance. It is hardly surprising that many who go on to careers as college teachers are insufficiently prepared in research methodology, view research efforts with suspicion—if not open hostility—and fail to appreciate the practical potential of research, even in their own branch of the discipline.

There are two reasons for music administrators to promote research in the field of applied music. First, research can lead to practical application. It can improve the quality of our educational product and help us efficiently to use available resources. Knowing as much as possible about the processes and products of applied instruction can help with decisions about staffing (for example, the number and definition of faculty lines and the division of full- and part-time assignments), instructional modes (including class size, delivery systems, student selection, instructional outcomes), and faculty personnel policies (appointments, development, loads, evaluation). Second, academic leaders have the responsibility to promote inquiry. We all know how much the unexamined life is worth! We also know that research is a fundamental mission of higher education. A major responsibility for enlivening research activity rests directly with administrators who are in a position to stimulate colleagues and students in fulfilling this important mission.

Are you feeling uncomfortable yet? I hope so. I think the time is at hand to examine even the most sacred of our traditions.

But be of good cheer! My colleague, Richard Kennell, is going to share some research results that can provide us with a framework for this examination.

ENDNOTES

¹NASM *Handbook 1993-94*, p. 22, Article I.

²Code of Ethics, Music Teachers National Association.

³*Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting: National Association of Schools of Music*, LXXIII (1985): 33-87.

⁴Clifford K. Madsen, "Developing a Research Agenda: Issues Concerning Implementation," *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting: National Association of Schools of Music*, LXXIII (1985): 37-43.

⁵John M. Geringer and Clifford K. Madsen, "An Investigation of Transfer: Music Education Research and Applied Instruction," *Bulletin, Council for Research in Music Education*, No. 91 (Spring, 1987), p. 46.

⁶Manny Brand, "Voodoo and the Applied Music Studio," *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*, Vol. III, No. 2 (Summer, 1992), p. 3.

⁷Charles P. Schmidt, "Systematic Research in Applied Music Instruction: A Review of the Literature," *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*, Vol. III, No. 2 (Summer, 1992), p. 44.

⁸R.E. Radocy and J.D. Boyle, *Psychological Foundations of Musical Behavior* (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1979).

PERFORMANCE RESEARCH SINCE 1984

RICHARD KENNEL

Bowling Green State University

Dr. Thayer [*see preceding paper*] and I are treating Clifford Madsen's 1984 NASM address as a benchmark against which to measure our progress in advancing a research agenda dealing with applied music instruction. In that address, Dr. Madsen observed, "The way musicians pass on their applied art has not substantially changed in hundreds of years."¹ He lamented that performance practitioners—and I paraphrase—have little interest in professional knowledge that is obtained from scientific methods.

He also stated, "Issues relating to applied study are extremely complex and need a good deal of research that is much more comprehensive and sophisticated than we attempt at present."² He encouraged music administrators to support research that addressed applied music instruction as a special cognitive and social human context.

My remarks today will consist of three parts. First, I will provide a brief overview of recent research efforts concerning applied music instruction. Then, I will introduce you to a social instructional theory called *scaffolding*. Finally, I will offer some personal speculations on the possible importance of scaffolding theory for music teaching, music administration, and continued research.

In a sense, almost every research study, analytical paper, and philosophical essay has implications for some aspect of applied music instruction. But for the purpose of this update, I am going to focus on studies since Dr. Madsen's 1984 address that have focused on the teaching-learning process in the context of the applied music lesson.

Our limited time today does not allow sufficient opportunity to develop the important assumptions underlying this overview. So here at the outset, let me identify two of these assumptions.

The performance-research contradiction is the result of the blending of two important historical-cultural traditions and their respective institutions: the conservatory and the university. Musicians have coexisted with scholars in American universities for only a relatively brief period of time. We easily recall the tremendous conflict that occurred in this country when, earlier in this century, the study of music performance was advocated as an academic entity in the American university.

It is my first assumption, as a result of this “fortunate or unfortunate” marriage, that the kinds of questions musicians ask and the kinds of expectations we raise have been influenced by the values of our dominant cultural institution, the university. Why, just note the title of this session: “Performance Studies: Standards and Efficiency”! We could spend the entire session just deconstructing the cultural values and bias embedded in this title. Would this topic have been presented at the Paris Conservatory in 1896? I don’t think so!

Assumption number one is that our contemporary view of music and the study of music has been influenced by the cultural values of the American university.

Our ability to conduct normal research results from both the availability of an effective theory and the availability of appropriate research methods to test that theory. One possible reason why music research has not been of greater interest to performers is that the research itself has not been grounded in a viable theory of applied music instruction.

We have sophisticated research methods at our disposal, but the overwhelming body of existing research has been dominated by only one educational theory: behaviorism. We have research that focuses on the stimuli and reinforcement aspects of music instruction, but (here I agree with Dr. Madsen) this literature has not been of great interest to music practitioners. Applied music teachers just do not connect what they do in practice with educational theories based on behaviorism.

So, assumption number two is really a personal conclusion: we just do not seem to have an effective theory of applied music instruction.

Of course, the scarcity of research on applied music instruction can be explained by other reasons as well. Music performance faculty traditionally have not been trained in empirical research methods. There are extreme difficulties in designing quantitative research studies that involve the instructional setting of private lessons. Also, music faculty who have acquired the necessary research skills have more frequently focused their professional attention on group teaching situations.

As a result, there have been only a handful of studies since Dr. Madsen’s address. I will discuss three of these as representatives of our current empirical knowledge of applied music instruction.

In 1984, Roseann Rosenthal designed a study to test three applied music interventions in “The Relative Effects of Guided Model, Model Only, Guide Only, and Practice Only Treatments on the Accuracy of Advanced Instrumentalists’ Musical Performance.” In effect, Rosenthal represented applied teaching as teacher talk,

teacher demonstration, or a combination of teacher talk and demonstration. The practice-only treatment served as a control.

Rosenthal reported that modeling alone (a demonstration performance) was more successful in producing an effective student performance than the guide-alone or the guide-plus-model intervention.

In 1986, Lowell Hepler started with the premise that we do not understand very much about teacher-student interactions in applied music lessons. He developed an observational measurement system designed to quantify interactions between teachers and students in applied music lessons. The observational categories he established were validated by a panel of distinguished music experts. Videotapes of twenty different applied teachers were reviewed, and interactions were tabulated every six seconds. The results were published as "The Measurement of Teacher/Student Interaction in Private Music Lessons and Its Relation to Teacher Field Dependence/Independence." Hepler's conclusion: in applied music lessons, students play and teachers talk!

Embedded within this study is an interesting little dilemma concerning our efforts to study applied music. If the rationale of the study was that we truly do not understand the dynamics of applied music instruction, then how could we use music "experts" to validate that study? Is our knowledge really so limited? Let me provide an example: if we are used to seeing the sun rise in the east and set in the west each day, our experts can describe in great detail how the sun rotates around the earth. Of course, we now know experts can be wrong!

But Hepler quantified something that was extremely important. He observed that in practice, real applied teachers talk more than they demonstrate. Yet, we also know that demonstration is a very powerful teacher intervention. If demonstration is so effective, why don't applied teachers use it more in applied lessons? This is a compelling contradiction.

Our long and successful tradition of passing on such highly complex cultural knowledge from generation to generation suggests that applied teachers are highly effective in what they do. Let's turn now to the third study of applied music instruction.

This study was an experiment that I completed in 1989, titled "Three Teacher Scaffolding Strategies in College Instrumental Applied Music Instruction." From this title, you can tell why I am going to talk later about scaffolding theory! This experiment was actually inspired by the Rosenthal study: performance gains in three treatment groups were compared to a practice-only control group.

My study also included a model or demonstration treatment. But Rosenthal's guide-only treatment has been divided into two different treatment groups based on different forms of "teacher talk": "marking critical features" and "reducing degrees of freedom." For now, just think of these treatments as "*highlight the task*" and "*simplify the task*." While the initial experimental design was similar, these are fundamentally different treatment groups.

Another major conceptual difference dealt with the assigned musical task. The Rosenthal study presented one musical etude to her subjects. The Kennell study actually consisted of three different tasks representing three common pedagogical contexts. In effect, I ran three versions of the same experiment using three different musical tasks.

The first task represented high conceptual mastery and high skill mastery. The second task represented high skill mastery but low conceptual mastery. The third task represented low skill mastery but high conceptual mastery.

While Rosenthal found that demonstration was an extremely powerful teaching strategy, Kennell suggested that its effectiveness was limited to dealing with conceptual deficiencies. Other instructional strategies, such as reducing degrees of freedom, would be effective in dealing with skill deficiencies. In effect, applied teachers might employ different teaching strategies to deal effectively with different types of student problems.

These three studies, of course, represent only the initial empirical inquiries into understanding the complexities of applied music instruction. They are of interest because they reveal fundamentally different theoretical understandings of applied music instruction. Hepler's study in effect acknowledged a theoretical void—he simply wanted to describe what applied teachers do. Rosenthal depicted applied music teacher behaviors as consisting of modeling, talking or a combination of modeling and talking. Finally, Kennell suggested that applied teachers choose among various instructional strategies such as task modeling, task highlighting, or task simplification.

My experiment was based on a social instructional theory called "scaffolding." Since this theory is relatively new, I would like to explain it in greater detail for you. I believe this theory has important implications for music teaching and future research.

The origins of scaffolding theory can be traced back to the father of Russian cognitive psychology, Lev Vygotsky. Vygotsky wrote and published in the early 1930s. Unfortunately, time does not permit an adequate review of this remarkable man's contributions. For now, I will just acknowledge Vygotsky's interest in

expert-novice relationships. He called the expert-novice relationship a joint problem-solving context. This unique and powerful learning context is created when one individual with greater experience has the responsibility to bring about greater capabilities in a less experienced individual.

To Vygotsky, paper and pencil tests only measured previously existing knowledge. He called such tests “self problem solving.” Joint problem solving, however, allowed a teacher to better assess a student’s true potential for learning. In a joint problem-solving context, the teacher selects the next task especially for a particular student.

Vygotsky’s work was almost totally unknown in the West until 1962, when his now famous book, *Thought and Language*, was translated into English. His writings described a “Zone of Proximal Development”—an area of joint problem solving just beyond the novice’s current capabilities but within reach with the assistance of a more experienced expert.

Vygotsky’s notion of a zone of proximal development influenced a number of educational researchers in the 1970’s. Among them was the famous American educational psychologist Jerome Bruner.

Bruner and his colleagues worked to extend Vygotsky’s notion by utilizing the science of the day. They focused their attention on the specific interventions that experts utilized to support novices in solving a joint problem. From this work, they coined the term “scaffolding strategy” to represent specific teacher interventions they observed in expert-novice interactions.

Scaffolding as a metaphor nicely captures many salient features of the teacher’s actions in a joint problem solving context. A scaffold, of course, is used to reach for something beyond our current grasp. It is temporary and is removed when no longer needed. How do teachers act as scaffolds for their students?

From their study of a familiar context of expert-novice joint problem solving, Bruner and his colleagues identified six different scaffolding strategies:

The **recruitment** strategy focused the student’s attention on the task at hand: *“Have you studied the music of Paul Hindemith in theory class? This next piece is by Hindemith.”*

The **reducing degrees of freedom** strategy simplified the assigned task for the student: *“Let’s play this piece at a slower tempo...” Or, “Put your instruments down and just clap the rhythm...”*

The **direction maintenance** strategy had a future orientation to it and facilitated future learning. Goal setting is a good example of direction maintenance: "*Let's prepare this piece for our studio recital in three weeks...*"

The **marking critical features** strategy simply highlighted some aspect of the task: "*That phrase is forte...*" Note that this strategy did not simplify the task; it just focused the student's attention on some pertinent aspect of the music or the student's performance.

The **frustration control** strategy was utilized to counter fatigue or to anticipate frustration due to high task difficulty: "*I know this new piece is hard—just try to do your best!*"

Finally, the **demonstration** strategy offered an ideal model of the task for the student.

By identifying these six specific scaffolding strategies, Bruner and his colleagues have given us an opportunity to examine possible underlying rules that might govern the teacher's actions in a joint problem-solving context. For example, why does the teacher use a demonstration intervention instead of a recruitment strategy? Under what conditions are specific scaffolding strategies effective? In short, what rules govern the selection of effective interventions in private music lessons.

Jerome Bruner proposed the first rule for choosing an appropriate scaffolding strategy. He suggested that the teacher would present scaffolding strategies in a specific order. Starting with *recruitment*, effective teachers would then *demonstrate* the task in its entirety, then simplify the task for the student using *reducing degrees of freedom*, then finally *mark critical features* until the task was completely mastered by the student. At this point, the teacher assigns a new task and the order is presented anew.

David Wood, one of Bruner's colleagues, disagreed. He suggested that the scaffolding strategies functioned as a teacher involvement hierarchy. *Demonstration* represented the greatest teacher involvement. *Marking critical features* represented the least teacher involvement. *Reducing degrees of freedom* represented a level of teacher involvement in between *demonstration* and *marking critical features*.

The advantage of this hierarchy was that it allowed Wood and his colleagues to formulate a simple rule governing the teacher's selection of a specific scaffolding strategy. That simple rule is:

“If the student improves, when you next intervene get less involved. If the student does not improve, when you next intervene, get more involved.”³

Wood’s scaffolding rule relies on simple teacher assessment to determine the selection of an appropriate scaffolding strategy. By noticing student improvement or deterioration, the teacher chooses the appropriate intervention strategy.

In an attempt to find out if scaffolding strategies could be found in applied music instruction, I reviewed transcripts from seven applied music lessons. These consisted of three consecutive lessons with one applied teacher and four consecutive lessons with a second applied teacher. I focused on the teacher’s interventions in the lessons and classified the teacher’s comments based on the six scaffolding strategies.

Here is a summary of the scaffolding strategies from these seven lessons:⁴

STRATEGY:	FREQUENCY:
Recruitment	5
Reduce Degrees of Freedom	35
Direction Maintenance	17
Mark Critical Features	160
Reduce Anxiety	19
Demonstration	42

We notice, of course, that marking critical features was by far the most frequently observed strategy. Recruitment was hardly used at all! As a result, I am very skeptical of Bruner’s order of presentation theory. The applied teachers did talk a lot to the students. Reducing degrees of freedom and demonstration were clearly the second most utilized strategies after marking critical features.

In reviewing the applied lesson transcripts, I further noticed that the marking critical features strategy actually appeared in four different forms or modes: (1) we can make a statement; (2) we can show a non-verbal gesture; (3) we can ask a question; (4) we can issue a command. All of these will mark a critical feature.

We can highlight any specific aspect of the music by utilizing these four modes of expression. Underlying each communication mode, however, is a specific attribution on the part of the teacher. Note the difference between *assessment* and *attribution*:

Assessment notes success or failure—how much success or how much failure was observed.

Attribution, however, provides a rationale or assigns a reason for the observed success or failure—why the failure occurred.

For example, if we observe a performance failure, we can attribute this failure to one of two possibilities:

If the student did not understand what was asked, we could demonstrate the new concept. Or, if the student knowing what to do just forgot to execute the task properly, we could remind the student with a statement or a non-verbal gesture.

A third possibility exists. If the teacher lacks sufficient information to judge, we could ask a question and learn more about the student's knowledge.

But music—like everything we do—requires that our understanding of the task is matched with some skill capability. Music represents the “psycho-motor” domain, suggesting that we must have both cognitive and motor competence working simultaneously for successful execution.

You cannot perform a task you do not understand. Likewise, you cannot perform a task you do understand, if the skill demands are too high for you. So, we can present a similar attribution model for skill:

If we decide the student just does not have the necessary skill, we could simplify the task. Or, if we decide the student does have the skill but just did not pay enough attention, we could remind the student with a statement or non-verbal gesture.

Likewise, if we do not have sufficient information to judge, we could issue a command and test the student's skill.

In short, the teacher's choice of an effective scaffolding strategy appears to me not to be based on a simple assessment of success or failure, but on a more complex process of attribution. In other words, the assigned reason for failure drives the pedagogy rather than the simple observation that failure occurs.

If we put these two attribution models together, we arrive at a decision tree that leads teachers to three possible scaffolding strategies: marking critical features, reducing degrees of freedom, and demonstration. However, because we have four different modes of interaction for marking a critical feature, this strategy has four times as many chances of being selected as does the demonstration or reducing degrees of freedom strategies.⁵

In other words, for every pedagogical decision in a music lesson, there are six possible outcomes. Four of these outcomes are forms of marking a critical feature. One outcome is demonstration and one outcome is reducing degrees of freedom, a ratio of 4:1:1. You may recall that these were the approximate ratios I found in the applied lesson transcripts.

This may also provide a theoretical explanation why applied teachers in fact talk more often than they model or demonstrate in the music lesson!

This is scaffolding theory. Scaffolding is an instructional model that explains and predicts the choices experts make in working with novices in applied lessons. Viewed from a Vygotskian perspective, the applied lesson is first a joint problem-solving context. Teachers then create zones of proximal development for their students by assigning just the right pieces to just the right students. Finally, the teacher chooses the appropriate scaffolding strategy to match her attribution of the student's specific problems.

There are a number of important implications derived from this theory. I offer these personal speculations for your consideration.

First of all, the scaffolding model makes predictions—and these predictions can be empirically evaluated. Scaffolding therefore suggests a strategy for future research efforts.

For example, it allows us to rephrase familiar research questions with much greater specificity: not just, “How do experts and novices differ?” but, “How do experts and novices differ in their use of demonstration?”, or “How do experts and novices differ in the ways they mark critical features?”

Instead of focusing our attention on reinforcement strategies and rewards, scaffolding directs our attention to the moment of instruction—our interaction with the student. The teacher is not a spectator. She is an integral participant in the music lesson.

Scaffolding theory allows us to examine the teacher's intervention in much greater detail. We can first discuss the teacher's attribution of the problem. Then we can discuss the generic scaffolding strategy that she chooses. Finally we can discuss the improvisation that the teacher creates from the scaffolding strategy to fit the context of the moment.

The scaffolding process suggests how a teacher's finite experience can address a seemingly infinite number of unique teaching problems. Like great jazz, the artist-teacher spins an infinite amount of teaching material from a limited set of underlying rules.

From the scaffolding model, we see the applied music teacher as a thinking, deliberate, and engaged problem solver. The teacher's problem-solving processes are highly automated and even invisible to the observer. Yet scaffolding theory suggests a methodological problem-solving mechanism that may underlie our seemingly spontaneous instructions.

Scaffolding is derived from Vygotsky's notion of the special human teaching-learning context called joint problem solving. From this theoretical perspective, we can see that applied music instruction is fundamentally different from lecture-class instruction. The role of the teacher is different, the teacher's knowledge of the individual student is different, and the selection of tasks for the student is different. Perhaps this is why it is so difficult to apply a university grading system designed for the lecture hall to studio instruction! Also, perhaps this is why we do not have uniform curricula in flute, violin or piano! Private music instruction is just a fundamentally different mode of instruction! The vocabulary of scaffolding allows us to describe this uniqueness in greater relief and detail.

Another interesting aspect of scaffolding theory is that it presents us with a vocabulary—a palette of possibilities, if you will—that can guide our efforts to teach novices how to teach. Pedagogy classes might make use of videotaped lessons, watching for instances of teacher interventions such as demonstration, marking critical features, and reducing degrees of freedom. Students might be asked to practice various ways of simplifying musical examples. Scaffolding might help us to help our students learn how to become better teachers.

Of greater interest to me, however, is the possibility that scaffolding theory confirms our professional practice. It portrays performance practitioners as reasonable, rational experts possessing and applying a highly specialized professional knowledge. Again, the fact that we have been so successful in passing such a highly complex form of human knowledge from generation to generation speaks to the effectiveness of applied instruction. Instead of viewing performance practitioners as deficient because they do not appreciate our empirical research, it may be that it is our empirical knowledge that is limited.

Viewing our professional practice from the perspective of scaffolding theory, we can see that we do what we do because it is the right way, the most efficient way. And it is the most effective way of producing top performance from our students.

Note that scaffolding theory leads us to so many different professional issues and concerns. It raises more questions than it answers. And in my opinion, it illuminates the artistry that we know exists in teaching music. It reassures us that what we do is valid, effective, and important.

In looking to future applied music research, I would like to return to the two underlying assumptions of this paper. First, our view of music and music instruction is influenced by the cultural values of the university. Second, we do not seem to have a viable theory of applied music instruction.

Well, scaffolding theory offers us the opportunity to evaluate a new theory of applied music instruction—one that was not available in 1984. And our colleagues across campus are now asking new and exciting questions. Cognitive science has replaced behaviorism as the dominant paradigm in educational psychology. We have new qualitative research methods that have been designed to look at individual cases and provide rich detail. We are now more interested in human interaction—the social context of learning. We are interested in the influence of culture on learning. And, we are interested in breaking apart highly automated cognitive processes so that we can understand the underlying rules of our problem-solving strategies.

In short, our empirical study of applied music instruction—which has been heretofore beyond the grasp of the large group studies of quantitative research—is now at center stage. And, for perhaps the first time, we can consider not just what we can learn from our colleagues across campus, but what new ideas, exciting insights, and important knowledge musicians can offer them!

In closing, there is one final implication of scaffolding theory that I would like to mention.

Do you recall earlier that I cited the work of Jerome Bruner and his colleagues who originally identified the six different scaffolding strategies? I stated that they studied a familiar joint problem-solving context. Do you have any idea what special human relationship they studied?

They observed parents working with their children.

Scaffolding theory provides a direct link between teaching music today and the granddaddy of all instruction, parenting. In a sense, it connects what we do in transmitting the culture of music with the timeless flow of human history. Our relationships with our students are personal, intimate, and caring because we may have borrowed the successful techniques that parents have used in teaching their children from the dawn of time. And we may have refined these techniques far beyond childhood instruction to the most advanced levels of performance.

Just think about the vocabulary we hear in and about the studio: “My kids...” or, “I just love the way you express that...” Even these familiar expressions may be vestiges of the first human educational institution, the family. And reflect for a

moment on the esteemed lineage of applied instruction. We take great pride in the line of succession from our teacher's teacher to our teacher, then from our teacher to us because *we are a family!*

Scaffolding theory offers us a new way to conceptualize what we do in teaching music. It illuminates the moment-to-moment decisions that we make almost automatically. It raises new questions and suggests new possibilities. It reveals the highly complex problem-solving activities that expert musicians must master to become successful teachers. Scaffolding theory gives us a brief glimpse into the artistry involved in teaching music.

ENDNOTES

¹Clifford Madsen, "Developing a Research Agenda: Issues Concerning Implementation," *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting: National Association of Schools of Music* no. 37 (1984): 37.

²*Ibid.*, 38.

³D. Wood, H. Wood, and D. Middleton, "An experimental evaluation of four face-to-face teaching strategies," *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 1 (1978): 133.

⁴Richard Kennell, "Toward a theory of applied music instruction," *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* 3 (1992): 11.

⁵*Ibid.*, 5-16.

REFERENCES

- Hepler, Lowell. "The Measurement of Teacher/Student Interaction in Private Music Lessons and Its Relation to teacher Field Dependence/Independence." Ph.D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1986.
- Kennell, Richard. "Three Teacher Scaffolding Strategies in College Applied Music Instruction." Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1989.
- Kennell, Richard. "Toward a Theory of Applied Music Instruction," *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* 3 (1992): 5-16.
- Rosenthal, Roseann. "The Relative Effects of Guided Model, Model Only, Guide Only, and Practice Only Treatments on the Accuracy of Advanced Instrumentalists' Musical Performance." *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 32 (4), (1984): 265-273.
- Vygotsky, L. S. *Thought and Language* (A. Kozulin, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1987.
- Wood, D.J., J.S. Bruner, and G. Ross. "The Role of Tutoring in Problem Solving." *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17 (1976): 89-100.
- Wood, D., H. Wood, and D. Middleton. "An Experimental Evaluation of Four Face-to-Face Teaching Strategies." *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 1 (1978): 131-147.

TEACHER EDUCATION IN THE EVOLVING ACCOUNTABILITY CONTEXT

WHO IS ACCOUNTABLE—WE ARE

ROBERT J. WERNER
University of Cincinnati

As I began to prepare some remarks for this session, I was most concerned with coming to grips with what is meant by accountability, as perhaps compared to evaluation. I concluded that I would use as my benchmark the meaning of accountability as defined by Kenneth Mortimer when he said, "Accountability accentuates results—it aims squarely at what comes out of the educational system."¹ That is, not just content, as right as this is that the standards stress this over resources and methodology, but achievement is the test of content. As the overview for this session indicates, accountability evolves from a context that is shaped by our expectations of achievement. I have used these standards to focus my own thinking for making these few remarks for your consideration, so that, as this session was intended, we might focus on a few issues of concern to music units responsible for preparing future music teachers.

At the same time, I want to caution us that, as a NASM Executive Summary of November 1990 reminded us, we should be careful of the tendency to confuse raising standards with the standardization of results. Thus, my remarks are intended to accept accountability for also raising the standards of teacher education and through this the standards of the teaching of the alumni of these programs. It further warns us about the "reluctance to face the ultimate difficulty of measuring and articulating what constitutes good results." NASM has participated in this debate for many years. In its leadership position with the Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education in 1987, you might remember that it helped to publish a statement on "Teacher Education in the Arts Disciplines."² In reviewing this publication again, I found an important statement on accountability that focuses on the theme that I think we should be developing today. In this pamphlet, the committee points out that there are numerous accountability systems within teacher education in the arts, the most important of which, of course, are the accreditation standards set by the various associations in arts education such as our own NASM standards; in addition there are the general teaching standards of NCATE and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education which have influenced numerous state certification standards. However, it should be noted that quite often these additional standards require less than NASM's accreditation standards.

Recognizing this points out the importance of individual and program accountability as the basis for teacher education. May I suggest that we all are accountable for students in music education in several ways—from admission to retention and graduation, from teacher preparation curricula to initial and permanent certification. At each step there should be a sense of accountability achieved through constant monitoring of the process.

The WGAHE publication concludes by indicating that “the most important kind of accountability, beyond basic competence, is that imposed by an individual...that is, by his or her own commitment to a higher level of achievement.” I interpret this to be not only the individual student who is the recipient of our instruction, but the instructors themselves, and therefore the institutional administration that oversees such instruction for teacher preparation. I view accountability as being responsible first to our discipline and then to ourselves as measured against the highest standards of our profession. Our accepting this obligation voluntarily is the most important aspect of professional accountability and the implementation of standards.

For the members of NASM, accountability in teacher education should be of the highest priority, for this is the fundamental constituency within the Association, even though over the past two decades or more, there has been a noticeable shift in programs among our member schools from having music education as their primary mission to an increased emphasis on performance majors. As we know, this seems to reflect a national trend that now considers the education profession generally to be of a lower status.

Thus, as I view the issue of accountability, I begin with our Association’s responsibility to our membership to realistically discuss the ability we each have to influence and shape the education of musicians as teachers, so that we each recognize and accept our role for developing the talent and commitment of our professional students as the basis for effective and meaningful performance as teachers.

What we need is a new vision of what an education in music should be. The basis for this is contained in NASM’s newly adopted standards of a year ago for undergraduate programs that require a thorough grounding in the music competencies that are the fundamental preparation for teaching music. This has been a theme that the Association has continued to develop through several revisions of its standards, starting in the early 1970s with the acceptance of the “basic musicianship” standard that has been the keystone for the development of undergraduate and graduate programs ever since.

The National Standards for Education in the Arts³ comes with its own call for responsibility and accountability. Whether it eventually develops nationally accepted norms as a basis for the revision of state objectives or certification requirements or not, it should be seen first and foremost as an opportunity for those of us responsible for teacher education to review our objectives, our procedures, and our product.

We must ask ourselves if we are preparing teachers who can communicate even the most basic elements and various aspects of musicianship as represented in and called for by these standards. I believe that no matter what effect these standards might have, if they provoke a serious discussion and review of our music education programs, they can be responsible for a significant change in the profession. As the draft indicates, "Without question, the standards...call for improvement and change in how arts education is organized and delivered. They also contain the potential to act as a lever on public perception and teacher preparation."

They go on to acknowledge the important role that higher education must play because of our responsibility for pre-service and in-service training by indicating that "teachers encourage and lead this initiative process since it is impossible to teach what one does not know. Bringing the Standards to life in students will require professional development for many teachers and changes in many teacher preparation programs. Pre-service training will have to be restructured...teacher education institutions and local programs of in-service education all bear a responsibility." Certainly this is accountability of a most basic kind. It challenges us to be responsible for providing teacher preparation and professional development that will allow our teachers in training and our graduates in the field the ability to realize the quality of music education being proposed.

No matter how well shaped and articulate these Standards eventually become, they are mere words if they are not realized by teachers at all levels from preschool to graduate education. With this in mind, I would remind us of the discussions that we have had during the past few years within NASM, to which President Miller referred yesterday, under the general rubric of "All One System": that is, music study of all types from ages three through eighteen. As you know, it emphasizes the interrelationship that exists between the traditional K-12 school music program, the private teacher and the community and divisional music schools, since the practitioners in each of these settings are the alumni of our programs. They hold the ability to realize these standards and more.

As you can tell, I take a rather simplistic approach to this issue of accountability. I see it beginning with those whom we admit to our teacher education programs, those that we pass on to upper division status, and those that we graduate and continue to train through graduate and in-service programs. Our objectives

and standards are represented by the education they receive, which in turn should directly influence their ability to realize the basics of their art as articulated by our NASM standards.

The issues paper which was written for this session posed two rather important questions, one as to whether values are imposed from the outside, often driven by the political agendas of others outside the field, or if they are developed in a proactive atmosphere by our profession, our Association, or our music units? The other question is similar when it asks, what events, issues, and forces have the power to produce change? In both cases, I believe that these are questions best answered by recognizing and assuming the responsibility of *the individual*.

I have to admit that I have become a bit cynical about national reform because it produces precious little change. I've come to a strongly held conclusion that change only comes from individuals or groups of like-minded individuals with similar purpose. That is what I hope we have in NASM. This Association, through its influence on programs in our member schools, can contribute in all its contexts. Whether it is through our standards, their standards, or a combination of standards, in the end their implementation and our accountability comes back to each and every one of us first individually and then collectively.

The most important consideration in regard to accountability is the recognition that music education reform remains the basis for all that happens within the profession. The most important issue that should concern us is that the basic responsibility we have to our profession is the education and re-education of our pre-collegiate music teachers.

They are our future, the seed corn of the profession. We are accountable that all musicians in training obtain a comprehensive knowledge of their art and assume a responsibility for communicating this to a new generation.

For me, the answer to who is accountable is quite simple—*we are*.

ENDNOTES

¹Kenneth P. Mortimer, *Accountability in Higher Education* (Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1972), p. 6.

²*Teacher Education In The Arts Disciplines* (Reston, VA: Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education, 1987), pp. 22-25.

³Draft of *National Standards for Education in the Arts* (Washington: Consortium on National Arts Education Associations, 1993).

REPERTORY ISSUES OF THE 1990'S

REPERTORY ISSUES OF THE 1990'S

MELLASENAH MORRIS

James Madison University

There is little argument that the quality of performance in classical music in this country meets the highest standards in the artistic world. Orchestras, chamber ensembles, and soloists on the professional staff dazzle audiences and critics with their display of technical and musical mastery. Also, schools and departments of music at colleges, universities, and conservatories are making increasingly more difficult demands on applicants and students in music programs on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Thanks to what is now a long history of high national standards on the college level, more outstanding teachers are producing students well prepared to address the most challenging repertoire available.

A close look at music being studied and performed most frequently in our schools and concert halls will reflect a heavy emphasis on contributions made to music of the European tradition and a heavy focus on music written before the early 1900s. When twentieth-century American works are programmed, they usually are from the earlier part of the century and by such "household names" as Copland and Gershwin. Even works by non-American composers tend to include such names as Ravel, Debussy, or Bartok. If more "contemporary" music is performed, it is programmed in a way that says, "Sorry to cause you a bit of discomfort, but if you will bear with us, this will be over soon and we will return to our usual programming."

When Elyse Mach interviewed John Browning for her first volume of *Great Pianists Speak for Themselves*, Browning said of presenting new music:

There might be something permanent in the vast amount of avant garde music that has been written, but concert artists generally are just not interested in performing such work. It was written by people who specialized in it, not people who had careers in the open market to think of.¹

Later in the interview, Browning added that he believed it to be difficult to determine quality in new music, or as he put it, "to separate the wheat from the chaff in the period in which the music is played and heard."²

"Market-driven" programming must be a factor in impeding progress for the

living composer. Admittedly, there are times when the less-known artist feels compelled to place serving the interest of a community above one's own artistic preferences. Is there any hope that those playing to the audiences that help build careers will become more committed to bringing those audiences into their own time, into a world of diversity, of new intellectual and emotional ponderings, even if quality may not be decided for some years?

Robert Waller's romanticized photographic artist in the popular novel *The Bridges of Madison County* made the interesting observation that the "markets...are designed to suite the average tastes....The market kills more artistic passion."³ It was Waller's view that the fear of risk prevents the artist from exploring, experimenting, doing new things. As he stated, "It's a world of safety,"⁴ and audiences, or "the market," will expect the artist to do what is safe.

We live in varied communities with different "markets," with their own unique set of values and seeming demands on us as educators and performers. There are communities in which programming a Bartok string quartet can cause restlessness, serious "watch gazing," and an obvious relief for those who remain after intermission when Brahms reappears to save the evening. Others delight in discovering sensitivities in a new work by the area school's composer-in-residence. Some enjoy balance between the first half with Beethoven and Tchaikovsky and a second of an orchestral composition in the jazz idiom.

Regional aesthetic values certainly impact upon choices or risk-taking when it is important to keep ticket sales or audience attention at comfortable levels. They determine how adventurous classical radio stations feel safe to be in selecting music for the listening pleasure of their audiences.

The exploration of choices in repertoire for performance or for study in music programs in American institutions as we approach the 21st century is both difficult and controversial—difficult in that personal aesthetic values and societal matters are involved; controversial in that cultural diversity, currently a major consideration in many arenas, is an issue and often brings with it negative connotations. More specifically, it brings into focus the lack of attention given to minority and women composers in this country. Also adding to this complex subject is the risk involved in even suggesting new approaches or real changes in the missions of organizations or institutions responsible for the direction to be taken in the arts. This topic is receiving much attention now, partly because it has become an important element in facing the problems of declining audiences (therefore, revenues) at concerts of classical music.

One organization that has spent considerable time and effort on studying repertory issues of the '90s is the American Symphony Orchestra League. The

200-page report released by that group suggests the American audience is not hearing enough of a balanced programming to remain enthusiastic about today's classical concert series. Similar concerns about repertoire choices can be directed toward what is being studied and performed at our colleges and universities. Should it be a part of our educational mission to create an atmosphere in which the music of American composers is accepted as an important contribution to the repertoire of a variety of genres? Should this mission also assure the inclusion of women and minority composers? Obviously, many music units already are addressing this quite aggressively. But, if we do not have such a mission, it may be safe to say that another generation of performers and educators will be ill-equipped to build an appreciation for an expanded repertoire among American audiences, and diversity among concert-goers will not change significantly.

A music critic of the *Baltimore Sun* newspaper is one of the critics of the ASOL's report. In an article printed last July, he combined his thoughts with those of a *New York Times* senior music critic to suggest that Americanizing our orchestras, which means addressing cultural diversity in programming and in personnel, would weaken and perhaps even kill one of our country's strong institutions—the American orchestra. He stated that while critics of the report

...believe that cultural diversity is valuable, they also think that symphonic music is not necessarily the place to achieve it. When orchestras begin to worry about being all things to all people, cultural diversity becomes cultural delusion. Classical music is not—and shouldn't be—for everyone.⁵

Even though there probably are others equally concerned about the risk of changing our approach to musical study and performance, I am confident there are sufficient numbers of music educators, composers, and enthusiasts to elevate the level of thinking among those responsible for effecting change from a “fear” posture to one that is openminded and ready and willing to take as much time as necessary to identify really contemporary composers and their works for inclusion, for an opportunity to achieve the status of “tradition,” for acknowledgement of deserving attention by the developing student, the emerging artist, and the seasoned professional.

The world is growing in its recognition of and grapplings with cultural and racial diversity. It is undergoing major changes in the way we view the role women play and in the significance of the contributions made by women and minorities in many fields. As our way of thinking changes, new demands are being made by those previously excluded from the mainstream of society. The reality of the changes occurs faster than the rate of acceptance, thus creating a period of risk-taking for those in positions of decision-making. This is true in our music world.

To paraphrase a question asked by Michael Mark of Towson State University in an article on American music education, "Who are the American composers of the United States?"⁶ We may take as a basic premise the statement made by Dr. Mark: "Americans make up one of the most complex groupings of people in world history."⁷ Dr. Mark begins to answer his question by recognizing the roles played in the history of the United States by native Americans; Caucasian immigrants from Western, Eastern, Southern, or Northern Europe; Africans; Asians; and Hispanics. The term "melting pot" has been used to suggest a blending of people from many cultural/religious/ethnic backgrounds into a "oneness" of American society. It seems more realistic to view this country as a place where there is a separate existence of people with varying ideas in many fundamental areas. These differences include cultural considerations such as religious beliefs, relationships between children and parents, the role education plays in the value systems, and the concepts of beauty. This diversity is real and cannot be dismissed or deemed unimportant in the decision-making process for our programs, policies, and procedures. This multiculturalism or plurality as discussed in the August 23/30 issue of the *New Yorker* magazine should be represented in the classroom, on the podium, in the studio, on the stage, thus expanding our musical horizons with a vast amount of repertoire.⁸

The reassessment of repertoire choices for educational experiences and concert performances can be made with the understanding that change to assure the inclusion of contributions by a variety of twentieth-century composers will not require lowering standards or depriving students and audiences of their inherited right of access to "the best." Contemporary, and specifically American, composers bring much to the table for our programming choices.

What then is the role of the college music program in the appreciation and understanding of a wider diversity and of more current times? Ideally, the academic setting should be an arena for promoting change and exploring new opportunities, new directions. Classes in history, literature, analysis, conducting, and score reading offer the possibility of investigating the development of musical styles, forms, and methods of composition to include music of our time and of the country of the many peoples who make up the "American" composer. The private studio and the ensemble podium can be a source of encouragement for the performance of music by a diverse list of composers.

While there are music educators curious about repertoire outside the realm of the "traditional," funding problems for libraries and departments may restrict the amount of exploration that can occur in any given year. Budget limitations may seem to keep us rehashing the same ensemble pieces year after year unless there is a conscious effort given to building the new music part of the orchestra, choral, or symphonic band library with a plan in mind.

In the studio, the major teacher may feel compelled to focus heavily on technical development and learning standard repertoire which more frequently than not appears as requirements for competitions and orchestra auditions. How often have you heard faculty complain that there just is not enough time to cover the “standard” repertoire?

Some music educators, especially of my generation (the baby boomers) or older, may feel insecure in their knowledge of new music or of American composers, especially minorities and women. Encouraging such educators to develop relationships with living composers and performers who specialize in new music, and to study a new body of literature, may open exciting doors for them and for their students.

As music units, we may build a respect and curiosity about new music through encouraging faculty and students to perform student compositions created in composition classes or in applied studios within composition departments. This could benefit both performers and emerging composers. It also should offer communities fresh listening experiences.

The living composer is a valuable resource in the education of young musicians. History has shown that composers have been teachers of great influence on next generations of performers, composers, and theorists. Regarding our young composers as mentors for our students, as “friends” of our communities, may begin to foster the respect and understanding that can make a bigger difference in our choices of repertoire.

Isn't it time to move beyond the fear of sacrificing quality by including music by more diverse groups of composers, by living composers? Has the time come to begin investigating rather than ignoring, dismissing, or assuming inferiority in the musical expression of composers who have created works between 1950 and 1993? We are challenged to attract a diverse audience to our performances through our repertory selections. It is time to move into the twenty-first century through recognition and understanding of the full breadth of the twentieth century.

ENDNOTES

¹Elyse Mach, *Great Pianists Speak for Themselves* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company), 46.

²Mach, 47.

³Robert Waller, *The Bridges of Madison County* (New York: Warner Books, Inc.), 51.

⁴Waller, 51.

⁵Stephen Wigler, “Report on American Orchestras Strikes Loud Note of Discord,” *The (Baltimore) Sun*, 18 July 1993, D1.

*Michael Mark, "American Music Education in the National Context, 1892 to 1992"
(*The Ithaca Conference on American Music Education: Centennial Profiles*), 8.

*Mark, 8.

*Comment, "Save the Zeitgeist," *The New Yorker*, Vol. LXIX, No. 27, (23 & 30
August, 1993), 10.

OPEN FORUM FOR SMALLER MUSIC UNITS

LOADS FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY

EUGENE HOLDSWORTH

Bethany College

Faculty and administrative loads have been the focus of a number of forums and management round tables at recent NASM Annual Meetings. A wide array of responsibilities characterizes the work of administrators and faculty in all music units, whatever the size of the unit. In music units with smaller numbers of majors, loads are greatly increased for individual faculty members and administrators. This increase in load becomes even more pronounced in music units with fewer than fifty majors. Music administrators from larger music units (e.g., units enrolling 100 or more music majors) may not be aware of the concentration of responsibilities faced by administrators and faculty members in smaller music units. In addition, nonmusic colleagues and nonmusic supervisors of music administrators and faculty in institutions with smaller music units are often uninformed about the expectations, requirements and practices which are unique to the music unit.

FACULTY ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH LOAD CREDIT INFORMATION WAS COLLECTED AND REPORTED IN THE *HEADS MUSIC DATA SUMMARIES 1992-93*

In an addendum to the *HEADS Annual Report Form: 1992-93* titled "Faculty Teaching Loads," each institution indicated for which of fourteen categories of responsibility faculty were assigned load credit and the maximum percentage of load credit assigned to that category. The responses were summarized as Chart 44-2 in the *1992-93 HEADS Report "Faculty Teaching Loads."*

The following chart is based on the data from Chart 44-2. It indicates the *percentage of those institutions reporting* in which credit is assigned for various of the fourteen categories of responsibility. (Column headings show the type of institution [public or private] and the number of music majors per school.)

Responsibilities	Private 1-50	Private 51-100	Public 1-100
Conduct large ensemble (concert)	98%	98%	96%
Direct marching band	100%	94%	98%
Coach small ensemble	90%	93%	83%
Teach master class	9%	25%	32%
Teach performance class	59%	61%	66%
Prepare students for solo recitals	18%	27%	28%
Supervise student teaching	75%	80%	71%
Advise students	6%	14%	13%
Advise theses/dissertations	39%	25%	19%
Conduct faculty research projects	12%	15%	30%
Perform in faculty ensembles	17%	26%	17%
Perform in solo recitals	11%	12%	14%
Committee assignments	4%	3%	11%
Administrative assignments	59%	58%	53%

OTHER FACULTY ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH THE ASSIGNMENT OF LOAD CREDIT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED

In discussions of faculty load at recent NASM Annual Meetings, a number of categories have been mentioned which were not among those included in the Faculty Teaching Loads Addendum of the *HEADS Annual Report Form: 1992-93*. Other faculty activities which should be considered for load credit include the following:

Recruiting:

- Interviews and/or auditions with prospective students on campus
- Travel off campus to interview and/or audition prospective students
- Individual performances for recruiting purposes
- Tours by performing ensembles for recruiting purposes
- Phone calls
- Correspondence

- Tours by performing ensembles for institutional relations purposes
- Supply of music services for campus, community and constituencies

Music library-related responsibilities:

- Supervision and assistance of personnel and patrons
- Circulation and security of materials and facilities
- Acquisition and accession of books, periodicals, scores, and audio and video media

Media facility responsibilities:

- Listening and viewing equipment use and maintenance
- Supervision and assistance of personnel and patrons

MIDI laboratory:

Acquisition and maintenance of computers, controllers, software and hardware

Supervision and assistance of personnel and patrons

Keyboard instruction facilities

Recording services:

Primary recording for archives, broadcast and telecast

Record production for sale and/or public information

Sponsorship of student and professional organizations such as Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia, Sigma Alpha Iota; student chapters of Music Educators National Conference, Music Teachers National Association, American Choral Directors Association, American Guild of Organists; Pi Kappa Lambda, Mu Phi Epsilon, etc.

Accompanying, Coaching.

AN OUTLINE OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES IMPLICIT IN THE OPERATIONAL STANDARDS OF THE NASM *HANDBOOK*

In Section II, pp. 6-9 of the *Addendum to the NASM Handbook 1993-94* (November 1993), the operational standards provide an overview of the administration of the music unit in baccalaureate and graduate degree-granting institutions. The following list of responsibilities was derived from the operational standards section of the *Addendum*. The list is included in its abbreviated and modified form to provide emphasis on the leadership and management skills demanded of the music administrator. The chief executive of the music unit is responsible for initiating a strategy for and setting into motion the appropriate procedures for accomplishing each standard. The smaller the music unit, the greater the likelihood that the administrator works alone, on a part-time basis, and with restricted staff and clerical assistance.

II. OPERATIONAL STANDARDS (“...” and “[...]” indicate deletions and paraphrases)

A. Mission, Goals, and Objectives

[Ensure]...clear statements of [appropriate] mission, goals and objectives.

[Provide leadership in]...making educational and artistic decisions;

...long range planning, [including]

...developing new curricula,

...innovative activities,

...expansion or reduction of programs or enrollments;

...operational decisions, [including]

...admissions policies,

...selection of faculty and staff,

- ...allocation of resources,
- ...evaluation,
- ...administrative policies.
- ...degree programs,
- ...research institutes,
- ...major performance ensembles.
- ...publication [dissemination and monitoring] of mission, goals, and objectives.
- ...[coordination of] policies, practices, resources and programs.
- ...evaluation of ongoing viability of mission, goals, and objectives;
- ...implementation of change as appropriate.

B. Size and Scope

[maintain balance among] enrollment, faculty, resources, curriculum, and ensemble experiences.

C. Finance

[ensure] adequate financial resources;

[manage] budget allocations,

...maintain accurate financial records.

[advise on and consent to] regulations and policies concerning tuition, fees, refunds, etc.

D. Governance and Administration

[ensure]...adequate representation to deliberative bodies.

[promote mutually supportive relationships among] trustees,

...administration, ...faculty, ...students.

...provide mechanisms for communication.

...execute the required administrative and/or teaching duties effectively.

Note: As of November 1993, the following responsibilities of the music executive are new.

...exercise leadership in program evaluation and planning,

...encourage faculty development,

...promote among all faculty and staff a spirit of responsibility, understanding and cooperation.

...nurture an environment that contributes to the music unit's pursuit of its mission, goals and objectives.

OTHER MUSIC ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSIBILITIES WHICH SHOULD BE CONSIDERED FOR LOAD CREDIT

Student recital organization, management, publicity, and student performance and attendance verification

Publications (promotional materials, brochures, programs)

Public information (News releases, photographs, mailings)

Paid advertising

Grant writing and reporting
Supervision of diagnostic and summative testing
Networking of alumni and friends
Organizing of prospective student visits and auditions
Orientation of new students, faculty, and administrators
Contacts and references for graduates and alumni job/career needs
Professional accreditation agency report writing and monitoring of changing standards
Coordination/supervision of use of performing and rehearsal spaces in the music facility

RECOMMENDATION

There appears to be a need for the collection of information to establish a data base which describes current practices in assigning load credit for various responsibilities of music faculty and administrators. The information collected should focus on the actual task and time demands which are placed on music faculty and administrators rather than on percentages of an assumed 40-hour work week or averaged academic load.

LOADS FOR ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY AT SMALLER INSTITUTIONS

BIRGITTE MOYER
College of Notre Dame

The complexities of the work of the music administrators and faculty in smaller music units have been outlined by Eugene Holdsworth [*see preceding paper*]. My task today is to point out some problem areas connected with the loads of administrators and faculty in smaller music units. Having visited and read reports from a large number of schools with smaller music units, it appears to me that many of the problems are due to lack of communication about what constitutes the necessary work in a music department. In the smaller schools, the upper administration and, indeed, often the faculty in other departments appear to have less of an understanding of the unique features of the work of the music unit than do the administrators and faculty in schools with larger music units. The 1992-93 HEADS data on "The Music Executive's Job Analysis" (Chart 23), and "Music Faculty Teaching Loads" (Charts 44-1 and 44-2) have become a valuable first step in broadening the understanding of the situation of the music faculty. I would like to point to some conclusions we can draw from these charts, and also point out some areas where we still do not have adequate data, or where problems exist despite the available data.

In the following section, information pertaining to schools with fewer than 100 music majors has been selected from the 1992-93 HEADS summaries (see Tables 1-3). In Table 3 only faculty responsibilities performed by faculty in a majority of the smaller units have been listed. For example, only 18 out of about 90 private institutions with fewer than 50 majors report that faculty advise theses or dissertations; therefore this category has been omitted from the discussion. Furthermore, only responsibilities for which a significant number of institutions assign credit have been included. For example, 89 private schools with 1-50 majors assign credit for conducting large ensemble; this category has been included. At the same time only two of these schools and only 13 public institutions with 1-100 majors assign faculty credit for teaching master classes; thus teaching master classes has been omitted. The omitted categories from the full HEADS data where very few of the smaller units assign credit are: (a) teaching master classes; (b) preparing students for solo recitals; (c) advising students; (d) advising theses; (e) conducting faculty research; (f) performing in recitals; and (g) committee assignments.

Table 1. Executive's Job Analysis: Average Percentage of Time Spent

	Teaching	Research/ Creative	Admini- stration	Service	Fund- raising
Private Schools					
1-50 majors	55	7	33	3	1
51-100 majors	46	6	42	4	2
Public Schools					
1-100 majors	40	6	45	6	3

Data excerpted from Higher Education Arts Data Services, *Music Data Summaries 1992-93*, Chart 23.

Table 2. Faculty Teaching Loads

Average teaching in credit hours				
	5%ile	50%ile	95%ile	Average
Private 1-50	9	12	20	12.8
Private 51-100	7.5	12	24	13.4
Public 1-100	9	12	17	12.8
Maximum teaching in credit hours				
Private 1-50	10	12	24	13.8
Private 51-100	9	13	24	14.1
Public 1-100	11	13	20	14.1

Data excerpted from Higher Education Arts Data Services, *Music Data Summaries 1992-93*, Chart 44-1.

THE MUSIC EXECUTIVE'S LOAD

The music executive's load is often not well understood. As shown in Table 1, the smaller the music unit the higher the teaching load, and the less credit is given for administrative services and fund raising. Yet in the smaller units, the music executive often has responsibility for almost all facets of the music department, including recitals, programs, coordination of applied music instruction, jury exams, musical instruments, listening equipment, recordings, scores, sheet music, building the library collection, music technology labs, practice rooms, auditions, placement exams, pro-active recruitment of musicians, tours, fund raising, etc. All of these duties are over and above the "normal" responsibilities of department heads in other departments. Yet it is hard to make the rest of the campus understand that the teaching load of a music executive in a small music department needs to be lower than those of the chairs of other academic departments in order to avoid burnout. And of course, the "bottom line" speaks: the money to pay for all this is harder to come by in smaller institutions, and increased release time for the music executive would in many cases be the straw that broke the budget camel's back.

CATEGORIES WITH LITTLE OR NO CONTROVERSY

Table 2 shows areas with little or no controversy.

Average Teaching in Credit Hours

There is very little divergence from the typical faculty teaching load of twelve credit hours per week. The span in all the smaller schools ranges from nine credit hours in the 5th percentile to 24 credit hours in the 95th percentile, with an average of from 12.8 to 13.4 credit hours. This is not a problem area in most schools. Interestingly, from all the categories of schools, the highest average teaching load of 13.4 credit hours is in private schools with 51-100 majors. The private institution with 51-100 majors appears to be the least desirable teaching load situation.

Maximum Teaching in Credit Hours

We can draw exactly the same conclusion here as above. The span is not wide, ranging from nine to 24 credit hours maximum teaching load. This is not a major problem area. And, the highest average is 14.1 credit hours in private schools with 51-100 majors and public schools with 1-100 majors. In schools with more than 100 majors, the higher the enrollment, the lower the maximum teaching load.

Conversion Ratio: Studio Instruction to Credit Hour

Thanks to NASM's very clear operational standard with respect to the common conversion rate—two hours of classroom instruction equals three hours of private instruction (NASM *Handbook*, II.F., p.53)—almost all schools report adherence to this 1.5 ratio. That does not mean that the conversion ratio is always well understood or appreciated as indicated below.

PROBLEM AREAS

Table 3 includes several categories of faculty responsibilities where the maximum percentage of faculty load credit varies enormously. Load credit for conducting large ensemble varies from a low of 7.5% of full-time load in some schools to a high of 66%. Conducting marching band varies from 10% to 100%. Coaching small ensemble and teaching performance class varies from 3% to 50% of full-time load. We do not know from these data how *many* ensembles or performance classes a given faculty member conducts or teaches. In future HEADS reports we need to refine the data by asking how much load credit is given for *each* ensemble or performance class. The remaining categories (preparing students for solo recitals, supervising student teaching, and advising students) vary from 1% to 66.6%. The absence of an NASM standard formula for faculty load credit for ensemble coaching has caused problems in many schools. Even an advisory formula in the NASM *Handbook* would help guide institutions and contribute to a more equitable work load for faculty. On the other hand, such load categories as supervising student teaching and advising students are usually uniform across the disciplines in each institution, and therefore much harder to change.

In addition to the HEADS data categories for faculty load, there are some factors indirectly affecting faculty loads which are harder to quantify, but no less important than the HEADS statistics. These are the areas where communication with the rest of the campus is difficult. In spite of NASM *Handbook* standards it is often difficult to make non-music faculty and administrators understand (a) that performance and creative work are the equivalent of research/publication in tenure and promotion qualifications; (b) that some very highly qualified artist/teachers may not need to hold doctoral degrees, and that a doctorate is, in some areas, not particularly desirable; and (c) that the 2:3 conversion ratio for applied music instruction is not only a national standard, but also reasonable and fair. Directly tied to the conversion rate is the problem of credit hour productivity. I have seen a school try to hold all faculty to producing 150 credits per term. Clearly, for applied music faculty teaching 18 hours per week (with the 2:3 conversion ratio this equals 12 hours of load credit), producing 150 credit hours is an impossibility, even if each of their 18 students received NASM's maximum of six credits per term for their lessons (NASM *Handbook*, V. E., p. 59).

Table 3. Faculty Responsibilities

	Assigning credit	No credit	Maximum percentage		
			5%ile	50%ile	95%ile
Conduct Large Ensemble					
Private 1-50 majors	89	2	11.1	25	66
Private 51-100	58	1	7.5	30	50
Public 1-100	103	4	11	27.7	66
Direct Marching Band					
Private 1-50	13	0	10	33	50
Private 51-100	17	1	20	33	60
Public 1-100	58	1	12	40	100
Coach Small Ensemble					
Private 1-50	75	8	3	13	33.3
Private 51-100	54	4	4.2	13	30
Public 1-100	85	18	5	15	33
Teach Performance Class					
Private 1-50	34	24	4	10	33.3
Private 51-100	22	14	2	10	50
Public 1-100	44	13	1	10	25
Prepare Students for Solo Recitals					
Private 1-50	16	73	1	5	66.6
Private 51-100	15	41	0.5	10	40
Public 1-100	29	76	1	10	50
Supervise Student Teaching					
Private 1-50	56	19	1	15	60
Private 51-100	43	11	2	15	50
Public 1-100	57	23	1	16.6	50
Advise Students					
Private 1-50	5	85	1	8.3	25
Private 51-100	8	51	1	15	25
Public 1-100	14	94	1	10	25
Perform in Faculty Ensembles					
Private 1-50	10	49	3.1	8.3	20
Private 51-100	12	35	0.9	7	20
Public 1-100	14	69	4	10	50
Administrative Assignments					
Private 1-50	47	32	8.3	25	50
Private 51-100	31	22	6	25	50
Public 1-100	48	42	6	25	50

Data excerpted from Higher Education Arts Data Services, *Music Data Summaries 1992-93*, Chart 44-2.

The HEADS charts on faculty responsibilities are an important step towards achieving more equitable standards for faculty loads in music. A second helpful step could be an advisory statement in the *NASM Handbook* with respect to load credit for ensemble coaching. In addition, future HEADS reports should seek information about load credit per ensemble and number of weekly contact hours per ensemble.

All this said and done, we have to remember that many of our conclusions about music in higher education rest on assumptions that are likely to be questioned in the next decade. We are at a point where fundamental changes in higher education are being discussed. These may lead to radical changes in faculty conditions, and perhaps also radical changes in the NASM standards. Will the three-year bachelor's degree, which is now gaining many proponents, become the norm? If so, will faculty qualifications and faculty loads need to be changed? Will there be undergraduate majors in a three-year degree program? If the undergraduate major goes, will graduate programs become longer and more heavily enrolled? In other words, will a graduate degree be a necessity for professional work in music?

FUTURE OF THE CHURCH MUSIC CURRICULUM

A SURVEY OF NASM SCHOOLS OFFERING A CURRICULUM IN CHURCH MUSIC

LOUIS BALL
Carson-Newman College

A survey of NASM schools offering one or more curricula in church music was made in July 1993. Ninety-six schools are listed in the 1992 NASM *Directory* as offering a major in church music. Forty-four responded to the survey.

The schools seemed to fall into natural groupings as follows:

	<i>Number of Schools</i>	<i>Schools Responding</i>
Catholic (Liturgical)	6	5
Evangelical (Non-Liturgical)	5	4
Protestant (Liturgical)	6	4
Protestant (Non-Liturgical)	51	21
State/Private (Secular)	<u>28</u>	<u>9</u>
Total schools offering a church music major	96	43

(Note: Groupings were done on the information available in the Directory. There may be errors in placement.)

Enrollment trends in church music were ascertained by asking for the total enrollment in the church music curriculum in 1982, 1987, and 1992.

Ten-Year Enrollment Trends in Church Music

	1982	1987	1992	% change from 1982
Catholic	30	9	37	+23%
Evangelical	110	96	122	+11%
Protestant, Liturgical	31	16	12	-61%
Protestant, Non-Liturgical	525	475	343	-34%
Private/State	<u>47</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>-19%</u>
Totals	<u>743</u>	<u>659</u>	<u>552</u>	<u>-25%</u>

In 1982, a total of 743 students were enrolled in a church music curricula. Five years later 659 were enrolled. In the fall of 1992 or ten years later, 552 were enrolled for an overall decline of 25%.

Two groups, Catholic and evangelical schools, showed an increase of 23% and 11% or a combined increase of 13%. Protestant liturgical schools showed the most precipitous decline in enrollment of 61%, and one school in this category is dropping the curriculum.

Protestant non-liturgical schools decreased in church music enrollment by 34%. One school reports that the curriculum is being dropped.

State/private secular school church music enrollment dropped by 19%, although there was an increase from 1982 to 1987 of 34%. The decline from 1987 to 1992 is 39%.

If the trend is to abandon the major in church music, the question was asked concerning the best alternative curriculum to advise students to take. Twenty-six schools listed music education or music education in combination with another subject. Five schools suggested organ or organ/combination. Others mentioned were performance, conducting, composition, etc.

In the same line of thought, the question was asked about the most valuable subject in the church music curriculum. There was less consensus here; the suggestions were as follows: church music methods, 15; hymnology, 4; liturgies, 5; worship, 4; service playing, 3.

The percentage of church music graduates who now continue as full-time church musicians, while an estimate, is above 60%. Sixty-five percent of Catholic, evangelical, and Protestant-liturgical church music graduates remain in the ministry, while approximately 55% of Protestant non-liturgical and state/private school graduates have 5-year-plus stability.

Survey Comments

Catholic:

- We discontinued our church music major last year due to low enrollment and the scarcity of full-time church music positions (there are plenty of part-time positions).
- Organ performance is a necessity for this program.
- Topics to discuss: courses outside of music; dealing with multicultural churches; present state of worship practices in specific denominations.
- Church Music Degree: the Catholic Church and the Music Director.

Evangelical:

- We can't stay up with demands of the Assembly of God denomination in church music.

—Our curriculum must prepare students to face changing worship and music patterns in the evangelical Protestant church.

Protestant–Liturgical:

- Need: promote workshops and summer camps for high school students.
- The influence of technology on church music. Church music’s ability to accommodate a diversity of musical styles these days.

Protestant–Non-Liturgical:

- We were unable to have the church music curriculum approved without graduates, so we deleted it.
- Question: “Is it live or is it Memorex?” The theological validity (if any) of canned performance in today’s electronic entertainment age.
- I feel that all the controversy in our denomination has had a bad effect on students, causing them to decide not to enter church music as a career.
- Since job security in full-time church music becomes increasingly less, we are recommending music education as a preparatory curriculum which provides a “spare tire” career if needed.
- Has entertainment in the church replaced the need for ministry through music?
- We are currently revising the church music degree—to become a concentration in the B.A. degree rather than B.M. degree.
- We will be dropping our church music major. We’ve had only one graduate in nine years.
- How can we address the “praise and worship” segment of church music? Should we even try?
- Questions: Why are fewer students choosing church music degrees? Do we need undergraduate church music degrees? If so, why?
- Should Baptist colleges offer master’s degrees in sacred music, or is this in conflict with our seminaries?

Private/State:

- We are discontinuing this program due to small enrollment.
- The impact of contemporary music styles; what to do in regard to the education of clergy in worship and church music?
- Given decreasing numbers, plus budget constraints, perhaps church music major should be abandoned at the undergraduate level.
- Solutions to the shortage of organists. Organs are being built, but players are not being trained!
- Possibility of routinely preparing church musicians through music education and specialized courses.

THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH MUSIC CURRICULA

SISTER TERESITA ESPINOSA

Mount St. Mary's College

A productive discussion of the future of church music curricula must begin with a more precise understanding of the present state of church music in various faith communities. It is my purpose to highlight major trends in Roman Catholic church music in the last thirty years, and from that perspective open discussion and offer ideas towards a church music curriculum for the future.

One of the major forces affecting the Catholic Church in the 20th century has been the work of the Second Vatican Council, which had, among other goals, the spiritual renewal of the Church and the search for forms best adapted to the present-day needs of its mission. Of special interest here is the work of the Council affecting the Church's official public worship: the Mass.¹

The Council promulgated principles which deeply affected and renewed the concept of worship in the Catholic Church.² The meaning and significance of those principles have engaged and will continue to engage liturgists, musicians, artists, theologians and the entire Christian community in prayer, reflection, study, experimentation, and debate.

Salient points of those principles which have had the most impact on church music practice are:

1. Mass is not the private but the communal prayer of the Body of Christ—head and members—gathered to be fed by Word and Eucharist, and to offer itself in praise and thanksgiving to the Father, under the guidance of the Spirit.³ This principle calls for the full, conscious, and active participation of the entire assembly in the rites.⁴ These rites, therefore, must be made understandable to all,⁵ and should be in the vernacular.
2. Music is not only an adornment of the liturgy, reserved for the few, but it is essential in supporting the action of the rite, and in involving the assembly in expressing and sharing faith.⁶ Various musical styles, forms, and instruments are thus recognized as worthy vehicles of liturgical expression and for giving voice to the assembly.⁷
3. Sacred Scripture is of the greatest importance in the celebration of the liturgy, and therefore liturgical songs must be inspired by and derive their meaning from Scripture.⁸

What perceptible changes have these principles wrought in church music practice?

Since the primary musical group in liturgical worship has become the assembly, all existent musical roles have been redefined, and new roles have emerged. The choir functions as leader of the assembly, and as enhancement to the song of the assembly. It can also be expected to provide a reverent atmosphere for the silent prayer of the faithful or to sing works that demand its special competence. The organist may be asked to play in traditional or untraditional styles, to join orchestral or folk instruments, or not to play. It must be pointed out that in some Cathedral Churches, the choir and organist, while admitting an expanded repertory, maintain a more traditional role.

The song of the assembly has benefited greatly by the emerging role of the cantor, who acts as animator and leader of communal singing. Contemporary ensembles have likewise multiplied and have enlivened the participation of the faithful. These ensembles include endless varieties of instruments: while in their inception they were composed primarily of guitars, other folk instruments, and voices, they now rely heavily on piano, with guitar, voices, other folk and orchestral instruments and synthesizer.

In many parishes the music director/conductor is not *per force* the choral director/organist, but may be the contemporary ensemble director, the cantor, or another musician. The music director coordinates and administers the music program, and participates in worship committees with the presider, liturgist, liturgical environment team, and other members of the parish. In churches which sustain formal or informal educational efforts, the music director is often expected to provide expertise in music education.

Efforts to make the rites understandable to all have given rise to family Masses in which children are given special attention.⁹ These Masses can also include a separate Liturgy of the Word for children. In parishes where there is a large contingent of a like ethnicity, there are Masses that utilize elements of that culture,¹⁰ which can include the language and music of that culture.¹¹

What of the musical repertoire? It is already possible to trace a brief evolution.¹²

The first musical responses to Vatican II were English translations, often awkward, of traditional Latin hymns. A newly found affinity with popular styles and the vernacular soon gave rise to facile music with devotional text and low musical quality. This music was tried and gradually abandoned. A welcome addition to the

repertoire at this time was the well-established hymnody borrowed from various Protestant denominations.

New music in popular and traditional style utilizing scripturally based texts soon followed, together with settings of acclamations, responsories and other forms which support the action of the new rite. Music with bilingual text and in the style of specific ethnic cultures has also been written.

More recent trends include the steady improvement of the musical craft in all styles, a movement towards cross-fertilization of styles, the search for a unifying trans-cultural style, and the growing realization that musicians, liturgists, poets, and artists must collaborate to bring about an enduring liturgical medium, one which is a vehicle of the transcendent and a humanizing one as well.¹³

From this perspective, never before has the need for a strong church music curriculum been more urgent. What competencies should this curriculum develop in students entering this field?

First are certainly all the basic competencies for professional music students as outlined by NASM in the '93-'94 *Handbook*.¹⁴ Particular notice must be made of items relating to improvisation and composition, rehearsal and conducting techniques, and the development of skills to work with a comprehensive repertory which includes diverse cultural sources and media, historical periods, and music of the students' own time. Of great importance are efforts to develop the ability to communicate musical ideas and concepts, to form and defend value judgments about music of various styles, and to develop some teaching skills.

In addition to the competencies in church music recommended by NASM,¹⁵ the following are suggested as also essential:

- Understanding the function of music in the worship style of churches.
- Knowledge of contemporary religious and musical trends in the context of the tradition of various denominations.
- Understanding the function of all the arts in enhancing the rites and symbols of liturgy.
- Functional knowledge of orchestral, folk, and electronic instruments, and skill in arranging.
- Effective use of technology that enhances authentic human participation.
- Practical knowledge of the field through observation and internship.

Specific recommendations for general studies should also emphasize breadth, and include preparation for understanding varieties of human communities and personalities.

Another suggested component of this curriculum includes the following attributes that should mark a prospective church musician:

- Personal dedication and commitment to serve through the ministry of music.
- Ability to work productively within church structures and maintain positive relations with individuals of various social and ethnic groups and differing backgrounds.¹⁶
- Commitment to continued spiritual, personal, and professional growth.

Teaching staff is also key to this endeavor. It is vitally important that faculty responsible for teaching church music courses have recent successful experience in that field and that they maintain close contact with that field.¹⁷

To conclude:

Church musicians serve and will continue to serve in churches that reflect the rich diversity of the people of God. They will continue to be called upon to perform and choose music of various styles, forms and media; to work collegially with various sectors of the church, parish, school and music staff; to collaborate with representatives of other arts in planning for the future; to ponder questions that have neither clear nor definitive answers.

A church music curriculum for the future, therefore, must reflect the timeless, deeper reality at the heart of church music. It ought to challenge, to liberate. It must also prepare for musical leadership—for the practical, immediate and future needs of the profession. It must nourish faith, service, commitment, and growth, and it must instill competence, creativity, versatility, and vision.

ENDNOTES

¹While the work of the Council brought to a focus desired reforms, liturgical renewal was in the making many years prior to the convening of the Council. This movement took the form of scholarly research, national and international conferences on the liturgy, and pastoral experimentation.

²A handy resource containing some of the major conciliar and post-conciliar documents on Roman Catholic liturgical reform can be found in E. Hoffmann (ed.), *The Liturgy Documents: A Parish Resource*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1991). This publication contains the following documents:

Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (1963)

General Instruction of the Roman Missal (1974)

Appendix to the General Instruction for the Dioceses of the United States (1969)

Lectionary for Mass: Introduction (1981)

General Norms for the Liturgical Year (1966)

Ceremonial of Bishops (excerpts) (1984, 1989)

Directory of Masses with Children (1973)

This Holy and Living Sacrifice: Directory for the Celebration and Reception of Communion under Both Kinds (1984)

Music in Catholic Worship (1972)

Liturgical Music Today (1982)

Environment and Art in Catholic Worship (1978)

Fulfilled in Your Hearing: The Homily in the Sunday Assembly (1982).

³*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, #26, 48.

⁴*Ibid.*, #14

⁵*Ibid.*, #34, 37-40

⁶*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, #112; *Music in Catholic Worship* #23.

⁷*Music in Catholic Worship*, #28.

⁸*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, #24, 51, 56.

⁹*A Lectionary for Masses with Children* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press) is being published with Cycle B already available, Cycle C promised for July 1994, and Cycle A for January 1995. The "Eucharistic Prayer for Masses with Children" has already been incorporated in the *sacramentary* (1985) (which contains the texts led by the priest, including variable Eucharistic prayers).

¹⁰Mark R. Francis in his essay *Liturgy in a Multicultural Community* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991) offers some timely insights into the challenging topic of cultural diversity and worship.

¹¹In the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Masses can be celebrated in 47 languages.

¹²Edward F. Foley and Mary McGann, *Music and the Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988) pp. 1-6

¹³William Bauman, ed. *The Milwaukee Symposia for Church Composers* (Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1992)

¹⁴*Handbook 1993-1994* (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Schools of Music, 1993) pp. 61-64

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 67

¹⁶This statement represents a re-wording of "Desirable Attributes" for the Baccalaureate Degree in Music Education, *NASM Handbook*, p. 71

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 73

REFERENCES

- Bauman, William A. et al. (Ed.). *The Milwaukee Symposia for Church Composers*. Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1992.
- Best, Harold M. "Music Curricula in the Future," *Arts Education Policy Review*, 94: No. 2 (November/December 1992), 2-7.
- _____. *Music Through the Eyes of Faith*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1993.
- Chupungco, Anscar J., O.S.B. *Liturgies of the Future*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Fink, Peter E., S.J. (Ed.). *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*. Collegeville, Minnesota, The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Foley, Edward and Mary McGann. *Music and the Eucharistic Prayer*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988.
- Foley, Edward. *Music in Ritual: A Pre-Theological Investigation*. Washington, D.C.: The Pastoral Press, 1984.

- Francis, Mark R., C.S.V. *Liturgy in a Multicultural Community*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Hoffman, E. (Ed.) *The Liturgy Documents: A Parish Resource*. 3rd Ed. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1991.
- Jones, Cheslyn et al. (Ed.). *The Study of Liturgy*. Rev. Ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- A Lectionary for Masses with Children*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1993.
- Milligan, Thomas B. (Ed.). *On the State of Church Music*. Jefferson City, Tennessee: Center for Church Music, Carson-Newman College. n.d.
- Ravitz, Diane. "Multiculturalism," *The American Scholar*, 59:3 (Summer 1990), 337-354.
- Seasoltz, R. Kevin, O.S.B. (Gen. Ed.). *Worship*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- "America's Immigrant Challenge." *Time*. Special Issue, Vol. 142, No. 21 (Fall, 1993)
- Warren, Michael. *Faith, Culture, and the Worshiping Community: Shaping the Practice of the Local Church*. Rev. Ed. Washington, D.C. The Pastoral Press, 1993.

THE FUTURE OF CHURCH MUSIC CURRICULA

KENNETH W. HART

Southern Methodist University

I firmly believe that when Eve took a bite of the apple and handed Adam his first fig leaf, she said, "Dear, we are in an age of transition: here, wear this!" Certainly as we end this millennium and look to the 21st century, the Church in America is in a state of transition and so our ministries of music must be in flux as well. We all generally agree that the duties of a church musician are tripartite: musical, educational and pastoral. While the emphases change with time, these three roles remain constant and in some sort of precarious balance. Perhaps no one can accurately predict where we are going, but anyone who is at all aware realizes that we *are* changing. Naturally this will have a profound effect upon church music curricula, albeit an often uncomfortable and frequently after-the-fact one.

With this acknowledged state of flux in mind, and because several key faculty positions were filled a year ago by new faculty with new ideas, Southern Methodist University decided to examine and revise its curriculum for the Master of Sacred Music degree during the 1992-93 academic year. Ours is a 35-year-old graduate program sponsored jointly by a School of Theology and a School of the Arts. We began this review by writing to all NASM schools offering such a degree. Thanks to many of you, we received copies of 25 curricula for graduate programs in church music. The number of credit hours required in these programs ranges from 30 to 64 with a majority requiring about 50 semester hours. The titles varied from Master of Arts in Church Music (7) and Master of Arts in Pastoral Music (1) to Master of Theological Studies in Church Music (2) to Master of Music in Sacred Music (2), Master of Church Music (7), or Master of Sacred Music (2).

The most significant differences in these curricula have to do with the type of institution offering the degree. The programs housed in a seminary or offered jointly by a school of music and a school of theology require studies in theology, Bible, history of Christianity and worship in addition to those music courses required by all schools (organ or choral conducting, voice, theory, history and hymnology). Consequently the former, seminary-based programs generally require 50 to 60 hours of study. Those at state universities and other non-theological institutions pattern their church music degrees after their Master of Music degrees and expect 30 to 38 hours.

There are several assumptions that our curriculum committee arrived at after surveying these degree programs and after consulting with our alumni as well as current students and faculty. While the results of this study and the curriculum revision achieved cannot predict where we are going in the future, they do give

some insights into where we are now in church music education, at least from the perspective of faculties in music and theology and alumni currently working in the profession. These assumptions helped formulate our new curriculum:

1. This is a professional degree. For most of our students, it is a terminal degree. Those who later pursue a doctorate usually do so in musicology, not sacred music.
2. As a professional degree, a mix of theological and musical studies at the graduate level is most appropriate. In order to pursue graduate study in two disciplines, 50 semester credit hours is not an unusual or unreasonable expectation.
3. A bachelor's degree in music (preferably in organ, voice or choral conducting) is a prerequisite for admission to this program. We also admit students with a B.A. or B.S. in music education and a concentration in keyboard or vocal studies. The parallels between the fields of music education and church music are significant. Consequently a background in music education is an asset as long as the performing skills and abilities of the applicants are equal to those of students holding other undergraduate degrees in music. After all, the role of educator is a primary one for church musicians.
4. Proficiencies in several areas can be assessed upon entrance into the program, and remedial courses already being offered at our institution may be required as needed (but not for graduate credit). Currently these areas are music history, music theory and choral conducting.
5. Candidates must continue to meet the expectations of and be examined by the faculties of both the Arts and Theology Schools. They must be able to master graduate work in both disciplines. With this in mind, then, a conscious effort was made to include more courses taken simultaneously by Master of Divinity and M.S.M. students while eliminating "M.S.M. only" versions of the courses. Thus M.S.M.'s now take the full first year of Introduction to the Bible with their M.Div. colleagues instead of a one-semester M.S.M. Bible survey known unofficially as "Baby Bible." Such theological mainstreaming of M.S.M.'s has several advantages. Two of the primary concerns of alumni were that they did not receive enough training in biblical studies and they did not have enough contact with the M.Div. students. Both of these concerns have been met. Further, It is obviously more cost effective to offer fewer courses with higher enrollments. It is also educationally enriching to have more points of view offered in class discus-

sions. Finally, our students now are cementing some relationships with potential future employers and staff colleagues from the M.Div. program.

6. All candidates are required to have a fieldwork position during at least one year of their study. The M.S.M. Office assists in finding these positions, and M.S.M. faculty visit each student at the site at least twice during the student's ministry there. Most students hold down such a position throughout their graduate study for matters of economics as well as for the opportunity for professional growth.
7. The Practicum Service will continue to serve in lieu of a recital or thesis as the graduate project. This, too, is normally done at the fieldwork site and is evaluated by the M.S.M. faculty. The candidate plans a worship service (including all aspects of the liturgy and music) in cooperation and consultation with the pastor-in-charge and a lay worship committee. After the service is given, the M.S.M. faculty meet with the staff, lay committee and the M.S.M. candidate to evaluate the student's entire ministry at the church. Both constructive criticism and praise are encouraged. These sessions provide invaluable feedback of a kind that is very difficult to obtain otherwise and provide an evaluation of the church musician as performer and pastor.

As far as implications for the future are concerned, a few conclusions may be drawn from our deliberations:

1. There will continue to be enough jobs with adequate salaries as long as graduates are willing to go where they exist. We expect to continue to enjoy 100% placement, with that caveat in mind. The need for organist-directors and organists is particularly acute.
2. Training ministers of music and not merely good musicians will continue to be the goal of this degree. While the need for pastoring and teaching skills has never been greater, achieving these skills cannot substitute for any lack of musical competence. Rather, all three must be developed to the highest degree possible.
3. Training our future Ministers of the Word (M.Div. candidates) as to the nature of worship and the relationship of music to the other elements of worship is crucial to our survival. In the same way that Paul Westermeyer in *The Church Musician* (Harper & Row, 1988) urges church musicians to reclaim the role of the cantor in order to learn and promote the "people's song," so must our ordained clergy once again be trained in the arts and learn the value of music in worship. Like all other elements of worship, including the preached Word, music is not to be used for manipulation, but

rather to be embraced as an essential means of expression for the worshipping community.

4. To better equip our M.S.M.'s to learn and teach the "people's song," we have expanded our hymnology requirements and in several courses added the study of music and worship from a global perspective. We are helped in this effort by the approach and content of the newest *United Methodist Hymnal*.
5. Training our students on every instrument they might possibly have to use and study music of every style currently being used in any church are impractical goals and unnecessary endeavors. If we are training good musicians who respond to demands placed upon them with an active intellect and a sound theological base, they will be able to adapt to whatever may come in the future. Most of us, for example, cannot now imagine a day or an hour in which computers and other technological advances do not play a part. Yet, we have adapted to this change even though our undergraduate and graduate training did not specifically prepare us for these tasks. What we did learn of value two or three decades ago is still of value today. Learning to think and to perform well and to stay open to what lies ahead will continue to stand us in good stead as we race to play our part in the church of the 21st century. No matter how the balance between the roles of pastor, teacher and musician may change, our students will be prepared to adapt.

THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH MUSIC CURRICULUM: AN EVANGELICAL VIEWPOINT

EDWARD A. PIERCE
Oral Roberts University

My faith has found a resting place, Not in device or creed;
I trust the Everliving One, His wounds for me shall plead.
I need no other argument, I need no other plea,
It is enough that Jesus died, And that He died for me.

I well remember the first time I heard that hymn. It immediately struck my attention because of the boldness of its statement, its regular rhythm, and its simple but engaging harmonic structure. I liked it at once because it spoke of the certainty of faith, its deep commitment, and the fact that here was a philosophy for which a new model need never be sought. I first heard the hymn during the after-dinner devotional in the Houghton College dining hall, located on the first floor of Gayo Hall. My infatuation with it was due in great part to the matching of a strong text with a rhythmically strong, yet simple melody which cut to the heart of the meaning of the text. Evangelicals have a strong sense of duty to "get the word out." They feel that a sure word needs to be said about "the God who is there and who is not silent," as Francis Schaefer put it. They have a sense of duty and purpose and strong desire to meet people on an easily understandable level in order to share a message which is immediately apparent, which does not require great philosophical pondering to decipher, and yet which gives a sense of depth, responsibility, concern and openness.

The hymn I heard was from the nineteenth century and was neither complex nor musically forward-looking for its time, but it served to state its message effectively. The music of the church has been cast in various forms through the centuries, and each culture has sought to bring its highest musical gifts to the service of God using styles which range from folk songs to classical arias. There is much good music from the past which can be used in church services in our century and much traditionally oriented twentieth century music which needs to become a part of the worship experience. Today's less formal musical styles and forms can also be performed in a musically responsible way in the church, not simply as a bow to commercialism, but in order to lead the church in a worship experience that is more a part of the warp and weal of everyday life and experience. Such performance is not a promotion of glibness or pop culture for its own sake, but rather a use of the materials of contemporary culture to meet people on a level from where they can be gradually led to experience additional and perhaps less familiar styles with which to worship. The challenge in this for the music minister is that s/he must first earn the trust and respect of those s/he is trying to lead. The time that this process takes will depend in great part on the ability of the leader to discern and work with the needs of the choir and congregation. It is imperative that the

congregation be involved in singing whenever possible as an aid in gaining this trust. In his article entitled "The Present State of Church Music: A Personal View," Noel Tredinnick states that "musical leadership needs to concentrate effort on providing stimulating and varied music for the congregation itself to sing, and lots of it, and to consider congregational singing as *top* priority." He goes on to say that "the chief aim of any trained choral group is to sing *with* the congregation and not *at* or...in place of them."

How should we prepare our future church music leaders for this task? The training of a church musician must include a wide variety of approaches. There must be specialization in a given area of applied performance and conducting. Schools must continue to stress the importance of traditional training in music fundamentals and good basic musicianship as an aid in developing popular contemporary styles which have often been sloppily constructed in the name of making music accessible and spontaneous sounding. Popular contemporary styles are a product of our times, and many of them are fine in and of themselves, but they must be presented with a secure knowledge of music fundamentals. For directing singers, a solid background in language and diction will help with both song leading and choral conducting challenges.

Curricula should include work in how to effectively use the praise and worship choruses currently popular in evangelical worship and in how to make the groups leading them more effective as a catalyst for a worship experience that is more than an emotional release. Each student needs to develop a proficiency for dealing with the volunteer choir and learn how to build confidence and loyalty while avoiding a dictatorial attitude. Many times the musicality of a phrase comes best after a kind word or a reassuring look. Members of both congregation and choir are very interested in textual meaning, and many times text explication will work wonders on musicality and phrasing. It is also just as important to learn techniques for dealing with pastors, parishioners and publishers when planning programs as it is to learn the skills necessary for musical analysis and score preparation.

It is incumbent upon each music minister to discover the needs and backgrounds of a congregation and to endeavor to meet those needs rather than to pursue a program based solely on traditional styles if something additional is desired. Traditional styles should certainly be used as much as possible, but the ideals, strong musical concepts, and well-grounded sense of musicality that have kept certain styles of composition fresh and vital throughout history should be applied in today's styles and forms with the same vitality and attention to detail. Many times, young ministers of music try to begin their careers by choosing music that is far too challenging for either choir or congregation to grasp rather than beginning on a more familiar level and gradually adding the less familiar. The words of an outspoken and highly opinionated choir member in my first choir still ring in my ears

today. I had endeavored to build a choral program in a church where there had been no program. I had donated money and much time to build a small library of octavos, buy robes and plan a program which I felt certain would be the envy of all who heard it. The words which resulted were, "Whose money did you waste to buy this music?" I have not forgotten that moment. I had apparently become too enmeshed in form and style and had forgotten need.

The use of the practicum is a good way to help students find their suitability for dealing with church issues and needs. Involvement of these future leaders in planning and leading services and various activities from the outset of their education will help them gain perspective and foster a heightened interest in their training. We must impress upon them the idea that in order to be strong leaders they must be excellent followers, cultivating the ability to listen patiently and with concern to clergy and laity alike.

Finally, time should be given to dealing with the changing face of church music ministry as economic pressures tighten budgets and cause greater upheaval and uncertainty over long-range goals. It is very important to keep volunteers glad they came to rehearsals and proud to be part of a program which is effective and forward-looking. The music minister must be willing to meet the changing needs of the surrounding culture and society and to lead with integrity, whatever the style of music chosen.

If the church music curriculum can maintain the teaching of good basic musicianship and apply high musical standards of performance to the constantly changing styles of music composition and performance practice, music ministers will be enabled to distinguish the acceptable from the unacceptable in music while still meeting the needs and desires of the church.

ENDNOTES

¹Noel Tredinnick, "The Present State of Church Music: A Personal View," in *On The State of Church Music*, ed. Thomas B. Milligan, Center for Church Music, Carson-Newman College, 34.

CHURCH MUSIC CURRICULA: A PLURALIST APPROACH

CHARLES WEBB
Indiana University

Indiana University School of Music offers instruction in church music at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

The undergraduate degree is in organ and requires in addition to the usual applied music study, theory, history, and general education requirements, four semesters of church music which include basic keyboard skills of modulation, transposition, improvisation, and score reading as well as a survey of liturgies, introductory hymnody, console conducting, and service music.

The graduate degree is a Master of Music in Organ and Church Music and requires special courses in organization and development of youth choirs, study of the history and structure of hymn texts, music improvisational skills, oratorio accompanying, and choral literature with special courses devoted to smaller forms (motets and anthems), and larger forms (cantatas, oratorios, masses). There is also a special course on the integral relationship of liturgy, music and other arts both in history and current practice.

Our emphasis is on the traditional, historical development of church music from Gregorian chant to the present. We believe in a musical pluralism which respects autonomous participation in and development of ethnic, racial, religious or social groups all within the context of a common civilization.

But as pluralists we also have a base—a center—a musical and cultural home. Harold Best, in his perceptive book *Music Through the Eyes of Faith*, says that the musical home

forms a perceptual base from which additional musical choices are made. Musical pluralism is not an ambiguous, sonic anarchy; it is not a trendy and valueless everything-is-okay-ism. Even though we are free to assume that all music possesses its own kind of worth, no one is obligated to assume that there is no intelligent choosing, no sorting out, and no hierarchy of values. Totally relativized pluralism, in which everything is considered the same, is an intellectual travesty.

In the Church Music program of Indiana University School of Music, our musical home is in the classic tradition of what has been judged to be the best of many periods and styles for the last 1100 years. This music is linked to an enormous number of masterworks which deeply challenge musical and spiritual perceptions. The musical choices grow out of a strong desire to use excellence as the

keyword in making decisions about what to teach and what to use. It also makes a conscious distinction between any art form and the truth that it may seek to describe. Once again I quote from Harold Best for a clear and succinct description of our fundamental thinking:

Art and music are essentially neutral in their ability to express belief, creed, moral and ethical exactitudes. No matter how passionately artists may believe what they believe or try to show these beliefs in what they imagine and craft, their art remains purposely “dumb.”

We can appreciate and respect many types of musical offerings, but as we make personal choices for ourselves, our choirs, our churches, a striving for excellence (which, after all, is simply a process in which we continually try to be and do better than before) is the optimum guide for all our doings.

MEETING OF REGION TWO

MUSIC THERAPY: A GROWING EDGE OF NEW MUSIC PROFESSIONS

CHARLOTTE KROEKER
Whitworth College

Music therapy programs can be a very effective way to build curricular breadth and new student offerings for an accredited, undergraduate music curriculum. This is particularly appropriate for NASM Region Two, since the only programs in this area of the country are at Willamette and Utah State Universities. As the medical and therapeutic industries grow in importance to our economy, a music therapy program is a natural opportunity for music administrators to consider when developing new, marketable degree programs. Music therapy is a relatively young, growing profession, and one that has great potential to enhance the offerings of an existing music department.

1. What is music therapy?

The National Association of Music Therapy has developed this definition: "Music therapy is the use of music in the accomplishment of therapeutic aims: the restoration, maintenance, and improvement of mental and physical health. It is the systematic application of music, as directed by the music therapist in a therapeutic environment, to bring about desirable changes in behavior. Such changes enable the individuals undergoing therapy to experience a greater understanding of themselves and the world about them, thereby achieving a more appropriate adjustment to society. As a member of the therapeutic team, the professional music therapist participates in the analysis of individual problems and in the projection of general treatment aims before planning and carrying out specific musical activities. Periodic evaluations are made to determine the effectiveness of the procedures employed."

A simple definition my colleague and music therapist, Dr. Juanita McElwain, used to give is, "Music therapy is the use of music to help someone." It is perhaps helpful to contrast the goals of music therapy with those of music education and performance, with which all of us are more familiar. A music educator is interested in developing a student's musical skills and knowledge, and a performer is interested in a high level of musical and technical skill in order to communicate

effectively with an audience. A music therapist, on the other hand, uses music as a tool to accomplish a non-music goal, such as improvement in verbal or social skills. While music therapists must be highly trained and skilled musicians, the use of their training and skills has a different focus than that of a music educator or performer. And because the individual therapist's training, clinical setting and the individual needs of a client differ so widely, music therapy will take many different forms in practice.

2. With whom and where does a music therapist work?

Analysis of the membership of the National Association of Music Therapy provides us with an idea of the populations served by music therapists and the kinds of settings in which they are employed. A brochure produced by NAMT and the American Association for Music Therapy gives examples of how music therapy can make a difference in various therapeutic settings. "Music therapy makes a difference for people with mental health needs, developmental disabilities, Alzheimer's disease, substance abuse problems, brain injuries, physical disabilities, and chronic illnesses...Music therapists work in psychiatric hospitals, rehabilitative facilities, medical hospitals, outpatient clinics...Music therapists assess emotional well-being, physical health, social functioning, communication abilities, and cognitive skills through musical responses. They design music sessions for individuals and groups based on client needs using music improvisation, receptive music listening, song writing, lyric discussion, music and imagery, music performance and learning through music."

Another burgeoning field for music therapists is the application of music therapy in K-12 education. As the trend of mainstreaming of various handicapped populations into the public schools gains momentum, education systems are looking to musicians with certification in both music therapy and music education to fill their needs. Many public school systems hire significant numbers of such dually certified professionals to fill these new needs for new populations. Graduates of the program I was associated with were employed in V.A. hospitals, mentally handicapped institutions, psychiatric wards in hospitals, substance abuse clinics, and paramedical settings such as hospice, group homes and elderly care facilities.

3. What is the history of music therapy in the U.S.?

As a known profession, music therapy is a relatively new field of endeavor. While the benefits of music for relaxation and leisure have been known informally for centuries, the scientific documentation of the value of music therapy and accompanying training of professionals is fairly recent. The first collegiate programs to train music therapy professionals did not appear until the 1940s, when the Music Teachers National Association formed a Committee on Music Therapy. In

1950 the National Association for Music Therapy was formed, and met concurrently as an organization with the MTNA national convention. In 1956 NASM officially became the accrediting agency for the Registered Music Therapist certification. NASM continues to have importance in the accrediting process—without NASM accreditation of a music program, NAMT will not approve a music therapy program. There were approximately 3,650 music therapy professionals in the United States in 1990.

4. How can a music therapy program be incorporated into an existing accredited music program?

First, all the basic music coursework required for a NASM accredited music degree is also required for an approved music therapy program. Music therapy students fill seats in music theory, history and ensemble courses, as well as in applied music studios and music education instrument/voice classes. In other words, music therapy students are trained as musicians either prior to or concurrently with their music therapy training. If a music department has space in these general music classes, no new faculty will need to be added to accommodate music therapy students. An additional 15 hours of supporting courses can be drawn from courses already taught in the typical liberal arts and education curriculum, meaning no additional faculty need to be hired in this capacity. Twenty hours of music therapy courses can usually be taught by one music therapist, making the addition of one music therapy faculty member the usual requirement for adding a music therapy program. Other considerations will be the additional room needed to house the program and the new faculty member, presence of special needs populations in the community for students to access for practica, and purchase of some equipment needed for clinical and evaluative procedures.

Once the music therapy program is in place, the department serves to benefit from the student already holding a music degree, who wants to pursue music therapy equivalency training to prepare for a career as a music therapy professional. Although a transcript must be evaluated, an equivalency student can usually finish music therapy requirements by going to school part-time for two years.

5. What kind of department will best accommodate a music therapy program?

In its philosophy, a music therapy program is quite similar to a music education program. Both are service/teaching professions, and tend to draw the same kinds of students and faculty. For a highly performance-oriented department, the addition of a music therapy program may be less harmonious. Music therapy requires a heavy commitment to practicum time for the students throughout the training. Faculty who demand high volumes of time in performance ensembles

may have difficulty with the time required for the practica for music therapy students. A faculty with understanding and appreciation of the goals of music education, however, will be more compatible with the needs of a music therapy program. Another helpful setting is one where interdisciplinary work is common, such as a liberal arts institution. Since some coursework for music therapy students is "borrowed" from the behavioral and natural sciences, a good working relationship with faculty in these fields is necessary. A college or university with a strong service orientation is also a good setting for a music therapy program. An educational environment with outstanding programs in social work and education, for example, will likely support music therapy as well.

6. What are funding implications and sources?

As stated above, the primary expense for a music program will be support for one faculty member and space to accommodate the program. Space needs will be for the faculty office, a classroom (if scheduling demands on existing classrooms cannot be met), a large room for therapy procedures (may be the same space as the classroom), and space for storage of instruments and equipment. If space and program needs allow, instruments and equipment such as tape recorders and camcorders that are needed for both music education and music therapy classes can be shared. Some additional equipment for research purposes will be needed, such as that to measure blood pressure, muscle potential, and brain wave activity. The extent and sophistication of the equipment will be dependent upon the research orientation and depth of the program.

Funding sources are often generous for the support of a music therapy program. Social service groups such as Rotary or Kiwanis who already target special needs populations are often willing to support music therapy programs and scholarships for students. Also, funding sources for medical research, equipment and training are an entirely new source of revenue for support of the music therapy program, separate from those sources usually tapped for a music department or college in general.

7. How does a music therapy program impact the lives of the students in the program and the music department?

In general, the music therapy students I have known have been both some of the strongest musicians in the department and also some of the most caring, balanced people. Without fail, the music therapy students turned out to be among the most disciplined, talented performers. They also were leaders in the department as a whole, functioning as student representatives to the music administration, elected to choir and band offices, and vital to the Mu Phi Epsilon organization. The nature of the field and the emotionally healthy people who are drawn to music therapy

can benefit the entire music department. The training the students receive in understanding others helps them to learn to know themselves well also. They arrive at the end of their degree work as balanced persons, who can work creatively and well with others. The content of music therapy classes can be beneficial to other music majors as well, especially the music education majors who can use the information found in psychology of music, research, and basic music therapy classes.

Two examples of the impact of the music therapy program come to mind, one of an individual and a presentation that had impact on the music students as a group. One freshman student came to school with a less than supportive family structure and epilepsy that interfered with his ability to learn. He nearly failed academically in his first year, but found he had a good voice and liked helping people. He decided to enter the music therapy program. By the end of his four years in the music therapy program, he gave a full voice recital (memory had been very difficult for him), was making nearly all A's in coursework in varied fields, and was elected choir president. He is now in seminary and plans to be a minister. He married a music therapy student who is now in graduate school, and they have one child. While other students have come in with more apparent promise and have also done well, music therapy can be a valuable experience for students who gain tremendously from the therapeutic nature of the program.

The other example was a demonstration from a handbell choir from a local institution that serves the mentally handicapped. The choir played for the weekly gathering of all the music majors where topics related to music and performances are presented. The purpose of the choir was to help the clients develop social skills in working as a group. The therapeutic tool was the performance of the handbell choir. The tremendous effort each client made to play one bell at precisely the right time was evident. Their mastery of a simple task as a member of the group was a source of great pride to them and to those of us who listened and watched. Their accomplishment was amazing to those of us who would ordinarily take for granted such a performance, and be inclined to critique its quality. I doubt any person in the room remained unmoved at the end of the hour, and we were profoundly convinced of the value of what we had observed.

In summary, a music therapy program is not appropriate for all music departments. But it should certainly be considered by some. For schools where appropriate, it can enhance and build those music programs in new and creative ways. For many departments, it need not require a large infusion of money to establish a quality program. And, given the characteristics of a music therapy program, there are many benefits to be had in new educational and professional opportunities for students as well as opportunities for the music department to network with new agencies outside the college/university. A music therapy program will bring an

infusion of good musicians and people to support and augment existing music classes, ensembles and programs.

Further information can be obtained from:

The National Association for Music Therapy, Inc.
8455 Colesville Road, Suite 930
Silver Spring, MD 20910
(301) 589-3300
FAX (301) 589-5175

MEETING OF REGION FIVE

CONFIDENTIALITY IN PROMOTION/TENURE DECISIONS

ROBERT L. COWDEN
Indiana State University

The purpose of this presentation is to take a look at the subject of confidentiality as it relates to personnel decisions in institutions of higher learning. Definitions of some key terms will be advanced as they relate to this subject. Five significant court cases will be cited which provide guidance and direction, albeit conflicting. And finally, some suggestions will be made for consideration by music executives who hear or read these words.

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions are advanced to create a common understanding among us.

Discovery—a procedure prior to a trial during which both parties seek information and documentation that enable them to prepare for a full and fair hearing.

Redact—to edit; the term is used when indicating that a document has been edited or shortened—often to indicate that authorship has been removed.

Tenure—a status by which a faculty member can expect reappointment to a professional position in higher education on a continuing basis; the status occurs after a series of evaluations conducted over a period of years; usually occurs only once in an individual's academic life.

Promotion—similar to tenure in that the status occurs after a series of evaluations and recommendations by individuals and committees; dissimilar in that it may occur two or three times in the course of an individual's academic life. A survey conducted in 1980 revealed that 80% of the institutions who responded stated that they used the same criteria for promotion as for tenure. This doesn't mean necessarily that the criteria were applied in the same way or with the same weight.¹

Discrimination—the making of a judgement about an individual on the basis of race, religion, sex, national origin, disability or age.

Confidentiality—a principle based on secrecy—when one says something in confidence he/she expects that it will not be revealed to anyone else; when one writes something about someone he/she expects that the communication will not be revealed to the subject of the commentary.

Privacy—a state of not being open to the public; personal matters that are held in secret and not subject to publication. “When examining the balance between individual privacy and requests for disclosure,” says Coburn, “privacy has historical, constitutional, common law and statutory protection.”² The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution specifically addresses the right to privacy.

Privacy and confidentiality are both protected in numerous federal and state laws and regulations such as the Federal Privacy Act of 1974 and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of the same year. The Federal Privacy Act of 1974 accords all persons certain rights enforceable against the government concerning information about them in federal agency files. Similarly, the Buckley Amendment regulates access to student records.³

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Nearly thirty years ago, during Lyndon Johnson’s presidency, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act. Title VII of that act made the federal courts the final adjudicator for claims of employment discrimination. At the time of enactment, higher education was excluded from the provisions of Title VII. However, in 1972, with the passage of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act, educational institutions were specifically included under the Title VII umbrella, which said that it was unlawful for discrimination in employment to occur based on race, religion, sex, national origin, disability or age.

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1991

Some twenty-seven years after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the United States Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1991. Among the several provisions of this act are ones relating to damages, jury trials and glass ceilings.

This act permits compensatory and punitive damages, previously available only to racial and ethnic minorities, to be sought by victims of intentional discrimination based on sex, religion or disability. Caps on these damages are from \$50,000 to \$300,000, depending on the employer’s workforce. A jury trial may be

requested by any party to a case in which compensatory or punitive damages are sought.

The act also established a Glass Ceiling Commission to study barriers to the advancement of women and minorities in the workforce and recommended means of overcoming those barriers.

COURT CASES

Five court cases in the period 1981-1990 provide guidance as we strive to understand the meaning and implications of confidentiality as it pertains to personnel decisions in higher education.

In *Blaubergs v. the Board of Regents*⁴ the court was asked by the plaintiff to require disclosure of the votes and the rationale of each tenure review committee member. In *In re Dinnan* (1981)⁵, which stemmed from this case, committee member Dinnan refused to reveal his vote in this decision for Maija Blaubergs who had filed suit claiming denial of tenure as a result of sexual discrimination. While recognizing the principle of academic freedom, the court also acknowledged its limits. The Fifth Circuit Court judge found Dinnan in contempt of court and sentenced him to jail. Dinnan presented himself with much fanfare and in full academic regalia at the prison gate to serve a sentence of ninety days. The Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal.

In *Gray v. Board of Higher Education*⁶ (1982), S. Simpson Gray, an unsuccessful candidate for tenure, sought discovery of votes of certain members of peer review committees. The federal district judge, recognizing a qualified privilege of academic confidentiality, denied disclosure.⁷

The argument was advanced by the Board of Higher Education of Georgia that if faculty evaluators are to make an effective assessment of a tenure candidate's qualities, the evaluators must be able to engage in free and open discussion. Frankness is not likely to occur if exchanges do not remain confidential. Failure to maintain confidentiality on votes of tenure decisions would tend to limit discussion, promote divisiveness among faculty members and could well lead to a disproportionate impact on tenure decisions by department chairs and others.⁸

Upon appeal, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit's decision was to order a disclosure of individual votes. "Academic freedom is illusory," said the judge, "when it does not protect faculty from censorious practices but provides a veil for those who might act as censors."⁹

In the case of the *Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) v. Notre Dame du Lac* (1983)¹⁰ the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit overturned a lower federal court order granting enforcement of an EEOC subpoena requiring the university to produce tenure review materials which the Commission sought in its investigation of a racial discrimination charge brought by a professor who was denied tenure. The court said that the EEOC must first make a “substantial showing of particularized need” when seeking confidential tenure review material. Further, the court allowed the university to redact information revealing the identity of peer reviewers.

Professor Gerald Montbertrand, a former assistant professor, filed a suit with the EEOC because he was not awarded tenure, charging discrimination based on his French national origin. The French and Italian departments had recommended tenure, but negative recommendations had come from the Professional Standards Committee, the Dean and the President. The case became the *EEOC v. Franklin and Marshall College* (1985).¹¹

A federal order (1985) required Franklin and Marshall to turn over tenure review documents. The college argued, unsuccessfully, that academic privilege shielded all confidential peer review material.

The EEOC subpoenaed college records relating to all tenure cases since 1977 but offered to have names removed. The college agreed to produce items such as student evaluations and enrollment data but refused to submit documents it regarded as confidential, including tenure recommendation forms, reference letters, and evaluations of publications by outside experts.

The EEOC filed suit in the U.S. District Court for Eastern Pennsylvania, and the court granted the EEOC request but allowed the college to omit names and other identifying data—a redacted version, in other words—from so-called “confidential” material.

Subsequently, the college filed an appeal with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, arguing that the court should recognize a “qualified academic peer review privilege.” The court rejected the college “privilege” argument, and Franklin and Marshall was ordered to produce all material sought by the EEOC.

At this point we have a multi-horned dilemma. There is a federal statute which says that there can be no discrimination in employment based on race, religion, sex, national origin, disability or age. The U.S. Second and Fifth Circuit Courts required that peer review materials and votes be disclosed, a Seventh Circuit Court said a “particularized need” for documents must be shown, and the Third Circuit

Court stated that all relevant material was to be made available, albeit with identifiers removed.

That brings us to the most important and far-reaching case of all, the first and only time the Supreme Court of the United States has dealt with the matter of confidentiality. The case concerns Rosalie Tung, an associate professor at the Wharton School, who was denied tenure. Ms. Tung filed a charge with the EEOC alleging discrimination on the basis of race, sex, and national origin. She alleged that her qualifications for tenure were equal to, or better than, five male faculty who were more favorably treated. The case was considered by the United States Supreme Court in 1990 and is known as the *University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC*.¹²

The EEOC issued a subpoena seeking Tung's file and those of the five males. The University of Pennsylvania refused to comply, asking that confidential letters written by evaluators be excluded. The issue was drawn—are the evaluative portions of the tenure review files of a female faculty member and allegedly comparable males subject to subpoena by the EEOC pursuant to its investigation of a charge filed by the female faculty member against her covered employer?

The Supreme Court said “yes!” by a vote of 9-0. (It should be pointed out that *very few* Supreme Court decisions are unanimous.) The Court reasoned that an alleged perpetrator of discrimination cannot be allowed to pick and choose evidence necessary for an investigation, that confidential material pertaining to other candidates may demonstrate that persons with lesser qualifications were granted tenure, and that peer review material must be investigated to determine whether the evaluations are based in discrimination and whether they are reflected in the tenure decision. A university interest in maintaining the confidentiality of its peer review process must give way to the alleged victim's right to obtain evidence necessary to substantiate charges of discrimination.

The court held that, although the possibility of disclosure may cause some evaluators to become less candid, an equally logical result is that they may become more specific and illustrative in order to avoid claims of bias. “Not all academics will hesitate to stand up and be counted,” said the court, merely because of possible disclosure of their evaluation. The court rejected the university's argument that the disclosure of relevant employment information such as tenure files impinged on academic freedom.

The Court reasoned, in this unanimous decision, that any smoking gun indicating invidious discrimination in tenure decisions would be tucked away in peer review materials. The plaintiff's interest in discovering peer review materials was great; the university's nondisclosure interest was slight in comparison.¹³

CONCLUSION

Times have changed. Laws and rules which historically had not been applied to colleges and universities now stipulate that higher education is to be included in their domain. After generations of almost complete immunity from regulation, higher education institutions find themselves subject to a host of rules covering a long and growing list of campus activities.¹⁴

Most of the court cases have dealt with the issue of tenure rather than the issue of promotion. We think of tenure in the academy as a way of life—and on 85% of campuses in the United States that is so. But at the beginning of the twentieth century, tenure was not common in American higher education. By 1913, however, with the founding of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), tenure became more and more common as a safeguard for both the principle and practice of academic freedom.

It may come as a surprise to many that Title VII of the Civil Rights Act is not the only statute that deals with the problem we are discussing today. In fact, there are eight federal discrimination statutes and a major executive order applicable to postsecondary education. These anti-discrimination statutes supersede any conflicting state law because they are federal laws.¹⁶

Most personnel decisions, as a matter of fact, are not challenged under Title VII, and when they are most plaintiffs don't succeed. A study of all cases litigated under Title VII through 1984 revealed that only 20% were successful.

Since 1984 there have been nine successful suits brought by plaintiffs charging colleges/universities with racial or sex discrimination. The awards have been from a low of \$100,000 at Texas A & M University to a high of \$7,500,000 at the City University of New York.

In the cases where plaintiffs have prevailed, it is not the material itself that has been persuasive so much as sexist or racist comments that have been made by department colleagues or administrators, communications regarding refusal to hire women faculty or clearly less favorable treatment of women faculty by male administrators.¹⁷

The conclusions are inescapable. We must be diligent in treating all employees with fairness and equity. We must be alert to see that those of protected classes are not the recipients of discrimination. And, if there is the suspicion of discrimination, and if documents are needed to substantiate that belief, then confidentiality that may have been a principle upon which the documents were created will yield to the principle of providing access to the information for one with a need to know.

SUGGESTIONS

In the spirit of wishing to be helpful to fellow music executives, I offer the following suggestions:

1. Develop and ratify as a department, school, college or university a set of standards—criteria by which colleagues will be measured in personnel matters. See to it that these criteria are uniformly applied.
2. Be fair and consistent. Evaluate all personnel in the same way. Procedures should be clear and understood by all.
3. Adopt a policy of openness, i.e. share the recommendation (text and numerical vote) with a candidate at each decision-making level.
4. Counsel with unit personnel committees about the importance of evenhandedness and objectivity. Stress the need for evidence upon which to base conclusions; about the fact that discriminatory behavior cannot be tolerated.
5. Inform ones from whom you seek evaluations (peers, external reviewers, e.g.) about the disposition of their statements—who will see the statement, its weight in the total process and whether or not it will be treated confidentially.
6. Know the laws of the land that govern behavior in personnel matters. The corollary: consult your college/university attorney when in doubt.

ENDNOTES

¹Mary Büttner Coburn, "The Conflict Between Confidentiality and Open Meeting Law and Its Impact on the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Process in the Florida State University System," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1992, 13.

²Coburn, 24.

³Coburn, 28.

⁴*Blaubergs v. Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia*, 661 F.2d 426 (5th Cir. 1981).

⁵*In re Dinnan v. Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia*, 661 F.2d 426 (U.S. App. 5th Cir. 1981).

⁶*Gray v. Board of Higher Education, City of New York*, 92 F.R.D. 87, 93 (S.D.N.Y. 1981), rev'd, 692 F.2d 901 (U.S. App. 2nd Cir. 1982).

⁷David M. Rabban, "AAUP in the Courts: The Association's Representation of Faculty Members and Faculty Causes in Appellate Litigation," *Academe* 69:1 (March-April 1993), 1a-12a.

⁸J.G. Hill, Jr. and E.E. Hill, "Employment Discrimination: A Rollback of Confidentiality in University Tenure Procedures?" *American Business Law Journal*, 22 (Summer, 1984), 209-225.

⁹*Gray v. Board of Higher Education*, supra.

¹⁰*EEOC v. University of Notre Dame du Lac*, 715 F.2d 331 (U.S. App. 7th Cir. 1983).

¹¹*EEOC v. Franklin and Marshall College*, 775 F.2d 110 (U.S. App. 3rd Cir. 1985).

¹²*University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC*, 110 S. Ct. 577 (1990).

¹³J.L. Curcio and A. Ross, "Supreme Court Strikes the Balance in Favor of Peer Review Materials Disclosure." *West's Education Law Reporter*, 63:3 (Jan. 3, 1991), 697.

¹⁴Derek Bok, *Beyond the Ivory Tower*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), 37.

¹⁵Coburn, 11.

¹⁶S. Moore and G. Fowler, "When Discrimination Supersedes Confidentiality," *Nursing Outlook*, 39:2 (Mar.-Apr. 1991), 78.

¹⁷B.A. Lee, "Peer Review Confidentiality: Is It Still Possible?," Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Attorneys, 11.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books, Articles, Dissertations

Ambrose, C.M. "Academic Freedom in American Public Colleges and Universities." *Review of Higher Education*, 14:1, 1990, 5-32.

American Association of University Professors: Committees A & W. "Access to Faculty Personnel Files." *Academe* 78 (July-August, 1992), 24-28.

Bednash, Geraldine. "Tenure Review: Process & Outcomes." *Review of Higher Education*, 15:1 (Fall, 1991), 47-63.

Bok, Derek. *Beyond the Ivory Tower*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Breckinridge, A.C. *The Right to Privacy*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1970.

Campbell, R.L. "Academic Status and Judicial Review." *Interchange*, 17:3 (Autumn, 1986), 28-41.

Cleveland, H. "The Costs and Benefits of Openness: Sunshine Laws and Higher Education." *Journal of College and University Law*, 12:2, (1985), 127-173.

Coburn, Mary Biittner. "The Conflict Between Confidentiality and Open Meetings Law and Its Impact on the Faculty Promotion and Tenure Process in the Florida State University System." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1992.

College and University Personnel Association. "Tenure at Two-Year Colleges and Universities." *Journal of College and University Personnel Association*, 3(3-4) (1980), 109-135.

Curcio, J.L. and Ross, A. "Supreme Court Strikes the Balance in Favor of Peer Review Materials Disclosure." *West's Education Law Reporter*, 63:3 (Jan. 3, 1991), 689-702.

Dilts, J. "Open Meetings in Higher Education." *Communication and the Law*, 9 (1987), 31-42.

- Dorminey, J.J. and Eckart, J.A. "Writing Narrative Evaluations and Letters of Recommendation." *The Clearing House*, 64 (Sept.-Oct., 1990), 28-30.
- Franke, A.H. "Life in the Academy After *University of Pennsylvania v. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission*." *Education Law Reporter*, 62 (1990), 22-26.
- Hill, J.G., Jr. and Hill, E.E. "Employment Discrimination: A Rollback of Confidentiality in University Tenure Procedures?" *American Business Law Journal*, 22 (Summer, 1984), 209-225.
- Joughin, L., Ed., *Academic Freedom and Tenure: A Handbook of the American Association of University Professors*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Kaplin, W.A. *The Law of Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985.
- Leas, T. "University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC: The Death of Academic Freedom in Tenure Decisions." *Education Law Reporter*, 62:1 (1990), 1-9.
- Lee, Barbara A. *Peer Review Confidentiality: Is it Still Possible?* Washington, D.C.: National Association of College and University Attorneys, 1990.
- Miller, R. *Evaluating Faculty for Promotion and Tenure*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Moore, S. and Fowler, G. "When Discrimination Supersedes Confidentiality." *Nursing Outlook*, 39:2 (Mar.-Apr., 1991), 77-81.
- Prosser, W.L. "Privacy," *California Law Review*, 48 (1960), 383-423.
- Rabban, David M. "AAUP in the Courts: The Association's Representation of Faculty Members and Faculty Causes in Appellate Litigation." *Academe*, 69:2 (Mar.-Apr., 1983), 1a-12a.
- Rasnic, C.D. "Litigating the Adverse Peer Review Decision." *West's Education Law Reporter*, 66:1 (May 3, 1991), 1-18.
- Shils, E.A. *The Torment of Secrecy*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1956.
- Wagner, E. "Tenure Committees—Take Heed: 'University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC' Should Change the Way You Proceed." *West's Education Law Reporter*, 64:4 (Feb. 28, 1991), 979-997.
- Warren, S.D. and Brandeis, L.D. "The Right of Privacy." *Harvard Law Review*, 4:5, (1980), 193-220.
- Weeks, Kent M. "The Peer Review Process: Confidentiality and Disclosure." *The Journal of Higher Education*, 61 (Mar.-Apr., 1990), 198-219.

Court Cases

- Blaubeergs v. Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia*, 661 F.2d 426 (U.S.App. 5th Cir. 1981).
- Gray v. Board of Higher Education, City of New York*, 92 F.R.D. 87, 93 (S.D.N.Y. 1981), rev'd, 692 F.2d 901 (U.S. App. 2d Cir. 1982).
- In re Dinnan v. Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia*, 661 F.2d 426 (U.S. App. 5th Cir. 1981).
- EEOC v. Franklin and Marshall College*, 775 F.2d 110 (U.S. App. 3rd Cir. 1985).

EEOC v. University of Notre Dame du Lac, 715 F.2d 331 (U.S. App. 7th Cir. 1983).

Tallahassee Democrat, Inc. v. Florida Board of Regents, 314 So. 2d 164 (1 D.C.A. Fla. 1975).

University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC. U.S. 110 S. Ct. 577, 107 L. Ed. 2d 571 (Ed. Law Rep. 666) 1990.

MEETING OF REGION SIX

THE IMPACT OF CURRENT EDUCATIONAL REFORM ON HIGHER EDUCATION

NATALIE L. OZEAS
Carnegie Mellon University

I read recently in a publication of the Education Commission of the States, an attempt to explain outcomes-based education and its current impact. It stated that in an attempt to make systemic changes in an educational system that “could not adequately prepare students for life and work in the 21st century, educators and policy makers are attempting to change the way we measure the effectiveness of the education from an emphasis on traditional inputs, such as course credits earned and hours spent in class, to results or outcomes.” In the at least 24 states where some form of outcomes-based education has been developed or implemented and in the 12 additional states where it is being considered or has become a part of the state assessment process (note: that is a total of 36 out of 50 states), the Carnegie Unit has been dropped as a measure for completion of high school requirements. The demonstration of what a student knows, how that knowledge can be applied to real life situations and whether or not the necessary skills have been achieved has been adopted in its place.

Outcome-, outcomes-, or performance-based education has received a level of national and local attention which is unique in the recent history of educational reform. It did not spring full-blown from the brain of William Spadey, who has been credited for its philosophical basis, or from other educational theorists who are currently supporting its merits, but it has been the result of an attempt to use the findings of educational experimentation and research to attack some of the current problems in public education. It is also the logical “next step” in a long chain of educational reform which has taken place during the past twenty-five years. I remember clearly the introduction of “behavioral objectives.” Imagine the idea of writing the objectives for a class in terms of what a student would know or do rather than what a teacher would present! Initially the musicians’ reaction to this new approach to curricular planning was to declare that it would be the death of aesthetic education. As a public school teacher, I attended a special workshop at Penn State University in the early 1970s to learn how to write behavior objectives, and when I returned to my classrooms, I found that the quality and quantity of

learning improved as a result of the changes which I made in my approach to planning. Now, I can't imagine ever having done it any other way.

Another step occurred with the introduction of the IEP, the individualized educational program, in which individual goals were developed for students who were either educationally learning disabled or gifted or talented. Ideally, teachers, students and parents participated in structuring the design of the program that was intended to reach these goals. Music teachers protested loudly that considering the number of students with whom they worked and the involvement of so many unenlightened parents, the task for them would be impossible. But today, IEP's are a part of most school systems and have provided the special instruction and motivation which is essential for special students with widely varying abilities.

Logically, the next step in the recent road of educational reform led to mastery learning, in which students were responsible for proving that they had achieved the "mastery level" of each of the minute steps required to build toward a final objective. Mastery learning and outcomes-based education are not the same, but the similarities may become obvious.

Additional pressure for reform came from several devastating studies in the 1980s which criticized education and revealed the serious deficits in United States students' achievement when compared with other countries of the world. SAT scores showed a continuing decline, and the drop-out rate in the nation's cities was appalling.

The educational reforms which were becoming an integral part of public education and the criticisms of traditional educational practices which were widely heard on television and circulated in print created an atmosphere in which change was mandated. This, combined with the growing acknowledgement that America's educational opportunities were not equal for all its children as dramatically documented in Jonathan Kozol's *Savage Inequalities* and the work of Howard Gardner in identifying at least seven different intelligences in his *Frames of Mind*, set the stage for the development of new and innovative ways to organize and deliver education in the public schools of America. Despite this logical progression of reform, I know that I—and I would guess that most of my colleagues in higher education in Pennsylvania—were unprepared for the sudden appearance in our state of outcomes-based guidelines and for the ensuing furor which was generated by its opponents—particularly those from the religious right.

After speaking at hearings held by the Education Committee of the Pennsylvania Legislature concerning the recent ten-year mandated revision of the school code, I decided that the arguments which I had presented in the past were not appropriate and that I had to learn a great deal more about outcomes-based

education. As a result of a faculty development grant from Carnegie Mellon and with support of the Pennsylvania Music Educators Association, I began to study the many facets of OBE. I read about the philosophy, and through the Music Educators National Conference, I identified school districts in which OBE was being implemented. I then visited schools in Minnesota, Colorado, and California and spoke with state music supervisors in Arkansas, New Jersey, and Oklahoma. In school districts where OBE was in place, I talked to administrators, teachers, students and parents. I came out of my immersion in OBE— a strong supporter. I do not begin to know all the answers to the many questions and concerns that are being raised, but I do believe that within this philosophy there are the possibilities for allowing more children to succeed, for raising achievement levels, for allowing students to develop a sense of responsibility for their own achievement, for involving parents in a meaningful way, and for increasing the relevancy of music education for all children.

There are several principles upon which outcomes-based programs are developed. First, there is the fundamental assumption that all children can succeed if the outcomes are written correctly, if the material is presented in the manner in which the child can process it and if he or she is given sufficient time. Administrators and teachers must believe that all children can succeed. The dedication to this idea has generated new energy and commitment among faculties where it is being implemented and has created a base of success upon which individual students can continue to build. The buzz phrase for OBE proponents is, “All children can learn, but not on the same day or in the same way.” This requires far less change for implementation in music than it does in some of the other academic areas. Think of the math teachers who have for years taught the chapter, tested, given A,B,C,D, and F grades and moved on to present more material which undoubtedly built on what had or had not been learned. Conversely, the band director rarely works on a number until everyone but the oboes knows their parts, gives the oboes a failing grade and plays the piece. If the rhythm is incorrect, the teacher may clap the correct one, he may sing the correct phrasing or he may simply tell the student how to finger D-flat. He may also schedule after-school rehearsals for the oboe section, but with a little luck, by the time the piece is performed, the oboes will also have learned the music.

Briefly, when thinking in outcomes-based terms, we look at the ultimate, long-term objectives for every student. What real-life difference will it make to have participated in music classes for anywhere from one or two to twelve years? What is it that we feel is absolutely essential for every child to know and be able to do as a result of the music education being provided for them? The answers to these questions are not specifically curricular. They are far broader than “identify the instruments of the orchestra” or “identify the stylistic characteristics of the Baroque Period.” Identify is a very low-level skill in Bloom’s Taxonomy. This

information may be helpful or even highly desirable, but it is hardly at the level of exit outcomes with lifelong impact for all children. We cannot begin to teach a student all that he or she will need to know in order to succeed in the 21st century. It is essential that we teach the skills necessary for lifelong learning—the application of knowledge—analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

When writing exit outcomes, we determine what are the absolutely essential exit-level goals for education. Then we look at what must be done initially and progressively to reach those goals. Based on the agricultural-driven calendar and the industrial-driven delivery system, we have arbitrarily placed learning within a time frame and information within cubicles.

Students in an outcomes-based curriculum do not progress to succeeding levels with grades of C or D. While the forms which OBE takes from state to state and district to district may vary, grades below a B are not generally given. There is no indication whether a student took six days, six weeks or six months to achieve a goal. Only the achievement is recorded. Governor Romor of Colorado told an interesting story in explaining his dedication to OBE. He said that he was a pilot and that in order to receive a pilot's license, you must achieve a specific standard. It really doesn't matter whether it takes two days, two months or two years to reach that level—you do not become a pilot until you do! There are no D-level pilots. How many of you would really like to know that you were flying with a pilot who had received a D in "landing"?

Students who do not achieve the desired outcomes after the first attempt are "recycled." The idea is not to present the same material more slowly and loudly, but to present it in another manner, addressing another learning style which may be more appropriate for this specific student. Students will obviously not progress at the same rate in all subjects—but they never have! We may need to begin to look at schools that are really nongraded or multi-leveled. The arbitrary division between areas of learning may become less distinct when real-life application of knowledge becomes the focus of achievement.

New methods of assessment which are closely related to real-life, long-term objectives are being created. The Arts Propel program in the Pittsburgh public schools, which has been developed in conjunction with the New England Conservatory and based on the work of Howard Gardner, is leading the way towards the development of critical thinking skills through the arts and towards the development of portfolio assessment. The days of true/false and multiple choice tests may be gone. One demonstrates the acquisition of knowledge or skill by using it.

How will these changes in course content, developmental records and graduation requirements impact higher education? My best and, I hope, most educated guess is that the impact will be in the following areas.

1. Admissions standards are going to be dramatically affected. In music we are somewhat more fortunate than those in other fields because for many of us, the first level and, for some, the entire acceptance is based on an audition. Nothing could be more “performance based” than that. This immediately eliminates the need to deal with other information from many students. But what will the records look like for those students for whom we will need additional information? If there are no grades given below a B, class rank and transcripts will become somewhat meaningless. In an age when SAT scores are being increasingly questioned as a basis for predicting college success, what sources beyond the audition are we going to use to determine the potential for success at the university level?

The task of trying to deal with portfolios from the many applicants who have passed the audition level and are being considered further is awesome. It is absolutely necessary that we and the admissions departments of the colleges and universities work with the high schools in determining the ways in which information can be presented in a manageable and meaningful way. In the Arts Propel project they are considering the prospect of storing students’ portfolios on CD ROM rather than on audio and videotape and on paper. Certainly applications and high school records could be presented in this manner. College admissions counselors would have to be trained to be able to evaluate this new information.

It is interesting to note that as early as 1933 an experiment in outcomes-based education in which 300 American colleges and universities agreed to free 30 experimental high schools from their conventional subject-unit entrance requirements and rather to accept detailed information concerning their graduates seeking college admission was highly successful. These high schools then designed courses to foster the kinds of higher-order thinking and learning skills required of successful college students. The colleges reported that the students from these programs were “strikingly more successful” than their counterparts.²

2. Teacher training programs will have to be revised to reflect the movement towards the acquisition of lifelong skills, the development of critical thinking and application of knowledge within the classroom at every level. Students will have to experience courses being taught and assessments made within this new paradigm in order to be able to function creatively and effectively in it as they move into the public schools.

3. Students will need to demonstrate their ability as teachers in order to obtain state certification. It will not be sufficient to present a transcript of courses and credit hours completed. This is already being implemented in several states.

4. Students will enter colleges, universities and conservatories expecting to succeed. We must attempt to create the flexibility which they have been trained to expect in the presentation of concepts and in the time allowed for their acquisition. Professors will need to expand their teaching styles to include those who learn in different ways. Departments may need to develop different ways of recognizing the accomplishment of the necessary outcomes rather than through the traditional grades given to document the achievement during a specific amount of time. They will not, however, expect the lowering of standards or the acceptance of slightly less than adequate completion of requirements.

5. Eventually, students will enter having assumed more ownership of their own education. They will expect to be partners in determining their programs and in evaluating the progress which they are making in pursuit of the agreed-upon goals. They will also expect to participate in determining the ways in which that achievement will be measured.

The development of the National Standards for Arts Education is exciting and has and will be receiving a great deal of national recognition. It is important to note that the National Standards are not outcomes based, but there is a great deal of compatibility between the models. Both are establishing standards or outcomes and are, therefore, criterion not normative referenced. In most states where OBE has been adopted, it is mandatory, not voluntary as are the National Standards. In Pennsylvania, in helping local school districts use the Model Outcomes-Based Curriculum for Music that has been developed, we have encouraged local school districts to reference the National Standards when developing curriculum. We find that the standards, while far more specifically curricular, are highly compatible with our curriculum.

I would like to affirm once again that I had nothing to do with developing either the philosophy or the forms of outcomes-based education. I do believe, however, that the model has potential for positively affecting the education of every student in the public schools. I also believe that it is an education movement whose time has come and that we in higher education need to be ready to deal with the consequences.

ENDNOTES

¹*“Outcomes-Based” Education: An Overview*, Education Commission of the States, 1993, 707 17th Street, Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202.

²*Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, American Educational Research Association, 1960. Cited in *“Outcomes-Based” Education: An Overview*, Education Commission of the States, 1993.

THE PLENARY SESSIONS

MINUTES OF THE PLENARY SESSIONS

**First General Session
Sunday, November 21, 1993**

President Frederick Miller called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and welcomed those assembled. He introduced Ed Thompson of the University of Utah, who led the membership in singing the National Anthem and the Thanksgiving Hymn. Arthur Tollefson of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro accompanied at the piano.

President Miller recognized two past presidents of NASM in attendance, Robert Bays and Robert Werner. He then introduced the officers and staff seated at the podium, who included:

Harold Best, Vice President
William Hipp, Treasurer
Helen Laird, Secretary
Lyle Merriman, Chair, Commission on Accreditation
Joyce Bolden, Associate Chair, Commission on Accreditation
Robert Tillotson, Chair, Commission on Community/Junior College
Accreditation
Robert Thayer, Chair, Commission on Non-Degree-Granting
Accreditation
Marvin Lamb, Chair, Nominating Committee
Samuel Hope, Executive Director
David Bading, Editor and Recorder for General Sessions

He then announced that Helen Laird had just been elected by the Board of Directors as an honorary member of NASM.

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

President Miller recognized the chairs of the three accrediting commissions in turn to give their commission reports. Reports were delivered by Robert Thayer,

Robert Tillotson, and Lyle Merriman. Each gave a brief summary of actions taken by his respective commission during the past week and announced that the full report of commission actions would be mailed with the next newsletter. [*The reports of the commissions appear separately in these Proceedings.*]

President Miller welcomed representatives of six institutions that joined NASM during 1993. They included, as Associate Members:

Edinboro University
George Mason University
Lee College
Shepherd College

and as Members:

David Lipscomb University
South Carolina State University

Treasurer William Hipp was next recognized to give the Treasurer's Report for 1992-93. Mr. Hipp reported that NASM remained financially well managed. He noted that revenues were bolstered each year by management fees received from the other three arts accrediting associations that shared the National Office. He also directed attention to the reserve fund of \$407,000, which he said was well on the way to the goal.

Motion: (William Hipp, University of Miami/James Hause, Eastern Michigan University) to accept the Treasurer's Report. **Passed.**

President Miller next recognized Executive Director Samuel Hope, who made several logistical announcements and introduced the NASM staff members present: Nadine Flint, Betty Weik, Willa Shaffer, David Bading, Chira Kirkland, Lisa Collins, Margaret O'Connor, and Karen Moynahan. Mr. Hope also thanked Pi Kappa Lambda for sponsoring a continental breakfast at the Annual Meeting.

Mr. Hope next drew members' attention to the proposed changes to the NASM *Handbook* before them. He explained that the proposed change to the Rules of Practice and Procedure had been approved by the Board of Directors two days ago and was therefore in effect. He then announced that the first proposed change in the Code of Ethics ("Proposed Revisions," p. 3, lines 36-44) would be subject to separate action following a vote on all remaining changes. He further explained that the Board of Directors had recommended three amendments to the proposed Bylaws changes as a result of recent government regulations. These amendments were as follows:

- (1) to amend page 2, line 57, of the proposed revisions to read “three Public Members” instead of “two Public Members”
- (2) to amend page 3, line 5, of the proposed revisions to read “six consecutive years” instead of “three consecutive years.”
- (3) to amend the *NASM Handbook* 1993-94, first complete paragraph on page 15, to read “The Commissions shall have three public members...” instead of “The Commissions shall have two public consultants....”

Mr. Hope stated that all proposed *Handbook* changes, with the exception of the Code of Ethics item mentioned previously and including the foregoing amendments, were recommended by the Board of Directors and awaited membership approval.

Motion: (James Fields, Nicholls State University/William Dederer, Boston Conservatory) to approve the remaining proposed *Handbook* changes as amended. **Passed.**

Mr. Hope then elaborated on the reason for a separate vote on the Code of Ethics item, which concerned a proposal to change the annual binding acceptance date for financial aid from March 1 to May 1. He explained that the change was requested two years before by several organizations representing collegiate admissions officers. The rationale was to bring music scholarship practices in line with a generally accepted date of May 1 for all financial aid. On the other hand, Mr. Hope noted that some NASM members were opposed to the change because of administrative difficulties in not having financial aid packages in place well before the end of the spring term. Mr. Hope stated that the Board of Directors had approved a membership referendum on the change, without making a recommendation for or against.

Motion: (Robert Sirota, New York University/Birgitte Moyer, College of Notre Dame) to approve the proposed change to NASM Code of Ethics regarding the binding acceptance date for financial aid. **Voice vote and show of hands inconclusive; written ballots were passed out.** Results were to be announced the next day.

President Miller next delivered the President’s Report, the text of which appears separately in these *Proceedings*.

Finally, President Miller introduced Marvin Lamb, Chair of the Nominating Committee, who introduced the candidates for office in the Association. He also announced that a chair and two members of the Nominating Committee for 1994

had been elected by the Board of Directors. Elected were Elaine Walter as Chair and Bernard Dobroski and Carolyn Jennings as members. Noting that the general election of officers would take place the following day, Mr. Lamb issued a final call for write-in nominations.

The session was recessed at 2:05 p.m.

**Second General Session
Monday, November 22, 1993**

President Miller called the session to order at 11:45 a.m. He began by announcing that after a count of written ballots, the proposed change in the Code of Ethics (changing the financial aid acceptance date from March 1 to May 1) had passed by a vote of 233 to 125.

He then proceeded to introduce guests at the Annual Meeting, including the following officers of music fraternities and sororities:

Katherine Doepke and Jo Ann Domb, Mu Phi Epsilon
Robert Hause and Douglas Stewart, Phi Mu Alpha Sinfonia
Daniel Sher, Pi Kappa Lambda
Brenda Ray, Sigma Alpha Iota

President Miller next called upon Ronald Ross, Chair of the Committee on Ethics, to give the Committee's report. (The text of this report appears separately in these *Proceedings*.)

Executive Director Samuel Hope was asked to give his report. After some preliminary announcements and introduction of NASM Projects Consultant Catherine Sentman, Mr. Hope referred the membership to his written report contained in their registration materials.

In additional remarks, he expressed concern over conditions in the national context in which the work of NASM takes place. He noted that the expansion of technology in our society seems to be accompanied by an expansion of pride in the ability of technology to conquer any problem. He also identified governmental intrusiveness and a preference for symbols over substance as continuing problems.

President Miller recognized Marvin Lamb, who conducted the election of officers. Following the introduction of candidates, ballots were distributed to member institutional representatives, then collected and counted by members of the Nominating Committee and NASM staff.

Finally, President Miller introduced Airns McGuinness, a consultant in higher education management from Boulder, Colorado, to give the principal address to the Association. [*The text of that address is contained at the front of these Proceedings.*]

The session was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Third General Session
Tuesday, November 23, 1993

President Miller called the session to order at 11:40 a.m.

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

President Miller thanked those who were completing terms of service within NASM. They included Helen Laird, Robert Thayer, David Kuehn, Birgitte Moyer, Allan Ross, Ronald Ross, Marvin Lamb, Don Gibson, Theodore Jennings, Jr., Judith Kritzmire, Patricia Lee, Wesley Tower, John Heard, and C.B. Wilson. He then proceeded to announce the results of the previous day's election of officers and asked the new officers to stand. They included:

Secretary: Dorothy Payne

Chair, Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Accreditation: Deborah Berman

Chair, Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation: Robert Tillotson

Members, Commission on Accreditation: Lynn Wood Bertrand, Robert Cowden, Jack Heller, Shirley Howell, Kenneth Keeling, David Lynch, and Daniel Sher

Members, Nominating Committee: David Nelson and Elda Tate

Member, Committee on Ethics: Linda Snyder

President Miller declared the Sixty-Ninth Annual Meeting of NASM adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Helen Laird
Temple University

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

FREDERICK MILLER
DePaul University

Many of you know David Boe, who was dean of the Oberlin College Conservatory for many years, and who served as secretary of NASM. David tells about the time he was on the campus of another institution serving as a member of an accreditation visiting team. He stopped in a washroom, and discovered that they had no paper towels; instead they had an electric hand-drying machine. And some smart-aleck sophomore, we presume, had posted a sign above the machine that said, "For a twenty-second message from the dean, push this button."

I will probably run longer than twenty seconds today, but hopefully, what comes out will have more substance.

It would always be a pleasure to report to you on the state of the Association, but it is an especially pleasant task when the news is good. As we heard just now in the Treasurer's report, the financial health of the Association is sound. Mindful that these are tough financial times on many of our campuses, we have held dues increases at the lowest possible levels in recent years. Yet we are operating with balanced budgets, we own our facilities, and we are more than two-thirds of the way to our goal of creating a reserve equal to approximately one year's budget, so that we can be assured of retaining total financial independence.

Our good financial health results in large part from Sam Hope's effective and efficient direction of NASM operations, and the splendid contribution of our very capable staff. It is not an exaggeration, I believe, to say that the staff is one of our most valuable assets. If you have had an opportunity to call or visit the National Office, you have seen this first hand. The thorough planning and careful organization of the Annual Meeting is further evidence of this. So both for myself and on behalf of the membership, I want to extend sincere thanks to the entire staff, and I ask you to join me in an expression of appreciation for their fine work.

There are many other reasons to be optimistic. We have a stable membership. We have a clear and well-defined purpose, and we carry on the work of accreditation with real integrity—integrity that is both observable and enviable. There can be little doubt that in the coming months and years, NASM will confront many difficult issues and troublesome external forces. I will mention some of these later. But we will confront these challenges with the strength that comes from solid organization and these assets.

I mentioned the integrity of our accreditation practices, and I will have more to say about this. But for now, let me just say that I wish it were possible for everyone to see the commissions at work. Both the amount of work they do and the thoroughness that is brought to every commission action is most impressive. I offer congratulations and thanks to the members of the commissions and also to the corps of visiting evaluators. The work that you do is exemplary, and it really is at the center of what NASM is all about.

If you are not presently serving on a commission or a committee of NASM, or if you are not currently a site visitor; if you are not working on a self-study document; and if things are moving along with relative calm on your campus, it may be that you don't think about NASM very much from one annual meeting to the next. Because this probably describes many people in this room, I thought it might be useful to take just a minute to recall some of the things that NASM does.

The primary business of the Association is accreditation, and I believe we can say with confidence that we do it well. Our accreditation standards are developed by the membership, and great care is taken to insure that everyone has an opportunity to participate in developing these standards. Our work is carried on not with an attitude of regulation, but in a spirit of service. Our purpose is not elitism, but the encouragement of quality and integrity in music in higher education.

In addition to accreditation, NASM works regularly in three other areas. One of these is the gathering and dissemination of statistical information. This is accomplished mainly through HEADS—that is, Higher Education Arts Data Services. HEADS is a project that we share with our sister arts accrediting associations in art and design, theater, and dance. There is a wealth of useful information both in the HEADS annual report and in special reports which can be prepared for ten or more institutions for which you might like to see comparative information. The National Office is especially helpful in providing these special reports, at nominal cost. They can perhaps make you feel good about how well off you are, or if not, provide useful data to support your case with the provost.

A third area of activity has to do with efforts to assist the professional development of music executives. Examples of this are the special workshops that typically precede the Annual Meeting or management presentations offered during the meetings. Recently NASM has participated with six related organizations in studying the nature of the work of arts faculties: how we define our work, how we evaluate it, and so forth. A joint effort with the Music Library Association is producing information, not about what books or records to buy, but how advancing technologies may affect the ways that we collect and store music materials and information in the future.

One of the most important illustrations of this kind of activity is the excellent work of a task force of some of our colleagues a few years ago to consider how the future may affect our work and our programs. That effort produced two publications: a *Sourcebook for Futures Planning* and a set of *Executive Summaries*. Both are available from the National Office, and I commend them to you most highly to assist you in strategic planning.

The fourth area in which we work has to do with public policy. The extent to which NASM can influence policy in the arts and education is limited. We cannot lobby. We don't have the resources to confront the media or other forces that shape public taste or define the directions of culture. But we do engage in analysis of public policy, particularly to provide information to the membership that may help us deal with issues and assist the cause of arts education locally, in whatever ways we can.

You may recall that one year ago I announced our intention to examine two such issues as a longer-range undertaking. The first of these addresses the question of who will provide the musical education of future generations of young Americans, as arts instruction continues to be removed from the curricula of many of our schools. The first of a series of meetings to examine this issue was held last summer. Others will follow in the coming months.

The other of these issues is the question of how to improve opportunities for music education for minority children. Some early research on this topic documents the reality of the problem and provides information on the dimensions of the problem. Further study and a series of meetings on this topic will look for examples of successes that already exist, and focus on ways that others of us might be able to contribute to solutions.

Sometimes, as we work on these projects or study these issues, we do so in collaboration with the other arts accrediting groups. Organized rather loosely but effectively, the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations consists of the presidents and vice presidents of the four associations for music, art and design, theater, and dance, and the executive director of the four groups. We meet together once a year to consider a mutual agenda, cooperative efforts, and the combining of resources to address shared concerns. I have already mentioned HEADS as a joint activity of the Council. Another example is our shared interest in increasing minority access to arts education.

Well, as the old-time preachers used to say, "There endeth the gospel." The sermon that follows will be a brief consideration of how things are in three arenas that are of primary concern to all of us: the arts, education and accreditation. And how things are, is troublesome. In fact, compared with arts, education and accredi-

tation, it may be only slightly more daunting to look for the optimistic aspects of the bubonic plague, the Johnstown Flood and World War I. I think we need have no concern about the survival of the arts; the arts have been around in various forms for almost as long as mankind, and they give evidence of a real indomitability. The issues for us, and perhaps for any age, are the extent to which the arts flourish, how accessible they are, and how they are valued.

As it has to do with music, the reasons for concern are all around us. They are observable in the deteriorating financial condition of orchestras in America, for example, and in the disappearance of classical radio stations. They are observable in what is available for public consumption as the media cater to increasingly shallow tastes. Most frighteningly, perhaps, they are observable in the decline of unit sales of acoustic instruments and the elimination of the arts from the curricula of many of our schools.

Is it not a paradox that this occurs at a time when we are surrounded—some might say bombarded—by music? We are simply and increasingly unable to distinguish art from entertainment, or, in entertainment, to distinguish the popular from the vulgar.

I need not belabor the shortcomings and problems of education in America. Elementary schools have too frequently become vehicles for social engineering. The secondary schools in our cities have become battlegrounds, and student attainment generally lags behind the rest of the industrialized world. Those of us in higher education know that for some time, freshmen have come to us with marginal communication and computational skills. And I need not point out to this audience that things are not altogether rosy on many of our campuses. Budgets remain tightly constrained, faculty positions are threatened, and in some places there is concern about the survival of programs. And this comes against a negative background created by unsupportive government, by suspicious trustees and regents, and by a frequently hostile press who would have the world believe that all of us are lazy and inefficient.

There are many people who believe that these problems could be solved if we had more money. I don't believe so. It is true, of course, that school referenda are about the only taxes a tax-weary electorate can vote against. If we had more money, we could possibly hire an elementary music specialist—though I'm not sure that we always would. And we probably could maintain the pianos better, and maybe retain the French horn teacher.

But whatever else we might do, however many new resources we might invest, I just don't see how things can change very much unless we are able to bring about fundamental changes in the way society values both education and the

arts. Is this possible? I think so. It will be difficult, but not impossible. So what do we do?

There are no easy solutions—no magic bullets. It won't be done by forging new alliances or creating new bumper stickers. Our best hope, I think, lies in making many, many small gains, and that is something we can all work at, each in our own way.

It brings to mind the tale of two hunters who went duck hunting one frosty November morning. One brought along a thermos of coffee, and the other brought a bottle of Scotch. And as they sat in the boat, sipping their way through the morning, they never saw a single bird. Finally about noon, when they were freezing cold, thoroughly frustrated and about to give up, one lonely, scrawny duck flew over. So the coffee drinker set down his thermos, picked up his shotgun, took aim and began blazing away, but without success. So just as the bird was about to fly out of range, his buddy gulped down the last swig of Scotch, threw the bottle overboard, hauled up his gun and, without even taking aim, fired off one shot, and down came the duck. And his pal said, "Good grief! What fantastic shooting! How in the world did you ever make a shot like that?" And he replied, "Well, with a flock that big, I don't know how you can miss."

Now if there is a point to all of this, it is that there are many targets out there, and most of them are small. There are many kinds of opportunities for all of us to make a little difference, however and wherever we can. For all of us to make a big difference, each of us must be willing to settle for simply making a little difference.

Finally, we note that these are not the best of times for accreditation. Support of accreditation by the leaders of higher education has been limited and grudging, both in their national organizations and on their campuses, where many presidents and provosts regard accreditation as little more than an intrusive nuisance. The questionable and excessive practices of a few associations have perhaps contributed to some of this. But it is not fair or logical that we should all be tarred with the same brush.

There have been deep divisions within the accreditation community itself. Within recent months the regional accrediting associations have withdrawn from COPA, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation. And that, in turn, was a principal reason for the demise of COPA, which followed.

But probably the biggest threat to accreditation comes from the federal government, where there is a real effort to redirect responsibility for approval of our institutions and programs to the several states. The supposed justification for this

is alleged failure of accreditation to get at the problem of student loan defaults. While it is not at all clear why this should be a responsibility of accreditation, it is even more illogical since the vast majority of student loan defaults do not occur in postsecondary academic institutions; they occur in the for-profit sector, in places like beautician schools.

As ever, the tool of government will be regulation, not service, as we prefer to think of accreditation. If we reflect on how the states have dealt with public schools, at least in states like the one I live in, or if we think about the politics and bureaucracy associated with state certification of teachers, we can hardly be optimistic about the idea.

In my mind, the signal that this sends to NASM is very clear. It is that we must take great care to insure that accreditation, as we practice it, retains high value for its own sake. We must make sure that it is useful, desirable and worthwhile for institutions to voluntarily be accredited by their peers, according to standards developed by their peers. And they should do this not simply to be able to hang the charter in their showcase, or to be eligible for grants. Rather, like the *Good Housekeeping* seal, or approval by Underwriters Laboratories, music accreditation must be valued primarily because it signifies compliance with the high standards associated with NASM, and because it speaks to the quality of an institution.

This is what we must work on, then, as an association: making sure that we maintain the very high standards and integrity that have long been a hallmark of accreditation by NASM. As individuals, we must be prepared to respond, in whatever ways we can, to any opportunities that come our way to improve the arts and education, especially access to them and appreciation for them.

Tip O'Neill, the former speaker of the House of Representatives, maintained that all politics are ultimately local. It just may be that the solutions to the challenges we face are also ultimately local. And good hunters know that you have to hunt where the ducks are.

It remains a privilege and a pleasure to serve as your president. I wish you every success in the direction of your programs, and I hope that the next three days are enjoyable and rewarding.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SAMUEL HOPE

The 1993-94 academic year will mark NASM's 69th year of service. Many of the issues and projects addressed in 1992-93 remain as concerns of the Association. NASM's membership continues to respond with increasing knowledge and sophistication to a variety of accreditation, education, and cultural policy issues. Principal issues and activities are outlined below.

NASM ACCREDITATION STANDARDS, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES

NASM has been reviewing its accreditation standards section by section for a number of years. Since November of 1992, the Association has been working to complete revisions of its operational standards statements. These changes are coming at the end of a multi-year review of NASM accreditation standards. The work on operational standards is also coinciding with new requirements in the federal Higher Education Act.

The Association has also completed a review of its accreditation procedures. This review is scheduled automatically on a five-year cycle. The result is a more "user-friendly" document for institutions and visiting evaluators. The Association is grateful for the questionnaires completed by institutions participating in the accreditation process, and for comment received from various members and officers, all of which were used in the redrafting process. The new procedures are available, and were mailed over the summer to institutions with visits scheduled during the next two years.

The future will surely bring challenges and opportunities; however, NASM's recent reviews of standards and procedures place the Association in an excellent position to work effectively in new and evolving conditions.

NATIONAL ACCREDITATION ISSUES

Since the November 1992 Annual Meeting, many new pressures have come to the national accreditation system. There is tremendous concern about provisions of the Higher Education Act, and particularly about the nature of regulations for accrediting bodies that may be imposed by the Department of Education. In addition, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation will be dissolved on December 31, 1993. A wide variety of issues coincided to impact COPA's viability. NASM

will be represented in successor organizations, and will continue to hold private-sector national recognition.

Much of this external situation seems ironic. NASM and many other accrediting agencies seem to be providing better services with less friction than ever before. Internally, agency by agency, most accreditation seems to be working quite well. However, the external context is a nightmare of conflicting interests, chronic myopia, and temporary advantage-seeking. The situation changes hourly, and seems to develop irrationally.

NASM, the other arts accrediting associations, and other specialized accrediting groups are monitoring the situation, maintaining a posture of quiet statesmanship, and developing contingency plans to ensure that students, institutions, the professions, and accreditation can continue to have a positive influence on development of the national higher education system. There is determination to keep accreditation service-oriented, and to resist pressures that would turn accreditation into a regulatory mechanism. We will inform the membership if the situation becomes either more critical or more settled.

We continue to advise NASM members of the importance of working carefully in campus contexts with both accreditation status and the accreditation standards of the Association. Accreditation, whether institutional or specialized, is often misunderstood. The process is complex, and the concept of “standards” is so rich with multiple meanings that there is much opportunity for confusion. These conditions often tend to expand themselves to the point where individuals and groups hold tenaciously to erroneous information and assumptions. While no amount of striving for accuracy and clarity can prevent problems altogether, NASM members can help the situation by being as familiar as possible with the basic documents of the Association such as the *Handbook*, the *Procedures for Institutional Membership*, and the document entitled *A Philosophy for Accreditation in the Arts Disciplines*. Another mechanism for keeping things straight is to contact the National Office whenever problems arise, particularly when assertions are made that do not seem accurate or fair. Fortunately, NASM works relatively unencumbered with intractable problems, but the difficult context in which higher education is now operating can exacerbate local difficulties to the point where clarification is needed.

ARTS AND ARTS EDUCATION POLICY

K-12 arts education has been the major issue since November of 1992. Two large projects are under way. The first is to develop national voluntary standards at the K-12 level for the fields of the music, visual arts, dance, and theatre. The

Executive Director of NASM is a member of the steering committee for this project. A draft with call for comment was mailed to all NASM members in August. A discussion on the impact of these standards is scheduled for the 1993 Annual Meeting.

The second effort involves preparing for a National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) report on arts education in 1996. The Executive Director of NASM is a member of the national steering committee for this project. The goal is to use the results of the national standards project as a foundation for doing the NAEP study of arts education.

As we all know, K-12 arts education is a difficult field. Low funding, lack of public understanding, and extreme contentiousness among partisans of various points of view can be frustrating. These two important projects will certainly be affected by these traditional problems; however, we can all remain hopeful that for the first time in many years, there is an attempt to work toward a national consensus that respects all serious points of view and that forges common instruments for addressing the values issues that produce the funding problems.

PROJECTS

NASM's futures efforts continued with completion of work on the third supplement to the NASM *Sourcebook for Futures Planning*. A major feature of this supplement is a long section on diversity and multicultural issues. *Sourcebook Supplement III* was mailed to NASM members in the late spring of 1993.

The spring of 1993 also saw the completion of Phase I of a project entitled "The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education." NASM joined with five other arts accrediting associations as part of a national effort to broaden common understanding of the nature and content of faculty work across the range of arts, sciences, and humanities disciplines in higher education. Marilyn Taft Thomas, Head of the Department of Music at Carnegie Mellon University, and Kenneth A. Keeling, Head of the Department of Music at the University of Tennessee, serve as NASM representatives to the Task Force developing this project. The second phase will involve developing a questions and issues document as a companion piece to the first document, which outlines the elements of work performed by arts faculties. This second document is intended to assist institutions in developing their own policies and procedures statements based on their specific missions, goals, and objectives. Work on this project will continue in the 1993-94 academic year. A hearing on work in progress is scheduled for the 1993 Annual Meeting.

NASM and the Music Library Association are continuing work on a project concerning the future of music libraries. Representing MLA are: Dan Clark, James Madison University; David Fenske, Indiana University; and Jane Gottlieb, the Juilliard School. Representing NASM are: Sterling Cossaboom, Southeast Missouri State University; Barbara Lister-Sink, Salem College; and Rollin Potter, California State University, Sacramento. A preliminary report was reviewed during the 1992-93 academic year. During 1993-94, the Task Force will prepare several documents to serve local decision-making about information services.

NASM participates in the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations with NASAD (art and design), NASD (dance), and NAST (theatre). The Council is an ad hoc effort concerned with issues that affect all four disciplines and their accreditation efforts. The Council is beginning work on a project concerning minority recruitment. The Council is also preparing briefing and position papers concerning interdisciplinary work in the arts, futures issues in accreditation and quality assurance, and evolving definitions of quality in the arts. Texts from both of these efforts are the subject of hearings at the 1993 Annual Meeting. A more complete summary of the Council's efforts for 1993-94 appears in the March/April NASM *Report to Members*.

The Association is also in the exploratory, fact-finding stage of projects concerned with music study ages 3-18 and the development of an American repertory.

The Higher Education Arts Data Services (HEADS) project continues to be a major feature of NASM's service to the field. The project is continually striving to improve turnaround times for data. We are also in the process of a general review of HEADS in light of new technologies and new contextual conditions for higher education. New approaches to determining quantitative information are under consideration, especially with a view to providing greater efficiency and speed throughout each step in the process.

Finally, major project activity is always associated with the NASM Annual Meeting. Members and friends of the Association are unstinting in their efforts to create a productive experience for all involved. No matter what subject matter or format, organizers, presenters, and attendees give their best. The spirit, energy, and concern of the membership bode well for continued success of the Annual Meeting events.

NATIONAL OFFICE

NASM maintains a National Office in Reston, Virginia, a suburb of Washington, D.C. The office is about eight miles from the Dulles International Airport. The National Office staff welcomes opportunities to visit with Association members when they are in the Washington, D.C. area. We ask only that you call or write in advance of your visit.

The NASM National Office houses the records of the Association and maintains the program of NASM on a day-by-day basis under the policies and procedures established by the Board and the Association as a whole. Eight full-time and one part-time staff members work extremely hard with great dedication to keep the Association's work moving forward. Karen P. Moynahan, Margaret O'Connor, Lisa Collins, Chira Kirkland, David Bading, Willa Shaffer, Betty Weik, and Nadine Flint provide consultation, services, and expertise essential to the Association's work. The staff's efforts, however, would not be successful without the continuous and thoughtful cooperation of members and friends of the Association. The staff is grateful for the many expressions of support it receives, in both word and deed.

In closing, we respectfully remind the membership of the importance of communication within and across the Association as we work together to develop our approaches to the various aspects of the Association's work. As NASM continues its efforts in accreditation, professional development of music executives, statistical services, and policy development, it is critical that we use every opportunity to communicate with each other. As long-term members know, NASM cannot operate effectively unless it receives comment on proposals forwarded through the mail. The Association consults widely and receives the benefits that accrue when many minds are focused on a common issue. Although there is not always one hundred percent agreement on everything, we are effective in finding consensus positions and in moving forward to develop specific approaches under common frameworks that serve students, institutions, and the profession. We ask members to continue their tradition of communicating with the National Office whenever questions, concerns, or opportunities for assistance come forth. On behalf of the National Office staff, may I express appreciation for the opportunity to serve the mission, goals, and objectives represented by NASM and its institutional members.

Best wishes for the forthcoming year.

REPORTS OF THE REGIONS

REPORT OF REGION ONE

The meeting of Region 1 was called to order by Chair Carl Nosse. The meeting began with a presentation by Robert Commandy, retired music critic for the *San Francisco Chronicle*, entitled "Looking Into Schools of Music, Looking Out." Mr. Commandy spoke about the responsibility of music units in higher education for education and the art of music in their local and regional communities. He also discussed the development of music critic skills in undergraduate and graduate education. In discussion following the presentation, members of NASM Region 1 pointed out various highly organized, successful programs which currently respond to the "community service" challenge offered by Mr. Commandy.

During the business portion of the meeting, the chair reported information from and action taken at the recent NASM Board of Directors meetings, concerning:

- New approved accreditation policies
- Higher Education Act
- Proposed *Handbook* changes and subsequent Association action
- By-Laws changes

The following topics for future national meetings were suggested:

- Defining individual identity and culture of institutions
- Community support programs
- Youth (pre-college) programs in the community
- Use of modern (i.e., post-1970) music in classroom and performance

A lively interactive discussion then ensued regarding accreditation, including the recent expansions in guidelines and standards and the resources (personnel and financial) required to prepare self-studies. Some members felt that use of the term "deferred" in Commission actions may be detrimental to music units in institutions engaged in downsizing. The following questions were raised:

- What percentage of institutions are deferred during an annual accreditation cycle?
- Are the structures of (a) the self-study, (b) the visitors' report, and (c) the Commission reports consistent?

Respectfully submitted,
Carl Nosse
University of the Pacific

REPORT OF REGION TWO

The meeting of Region 2 was held at 10:00 a.m. on Monday, November 22, 1993. New music executives in the region were introduced and all in attendance were welcomed, including 22 region members and 14 guests. A short business meeting was held during which communication was given from the national board, and a nominating committee was formed for presentation of a slate of regional officers at the 1994 annual meeting. The nominating committee will be chaired by Al Shaw of Western Washington University. Other members are Richard Evans of Whitworth College and James Sorensen of the University of Puget Sound. Several topics for the 1994 meeting in Boston were suggested including:

1. Music and music education for older or "chronologically gifted" populations.
2. Musical intelligence with Howard Gardner.
3. Future possible cooperative ventures with Canadian and Mexican music schools as a result of NAFTA.

Following the business meeting, Dr. Charlotte Kroeker, Director of Development and Artist in Residence at Whitworth College, Spokane, presented a paper on the topic, *Music Therapy: A Growing Edge of New Music Professions*. Questions and discussion followed her presentation.

Respectfully submitted,
Alan E. Stanek
Idaho State University

REPORT OF REGION THREE

The meeting of Region 3 was held at 3:45 p.m. on Monday, November 22, 1993. During the business portion of the meeting, Chair Hal Tamblyn gave a brief report on actions and discussions of the Board of Directors, and future meeting locations and topics were announced. Three volunteers were solicited to serve on a nominating committee for next year's election of regional officers. Donald Brown from William Jewell College and Joseph Shirk from Emporia State University volunteered to serve, leaving one seat still to be filled.

The program was titled "Accommodating Handicapped Students: What's Reasonable?" Michael Brown, from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights in San Francisco, provided a summary of the relevant aspects of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Harold Kafer, Chairman of the Department of Music at Northern Illinois

University, then gave a presentation in which he related his experience in assisting a student seeking accommodation. After describing his own experiences with accommodation, Chair Tamblyn opened the floor to questions and comments. Various members reported problems linked to piano proficiency examinations for future student teachers. One member even reported having had a student who had been professionally diagnosed as suffering from "low motivation syndrome." The variety of situations described in the interchange with the audience verified that accommodating students with disabilities is indeed a challenging responsibility for music executives.

Respectfully submitted,
Hal Tamblyn
Metropolitan State College of Denver

REPORT OF REGION FOUR

Region 4 convened at 10:00 a.m. on November 22, 1993, with an overflow crowd of over 100 members and guests. This demonstration of interest was undoubtedly stimulated by our topic of the morning, "Performing Arts Medicine: Implications for the Instructional Program," and our distinguished guest presenters, who represented the Performing Arts Medicine Association. PAMA is a relatively recently formed group of health professionals who have banded together because of their mutual concern over the holistic care of musicians and other performing artists. The speakers—

Dr. Peter Ostwald, psychiatrist and Medical Director of the Health Program for Performing Artists (part of the Performing Arts Clinic of the University of San Francisco) as well as the prize-winning author of the recent psycho-histories of Schumann and Nijinsky;

Dr. Frank Wilson, neurologist, president-elect of PAMA, and acknowledged expert on the relationship of the brain and music; and

Dr. Barry C. Barron, otolaryngologist and professor at the California Medical School—

gave presentations on developments in this helping field to the performing arts and made both passionate and well-reasoned pleas to our membership to give structure and substance to the research, curricula, and processes related to performance, wellness, and health. (Parenthetically I must add that the level of the passion of the presenters is attested to by the fact that these three distinguished physicians arrived 15 minutes early and waited until the musicians arrived to begin!)

Our guests were later joined by our distinguished colleague, Dr. Franz Roehmann of the University of Colorado at Denver, whose long-term interest and familiarity with our topic made an ideal transition to a lively give-and-take session that was terminated only by the statutory requirements that new officers be elected. A short business meeting was convened in a corner while our guest attendees and presenters continued their discussions. (As far as I know, they may still be going on.) During this meeting, David Childs of Concordia College was advanced from Vice Chair to Chair, Judith Kritzmire of the University of Minnesota, Duluth, moved from Secretary to Vice Chair, and Arvid Larsen of Illinois State University was elected Secretary.

An uncharacteristically enthusiastic discussion of future meeting topics followed. The current chair, Tower, was charged with the responsibility of communicating to the Board of Directors the unanimous recommendation of Region 4 that a broad-based topic encompassing performing arts medicine and its curricular, pragmatic, and legal implications be one of those selected for future national meetings. With this report I am discharging that responsibility, my last official act as departing chair. I do this with both a sigh of relief and a sense of gratitude and satisfaction for the opportunity to have served a region of such distinctive character.

Respectfully submitted,
A. Wesley Tower
Millikin University

REPORT OF REGION FIVE

The meeting of Region 5 took place at 3:45 p.m. on Monday, November 22, 1993, in the Elizabethan Room.

The following officers were elected:

Chairman—Greg A. Steinke (Ball State University)
Vice Chairman—Edwin L. Williams (Ohio Northern University)
Secretary—Edward J. Kvet (Central Michigan University)

Robert Cowden from Indiana State University and Paul Formo from Dana College gave an informative and enthusiastically received presentation on "Confidentiality in Promotion and Tenure Decisions."

Respectfully submitted,
Edwin L. Williams
Ohio Northern University

REPORT OF REGION SIX

The Annual Meeting of Region 6 was called to order at 10:00 a.m. on November 22 by Chair C.B. Wilson.

After some brief announcements, music executives new to the region were welcomed.

Topics for the Region 6 meeting in Boston were solicited. A straw vote of the membership identified three items which were of greatest interest:

1. Technology and its Applications
2. The Relationship of Professional Arts Organizations and Higher Education
3. Admissions Standards and their Relationship to Technology and Demographics.

These topics will be explored by the officers of the region.

A slate of officers proposed by a nominating committee chaired by Elaine Walter was presented to the membership. It was duly moved and seconded that the slate be accepted, and a positive vote ensued. Officers for the next three-year term are

Chair: David Herman

Vice Chair: Ludlow Hallman

Secretary: Laura Calzolari

Following the business meeting, two presentations addressed the topic, "Impact of Current Education Reform on Music in Higher Education." Natalie Ozeas, of Carnegie Mellon University, provided information about outcome-based education and made observations about its impact on NASM programs.Carolynn Lindeman, of San Francisco State University, focused her remarks on the new national curriculum standards for music. Both presentations suggested new challenges ahead, and their timeliness promoted a lively discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Ludlow Hallman
University of Maine

REPORT OF REGION SEVEN

During its business meeting, Region 7 discussed possible topics for future annual meetings and regional sessions during such meetings. The program presenter, Manuel Alvarez, University of South Carolina, proposed consortia of performing ensembles and individuals for and from the Region area. Pros and cons of the proposal were cited by Ralph Verrastro, University of Georgia; Malcolm Tait, East Carolina University; and Jon Piersol, Florida State University. Following a far-reaching discussion by the membership in attendance, Dr. Alvarez indicated his intention to prepare a questionnaire on this issue to be mailed to the entire regional membership.

Respectfully submitted,
Arthur R. Tollefson
University of North Carolina at Greensboro

REPORT OF REGION EIGHT

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the California East Room of the Westin St. Francis Hotel by Dr. Milburn Price of Samford University and Chair of Region 8. Other platform guests were Dr. Roy E. Ernst of Eastman School of Music and Dr. Roosevelt O. Shelton of Kentucky State University, Secretary of Region 8. After a brief introduction of the podium guests, Dr. Price introduced those music executives who are new to Region 8.

Chair Price announced that there were no major business items scheduled for the agenda and solicited institutional representatives to register suggestions for topics and presentations for our next meeting. Institutional representatives were provided forms on which to submit their suggestions, and completed forms were to be submitted to the region chair as soon as possible.

Dr. Price introduced Professor Ernst of the Eastman School of Music, who then presented an informative session on "Increasing the Musical Participation of Senior Adults." Professor Ernst concurred with Dr. Price that the term "chronologically gifted" is an excellent term to use in reference to senior adults who show an interest in musical participation. Afterward, Professor Ernst provided a description of his senior adult music program at Eastman, which was supported by a grant from the National Association of Music Merchants. Professor Ernst provided several interesting statistics in his rationale for attempting such a project. Other comments provided were as follows:

- Medical research shows that mental decline is not inevitable.
- It is extremely important for senior adults to have activities which challenge their mental capacities.
- The next decade will see the population of senior adults double, and this population will have a high percentage of recreational time as well as financial resources.

Professor Ernst's project also provided new teaching opportunities for music education students at Eastman as well as facilitated increasing visibility of the university through the media.

Attending representatives were given the opportunity to view a videotape ("The New Horizons Band") which chronicled the development of this unique performing ensemble and showed the progress which was made over a 12-week span. After the presentation of the videotape, Professor Ernst offered the following closing remarks:

- Such programs as the New Horizons Band inevitably will bring rewards and a new dimension to schools of music.
- Such programs need the support of professional organizations such as NASM.
- The most important aspect of such programs is not whether or not they are orchestral, choral, or wind band but that they provide opportunities for group instruction to senior adults.

Chairman Price provided an interesting epilogue when he stated that the fastest growing segment of church music participation is senior adults choirs.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:06 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
 Roosevelt O. Shelton
 Kentucky State University

REPORT OF REGION NINE

The annual meeting of Region 9 NASM members was called to order at 3:45 p.m. on November 22, 1993, by Chairman James Fields of Nicholls State University. Marvin Lamb, Region Vice-Chair, and Annette Hall, Region Secretary, were introduced.

After adoption of the agenda by the assembly, music executives new to Region 9 were introduced and welcomed by Chairman Fields.

Reports of activities and concerns from state music executives in Region 9 were given by David Crouse of Arkansas, Charles Chapman of Oklahoma, Marvin Lamb of Texas and Buddy Himes of Louisiana.

In the business meeting, the following topics for the 1994 meeting to be held in Boston were suggested.

- How to Avoid Administrative Burnout
- Early Retirement Plans in View of the 1994 Retirement Changes
- Total Quality Management in Music Programs of Higher Education
- Innovation and Program Flexibility Within the NASM Guidelines
- Preparatory Units

A motion was made and seconded that the Region Chair invite a speaker to present a session on "Innovation and Program Flexibility Within the NASM Guidelines." The motion passed.

Following the business meeting, Chair Fields introduced the session speakers, Melvin Platt, Chair, Department of Music, University of Missouri-Columbia, and Walter Watson, Director, School of Music, Kent State University, who spoke on "Coping with Copyright Laws: Rights, Responsibilities and Risks." The timely presentation addressed critical issues pertaining to musicians and copyright laws. A brief question and answer session followed the informative presentation.

The meeting adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Annette Hall
University of Arkansas-Monticello

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ETHICS

RONALD ROSS, CHAIRMAN

No formal complaints have been brought before the Committee on Ethics during the 1992-93 academic year. However, under NASM procedures, the Executive Director has responded to inquiries concerning the ethics of student and faculty recruitment. In addition, the Committee on Ethics has scheduled sessions with the membership on Sunday afternoon and Monday morning during the Annual Meeting.

NASM representatives are respectfully reminded of their responsibilities to make their faculties and staff aware of the NASM Code of Ethics, particularly its provisions concerning student recruitment. Members also are asked to review the Code's provisions along with the complaint process outlined in the NASM Rules of Practice and Procedure. Both are found in the NASM *Handbook 1993-94*. Questions about the Code of Ethics or its interpretation should be referred to the Executive Director, who will contact the Committee on Ethics as necessary.

In addition to this formal report, I wish to call your attention to these two observations on the nature of our Code of Ethics. First, the Code represents a common agreement. It is our Code, collectively and institutionally. As institutional representatives, we have voted to accept its provisions. And, they have served as well over time. Second, the Code's purpose is to encourage orderly process. Its provisions work for the benefit of everyone involved. But, it is effective only when each of us ensures that our respective faculty and staff members work seriously with the Code.

I need not remind you that we live in unsettled and unsettling times. Resources are scarce, and competition for students and faculty has never been more intense. We must, therefore, be diligent in not allowing these concerns to become corrosive.

The NASM Code of Ethics is a set of guidelines that helps us work together on behalf of a common artistic and educational mission by maintaining the good faith and trust we have in each other. On behalf of the Association and the Committee, I ask you to do the following: First, read the Code of Ethics periodically. Second, when faculty are being hired or students recruited close to, and especially after, the deadlines stipulated in the Code, please take initiatives to ensure that all parties are aware of and are working under the Code. Third, and perhaps most important of all, make sure that your faculty and staff members understand that by being a member of NASM, your institution has agreed to abide by all provisions of the Code under all circumstances.

We want to draw your attention to a particular problem. Many of our faculty teach at summer institutes and festivals. It is especially critical that these individuals understand the student recruitment provision of the Code of Ethics. The NASM National Office will put a reminder about this issue in the spring *Report to Members*, and we ask that you discuss this matter with faculty before they leave for summer engagements. It is important to explain the reasons behind provisions of the Code as well as the provisions themselves.

If you have questions or concerns about the Code or about compliance with it, please take the first step and call our Executive Director. Let us continue to work together in the spirit of cooperation and mutual support indigenous to our art form. The Committee on Ethics and I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of these ideas.

Respectfully submitted,
Ronald Ross
University of Northern Iowa

ACTIONS OF THE ACCREDITING COMMISSIONS

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON NON- DEGREE-GRANTING ACCREDITATION

ROBERT THAYER, CHAIR
November 1993

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

A progress report was accepted from one institution recently granted Membership.

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

A progress report was accepted from one institution recently continued in good standing.

Two programs were granted Final Approval for Listing.

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

One institution was notified regarding failure to participate in the 1992-93 HEADS project (failure to submit the most recent annual report).

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGE ACCREDITATION

ROBERT TILLOTSON, CHAIR
November 1993

A progress report was acknowledged from one institution recently granted Associate Membership.

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

William Rainey Harper College

Progress reports were accepted from four institutions recently continued in good standing.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION

LYLE MERRIMAN, CHAIR
JOYCE BOLDEN, ASSOCIATE CHAIR
June and November 1993

Progress reports were accepted from two institutions recently granted Associate Membership.

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

Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
George Mason University
Lee College
Shepherd College

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

David Lipscomb University
Jacksonville State University
Northern Kentucky University
South Carolina State University
University of Mobile
University of Nebraska, Omaha
University of North Carolina at Wilmington
University of Wisconsin–River Falls

Action was deferred on nine institutions applying for Membership.

Progress reports were accepted from five institutions recently granted Membership.

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

Angelo State University
Appalachian State University
Belhaven College
Bluffton College
Bradley University
California State University,
Fullerton
Carthage College
College of Saint Catherine
College of Wooster
Columbus College
Corpus Christi State University
Crane School of Music at
Potsdam College
Eastman School of Music
Fort Hays State University
Georgia Southern University
Golden Gate Baptist Theological
Seminary
Henderson State University
Houghton College
Huntingdon College
Illinois State University
Lamar University
Loyola University
Maryville College
Metropolitan State College of
Denver
Midwestern State University
Millersville University
Missouri Western State College
Morgan State University

Mount Saint Mary's College
Nebraska Wesleyan University
Northwestern College
Oklahoma City University
Radford University
Rowan College of New Jersey
Saint Cloud State University
Saint Mary's College
Saint Olaf College
Southeastern Louisiana University
Southern Baptist Theological
Seminary
Southern College of Seventh-Day
Adventists
Stetson University
Tennessee Technological University
Texas Christian University
Texas Tech University
Towson State University
University of Colorado at Denver
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Kentucky
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
University of North Alabama
University of Northern Colorado
University of Texas at Austin
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
Valdosta State College
Virginia State University
Wingate College

Action was deferred on forty-two institutions applying for renewal of Membership.

Progress reports were accepted from fifty-two institutions and acknowledged from four institutions recently continued in good standing.

Ninety-two programs were granted Plan Approval.

Action was deferred on thirty-seven programs submitted for Plan Approval.

One hundred two programs were granted Final Approval for Listing.

Action was deferred on thirty programs submitted for Final Approval for Listing.

Two institutions were granted second year postponements for re-evaluation.

One institution was notified regarding failure to pay dues.

Nine institutions with fewer than twenty-five majors were reviewed.

Twenty-nine institutions were notified regarding failure to participate in the 1992-93 HEADS project (failure to submit the most recent annual report).

Seven institutions were notified regarding failure to participate in the 1991-92 and 1992-93 HEADS projects (failure to submit the last two annual reports).

Two institutions were notified regarding failure to participate in the 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93 HEADS projects (failure to submit the last three annual reports).

Oregon State University withdrew from Membership during the 1992-93 academic year. The University of Vermont withdrew from Membership during the 1993-94 academic year.

ADDENDUM: 68TH ANNUAL MEETING

CREATING NEW CULTURAL SYMBOLS

BARBARA KORNER
Seattle Pacific University

[Editor's Note: This paper, inadvertently omitted from the Proceedings of the 68th Annual Meeting of NASM, was presented as part of a session entitled "The Impact of Primary Change Agents, II: Diversity" on November 22, 1992.]

In *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*, James Hunter defines culture as "the area of human endeavor where symbols are created and adapted to human needs...[in order to] make sense of our lives and give us meaning." I prefer this active definition of culture to the dictionary listing of "the concepts, habits, skills, art, instruments, institutions, etc. of a given people in a given period." Hunter's definition suggests that culture is something dynamic and not static, something that we can influence. There are further implications of this definition salient to our chosen professions as arts educators. As artist/scholars, we strive to help people both create and interpret cultural symbols. As educators, we are intimately involved in cultural reproduction for succeeding generations, especially when we recognize our responsibility for training both future teachers and future parents.

As suggested by Hunter's title, culture is not neutral, but rather something worth fighting over, for the symbols that dominate also order our public life in such a way that the prevailing value system enjoys a "cultural hegemony" over all others.² Recognizing the power of the symbols of art that we deal with daily and the important role those symbols play in both defining and influencing human experience calls us to rethink our approach in selecting cultural symbols for teaching. Recognizing that culture is dynamic and not static calls us to rethink the methods and ways we choose to reproduce cultural symbols. Can we afford to excuse ourselves for offering a monocultural curriculum? Can we afford not to rethink what and how we teach?

This is particularly true for those of us involved in educating music educators. By college age, opinions are too well set. Biases about other cultural symbols are much harder to break. Generating respect for another person's value system, which does not mean forgoing one's own, is much harder to accomplish. This

does not excuse us from developing courses and changing existing courses to include a multicultural component at the college level, but it does mean that we need to encourage future teachers to prepare their own students for an increasingly diverse world.

The call for multicultural approaches to education has sounded loud and clear from several agencies and conferences throughout the last decade. *Change* magazine devoted its January 1992 issue to "The Curriculum and Multiculturalism." Even closer to our disciplinary interests is the Music Educators National Conference. In 1990, they passed a resolution that forcefully called for multicultural approaches in the classroom. Their May 1992 journal was devoted to "Multicultural Music Education."

If we accept that culture is dynamic and not static, and if we accept music as an important symbol that helps create and interpret culture, then it is important to ask: "What constitutes being educated musically at this point in history?" Trying to answer this question requires considerably more flexibility than is usual in coaxing movement from the dinosaur we have come to know as "higher education."

Where do we start? There are many obstacles to consider in answering this question and if we try to deal with them all, the task will be impossible. I would like to challenge us to consider three we might address. The first obstacle we need to tackle may be summed up in a key pedagogical question: "Do we teach music (or any art) as a way to help define 'culture' and therefore understand more about our own cultural values and others?" As an increasing number of universities are requiring culturally diverse courses, some are reported to have important philosophical as well as practical goals—such as "to stimulate students to rethink their attitudes and beliefs about races and ethnic groups and to understand the sources and consequences of prejudice and discrimination in the United States." Dare we set such high goals for the music curriculum?

Professor Bill Ferris, director of the Center for the Study of Southern Culture at the University of Mississippi, answers this affirmatively. At the recent dedication of the House of Blues, a new bar in a renovated house in Harvard Square, he ventured, "We are going to see blues as a king of medicine of the soul that will bring us all back home as Americans and as human beings." Ferris, Isaac Tigrett (who intends to replicate the House of Blues in several cities) and Harvard University's Afro-American Studies department are developing curricula for elementary and high schools on the blues, African-American folk art forms, and race relations.⁴

Art can make a difference in what and who we value because it can speak to us in ways that intellectual reasoning alone cannot. If we are going to use music to help students value other cultures, we must change our attitudes about, and experiences with, music of other cultures. We must value them both by what we say and *do* in the classroom. We must learn to think in the language and syntax of music of another culture. And we must train music educators that not valuing and avoiding learning about the music of another culture are unacceptable.

It is in our own best interest to train music educators to develop a multicultural approach in K-12 education. Increasingly, students will be a part of mixed cultures on campuses and helping them experience another culture's symbols will better prepare them for the increasing diversity they will face. Attitudinal barriers of students might not be cast so solidly; students might come to the college level more open to diverse cultures because diversity has been a part of their education from an early age.

Further, stressing a multicultural approach may even be a subversive way of placing arts more centrally in the education curriculum. Just as much of the "Arts as Basic" movement is enjoying some success because it has linked the arts to an important way of learning that is essential for the total intellectual growth of many students, so perhaps we can use to our advantage the emphasis on multicultural education. If we can find ways to show that the arts help students "get inside" another culture and not just "learn about" it, we can perhaps convince people that this will be the way to develop true empathy and understanding among cultures.

We also cannot be put off by those who would insist that students don't know enough about "American" or "Western" music which is their true heritage, that students have to study their own before they can be led into other cultures. This is a value statement fraught with implicit superiority. The American culture has been heavily influenced by Western European culture, but there are other important influences. What about American composers such as Hovhaness whose work reflects the influence of Japanese and Indian folk songs? How can one talk about the cultural context of rock, jazz, folk, or gospel music without including their relationship to African music? With the fusion of styles in popular music and rap and the increasing demographic diversity, Western art music is a foreign symbol to many students who come to our classrooms. As we lead students to a definition of American culture through recognizing the nature of its multicultural development, we may open them to more intensive multicultural experiences once they understand their own connection to other symbols.

This leads to the second obstacle we need to tackle: "How can a multicultural approach become a part of the music educator's classroom experience?" How can

we ensure that there are substantial multicultural experiences within the music curriculum and that they not be relegated to general education courses?

Integration of other cultures does not necessarily mean developing specific new courses. Rather, music from other cultures can be used in existing courses. Neither does it mean we ignore Western art music. We do not have to take an “either/or” approach; we can take a “both/and.” We can train ourselves to use a variety of cultural examples to help students understand the basic elements and vocabulary of music in fundamentals classes. Patricia Shehan Campbell gives several examples of how “the application of classic pedagogical techniques to a new repertoire of music is the appropriate balance for achieving the aims of multicultural music education.” In the May 1992 edition of *Music Educators Journal*, she lists several examples with lesson plans for incorporating a variety of cultural experiences to help students grasp the basics. William Anderson’s article, “Rethinking Teacher Education,” in this same issue also lists specific examples. Students are asked to aurally identify meter in Mozart and a Chinese composition, in Beethoven and a Korean song, in Greek dance and Brubeck.⁵ While working through the musical elements, the cultural context of the examples should be introduced. This keeps the important role of music as a cultural symbol in the students’ mind whether dealing with symbols familiar to their own experience or stretching to deal with unfamiliar symbols and syntax. The objectivity inherent in students’ experiential distance from some of the examples may, in fact, help them objectify and hereby understand the value of the experiences they identify with more closely. Seldom do we pause to recognize the cultural significance of experiences that encircle us.

To incorporate more multicultural experiences, we will have to be resourceful. It is unlikely that we can learn all we feel we need to learn. The May 1992 issue of *Music Educators Journal* is full of resource ideas that can be adapted for the college curriculum. Another thing we can do is to take advantage of nearby people—invite guest artists to our classroom for one or a series of lectures. This frees us from having to feel that we must become experts in another cultural experience, and it models how we cherish learning as a lifelong experience. It allows us to acknowledge the limits of our own expertise and model learning along with our students. Classroom guests also help students see that this is a viable alternative when they are teaching and so swamped they don’t feel they can stop what they are doing to become experts; there are other alternatives.

What are some of the resources we can tap to generate multicultural experiences for our students? In an urban environment there are several possibilities. Most cities provide ready access to diverse classes in public schools. Some education programs require future teachers to observe a multicultural classroom. Some require a lab experience in student teaching in a multicultural setting. Often there

are local performers in an urban setting who will share their own cultural experiences in the college classroom.

The resource question may be more difficult for colleges and universities not close to an urban setting. Campuses that enjoy a great deal of diversity in the student population may take advantage of that diversity and invite students to perform and share their cultural experiences. I remember the rich diversity at Ohio University, which had an unusually high ratio of international students, an institutional priority. Though it was very isolated in a small community, at least an hour's drive from any large city, the international festivals and high visibility of international students allowed many of us to share in their cultural experiences. Those at more homogeneous campuses with limited resources will have to be more creative, but there is now available a wide range of recordings and videos that can still bring outside expertise into the classroom. The College Music Society has a project to develop a collection of examples from a variety of cultures to illustrate musical ideas. This will be most helpful for those with limited experience, exposure, and resources.

One last suggestion for developing a multicultural music education curriculum—and it is radical—was made by Carol Scott-Kassner in her keynote presentation to a recent MENC symposium: require music education majors to develop a proficiency in a non-Western secondary instrument. Though radical, it has some distinct advantages. Because much non-Western music is not notated, students will develop their own musicianship as they learn to grow more dependent on their ears to interpret the music. Second, going through the pains of learning an unfamiliar instrument will help them put other multicultural experiences in the appropriate contexts. They will be prone to “get inside” other cultures because they have had a closer experience with one outside their own.

The third obstacle to overcome in moving to a multicultural curriculum—how do we as administrators and leaders of music units help encourage the inclusion of multicultural experiences? One obvious answer is: hire more expert ethnomusicologists. Certainly, careful planning for future positions and setting priorities that will allow us to hire the growing number of graduates in this important field is crucial. We should continue to push for incorporating ethnomusicologists in faculties, and we should push for the inclusion of an ethnomusicology perspective in the textbooks we select. But what can we do if we have a demographically static faculty, a high percentage tenured, no likely retirements that will free up space, and/or budgets that may reduce flexibility in injecting such expertise? How can we move the current faculty to change their own attitudes toward multicultural music education? We need to help them search for workshops and find funds for travel. It may be even more valuable to find funds to bring someone to campus. The desire to change will be exponentially increased by the number of faculty who par-

ticipate together. There is a group synergism that dispels fear of the unfamiliar and can build excitement.

I believe that we also have to model what we ask them to do—we have to take risks and crawl out of our own comfort zones. We have to quit hiding behind the excuse that we aren't and can never be experts. We don't have to become experts to help students value and experience other cultures at a basic level. We can acknowledge that we are valuing and experiencing them right along with the students. We can practice what we preach about learning as a habit to develop for a lifetime. And we often can surprise ourselves.

I learned this first hand last year while teaching an interdisciplinary fine arts course. Desirous of opening new doors for them, I invited a percussion professor who has trained under a Nigerian master drummer of Yoruba drumming. We were all impressed with the intricate rhythms and subtle meanings inherent in length and pitch of tones that carry specific messages. He broke us into groups, and I struggled along with the rest of my students to keep my assigned rhythm intact as we were aurally bombarded with competing rhythms. The rhythmic sophistication along with the cultural context provided by his lecture material gave us all a new appreciation for this culture and its music.

A few months later, I was privileged to see one of the final plays selected for the American College Theater Festival at the Kennedy Center. Written by an African American male graduate student from the University of Missouri, the play is entitled *Strands*. It traces the experience of the African-American male from the ancestral days of an African tribal prince to the desperation of a drug-addicted gang member, but it ends on a note of hope. The desperate man at the end reclaims his heritage as the chorus encourages him to "Sing the Song of Our Fathers." Music underscored much of the performance, and it was improvised by players well experienced in the African and the African-American traditions. The earlier encounter with African culture in the classroom allowed me to follow the thread of the music as an intrinsic part of the culture and to recognize the significance of hope carried in the final musical number. As a white female, I was able to experience a "foreign" culture, foreign both to my gender and my race, in a way that would never have been open to me before. It has inspired me to create different experiences in the classroom. I will never be an expert on African music. I will never be able to experience African-American music as an African American, but I can let African music open cultural doors for me and I can use African-American music to open cultural doors for my students.

ENDNOTES

¹James Davison Hunter, *Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America*. (New York: Basic Books, 1991) p. 53.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 56-7.

³Jerry G. Gaff, "Beyond Politics: The Educational Issues Inherent in Multicultural Education." *Change*, January/February 1992, p. 34.

⁴Cameron Barr, "Mississippi Blues in Harvard Square," *The Christian Science Monitor*, Friday, November 20, 1992, p. 14.

⁵Campbell, "Cultural Consciousness in Teaching General Music," *Music Educators Journal*, May 1992 (Vol. 78, No. 9), pp. 30-36. Anderson, pp. 52-55.

OFFICERS, COMMISSIONERS, AND STAFF OF THE ASSOCIATION

Officers

President: **Frederick Miller, DePaul University (1994)

Vice President: **Harold Best, Wheaton College (1994)

Treasurer: **William Hipp, University of Miami (1995)

Secretary: **Dorothy Payne, University of Arizona (1996)

Immediate Past President: *Robert Werner, University of Cincinnati (1994)

Commission on Non-Degree-Granting Accreditation

* Deborah Berman, San Francisco Conservatory of Music, *Chair* (1996)

Peter Gerschefski, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga–
Cadek Conservatory of Music (1994)

Robert Pierce, Peabody Institute of The Johns Hopkins Institute,
pro tempore (1994)

Commission on Community/Junior College Accreditation

* Robert Tillotson, William Rainey Harper College, *Chair* (1996)

Lynn Asper, Grand Rapids Community College (1994)

Richard Brooks, Nassau Community College (1995)

Commission on Accreditation

** Lyle Merriman, Pennsylvania State University, *Chair* (1995)

** Joyce J. Bolden, Alcorn State University, *Associate Chair* (1995)

Lynn Wood Bertrand, Emory University (1996)

Robert Cowden, Indiana State University (1996)

Ronald Crutcher, Cleveland Institute of Music (1995)

Jo Ann Domb, University of Indianapolis (1994)

Richard Evans, Whitworth College (1995)

Carl Harris, Jr., Norfolk State University (1994)

Jack Heller, University of South Florida (1996)

Shirley Howell, University of Northern Colorado (1996)

Kenneth A. Keeling, University of Tennessee (1994)

Gerald Lloyd, University of Massachusetts–Lowell (1995)

W. David Lynch, Meredith College (1996)

Daniel Sher, University of Colorado at Boulder (1996)

James Sorensen, University of Puget Sound, *pro tempore* (1994)

George Umberson, Arizona State University (1994)

Karen L. Wolff, Oberlin College Conservatory of Music (1995)

James Woodward, Stetson University (1995)

Public Members of the Commissions and Board of Directors

- * Christie K. Bohner, Alexandria, Virginia
- * Cindy Boyd, Dallas, Texas
- * Marcy McTier, Atlanta, Georgia

Regional Chairs

- Region 1:* *Carl Nosse, University of the Pacific (1994)
- Region 2:* *Alan Stanek, Idaho State University (1994)
- Region 3:* *Hal Tamblyn, Metropolitan State College of Denver (1994)
- Region 4:* *David Childs, Concordia College (1996)
- Region 5:* *Greg Steinke, Ball State University (1996)
- Region 6:* *David Herman, University of Delaware (1996)
- Region 7:* *Arthur Tollefson, University of North Carolina at Greensboro (1995)
- Region 8:* *Milburn Price, Samford University (1995)
- Region 9:* *James Fields, Nicholls State University (1995)

Committee on Ethics

- John Mount, University of Hawaii at Manoa, *Chair* (1994)
- Kate Brennan, Slippery Rock University (1995)
- Linda J. Snyder, University of Dayton (1996)

Nominating Committee

- Elaine Walter, The Catholic University of America, *Chair*
- Bernard Dobroski, Northwestern University
- Carolyn Jennings, Saint Olaf College
- David Nelson, University of Iowa
- Elda Tate, Northern Michigan University

National Office Staff

- ** Samuel Hope, Executive Director
- Karen P. Moynahan, Associate Director
- Margaret O'Connor, Accreditation Coordinator
- Chira Kirkland, Administrative Assistant and Meeting Specialist
- David Bading, Editor
- Willa Shaffer, Projects Associate
- Betty Weik, Constituent Services Representative
- James Modrick, Accreditation Specialist
- Nadine Flint, Financial Associate

*Board of Directors

**Executive Committee

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
11250 ROGER BACON DRIVE, SUITE 21
RESTON, VIRGINIA 22090