

*the bulletin of the*

## National Association of Schools of Music

*published from time to time for the information  
of its members and their faculties.*

---

---

NUMBER 40

APRIL, 1955

---

---

### The Thirtieth Annual Meeting

#### THE PRESIDENT REPORTS

Before presenting my report, may I take this opportunity to express not only my own appreciation but also that of our entire Association for the valuable contribution Dr. Raymond Kendall, his staff, and committees have made by assisting in arrangements for this Convention and program. Because of him, a task which would otherwise have been well-nigh impossible for me, has been a pleasant undertaking, and for this—my extreme gratitude.

At our last convention, my report centered principally around the problem of working out plans of cooperation with the regional associations as it concerned evaluation and accreditation. Some explanation is probably due you for what may seem a delayed action in achieving definite procedures with some of these organizations. I assure you that the delay is not due to any reluctance or uncertainty on the part of our own Association, nor is this caused by any arbitrary obstruction or adverse action on the part of the regional standing committees which have been authorized to formulate plans for dealing with these problems as they concern the professional associations. These committees are restricted in that the means by which they accomplish their assigned task, must be compatible with the fixed basic policies of their associations.

In an earlier report, I have expressed the hope that we might develop a uniform procedure for cooperation with each region and this may eventually evolve through the exchange of information and the pooling of experience; but at the moment, we must maintain a certain flexibility of method in order to best serve each standing committee which invites our participation in joint examination or in drafting an acceptable questionnaire for the purpose of self-evaluation. I might add that I am of the opinion that certain of the regions will, for the present, rely heavily upon the theory that a voluntary self-evaluation based upon a searching and revealing questionnaire will obtain the end results they desire.

We in our Association have found by experience that only by first-hand observation, plus such a self-evaluation, can we make a valid estimate of an institution's success in achieving its declared objectives. It becomes important to feel, so to speak, the pulse of

the school, to measure the qualities of leadership, imagination, or complacency of the administration—to observe the spirit of its faculty, whether composed of perfunctory conformists or individuals of inspirational ability,—to sample discreetly the results of these impacts on the students, and to sense the educational climate in which he lives. All of these constructive intangibles, we believe, cannot be revealed by a questionnaire.

Briefly, this is the present relationship between NASM, as a professional organization, and the six major regional associations which have been designated by the National Commission on Accrediting to invite our cooperation. With the Middle States Association and the Northwest Association we are actively cooperating, and, I can say, upon a most congenial basis. The Southern Association has voted to undertake this program and the authorized Standing Committee has notified me that following some immediate changes in officers, it will in the near future request the participation of NASM. If we have no direct invitation from the Western Association, I understand this entire problem is under consideration and no doubt it will present some plan in the near future. The North Central Association, due to its vast membership and many types of institutions involved, is understandably slow to take other than tentative steps. At present, it seems that their policy will be to include on their examining teams representatives of such professional associations as may be dictated by the type of institution to be examined, or to include a generalist appointed by their commission to accompany any professional team which has been invited to examine such special department. Since it is an experimental program, this involves no permanent commitment or major policy decision. The New England Association will move with even greater caution but I have been in very close touch with this situation and their Standing Committee chairman has expressed the opinion that the ultimate plan may follow more closely the pattern of North Central.

At the moment encouraging evidence has been demonstrated by the fact that thirty institutions have volunteered for re-evaluation by means of the questionnaire as it is now drafted. Actually, the experiment will be conducted with only seven schools and the results of this exploration may determine future policies.

I feel justified in stating at this time that the National Commission on Accrediting, considering the magnitude of its undertaking, has accomplished in a remarkably short period its declared intention, namely, to bring about an effective, uncomplicated and economical method of evaluating practices and establishing appropriate accreditation for institutions of higher learning. If certain professional associations found it difficult to comply with all the policies of this central Commission, opposition has largely disappeared with the complete clarification of the aims and purposes. I predict that we will hear less of this subject as soon as these programs are put into operation.

It is my hope that we may all take away from the programs presented at this Convention something beyond the workings, policies, and mechanics of this Association,—some thought-provoking ideas,—some stimulating experiences,—refreshment in the approach to your own role, and inspiration to achieve new goals.

I am also convinced that we, as a body, are mature enough, strong enough, and broad enough to welcome the introduction of new philosophies and objectives differing widely from our own which we may choose to profit from or to reject, if they are in uncompromising conflict with our basic principles and aims.

Great problems of educational methods lie ahead—increased student bodies—possible shortage of quality teachers—how to produce an educated man—educated musician.

Someone recently remarked that Sir Isaac Newton in his day undoubtedly understood all that was then known about mathematics, physics, and chemistry, but today the accumulated information and volume of contributions make it impossible for any one life to explore more than a fraction of any one field such as science, history, etc. Music may not have had such spectacular and dramatic changes but it, too, has had much literature added at both extremes of the historical calendar—early and contemporary. It may well develop then, in the future, that more emphasis may be placed upon the study of technics and methods rather than information and data in order to produce in the limited time permitted an educated musician, who, if not versed in every phase of music, will be equipped to think as a musician.

For the particular benefit of our guests and without attempting to anticipate the philosophy of our forthcoming speakers, it seems appropriate that the major objectives of NASM be accurately interpreted. In setting up standards of achievement we have no desire to curb or restrict an administration or school in its freedom to develop new ideas, to experiment, or to expand its program. Rather, we recognize that inspired teaching may rightly reject a status quo philosophy. The prime objective will always be to make certain that every music student receive the opportunity to develop his individual talent to its utmost.

This then is the responsibility of our Association—that no member school fail to maintain such educational standards as will produce a musician and scholar qualified to take his place in society as a citizen with a broad cultural background, trained in his musical skills and prepared to assume the musical leadership in his community, school, or any other chosen field of activity.

We ask that no mold be contrived which would produce an individual limited in any way to exercise his maximum powers for the cause of music either on a professional or cultural basis. We do, however, insist that he bear the stamp of excellence. Our concern is not confined solely to the music student at college level, but we recognize and actively defend the right of every American child to have the privilege of early and effective music training.

As a result of its accomplishment for the cause of music over these past thirty years, the National Commission on Accrediting has designated NASM as the professional association to develop sound cooperative procedures with the six major regional accrediting associations to insure the maintenance and development of music training standards in higher education.

This complex and critical task is already well advanced and it is my hope that this program may soon reach final achievement.

The future of our organization is bright and its strength is still derived from the desire of its members to contribute a mutual service to each other and to music.

Harrison Keller, President

## THE THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY MEETING

The annual meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music for the year 1954 was held at the Hotel Statler in Los Angeles, California, from December 29th to 31st. This was our first regular meeting to take place in a Pacific Coast city and was so located to make possible a complete attendance by the members of the region and to permit us to

become acquainted with representatives of the many non-member schools who were our welcome guests. Unfortunately many of the members from the east and central regions found it impossible to be present, but the total number in attendance was considerable, representing half of the member schools.

At this meeting, the addresses and the panel discussions assumed paramount importance and are placed in the early pages of this bulletin. The more routine reports will follow in the later pages.

## PROFESSIONAL MUSIC EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES 1924-54

Address by Howard Hanson

Director, Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester

When the historian of the year 2000 looks back on the progress of professional music education in the United States in our century he will, I believe, note as the outstanding sign of that progress the entrance of music into the professional family of the American University. Even those who might not consider this to be a "sign of progress" will, I believe, accept this development as the most significant of our era. By "professional" music education I mean, of course the training of the practicing musician, be he composer, performer or teacher, as contrasted with the study of music as a part of our general culture.

Music as a part of general education has a long history, dating back at least to the *quadrivium* of the medieval university, taking its place in medieval education with arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. In professional training however the pattern in Europe has been one of independent or state-supported conservatories having little, if any, relationship with the university.

The early pattern of professional training in music in the United States closely followed the European tradition. The great music schools founded in the United States in the last half of the nineteenth century, the New England Conservatory, the Cincinnati Conservatory and Cincinnati College of Music, the Peabody Conservatory, the Chicago Musical College and the American Conservatory of the same city—all founded between 1867 and 1886, were all independent schools, or "conservatories" of music; and even Oberlin Conservatory founded in 1865, was, I believe, at first an essentially independent school of music, although it became an integral part of the College-Conservatory organization only two years later. Of the four important professional schools of music founded in the first quarter of the twentieth century, the Institute of Musical Art in New York, the Juilliard School, the Eastman School, and the Curtis Institute, three still followed the European pattern. About the beginning of the second quarter of the century, however, the pattern began to change. An increasing number of the great state universities had already begun to establish, within the organization of the university, important schools of music for the training of the professional musician. More and more colleges developed conservatories of fine arts in close relationship to the parent college, and a number of important private conservatories developed more or less close organizational relationship with a college or university in the same community.

A study of the 184 full members of the National Association of Schools of Music clearly indicates this changing pattern. 102 are departments of colleges or conservatories

directly attached to patent colleges. 55 are schools of universities, and only 27 may be classified accurately as independent institutions. These statistics are, of course, not meant to carry any qualitative implications. They do however clearly indicate the changing organizational pattern and indicate beyond the possibility of a doubt that professional training in music, for better or worse, has been largely taken over in the United States by the college and university in contrast with the European tradition.

In viewing this changing pattern our historian of the year 2000 will have to give the credit—or the blame—for this development to the National Association of Schools of Music organized in 1924 for the modest aims, as expressed in its first published documents, of "securing a better understanding between such schools; of establishing a more uniform method of granting credits; of setting minimum standards for the granting of degrees and other credentials."

To the younger and more sophisticated music director or dean of today this emphasis on "standards" for credits, degrees, and "other credentials" may seem uninspired and pedestrian, but to those of us who took part in the founding of the Association these words presented a very real challenge. For those days were the days of the growing pains of American musical education. By standards we meant, not uniformity of ideas and ideals in education but rather the much more primitive meaning of the word, something more akin to uniformity of weights and measurements.

To understand those days, which can only be described as pioneering, it is necessary to remember that conditions in professional music education on the eve of its induction into the academic service were more than mildly chaotic. The basic professional degree, the Bachelor of Music, taken over originally from English practice, had almost lost any academic significance. In certain institutions the degree represented five, or even six, years of professional study beyond high school graduation. In other schools it might be granted without even the mildest academic pre-requisite of high school graduation, or might be granted while the student was still in high school.

It was, I believe the fear that the basic degree in music might be entirely washed out of the academic scene which, coupled with a desire for higher standards of professional training, first led the small band of pioneers to form the N. A. S. M. If it is true that an institution is the lengthened shadow of a man, it should be said that the N. A. S. M. is the lengthened shadow of a group of men who gave selflessly of their time and energy so that the impending calamity to music education might be met and conquered. Many of these men have already passed on, having left the rich heritage of their labors. Their names form a distinguished list, George Chadwick, Frank Damrosch, David Stanley Smith, Wallace Goodrich, Harold Randolph, Louise St. John Westervelt, Peter C. Lutkin, Gilbert Combs, Rosseter Cole, Albert Riemenschneider, John J. Hattsaedt, Charles N. Boyd, James Quarles, and our first president, Kenneth M. Bradley, to name but a few.

There are two members of the original group with us today, both, I am happy to say, very much alive, and doing an important work for music education in the United States, our indefatigable and devoted Burnet Tuthill, since the foundation of the NASM the executive secretary of the organization, and Earl V. Moore, chairman of the Commission on Curricula and a past-president of the Association. To both we owe a deep sense of gratitude for strenuous and effective work for the Association over a period of thirty years\*

\* Dr. Hanson modestly omits his own name from the original group; also that of William MacPhail. (Ed.)

The committee on membership in the NASM which passes on requirements for the admission of institutions to membership is still known as the Commission on Curricula. The title has historical significance, because in those early days it was considered that an institution which could develop and sustain a proper curriculum was worthy of membership in the Association. I remember this well because I was the first chairman of the Commission. I believe that the chairmanship was decided by the simple expedient of drawing straws, but that is no longer important. I did draw the longest straw and as a result it was my privilege to preside over the deliberations of this most important of the Association's commissions for many years.

The first members of that commission represented an interesting cross-section of American musical education, John J. Hartstaedt, president of the American Conservatory in Chicago, Gilbert Combs, president of the Comb-Broadstreet Conservatory in Philadelphia, Harold Randolph, director of the Peabody Conservatory of Baltimore, Louise St. John Westervelt of the Columbia School of Music, and Earl V. Moore, Dean of the School of Music of the University of Michigan. Our president was Kenneth Bradley of the Bush Conservatory in Chicago. Later presidents were Dean Harold Butler of Syracuse University, Dean Moore, myself, Dean Donald M. Swarthout of the University of Kansas, Price Doyle of Murray State Teachers College, and today, Harrison Keller, President of the New England Conservatory. All of these presidents, past and present, will I believe agree that upon the Commission on Curricula has fallen the greatest burden of labor for the welfare of the Association.

In those early days we discussed some basic questions: "what is musicianship," "how much general education should a music student have," "should a musician be able to hear?" This last question, I believe, judging from some recent developments, we should once again begin debating. And then there was the perennial question of the proper curriculum for the music teacher in the public schools—the proper balance between "music" and "education," which we seem to be debating today quite as vigorously as we debated thirty years ago, and with as little effective solution!

Since those days effective commissions on Library, Preparatory Music, Public School Music, Ethics, and Publicity have done important work. The newest commission, the Graduate Commission, I may be permitted to single out for special mention since it has been my privilege to have been its chairman since its inauguration in 1936. This has been a fascinating experience for it has marked music's coming of age as a member of the academic family. The first report of the Graduate Commission was issued in 1938 after two years of intensive study of problems of graduate study in music. It concerned itself primarily with the Master of Music and Master of Arts degrees, with some study of the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Along with this study went the constant probing of the wisdom of a professional doctorate in music, a subject first considered intensively in a special conference in Chicago in 1936.

It is an example of the basic and wise conservatism of the Association that the proposal of a professional doctorate in music waited almost fifteen years for approval. Now, at long last, this has been accomplished and we have the Doctor of Philosophy degree in music for the research scholar, and the Doctor of Musical Arts degree for the musical practitioner. And so music education has in a little more than a quarter of a century integrated itself as a member of the academic family, changing from the European conservatory pattern to the American university pattern, with results which will I believe prove beneficial both to music and to education.

That this transformation has come about in such a relatively short time is not a matter of accident, but the result of strenuous work by an army of devoted servants of the art of music. As we go into a future which holds the brightest prospects for new and important developments in music education, I hope that we shall not forget our friends of the past, the men and women who gave of their hearts and their minds to make a place for the art which they loved in the country which they loved. To these pioneers we raise a grateful salute in memory.

## LOOKING FORWARD

Address by Earl V. Moore  
Dean, School of Music,  
University of Michigan

Responding to the request of President Keller to report to you on what lies ahead for the National Association of Schools of Music, I speak neither as soothsayer nor prophet, but as one who has marched in the procession of development of this Association for thirty years. I invite our guests and representatives of member schools of music to give serious attention to the specific situations in which we who are interested in education in music find ourselves during the first decade of the second half of the twentieth century.

I am speaking as a representative of an organization of institutions concerned with higher learning in the field of music; an association which has attained a certain maturity by reason of more than three decades of study and consultation and definitive action on problems of mutual concern; an association which in the last few years has had given to it additional and new responsibilities in the area of accreditation on a regional and a nation-wide basis.

By virtue of the fact that the National Association of Schools of Music is the only organization in the field of music serving the entire country in the area of music, and by virtue of the further fact that membership in the Association is entirely voluntary, it follows that if constructive leadership is to be continued and further developed in matters musical in the field of higher education, it is necessary that all institutions in the higher education bracket concerned with music work together as far as possible. During the last three decades, definite strength has been developed through the unity of action which this Association has provided. Note I did not say "uniformity." The Association recognizes that as there are individual differences in our music students, so must there be a variety of institutional objectives and differences in operational procedures. Recognition of this principle has been the basis of progress to date. Regimentation of programs for musical development has never been the objective of this Association, despite the necessity in the early years of spelling out in some degree of detail end goals that should be reached if the degree programs were to measure up against baccalaureate and the master's degree programs in other academic disciplines.

As Dr. Hanson has indicated in his survey of our historic past, the Association has moved slowly in its study of various groups of problems. Actions have been taken after ample discussion and indicate wisdom and good judgment in the acceptance of new programs by the Association as a whole.

It is crystal clear to those of us in the several commissions who are concerned directly with the problems of the many types of institutions offering instruction in music at the

collegiate level, that difficult as have been the problems in the past, the immediate future poses even more significant questions. My purpose in the few minutes at my disposal is to invite discussion of some of these problems and to assure you that whether your institution is a member or a non-member of the association, your interest and comments will be appreciated by the officers and members of the commissions to whom are delegated the responsibilities of adjusting the activities of the Association to the new needs.

The all important and overshadowing situation which confronts education in general and music in no less degree is the overwhelming number of students who will be of college age in the next fifteen years and which will doubtless result in a significant increase in enrollment in every type of institution. This situation places upon administrators and departmental chairman definite responsibilities in the area of finance, enlargement of physical plant, recruiting of appropriate staffs of instruction, and perhaps even more significantly, survey of curriculums which should perhaps be modified to meet the requirements of the 60's or 70's.

A second point of view which all music schools and departments of music are aware of now, and which may have even greater significance in the decades just ahead is the acceptance by educational institutions of their responsibility for the training of teachers of music at the several levels, as well as the training of musicians for the professional field. The changes that have taken place in the last few years in curriculum offerings at the baccalaureate and the master's degree levels and the trend in new curriculums at the doctorate level substantiates the position that schools and departments of music must look toward a wider pattern of curriculum offerings to meet the needs of the musicians of the next generation who must serve a broader area than in the first half of this century. Because of the increased number of students who will be enrolling in higher education and because of the increased cost of college programs, both to the college and to the student, it is obvious that curriculums of study should be one of the predominant problems of music school faculties, and professional organizations such as Music Teachers National Association and the Music Educators National Conference. Only as the practitioner in the field works in conjunction with the faculties of schools that are training teachers in the planning of future programs, can appropriate economies be effected.

The National Association of Schools of Music has been alert through the years to the changes in types and character of curricula; it dealt first with undergraduate problems, and later with those related to the establishment of master's degrees in several areas of music, and more recently to the more complicated considerations surrounding the evolution of programs leading to the doctor's degree. I cite these facts as evidence of the catholicity of interests as well as the effectiveness of leadership that has been given to these all important problems in the past decades, and to give assurance that a similar interest in the curriculum problems in music schools in this country will be continued in the future by the two commissions concerned with these areas.

For this reason, if for none other, it is important that the institutional membership of the National Association of Schools of Music represent as far as possible all schools and departments that are making contributions in their own areas of a creative and constructive character, whether or not those patterns coincide with the patterns already approved by this Association. NASM has always welcomed, and continues to welcome, experimentation in curriculum organization. Its interests are not limited by the confines of the Bachelor of Music or professional degree. The category of membership of institutions includes those giving the Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree with a major in music. It is



recognized that these two degrees are designed to provide for the needs of a wide variety of students who seek an intensity of instruction in music somewhat less than is provided for in the Bachelor of Music degree. Whether the program leading to a baccalaureate degree is for the training of a teacher, or for the training of a potential performer, or for cultural enlightenment, the Association recognizes as equally valid these several objectives.

In the immediate future, it is obvious that enrollments in the junior colleges of the country will have to increase to help absorb the greater number of students aged eighteen to twenty-two, who will want to be in college. It is further obvious that programs in junior colleges will need to be reviewed in the light of the need of the students, rather than to adhere strictly to certain curricula which have been operated in the past, but which may not be as appropriate to the next decade as other types of course offerings. The Association is vitally interested in assisting these junior colleges and community colleges in establishing opportunities for students in those institutions to obtain an introduction to music as a literature, and if possible, to provide some opportunities for professional development.

I believe it is fairly obvious from the above statement that the whole area of curriculum and curriculum development holds an even greater challenge for those of you who will be in positions of responsibility in the next few years than it did to those of us who had the privilege of working together as a small group in the years in which this Association was founded.

Another area of concern to all of us as administrators and to the Association as well is the broad question of finance. In another area of education, this problem is highlighted by an editorial in the Los Angeles Times under date of December 28 entitled, "The Problems of Medical Schools." I will read two or three isolated sentences: "There are eighty medical schools in the United States . . . Their operational costs total approximately \$132,000,000 annually, and of this amount, less than \$20,000,000 is paid in fees and tuition by medical students . . . Some of our schools are living what virtually amounts to a hand to mouth existence and others are approaching such straits. For example, it costs \$3,000 to \$4,500 a year to educate a medical student who pays between \$600 and \$900 a year for tuition. The school is thus dependent upon gifts, income from endowments, general university funds, public appropriations, and so forth." Similar statements by changing medical to musical and changing the dollar signs where figures are used could be made for the number of schools engaged in training musicians and the differential between costs and tuition paid.

This represents a significant change from that of fifty years ago, when musical instruction was expected to "pay its way" and perhaps provide a credit balance for the mothering college or for the independent institution. The remarkable shift in institutional policy has been witnessed in the last decade or two. Colleges and universities have recognized the importance of music as one of the disciplines which should be provided in college or university program, and have accepted the responsibility budget-wise for such instruction. Sometimes at no additional fees, and in other cases with fees related to the increase in cost of music instruction over, for example, liberal arts education.

As curriculums in the future demand more basic instruction in the area of general education, and as instructional costs increase in the type of instruction which is necessary in music, namely, individual lessons in applied music, it is more and more apparent that tuition can no longer suffice to cover the costs either to the independent school or to the department in a college, or a school of music in a university. If instructional standards are to be maintained in the field of the arts as they are in humanities and the sciences, and

in other professional fields such as law and medicine, music must have some support from other sources than tuition income. It is believed that the Association can be helpful in supporting this trend and in providing the forum for communication of ideas and the development of means of securing additional funds.

A third area of concern is an outgrowth of our new relationships and responsibilities to the regional accrediting associations. President Keller has reviewed in detail the developments that have taken place between the National Commission on Accrediting and the several regional associations and the relationships which the National Association of Schools of Music now enjoys with two or three of the regional associations.

A readjustment in the whole procedure of accreditation is in progress and obviously a host of new problems arise out of this situation. Since we have been designated by the National Commission on Accrediting as the professional organization in the field of music to work with the Regions in joint visitation, NASM is called upon to furnish panels of musicians to join with representatives of the other subject fields or professions when a team is sent by a regional association to evaluate the work of an institution. For this new service our music examiners must be qualified to work not as independent teams as they have in the past, but as part of an over-all valuation group, and to join with the other subject fields in evaluating the institution.

It is further apparent that the several regional associations will have somewhat diverse approaches to the evaluation of the institution in its total aspects and therefore we must be flexible enough in our thinking and interpretation of standards to adjust to the specific requirements of each of the regions. These new evaluative services have already proved challenging to the musicians who have participated in several of the team visitations. The reports of the music examiners together with the over-all report on the institution are presented to the Commission on Curricula if the work is all in the undergraduate field or to the Commission on Graduate Study if work at the graduate level in music is carried by the institution in question. Thus the Commissions have the opportunity of gaining a wider and more comprehensive picture of an institution's purpose, its strength and weaknesses, than was possible under the single team evaluation in the area of music alone.

In conclusion, may I point up our look into the future with a few questions? (1) Does not the immediate future offer each of us an exciting challenge with its boundless opportunities for experimentation and for expansion to a wider and higher level of service by music and musicians to our society? (2) Is it not a rare privilege to have a part in "making the history" of the new cultural development in the decades just ahead? (3) Isn't it probable that our contributions as music administrators and educators can be more effective and be more certain of ultimate and permanent values if we in the schools and colleges of music jointly share these responsibilities?

While I will not be an official member of this Association in 1964, as one on the sidelines, I hope to look back and contemplate what you who are here assembled will have accomplished in the decade that will have intervened. Perhaps you will have put into the haze of a distant past the achievements of NASM in the thirty years of its previous active life. From those of us who have had the privilege of sharing in the developments in the years since 1924, I can assure you that we will look upon such an achievement as the finest tribute you can pay to the Association which through all the years has continued to look ahead courageously and constructively and resolutely. I believe you will agree that the future is greater than the past.

## PROBLEMS OF REGIONAL ACCREDITATION

### as they relate to music.

A panel discussion of this subject was led by Dr. F. Taylor Jones, executive secretary of the Middle States Association of Colleges, as chairman of the panel. He first addressed the assembly as follows:

Let me preface my remarks by suggesting that the importance of accreditation has been badly exaggerated. Accreditation has its uses, but it solves no problems, it induces smugness, and it becomes sterile unless it is periodically reviewed.

Then why bother with it at all? Because properly understood and used, it can also be a significant constructive influence. Accreditation does give at least a rough indication that an institution has met the conditions under which a good educational program can be presented, although it does not certify that such a program is in fact uniformly being provided. Accreditation meets certain legal and regulatory requirements. And, more important, accreditation commonly carries with it membership in an association of like-minded institutions. Such a forum for the exchange of ideas may be of more practical value than the prestige of formal recognition, and it gives the institution a voice in crystallizing and refining the educational standards of its area.

But these are minor values. I wish to present and support the thesis that the process which leads to accreditation ought to be and can be far more important than the end result; that evaluation under the auspices of competent accrediting bodies can be one of the most powerful instruments yet devised for improving and strengthening an educational institution.

It takes a definite set of conditions to make this possible. The first requisite is a qualitative approach. Let me remind you of the three words which have been used, historically, to describe the process leading to accreditation. A generation ago it was "standardization." That concept is gone—the very thought of standardization is anathema. That word was replaced by "inspection." But that too is unsatisfactory, although we still speak carelessly, too often, of our inspections and our inspectors. The terms carry an unwelcome connotation of regulations, codes, and formulae. A far better name, the one used in current practice, is "evaluation." That implies a weighing of qualitative values, which is and should be the heart of the matter, for when you reduce educational evaluation to essentials, you find there are only two important questions to ask. The first is "What does the institution propose to do?" The second is simply "How well does it accomplish its purposes?" That is an over-simplification, of course, but it summarizes our whole concern. If you could define an institution's aims precisely, and, assuming that they are realistic and worthy, could measure its success in achieving them, you would not need to ask any other questions. Since you can not do it quite so directly, you construct an evaluation process on that premise. You devise questionnaires and procedures to explore the quality of educational fulfillment. This, the qualitative approach, is the first requisite for making the accreditation process an effective educational instrument.

The second is commitment to the proposition that the primary purpose of accreditation is to strengthen and improve the particular institution concerned. The point of reference is not the accrediting association, the public, or the profession: it must be the individual school or college. Such an orientation keeps accreditation in a proper perspective.

The third condition for the effective use of accreditation is the realization that the most important part of the process takes place before the visiting team arrives. Thorough self-evaluation, that is to say, not only precedes the work of the outside agency, but is quite necessary to enable the agency to make a fruitful contribution. The action takes place in both directions, of course. The outside agency impels the self-evaluation, gives it experienced direction, and keeps it honest. But visiting colleagues can not perform the central task. Only the institution's own staff can do that.

And it is quite a task. Perhaps one could analyze it into four phases. It begins with a precise, objective description of the institution as it exists, a clear picture of its entire life and activity. That needs to be paralleled by a description of the ideal institution the faculty and administration have in mind, the one they would create if they had the means and a free hand. The third stage is to identify the forces and factors which are making for progress toward the ideal, those which are retarding such progress, and those which are simply waste motion. The final task is to discover how to strengthen the forces which help the institution move toward its ideal, and to slough off the others. You see that that puts evaluation and accreditation in perspective, as a seminal force in a long, important process.

No one can prescribe just how this process should be carried out in a given institution, for it must be rooted and organized in the institution's own life and forms. Observation does suggest, however, certain principles which seem to promote its effectiveness. One is that the whole staff of the institution needs to participate. The president can not possibly carry through this process alone, nor can the administrative officers or the trustees. Its primary purpose is understanding and commitment, unification of the institutional community in a definite and agreed task. That has to come from the grass roots.

If the whole institution is to be involved, the task will of course have to be subdivided among small working groups, many of them. Yet the second operating principle must be to require the entire group to take responsibility for the entire study. A vital sense of integration, an awareness of institutional entity, is one of the tremendous assets this process can yield. Therefore you must create a network of communication among the committees working on the several parts of the enterprise. None must do its thinking in a vacuum. Ultimately, all the findings and plans must come to the general body, be understood, perhaps refashioned, and eventually accepted there and made a basis for action. That does not mean that the general faculty will agree on details—heaven forbid a group of professors who all think alike—but they need agreement on and commitment to a fundamental philosophy and program for the institution.

Finally, you must take care to see that the whole long process does not peter out in words. Make it shape up into a pattern for action. Cut up this pattern into manageable, yet ambitious, time sequences. Set limited, defined goals, and insist on reports and criticism of achievement at each stated period. Keep the sense of responsibility alive.

All this, in summary, is the fruitful process which accreditation can spark. It is far from a static thing, done once for all. It is based on a qualitative concept of education. Its objective is the improvement of the individual institution. Its chief technique is self-evaluation, which the outside agency stimulates and keeps realistic. My contention is that this process can be made a powerful instrument for educational progress, perhaps the most powerful instrument available. This is the real use and significance of accreditation.

The regional associations like those your speakers represent and the specialized agencies like NASM can handle this instrument together better than they can separately, if both

understand its nature and function. Their work is complementary, as at least Middle States and NASM have proved in a number of trials. The main difference between them is that the regional group is concerned with the institution as a whole, the professional society with one of its segments. But the regional agency knows that the whole can not be sound unless its parts are healthy, and the specialists understand that the effectiveness of the organ is conditioned by the welfare of the body. What we need to do, therefore—what NASM and several of the six regional associations have been doing—is to mark off the parts of our work which we can do together, and get started. We need not solve all the ultimate problems—need not even worry about them. We can cooperate on some things, to mutual advantage. Let's do that. Some of our theoretical problems may solve themselves as we get to know each other. Some have already.

We have discovered in practice that the quality, competence, and seriousness of our accrediting commissions—the responsible body, whatever it is called—is a crucial factor in our success. Its members must as individuals command the respect of their colleagues. They must be qualified for, and be willing to take time for, heavy responsibilities for study and decision. They must represent our constituency comprehensively—the control of this work must never fall into the hands of any one school of thought. Preferably, in my view, the membership of the responsible group should be rotating, on a fairly long term basis.

No one who has tried it pretends you can jump into this sort of thing and do it well. First of all, you must dig your way through to clear concepts of what you are doing and why. You must prepare your materials carefully, and make sure they conform to your philosophy. You must orient the institution which is to be evaluated—obviously and necessarily so, since its own self-evaluation is the heart of the process. And you must school your evaluators, so that they will actually be evaluators and not inspectors. Since the field work itself is invaluable to the individual who does it, and since this needs to be a democratic, widely-based enterprise, you should develop a large corps of experienced evaluators.

Fortunately all this can be done without elaborate organization, by volunteer work, on a small budget, as we all know from experience. As we prove our effectiveness in the service of our member institutions, we can gradually accumulate the material resources to enable us to extend our usefulness.

In summary, I have attempted to present and defend three theses:

1. That accreditation, by itself, is unimportant.
2. That evaluation, as a process leading to accreditation, can be a powerful instrument for strengthening an educational institution.
3. That the regional and the specialized agencies have everything to gain by the closest cooperation.

### **DR. ARMACOST SPEAKS**

Dr. Jones then asked a second member of the panel, Dr. George Armacost, President of the University of Redlands and of the Western Association of Colleges to contribute his thoughts to the discussion. Here are the remarks of Dr. Armacost:

There are no sharp differences of opinion that I want to express at this point. I think we would gain more if those of you who have questions would ask them, and we can get you talking among yourselves.

I am an employer of teachers of music. Consequently, I am much concerned with the standards of the institution to which we go for music teachers for our faculty, and I approach the problem from the standpoint of the employer who is looking at the institution and its aims and purposes, asking myself the question: "Can we rely upon the product to be what the institution claims it is?" That is, I think, the problem of accreditation in a nut shell.

From the institutional standpoint and view, accreditation is an expensive and time-consuming process. We would like it to have genuine value for the people who are being evaluated. Therefore, I want to approve heartily what has been said by Mr. Jones concerning the self-evaluation part, which takes place before the committee comes on the scene.

The Western College Association is new at this business. We took over accreditation activities several years ago when the Association of American Universities ceased to be an accreditation agency. Until then, we were a happy association of college people coming together for a private meeting of friendships and stimulation. Very little of our time was spent in discussing problems of accreditation.

However, in the last three or four years the reverse has been true. Most of the questions coming before the Western College Association at the present time are related to our function as an accreditation agency. We have standard questionnaires and suggested procedures for collecting data, so that we can compare one institution with another and arrive more or less at a general appraisal.

I believe in doing this to prevent an individual from one institution from injecting his own standards into the picture as to comparison, and saying that this institution is not ready for accreditation because its program is not like the institution he represents. We like objective statements and objective standards for the institution as a whole, its management, its administration, its student personnel policies, its general education program, its general undergraduate program and so on.

We hope to work with the specialists from the various agencies in their particular fields of competency. From the standpoint of the regional accreditation agency, we are concerned with the general work of the institution. We are concerned as to whether the individual who graduates from the institution, or the parents or the student who is planning to go to the institution, can be reasonably satisfied that the institution gives the kind of program which it claims to offer. We want to see evidence to validate its claims and purposes. We are looking at the quality of the program and also the quality of the people who administer and promise instruction.

### **DR. PETERSON'S REMARKS**

Dr. P. Victor Peterson, President of Long Beach State College and representing the Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools was the third member of the panel to be heard. He spoke in these words:

I would like to emphasize one or two things President Armacost said, which I think are important as far as such organizations as yours are concerned.

Those of us who are in the position of employers are very definitely interested in the product that we secure from your schools, and especially that they can do the kind of job we need to have done. I am sure that not only your group but all other professional

organizations representing educational institutions are interested in producing as effective a product as possible.

Now, in regard to accreditation. If the experience of a visitation is to be interpreted only as an accreditation, I doubt if it is worth the effort. On the other hand, if we have an opportunity, group-wise, to look at our own problems and then to sit down with others who work in the same area and evaluate those problems, we secure real benefit.

I have been very favorably impressed with the work which has been done in the Middle States Association, as I know those of you who have watched it closely have been, in the development of a cooperative attitude between the general and the specialized groups. I heard the other day of one institution which was visited by fifty-seven different committees in a single year. I can't imagine any administration which can afford to give that amount of time to accreditation. If I have any one plea to make to you people, it is that so far as possible you work closely with the regional associations because I am sure that working with other groups interested in the welfare of the institution will make your effort more effective. We tried it in the Northwest this year at the University of Idaho and Idaho State. We had six cooperating agencies at the University of Idaho and seven at Idaho State. The amount of material which was gathered together for those evaluations was enormous. I hope we can find ways of paring it down—getting at the kernel of the problem, and then sitting down with experts in the various areas to evaluate it.

Taylor Jones said that evaluation does not mean alignment, stratification, conformity, or uniformity. We certainly do not want to make all the institutions uniform from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific coast. God forbid! There has been a feeling that we have tried to fit general education into a specific pattern and make every institution follow that particular pattern, as far as courses are concerned. I don't think that was the intent. General education should be placed within the framework of each particular field of specialization.

## DISCUSSION CONTINUES

PRESIDENT KELLER: I hope we will have some searching questions from the floor because this panel has a great deal to offer you. I would like to fill perhaps one small gap that seems to have been overlooked, but first of all, let me state that it is rather reassuring and a kind of relief for many of you to hear this exposition put to us in this clear manner. It takes some of the apprehension and some of the anxiety off the institutions that felt they might be subjected to a kind of police action. It is good to hear emphasis put on service instead of arbitrary demands and I would like to re-emphasize that point.

The omission to which I referred is the benefit which I feel every member of an evaluation team derives both for himself and indirectly for the institution to which he returns. In his search for any weakness in a given school's program, he is sure to discover new and constructive ideas which he may take back to his own institution. He profits much also from this association with other members of the visiting team—men of other professional backgrounds—and their reactions to situations observed serve as a most stimulating experience.

I don't want to take any more time because I really want some questions from the floor, but may I add the following remark. I not only have it from the Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Accrediting, but I know it to be a fact that the enunciation of this policy by Mr. Jones represents the precise thinking of the National Commission, which I think is helpful for us to know.

MR. SPELLMAN: I have a question. Does cooperative accreditation imply that all visiting of institutions will be bipartisan—that no agency can visit without the others?

MR. JONES: I don't know why it should. I think it implies working together, and the hope that it would be continuous, which we found to be the case in our Middle States experience. I am not trying to say that that is the only way to do it. Some of the professional societies differ from the regional associations—and indeed from each other—as to time intervals between re-evaluations. Some of the societies return in five years, some in three. Sometimes we like to have one of our people go along, sometimes we do not. We exchange reports after such interim visits, to our mutual advantage. I don't think that we ought to tie ourselves up to any straight-laced operational procedure; we need to be flexible.

DR. DOYLE: Do all of the regional organizations use the same system of questionnaires and that sort of thing?

MR. ARMACOST: No. Are we going to? I, personally, think not, for two or three reasons. There is a great advantage in differences in this great country of ours. I am glad that all of us don't have the same type of education. We don't have quite the same ways of doing things, but the basic ideals are the same.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Does cooperation between the specialized agency like NASM and the regionals look eventually toward a single accredited list?

MR. JONES: I don't know and personally I don't care. Certainly we in the Middle States are not interested in eliminating anybody. That is not our responsibility at all. There is a great deal of important work for you people to do, and for every other professional agency to do, each in its respective field. Whether at some future time, twenty years from now, we shall have a single list or shall agree to have twenty lists, I don't think is very important.

MR. PETERSON: I certainly agree with Mr. Jones. I think it would be too bad to straight-jacket institutions into a common accreditation pattern, although you may have a single clearing house some day.

MR. GEIST: Suppose one unit in the university is weak and the others are strong. Would the regional association accredit the university, even though professional society turns the unit down?

MR. JONES: The question is, of course, a very important one. In my experience the situation does not often arise in an extreme form. Weakness in one unit is very likely to be paralleled by weakness elsewhere.

If we found a strong institution which as a whole has earned recognition and prestige, but which has a weak unit, the Middle States, to speak only for my own agency, might consider accreditation. But if the professional society concerned were not ready to accredit it, or should drop it from their list, continued weakness in the poor unit would jeopardize the standing of the institution as a whole.

One advantage in the cooperative approach is that the regional association is as deeply interested in the strength of the professional unit as the professional society is. We support each other and things really do get done that wouldn't otherwise get done.

MR. ARMACOST: I think the Northwest attitude is very much the same as the Middle States. I can't remember a single case in which the special agencies alone have refused accreditation. However, if that were the case and the institution as a whole were



strong, I am sure that the Northwest Association would grant accreditation. They would work with the agency in whose unit the weakness existed and help them strengthen it, as well as with the institution. If it seemed impractical to strengthen that particular area, we would urge the institution to drop that aspect of its program.

MR. RICHMAN: Many faculties have a lot of confidence in their executive officers. When it comes time for evaluation they are prone to let the executive officers take over and say "Now we believe in what you are going to do. You go ahead with this." The result is that the evaluation sometimes does not get down to the people you really want to reach.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: Why not get down to cases? I suggest that we print a number of evaluation reports. Keep them anonymous, but use actual cases, with details. Let us study them and see how it works and what is involved.

MR. JONES: Well, we have tried that in our Middle States work and found it was not too satisfactory. One of the reasons is that a Middle States report is a completely confidential document. What the members of the evaluating team learn and suggest is nobody's else business. They must not discuss it; they must not reveal it to anyone else.

We took three reports which we considered rather typical and tried to edit out the references which might identify the institution. We had left such a vague sort of thing that it wasn't worth reading. Furthermore, the situation in every institution is highly individual. Unless the evaluation report is a highly particularized document it is not worth very much. In the Middle States area only the President of the institution concerned can release the report—he can, but the Commission itself can not.

MR. TUTHILL: There are twenty-seven schools in this association that are not connected with a college or university. Is there any place in the regional associations for the recognition of these schools?

MR. JONES: In 1954, the Middle States Association made independent schools of all sorts in our area eligible for membership. I see representatives here in the audience of independent conservatories which are applying for Middle States' accreditation.

MR. ARMACOST: The Western Association has had several such requests during the past year. We are more experienced in dealing with general programs, but we are trying to apply similar criteria to the specialized schools.

VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: How does one really evaluate the results of teaching? How can you tell whether instruction actually is attaining its aims?

MR. JONES: That is the most difficult problem of all. If we could measure outcomes of instruction directly, including the intangible outcomes, we should not need to go any further. Some of them you can assess statistically. You propose to furnish training for music, for instance, you can at least find out how many of your graduates really get into professional music. But a more important question is the quality of their musicianship and of their lives as educated men and women.

Liberal arts colleges can use certain testing devices. They can follow their graduates into graduate schools and see how well they do. I don't know what music can do along those lines.

We can at least determine whether we have established the conditions which are most likely to lead to the results we want—the curriculum, the classroom and studio conditions, the faculty, the extra-classroom opportunities, and so on. Many of the most important results of higher education are not subject to measurement.

## PROFESSIONAL TRAINING IN MUSIC

By Raymond Kendall

University of Southern California

A widespread misunderstanding seems to exist in American educational circles regarding the purpose and validity of professional versus non-professional training in music, particularly as this training is offered more and more frequently under the auspices of established colleges and universities.

The actual basis for this misunderstanding derives from the understandable tendency of both professional and non-professional to deal in stereotypes. To the non-professional—in academic circles, the college teacher of music who is primarily interested in music as one of the liberal arts—the professional is a digital or glottal expert more interested in playing or singing higher, faster, louder, than his contemporaries; one whose interest in and choice of repertoire emphasizes gaudy show pieces or arias of little or no musical consequence; one who would have students devote a lifetime to practice and the consequent development of technical skills irrespective of the value of the musical substance upon which these skills are to be exerted.

Irrespective of the fact that few such monsters exist nowadays, in or out of academic circles, the peril of such a creature's influence upon the student of music is sounded up and down the land as though it were impossible to combine an enlightened interest in the literature of music with superlative competence in its performance.

The stereotype of the academic musician, as seen through the eyes of the professional performer, is no less grotesque. From his viewpoint, the academic musician may be a theory teacher in whose classroom safe and uninspired classical exercises in harmony, counterpoint and orchestration reflect the innocuous products of a previous generation in their safest and most uninspired form and from whose classroom nary a sound of live music is likely to be emitted. Or he may be a teacher of conducting who, like the blind leading the blind, requires his students to conduct one another's fumbings at the piano as though this had some relation to the infinitely varied responses of an orchestra or chorus. The professional's pet stereotype is, of course, the musicologist who, whatever else he is, supposedly shuns live music and is generally suspected of preferring to read a score than to hear it.

Though such extremes may possibly exist in the body musical, they are likely to be rare either in the best professional or best non-professional schools.

It seems fairly clear that music got into the schools and colleges of America by the back door. Liberal arts institutions with religious affiliations had chapel services which required, at the minimum, an organist and, in better circumstances, a regular choir. Sometimes these organists gave music courses on the side and it is small wonder that some of the early music offerings in American colleges might well have prepared those who took them to pass organist's society examinations but may not have been the most desirable training for the general student.

One is forced to admit that in America, with rare exceptions, a full-time concert career probably does not exist any more for most of those who are taking their professional training in music. Substantial professional training, however, still remains a must for those who are going into the many other possible outlets for musicians in America—teaching, writing, composing, or concertizing on a limited basis.

I submit that those who expect to make a success of teaching or of writing about music, or of writing music—even more so if they plan to concertize locally or regionally—must have a highly developed performance capacity as musicians as a result of which they can penetrate the literature, understand its problems and create personally the kind of inspiration which in every other field of teaching is a priceless asset.

It seems to me that a teacher is not able to generate the same kind or quality of enthusiasm for a work of art unless in some aspect or it he can himself produce a valid example of how it should be done. This does not imply that all teachers will be able to play or sing equally well in all media, but it does imply that everyone who calls himself a professional in music ought to have some medium of expression which will allow him to experience and to re-experience music as an art existing in time and space and creating through its existence a consciousness of the art of which it is the living, breathing representative.

There are at least two aspects to professional training in music—manipulation and verbalization. In the former are the composers, singers, instrumentalists and conductors. In the latter, the historian and critic. These need to exist and to work together side by side and to be given appropriate emphasis in the curricula of American colleges and universities. In a strictly professional program, there will be time and place for more emphasis upon music itself; less in a non-professional program. But no program of music education worthy of the name dares to verbalize about music without providing its students a chance to manipulate the materials of music. Conversely, no professional program dares to emphasize the manipulative aspects of music-making to the exclusion of studies concerning the history and aesthetics of the art.

We who participate in the professional training of musicians are also interested in the training of the non-professional. To acknowledge the importance of general education as forming a legitimate and absolutely essential part of the training of the professional musician on the one hand poses upon all of us the obligation to have an equal concern with there being in the training program of the non-professional or liberal arts music major a sufficient amount of performance training to enable him to penetrate and to understand the literature of music.

As we are developing generation after generation of young professional musicians who also know something else about what is going on in the world, whose acquaintance with general literature, history, languages and such has not been neglected, we begin to provide the country with a reservoir of literate human beings whose field of human endeavor is music and who, as teachers, writers, critics and performers, are assuming their rightful place in society. These are becoming the musical arbiters of succeeding generations who will tend to justify the training which has been lavished upon them and who, through their perspective, will lead us to an increasing recognition that music is not a haphazard art whose devotees can be dilettantes. They will recognize and train their students and friends to recognize that the high calling of music requires much of those who pursue it and that those who have been trained best serve best.

## TEACHER TRAINING AS PART OF COLLEGE MUSIC STUDY

Marguerite V. Hood  
University of Michigan

All of us agree that the school music teacher plays an important part in the present and future status of music in this country. We also recognize that the college training this music teacher receives is directly responsible for his attitude, his skill and much of his success in the school field. Since this cause and effect relationship is so obvious, it becomes equally obvious that in any discussion of the college program in music education we must look realistically at the school music teacher's needs.

We must look at the teacher's job and the demands it makes (or should make if the school music program is a good one). We must study all phases of the college music program which touch the music education student and evaluate that program in the light of its function in developing the qualities and skills required for the music educator's success.

Just what can we expect of a music teacher in our schools? Here are the main requirements as I see them:

The music educator needs to be a *good musician*. Unfortunately, some music educators are poor musicians. This fact dismays all of us who are college teachers, in whatever field of music we may be. All of us must share the blame. The college music faculties are at fault for degrading their profession by accepting and graduating students who are poor musicians. In many cases these students might have become good musicians had they received the training to which they were entitled. Probably in some cases the students were misfits in the music program from the beginning. Unfortunately some schools and colleges have been known to sell the public schools short by shunting into music education the misfits who cannot "make the grade" in professional performance or elsewhere in music. A failure is just as big a failure in music education as in performance and this failure gives his school just as bad a reputation.

Now what skills and competencies does a music education student need if he is to become a good musician? *He needs to be a performer in some area of applied music*. Unfortunately many college applied music teachers are interested only in training professional performers in their various areas, and not in the specialized needs of their music education students. There must be one area at least in which each music educator performs well. Perhaps his repertory is not as advanced as that of the major in that performance area, but what he plays or sings he should do just as artistically as anyone else. If voice is his major he may not have been endowed with a beautiful instrument, but he must learn to use the voice he has well and musically in order to learn how to work with other voices. He should also, with any instrument or voice, have the personal experience of studying, memorizing and performing a good basic repertory.

An instrumental teacher should have a major performing instrument in which he is experienced and skilled. He should also have basic skills on several other instruments including, without any exception, some knowledge of playing strings. A good functional facility at the piano should be emphasized as a basic need for *every* music educator.

Now, just how does the music educator use this training in performance when he is in the teaching field? I might list some common situations. The school music teacher sings songs as a model for his classes to follow. He often plays for church; he may play accompaniments for school singing and for the Rotary Club; he plays or sings solos for commun-

ity programs; he coaches and teaches school music festival entries of solos and small ensembles, instrumental or vocal; he may start and teach beginning classes in a variety of instruments; etc.

*The music educator needs to know music theory.* First of all, let us look at some of the ways in which he will use his theory when he starts to teach. Here are some of the things he may be called upon to do: He may need to arrange the school song for the band or orchestra; he may arrange a favorite folk song so that a treble or mixed voice group can sing it. Sometimes the group will include changing voices with their limited and unpredictable ranges. He may need a functional knowledge of counterpoint in order to teach and direct a madrigal group or a band which is playing a fugue. He may have to simplify a piano accompaniment so that a high school accompanist can play it. He needs to be able to listen to a choral group and know which of the inner voices is wrong or out of tune. Or, he must be able to listen to his orchestra or band and know when certain parts are out of tune, and when his difficulty is caused by an arrangement which puts too many players on the third of the chord. He may have to arrange a musical introduction for a recorded school program or broadcast. There may be a budding composer in the high school theory class who needs his advice or guidance. He must select music of a variety of types, and needs skill in recognizing what is good and what is poor in harmonic progression, vocal arrangement, or orchestration.

Is this too much for the average music education graduate to be able to do? Probably it is if we look at it from the viewpoint of the old-fashioned theory or counterpoint class, with aural experiences confined to dictation from the piano, and counterpoint taught like a mathematical exercise. It was Jane Addams who said: "Many of the stumbling blocks against which we fall are the opportunities to which we have not adjusted ourselves." This could apply to the teaching of college theory which, by all odds, *should* be (but often is not) fascinating and functional and geared to the practical needs of the students.

*The music educator needs to have a good overall knowledge of music literature and history.* How will he use this knowledge as he teaches school music? Sometimes he may have to plan a listening lesson for the third grade, to try to establish listening habits and interests. Perhaps his problem will be to help a classroom teacher plan to use the music of a certain country or composer or period. He needs to be able to evaluate the musical worth of the school music films available today, and to use those films skillfully in teaching a class. He must be able to choose suitable music and prepare to present a basic listening lesson, perhaps in simple musical form for the sixth grade. He may be preparing a unit on contemporary American composers and their music for a junior high school class. He may find himself teaching a high school or adult evening school class in music history and literature. He is often the sponsor of the school's record collectors' club. It may be his responsibility to plan the program and prepare the children for a young peoples' orchestra concert. He is frequently called upon to speak to a group of parents on starting and developing a home record library.

How can a music educator be prepared to do all these things? First of all, he needs a good, broadly presented basic course in music literature and history, taught by an open-minded instructor who is interested in giving his students as comprehensive an understanding of the subject as possible. No one can learn all the answers in advance, but if his courses make the student intelligent as to sources of information, and if they develop in him a curious mind, good musical taste and integrity in musical standards, he will be able to handle any of these problems. His music education courses should also work hand in hand with the

music history courses by stimulating his interest in teaching this phase of music. There is good music, well-recorded, for all age levels. The teacher in the schools must have an understanding and appreciation of beautiful music and a desire to have children acquainted with it. These children are the concert audiences of the future and their whole attitude can be colored by their school experiences.

The music educator needs to have an understanding and an interest in people, world affairs, and all areas of education—not just music and music teaching. It is important for him to be skillful in speaking and writing English and to have some knowledge of history and literature. Though he probably cannot study all of them, it is also helpful to him to know something about some other areas, such as language, science, political science, or economics. Music specialists often seem to have had so much intensive preparation in music that there has been too little time left for developing breadth in general education.

What is the answer to this in training music teachers? Sometimes we hear it flatly stated that it is impossible for any student to get good training and develop fine skills in music and still have time to get a broad, well-rounded general education. Probably this is true if all the college courses continue to be organized as they are at present. It is hopeful, however, to find college faculties increasingly aware of this problem and moving to solve it. Many faculties are studying, for example, the possibility of teaching cultural courses which will be planned to broaden the students' understanding, rather than simply to prepare them for more advanced courses in the subject, as is so often the case at present.

The same criticism can be made of many music courses, when we study seriously the needs of students and the limited time available to them. For example, the music education student is not taking a music theory course in order to prepare for the next most advanced course and he cannot just continue enrolling in theory until every possible course offered has been completed. His time is limited and his needs are definite. In the same way, he does not have the time to take a long sequence of courses in music literature and history—his work in that area must be comprehensive in scope, but limited in detail. There is time to be saved in theory, music literature, and also in music education courses—in fact, probably in all the courses we require a student to take. But each of us who teaches in college must see his own courses as part of the overall training a music education student receives, rather than as courses designed to develop a specialist in our areas.

The music educator needs to be a good teacher, a good member of a school faculty, and a real educator in the professional sense of the word. Not all people who qualify musically can meet this requirement. Unfortunately, sometimes fine performers are poor teachers. Certainly performing skill or advanced knowledge of music do not insure that the individual will be a good teacher. Teaching skill is, to some extent, a gift, but it can be developed to a degree—especially if the individual is interested and is willing to work seriously to improve himself.

A teacher needs first of all to like boys and girls. He needs to believe that music has great values for those boys and girls, and to be willing to study carefully the organization of the modern school in order to make music an active part of the regular curriculum. And a teacher needs certain skills and attitudes which make it possible for him to tell his students *how* to do a thing, and to *let* his students play or sing, instead of continually doing the performing himself; to sense a student's tempo of learning, and not insist that each individual progress at the speed at which the teacher himself learns. Not everyone can develop the patience and skill to allow the deliberate learner (who may turn out to be an excellent

musician) and the fast learner each to have a chance to progress at his own speed, while the teacher by some magic keeps the group participating together. He should be able to teach even the simplest song or instrumental selection as a bit of art which can be performed beautifully, with phrasing, intonation, diction well done, rather than to feel that until a student is advanced there is no reason to worry about an artistic performance, and to capitalize on the performance of others. A frustrated soloist who wants to do all the performing himself can never make a good teacher.

The music educator really needs to have a positive working philosophy or set of beliefs about his subject. He must be willing to teach *all* children, recognizing the importance of what he does on the future attitudes of those who are not skilled musicians. Such children can profitably use music for recreation and leisure time employment, and can become the appreciative audiences of the future. At the same time, it is important for the teacher to recognize the needs of the children who have a special interest and skill in music, and to give them the kind of musical experience that will keep them stimulated, and provide them with a sound foundation of basic music fundamentals, and inspire them to make continual progress.

What are the professional responsibilities and duties of the individual who becomes a school music teacher? Here are some of the things he needs to know. In the field of vocal music, he teaches a fourth grade some basic rhythmic problem, possibly an understanding of 6/8 measure; he works with first grade non-singers; he helps a fifth grade teacher start part-singing, and conducts the third grade in its first experience with the musical score. He needs to know materials and methods for each of these situations, as well as for teaching various other rhythmic and singing problems, and listening lessons. He should have a knowledge of holiday and recreational songs; of junior high school voices and materials for them; of organizing and choosing the music for a select choir, or directing an operetta. In instrumental music he may find himself with a beginning string class, which means that he needs a knowledge of materials for the class, of tuning the instruments, teaching the class, advising parents about purchasing instruments. Similar problems exist in teaching woodwind, brass and percussion classes. He may be directing a marching band and preparing his orchestra and a variety of solos and ensembles for a competition. Whatever his field of teaching, he has endless school meetings to work with other school personnel on a wide range of subjects—on arranging time for instrumental classes in order to schedule enough lessons for the beginners; with the high school committee on producing an operetta (tryouts, costumes, rehearsal schedule, publicity, ticket sales, etc.); with a school curriculum committee to study the possibility of fitting a junior high school general music class into an already over-crowded schedule. He may have to set up a five-year plan for the purchase of instruments, in order that the school shall be able to plan its budget and that he will be sure to end up with a balanced instrumentation. He may be in charge of a committee appointed to adopt new music text books for the elementary grades. He may be in charge of the writing of the curriculum outlines in music for the school system in which he teaches. And so the list goes on almost endlessly. There are no comfortable ruts in music education!

To do all this successfully requires certain qualities, in addition to the musical and teaching skills. A school music teacher needs:

integrity—both personal and artistic;

humility—a knowledge of how little he knows, and his need for constant study if he is to do his work well;

curiosity of mind;

the ability to get along with people;

pride in his profession. Much of this pride stems from the knowledge that others whom the student respects, including his college music faculty and the dean or director of the department sincerely respect Music Education as a profession.

A student is not a completely educated person when he graduates from college, but with some of these qualities, and with an open, interested mind, he will become educated.

Now, how can we give our college music education students these professional skills and understandings? Certainly a good teacher training institution will study every music education student as an individual, and will give each one the same loving attention that each budding solo performer or composer gets. There can be no assembly line techniques in turning out music educators. Each student is unique and needs individual guidance in developing his skills as a teacher.

When it comes to courses in education and music education, there must be a serious effort to use the student's precious time to the best advantage, since there are so many things—in and out of education—that he would like to study. Professional education courses in principles or history or philosophy of education can be fascinating, and can develop a feeling for the breadth and exciting possibilities of the American educational program and a pride in education as a profession. Unfortunately, our young music educators (along with young educators in all fields) often sense a boredom and lack of inspiration on the part of those teaching the courses. Similarly, where music education courses are concerned, it is unfortunate for the whole future development of students if their own professional classes lack spirit and drive; if they are so limited as to provide the students with knowledge of only one method or set of materials from among many excellent ones that may be available; if they are taught as dry textbook courses, instead of including constant contacts with actual music and activities, and with actual classrooms and children. College music education students need to have a chance in their student teaching to work with children at a variety of school levels and in varying situations, with the assistance and under the supervision of excellent teachers.

All of this is complex and demands time and thought and a willingness to make drastic changes in the music education programs as they exist today. These are not impossible ideals, but to put them into action demands a vision of what may be. Their success depends on the interest and attitude of music education teachers, and teachers in all areas of music, teachers of professional education, teachers in general culture. But most of all the development of a program for training music educators who are the skillful, well-rounded individuals we need depends on the vision of the deans and department heads in the area of music, who plan for the future with the words of Albert Schweitzer in mind: "No ray of sunlight is ever lost—but the green that it wakes into existence needs time to sprout, and it is not always granted to the sower to live to see the harvest."

## **MUSIC IS A LIBERAL ART**

By Henry Leland Clarke

University of California at Los Angeles.

Nothing is more necessary for the prospective teacher than the inquiring mind, the creative impulse, and the amateur spirit. Without the inquiring mind, he absorbs only what is presented to him in the classroom, and whatever gaps there are in his schooling may



remain gaps for the rest of his life. Without the creative impulse, he has no desire to write either good English or good music. He lacks the imagination to discover creative talent in his young charges or to draw up and carry out a program consisting exclusively of music of permanent value suited to the forces at his command. Without the amateur spirit, he becomes prey to the virtuoso spirit and loses contact with everything except his own personal accomplishments.

On the other hand, if he has an inquiring mind he will refuse to enroll in any course of study that limits him too strictly to his own field. Or if he accepts it, he will insist on exploring for himself, discovering the environment of the great composers whose music is the basis of his life work, knowing their languages, and investigating the relationships of music to the other arts and to the sciences. If he has the creative impulse, he will write, compose, arrange, teach, and make programs, not as an artisan, but as an artist. If he retains the amateur spirit, he will love teaching, he will love music, and he will love children. Whatever his own successes, he will never lose the devotion that makes a good teacher.

My own ideal among secondary school music teachers is Gustav Holst, who was music director of St. Paul's Girls School for nearly thirty years. Although he was a great composer, conductor, and trombone player and a man of broad learning, he never lost the amateur spirit. An eminently practical man, he asked his Harvard composition class, "Why do you lads want to write nothing but symphonies when there is so much school music that needs to be written?" Music educators will understand from the use of his music what I mean by the amateur spirit of Gustav Holst.

The inquiring mind, the creative impulse, and the amateur spirit—to stimulate these in a prospective teacher is as important as to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to his profession. To do both is the purpose of the Bachelor of Arts Teacher Training Program. In this we are guided by the same liberal arts philosophy set forth by Gordon S. Watkins, Provost of the University of California, Riverside. At the dedication of this new liberal arts college, Dr. Watkins said, "First, we hope to develop in our students a solid foundation for later professional careers. The second segment of our educational design is broad cultural education. The broader the educational base, the more successful is later professional life." (*Idea and Experiment*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 2.)

At the same time, in the liberal arts Music Departments, we do not accept the idea that there is only one possible teacher training program in music. Thus, while it has no direct bearing on our own philosophy or course of study, we are interested in the efforts made over the years by the non-liberal arts Music Associations to work out an effective Music Education curriculum.

In attempting to prepare educated and trained school music teachers in four years, the fair apportionment of time is a tremendous task and has given rise to what may be called the "Battles of the Semester Hours." The First Battle took place at Clear Lake Camp, June 17-18, 1942, at a joint meeting of committees of the American Association of Teachers Colleges and the National Association of Schools of Music and resulted in the "Outline of the Course Leading to the Degree, Bachelor of Music Education." (NASM *By-Laws and Regulations*, 1949, pp. 19-23.) The Second Battle took place at Chicago at Thanksgiving, 1952, and resulted in the present proposed *Standards*, jointly sponsored by leading members of the NASM, the Music Educators National Conference, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and the Music Teachers National Association.

The Clear Lake *Outline* was explicitly designed for a professional degree and not for

a Bachelor of Arts degree. The even more professionalized Chicago *Standards* fail to state what degree they are intended for.

The Clear Lake *Outline* assigns forty semester hours to its first category, "Preparation to Insure a Broad General Culture." This is meager fare for anyone claiming broad general culture. But it was discovered that this *Outline* made no provision whatever for any actual courses in the subject matter of our profession, namely, Music Literature and its history. Consequently the Chicago *Standards* crowd into these same forty hours (still called "General Culture") all work in Music History and Literature, thus reducing knowledge outside the field of specialization to the low, old-fashioned conservatory level, which the NASM in the past has worked so hard to raise.

The Clear Lake *Outline* assigns thirty-two semester hours to "Preparation for Musicianship," consisting almost entirely of Theory and Composition. The Chicago *Standards* cut this figure exactly in two, leaving only sixteen semester hours for Theory and Composition, now entitled, "Basic Music." This amount of Theory and Composition is of course far below the minimum standards of any reputable music curriculum, whether professional or liberal arts.

The Clear Lake *Outline* assigns thirty hours to Applied Music, and the Chicago *Standards* raise this to forty hours. Since many music schools and conservatories come closer to the former figure, there appears to be no justification for this. In the field of Applied Music credit values are so unsettled and so much of the best work is done privately that proficiency is much better judged by examination than by the completion of a certain number of semester hours.

In "Professional Education," the increase from eighteen hours in the *Outline* to twenty-four hours in the *Standards* is indicative of the increasing neglect of content in favor of methods.

Two questions therefore arise. First, are the Chicago *Standards* in the best interests of the NASM and the other non-liberal arts Music Associations? This must be determined by the organizations concerned. Second, are they applicable to the Bachelor of Arts Teacher Training Program? The answer is, definitely not. The philosophies of the Professional Schools and the liberal arts Music Departments are distinct, and the standards of one cannot be used to measure the programs of the other.

On the one hand, the NASM states bluntly in its *By-Laws and Regulations*, "The Association deplures and accepts only with great reluctance the use of the Bachelor of Arts degree in connection with the professional preparation of teachers of school music" (p. 32.) On the other hand, the liberal arts Music Departments throughout the country are unanimous in finding the Chicago *Standards* incompatible with the aims of the Bachelor of Art in Music. A fair sample of this opinion is contained, I believe, in the following quotations from chairmen of liberal arts Music Departments in colleges and universities, private and state, in the West, East, and South:

1. This program "would seem to be typical of a B.S. degree in Education . . . My general criticism of this program is that it is neither a liberal arts program nor a B.M. program."
2. "I consider the recommended program very bad because I think it turns out students with a college background far too narrow and specialized to become good teachers."
3. "The whole program . . . has no particular connection whatever with any sound program of education."

4. "The NASM recommendations . . . are very short on the liberal arts and I feel it is necessary to call attention of our administrators to the problem, which if solved along NASM lines, would mean that liberal arts colleges are not qualified to train teachers—certainly a contradiction in terms, if there ever was one."

5. "The *Standards* in their present form will tend to bring undue pressure upon institutions to force them to conform to a particular undergraduate curriculum set-up which may be alien to their basic collegiate philosophy."

The very sharpness of the divergence in view is a measure of the deep conviction with which each side is pursuing its own path. We are all working for one goal, the best possible training of music teachers. But it would be a mistake to water down our programs in the hope of finding a least common denominator. I agree whole-heartedly with Raymond Kendall of the University of Southern California that "different institutions should take pride in emphasizing their unique contributions."

Personally I would be gratified if the liberal arts Music Departments would get together and work with the same earnestness and energy shown at Clear Lake and Chicago to formulate their minimum requirements for an ideal Bachelor of Arts Teacher Training Program. The Music Departments on three campuses of the University of California are presently at work on such programs, and certain general conclusions already emerge. If "General Culture" is taken to include all courses outside the field of music and all courses in Music History and Literature, the irreducible minimum for these studies is sixty hours. In Theory and Composition we endorse the minimum now set by the California State Department of Education, twenty-four hours. Even if the Department were to lower this standard, it is unlikely that the University of California would follow suit. In Applied Music examination appears preferable to specifying the number of semester hours. In Professional Education, if we exceeded the fifteen hours required by the State, it would be in carefully planned departmental Music Education courses.

In conclusion I have one statement which I am sure will meet with general acceptance. The time is coming when we shall all have to follow the lead of Pomona College and other institutions by providing the prospective school music teacher with a Five Year Program.

## JUNIOR COLLEGE PROBLEMS

Music Study Objectives in Junior Colleges and Problems of Transfer to Senior Colleges was the subject of a panel discussion presided over by C. Burdette Wolfe of Del Mar College. The other speaker was Dr. Gerald Strang of Long Beach City College. Mrs. Wolfe opened with the following statement:

Too often we approach the opportunities and problems of education from only one level or standpoint, failing get a total picture of the situation. The Junior College cannot stand apart from the entire educational system.

Each of us, in discussing our specific problems related to Junior Colleges and their offerings in music, is inclined to consider the national picture on the basis of our findings in specific institutions. Since Junior Colleges, largely, are institutions created to meet local needs—their programs vary, perhaps more widely than those of senior institutions.

The Community College philosophy—considering the needs of the citizenry—has been dominant in the minds of most administrators. One segment of the work done has been that of preparing the students for the baccalaureate degree. Of the 560,000 stu-

dents enrolled in the Junior Colleges of America in 1953-54, only 220,000 were pursuing a degree course.

There are those who may say that the Junior College program should confine its activities to terminal work; that the professional fields should be left to the Senior College. There are many students in my experience, who have in later years proven their ability to do superior work, who would not have enrolled in music had it not been for their experience in the Junior College. Our problem is a mutual one—how can we approach in a realistic fashion the problem of transfer.

I have had the opportunity to talk with Dr. Gerald Strang—I would like you to hear of the work being done in California towards the solution of their problems.

The essence of Dr. Strang's remarks follow: "I will talk concretely about my own situation. The program of the Junior Colleges in California is enormous. There are many transfers to Senior Colleges. The Junior Colleges vary greatly among themselves. They deal with both professional and avocational students and the large schools can segregate the two groups. The University of California recommends that the students be limited to doing the lower division work in the Junior College. The latter cannot complete professional work but they can do well this fundamental ground work of the lower division. We have a large transfer problem made difficult by the varying requirements of the Senior Colleges. The work of each junior college student must be planned in advance according to his choice of senior college. The problem becomes acute when the student has not chosen his future college or when he changes his choice late in his junior college period. A study is continuously in progress in an attempt to coordinate the work of junior and senior colleges. Consultations are constantly held through the meetings of the California Association of Music Executives toward the setting of standards that will stimulate the music programs of the junior colleges. Many of the junior colleges are successfully developing musical projects of real cultural value to their communities."

Beginning the discussion period, President Keller asked what percentage of transfer students had to lose credit because of their change of school. Mr. Wolfe said his students lost no credit except in the field of music education. Dr. Strang stated that most students suffered no loss except in transferring to certain specific schools or when they changed their choice of colleges. Dr. Keller asked if there was a difference between those proceeding toward a B.M. degree and those choosing an A.B. Dr. Strang suggested that to avoid loss of credit that the music content of the junior college program be kept high, say at 30 semester hours and that this policy was good for terminal students who may carry but 12 academic hours.

Dr. Doyle asked if Dr. Strang could set up a "gospel" for junior college music. The reply was: Give them the best and supply what the community needs at the highest possible level. Mr. Wolfe stated that half of the junior colleges lacked adequate staff and equipment to give music courses of adequate quality. Dr. Strang remarked that the California junior colleges are publicly organized and districted. Some of them cannot offer a pre-professional program and only those which can do it well should offer such a program. Most junior colleges try to give service to the non-major. Long Beach Junior College has six sections of music history for the non-majors and two for the majors. It also gives evening classes in piano and appreciation for adults. Three types of courses are given: those satisfying degree requirements; those which may or may not be applicable; those which are not intended for credit transfer.

## THE MEETING ITSELF

While the attending delegates found the arrangement of the meeting room more or less as usual, in detail it was quite new. The members were grouped by regions and our many guests from California had place cards in the section with our members from Region I. The roll call, instead of being made by the Secretary, was made by the regional Vice-presidents for their respective territories. There were 112 member schools represented by 139 individuals. The California guests numbered 31 individuals representing the following 21 schools: George Pepperdine College, University of California at Los Angeles, University of California, San Diego State College, San Francisco State College, Santa Monica College, Mount St. Mary's College, Occidental College, Long Beach City College, Long Beach State College, Los Angeles State College, California Baptist College, Dominican College, Notre Dame College, Pacific Grove College, Music and Arts Institute of San Francisco, San Francisco Conservatory, Pomona College, Whitman College, Chapman College and Fresno State College.

As soon as President Keller had called the meeting to order, the Deputy Mayor of Los Angeles, Mr. John J. Irwin, brought greetings from the city and welcomed the visitors.

## MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

Chairman Earl V. Moore of the Commission of Curricula reported the recommendation of the Commission that ten associate member schools be promoted to full membership, as follows:

Fisk University  
Flora MacDonald College  
Friends University  
Lewis and Clark College  
Midwestern University

Phillips University  
Southwestern University  
Viterbo College  
Wartburg College  
Webster College

The meeting voted approval of these promotions.

The Commission's recommendation of the election of seven schools to associate membership was next read by Chairman Moore:

Bucknell University  
Howard College  
McNeese State College  
University of New Hampshire

Virginia State College  
Washington University of St. Louis  
Yankton College

These schools were approved for membership by vote of the meeting.

Chairman Moore announced that the applications of five schools had been laid on the table because all of their offerings of degrees in music did not fully meet the standards of the Association and that the promotion of two associate members had been postponed. He added that additional curricula leading to baccalaureate degrees in member schools had been approved as follows:

Richmond Professional Institute, the B.M. in Composition  
Shenandoah Conservatory, the B.M. in Church Music  
University of Tulsa, the B.M. in Composition

He also reported that two reports had been received and approved concerning the music departments of Duquesne University and our member, Howard University, both of which had been re-evaluated by the Middle States Association with the cooperation of representatives of NASM who acted as members of the evaluating teams.

## GRADUATE AFFAIRS

Chairman Howard Hanson of the Graduate Commission announced that the Master Degrees of three schools had been considered and approved by the Commission:

St. Louis Institute of Music: M.M. in Applied Music; Music Education;

Ball State College: M.A. in Music; M.A. in Education in Music;

University of Redlands: M.A. in Music; M.M. in Applied Music; Composition.

The Commission had also approved the requirements and programs leading to the degree, Doctor of Musical Arts of Boston University and of the University of Illinois. These recommendations were approved by vote of those present.

Dr. Hanson reported that a new problem had been presented to the Commission, that of the approval of and membership for schools offering only graduate degrees in music. He expressed the opinion that membership for such schools should remain the province of the Commission on Curricula or at least be jointly recommended by that Commission and the Graduate Commission. Two schools of this nature are interested in such approval and membership.

In reporting the discussions of the Graduate Commission, chairman Howard Hanson reiterated that the Doctor of Musical Arts degree is one for the practitioner rather than for the scholar. He stated that there are now eight member schools which offer this degree based on requirements which have been examined and approved by the Graduate Commission. These eight are: Boston University, Eastman School of Music of the University of Rochester, Florida State University, Indiana University, Northwestern University, University of Illinois, University of Michigan and University of Southern California.

In the discussion which followed, Dr. Hanson answered a question asked by Mr. Elston of UCLA, by saying that NASM does not set a pattern for the Doctor of Musical Arts degree. All eight schools whose degrees have been approved, have submitted their own plans for the advice and suggestions of the Graduate Commission before undertaking to offer the degree. He complimented these schools for the fine example of cooperation.

Earl Moore asked how we could be sure of the possibilities of a candidate before he is admitted to doctoral study. The cost of the program is so high that it must be justified by the product in the development of those who undertake to seek the degree. Raymond Kendall suggested that careful testing of the candidates must be made in advance; he also suggested that the thesis for the degree could well be at the master degree level.

The control of the degree was the subject of remarks telling of the practice in several schools. Mr. Kendall expressed the view that degrees in professional subjects be administered by their respective departments, but under general university supervision. Howerton of Northwestern said that this policy was followed in his school with the cooperation of the Graduate School.

Dr. Hanson reported that a meeting had been held the previous evening which was attended by representatives of the schools granting the Doctor of Musical Arts degree and others interested in considering the degree. The purpose of the meeting was to compare notes informally on how the plans of each were working out. It was found that while four of the schools were working under their own graduate schools, the real administration of their programs remained in the music departments. Dr. Hanson mentioned the disapproval of the Doctor of Musical Arts degree which had come from a number of musicologists, but reminded us that it was a very well-known musicologist who had first suggested the degree in 1930—no less a person than Dr. Otto Kinkeldey.

## **ETHICS COMMISSION**

Chairman Luther Richman reported that during the past year all inquiries and discussions taken up with the Commission on Ethics have been settled between the parties involved without recourse to bringing them before the NASM convention. The members are to be congratulated on their cooperation in all matters relating to ethics. It is hoped that all members will feel free to bring all questions of ethics to the attention of the Commission for advice or action.

**HAROLD L. BUTLER**

The name in the heading above is that of the second president of NASM who is now retired and living in Bradford, Pennsylvania. Here is the message he has sent to our 30th anniversary meeting.

To the members, old and new, of NASM:

May I, as one of the charter members of your great organization, offer you my heartiest congratulations and very best wishes on this, your Thirtieth Anniversary. Although I retired nine years ago from active membership in your ranks, I have never lost my interest in your stupendous growth and development. You have every right to be proud of the work you have done, for your influence for good has spread throughout the length and breadth of our vast country. My wish is that NASM will continue its good work for at least another thirty years.

With most cordial greetings to you all, Yours sincerely

Harold L. Butler, Dean Emeritus, College of Fine Arts, Syracuse University

## **BY-LAWS AMENDMENTS**

When the By-laws were rewritten several years ago, an important clause was inadvertently omitted. To correct this an amendment had been proposed, notice of which had been given in the call for the present meeting. The amendment adds the words "which can give evidence of permanence and stability and" after the word "Schools" which begins paragraphs A 1 and 2 of Article II, I Membership (See the 1953 edition of the By-laws, page 4). The motion to adopt these amendments was carried unanimously.

## **TREASURER'S REPORT**

The Treasurer, Dr. Frank B. Jordan, presented his detailed report in mimeographed form. In brief it showed that the resources as of September 1, 1953 consisted of securities in the amount of \$18,167.50 and cash in bank of \$7,572.55 and that receipts during the year following amounted to \$17,161.74. From the grand total of \$42,901.79 must be deducted the principal of \$1480 of bonds which had been redeemed for \$2000 which latter amount is included in the income. The disbursements for the year were \$10,713.39 plus \$3000 for the purchase of U. S. Bonds, which amount is now included in the inventory of securities.

As of August 31, 1954, we find ourselves with securities in the amount of \$19,687.50 and with a cash balance in bank of \$11,020.90.

The Treasurer was authorized by the Executive Committee to invest \$2000 from our bank balance in U. S. Bonds.

## FUTURE MEETINGS

Because of the necessity of securing hotel accommodations well in advance, the Executive Committee has authorized the following bookings for the next three years:

1955: Hotel Jefferson, St. Louis, Mo.—November 25, 26, 27.

1956: Hotel Statler, Cleveland, Ohio.—November 23, 24, 25.

1957: Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois.—November 29, 30 and December 1.

## THE SECRETARY REPORTS

Facts and figures form the basis of the report to come from the office which deals with the routine business of NASM. Two member schools have resigned from associate membership in 1954—The Ludwig College of Music and the Music and Arts College, both of St. Louis, Mo. The Chicago Musical College has ceased to exist as an independent institution and has been absorbed by a newer member, Roosevelt University. This leaves us with a membership of 183 full members, 21 associate members, 9 junior colleges and one preparatory school. On recommendation of the Commission on Curricula, you have just promoted 10 schools from the associate to full membership, bringing the present total to 193; you have admitted seven schools to associate membership, leaving 18 in that classification; as the junior college and preparatory members remain the same, the grand total at the beginning of 1955 stands at 221 members.

The statistics for the year 1953-54 have been compiled from the reports of 212 of the 214 members, two of the smaller schools failing to report. The detailed figures of totals and averages, will be found in the usual table which includes comparative figures for five earlier years, beginning with 1940-1, the year reports were first inaugurated.

It is a long job to inspect all the programs sent in with your annual reports. The secretary has just been able to complete looking at those for 1952-53, and finds fewer weaknesses in this set than in those of the preceding year. The soft spots continue to be in the choice of songs by American composers, usually used for the closing group in voice recitals. Here a lighter touch seems desired, but this denies performance to the more serious and more important, musically speaking, songs by our creative musicians. From some of the programs submitted, it would seem that this habit can be broken by changing the plan to something less usual. The literature used for the brass instruments is also better; but it is hoped that more use may be made of the sonatas and concertos commissioned by NASM and published by the Remick Music Corporation.

It is the sad duty of the Secretary to report the passing of a number of loyal friends of NASM. Most of them were Directors of their schools at the time the schools were admitted to membership: Edgar Brazleton of the Chicago Conservatory, long a member of the Commission on Curricula; Frederick C. Mayer of Capitol University; Sister Amabilis of Our Lady of the Lake College; Philip Clapp of the University of Iowa. There are two more who have given much of themselves to the work of NASM, Kenneth Bradley, our first president and James T. Quarles, chairman of our Library Committee from 1938 to 1954. Memorial citations for these two follow:



## OFFICERS FOR 1955

Early in the meeting, the nominating committee, Charles L. Vardell chairman and the other members of which were Virginia Carty, Edwin Kappelman and Cecil Munk, proposed a slate of officers for the year 1955. After Chairman Vardell made his report, President Keller asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing none, he laid the election on the table to give those present an opportunity to consider proposing other candidates. Next day another call for nominations from the floor was made and again none were made. It was then moved and carried that the Secretary be instructed to cast one ballot for the names proposed by the nominating committee. The committee renominated all the present incumbents to their respective offices with the exception of Roy Underwood, who had served two terms as a member of the Commission on Curricula and was therefore ineligible for re-election. The following persons were nominated and elected:

President:—Harrison Keller, New England Conservatory, Boston

Vice-president:—E. William Doty, University of Texas, Austin

Treasurer:—Frank B. Jordan, Drake University, Des Moines, Ia.

Secretary:—Burnet C. Tuthill, Southwestern at Memphis

Commission on Curricula:—Chairman, Earl V. Moore, University of Michigan, Raymond Kendall, University of Southern California, (2nd term) Duane Branigan, University of Illinois, (1st term)

Graduate Commission:—Chairman, Howard Hanson, Eastman School of Music, Thomas Gorton, University of Kansas, (2nd term), David Robertson, Oberlin Conservatory, (2nd term)

Commission on Ethics: Luther Richmen, Montana State University, (2nd term)

## APPLIED MUSIC FEES

Thomas Gorton, chairman of the Committee on Research, was asked to ascertain whether or not there is a wide-spread trend toward the elimination of the traditional applied music fees. In this study a comparison of the fees assessed the music major is made with those charged to the typical liberal arts major in the same institution.

In the independent conservatory-type of music school, which enrolls only music majors as full-time students and which is dependent upon applied music fees, in large part, for income, it was not possible to make this comparison, for obvious reasons.

A total of 175 member schools replied to the questionnaire. For the purposes of comparison all fees were adjusted to the semester basis.

### No Extra Music Fee

17 (10%) of the 175 schools indicated that music majors pay no more tuition than liberal arts majors at the same institution. (In one school it cost, as a matter of fact, \$162.50 less per semester to major in music than in the liberal arts field.)

The break-down by types:—6 (10%) of the 61 publicly-supported schools; 7 (15%) of the 47 privately-endowed schools; 4 (9%) of the 47 church-supported schools. Of these 17 schools: 4 never have charged applied music fees; 1 abandoned such fees in 1901; 2 abandoned such fees in 1930-35; 5 abandoned such fees in 1950-54; 5 indicated no date.

### Package Fee

33 schools (19%) choose to assess a flat fee for music majors in addition to the basic tuition charged liberal arts students rather than to charge specific applied music fees. In many cases this inclusive fee covers such items as practice room rental, use of an instrument, admission to concerts, and locker space, as well as individual applied music instruction.

### Extra Fee for Music Majors by Semester

No. Reporting	Type of School	Range	Mean	Median
12	Publicly-supported	\$15—\$150	\$59.17	\$50
13	Privately-endowed	\$10—\$160	\$56.44	\$40
8	Church-supported	\$10—\$200	\$67.34	\$40
33	Schools total	\$10—\$200	\$60.00	\$40

### Applied Music Fees

From the 120 schools listing special fees for applied music study, the following figures were obtained. These are related to two half-hour (or one hour) private lessons per week generally, but in a few instances involve also an additional class lesson or an additional private lesson as required by the school's curriculum.

### Applied Music by Semester

No. Reporting	Type of School	Range	Mean	Median
42	Publicly-supported	\$22.50—\$105	\$48.28	\$50
27	Privately-endowed	\$40—\$150	\$83.16	\$76.25
34	Church-supported	\$30—\$360	\$75.79	\$80
17	Independent	\$105—\$280	\$131.29	\$152
120	Schools total	\$22.50—\$360	\$72.06	\$72

It should be noted, in examining the disparity between applied music fees in the independent conservatory and in the other types of schools, that whereas the applied music fee represents the major part of a student's tuition at the independent school, it is added to the basic fee in the other three types of institutions.

35 (27.5%) of these 120 schools charged variable applied music fees depending upon the instrument and/or the instructor involved.

### Practice Fee

Of the 175 schools responding, 51 (29%) indicated that they charged no separate practice fee. In some cases they stated that they considered this included in the "package" or in the applied music fee.

The break-down by types of the 51 schools charging no practice fee: 24 Publicly-supported, 14 Privately-endowed, 12 Church-supported, 1 Independent.

Of those schools listing a fee for piano practice the figures for one hour a day per semester were:

No. Reporting	Type of School	Range	Mean	Median
37	Publicly-supported	\$2—\$11	\$4.72	\$4.50
29	Privately-endowed	\$1—\$16	\$6.62	\$5.00
34	Church-supported	\$2.50—\$15	\$6.32	\$5.00
16	Independent	\$3.33—\$25	\$12.43	\$12.00

Although there would seem to have been some movement in the direction of eliminating special music fees in the past five years, the percentage of schools involved does not yet indicate a wide-spread trend.

The argument for the abandonment of these special fees is usually based on the theory that, in a democratic society, a student gifted in musical ability should not be penalized by having to pay more for his education than the chemistry or English major. Against this is the indisputable fact of the high cost of a large amount of individual instruction by specialists and the large expense of specially-designed physical space and equipment.

In view of the need for expansion to handle the enrollment bulge predicted for the near future and the ever-pyramiding instructional costs at institutions of higher learning, it is doubtful that many administrations will look with favor on giving up any present sources of income.

## NATIONAL MUSIC COUNCIL

A report of the most recent meeting of the National Music Council, Dr. Howard Hanson, President, was presented to the delegates by Price Doyle. Three actions of the Council were brought to the attention of the Association.

### INTERNATIONAL MUSIC AID

The Council has a Committee on International Music Aid, whose Chairman is Mrs. John B. Davison, National President of Sigma Alpha Iota. This Committee has done some very important work in helping organizations, such as the Seoul Symphony, to get re-organized. Needed instruments and music have been purchased. The Committee has no overhead, so that each dollar contributed actually is used. The Council had suggested that each NASM School might contribute a small amount to the fund. As little as \$5.00 from each of our members would be a help.

The Association unanimously agreed to this proposition. Mrs. Davison's address is 1009 Twenty-fifth Street, Des Moines, Iowa.

### EXCISE TAX ON MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

Congress will again be asked to repeal the excise tax on musical instruments. The Council is in favor of such action. The Association was reminded that when such action is initiated in Congressional Committees an expression from each of us might be a great help in getting Committee approval and eventually in getting approval of the entire 84th Congress.

The Association unanimously agreed to push such Legislation.

### SUBSIDY FOR THE FINE ARTS

During the past several years, Congress has been asked for legislation which would provide some form of subsidy for the Fine Arts. The Council from time to time has studied Bills which have been introduced into Congress by various Senators and Representatives. Most of the men who have written such Bills in the past are not in the 84th Congress. Congressman Kearns (R. Pennsylvania) recently suggested that the Council advise him as to the desirable content of such a bill which he proposes to sponsor. The Council approved his suggestion, and President Hanson appointed additional personnel to the Council's regular Legislative Committee to implement Congressman Kearns's suggestion.

The Association unanimously approved this action and agreed to help in the consideration and passing of such legislation in the 84th Congress.

## PUBLICITY COMMITTEE REPORT

Upon receipt in late October of the tentative program for the Los Angeles Meeting, Mr. Cording prepared a publicity release which went to some 40 national music magazines. Early in November, a meeting was held in Mr. Branigan's office in Champaign and a general program mapped out. A general press release for use by all members of the Association with the local newspapers was prepared. The Committee will appreciate any clippings for help in planning future campaigns.

Our local representative this year was Franz Darvas. At the cost of much time and effort, he achieved some really gratifying results. The City of Los Angeles has honored us by sending its Deputy Mayor here for an official welcome. A radio station on the ABC network played one of Dr. Howard Hanson's Symphonies and interviewed him. Dr. Hanson also appeared on Jack Owens TV Program, which is sent to the West Coast Stations on the ABC network.

The local newspapers have already mentioned our meetings in their columns and have promised us more coverage. Mrs. Raymond Kendall, President Harrison Keller and Dean George Howerton were interviewed by Miss Furmell of the Los Angeles Times, who writes a nationally syndicated column called TEEN AGE. The interview dealt with some musical areas of special interest to that important regiment of our society, the teenage. The various local merchants in the music trades placed cards in their show windows calling attention to our meeting. The Music Editor of the Los Angeles Examiner has assigned Don Donaldson to cover the entire convention.

A release for newly admitted schools has been prepared.

The Committee wishes to express its gratitude to Raymond Kendall for his enthusiastic cooperation.

Walter Erley, Chairman, Duane Branigan, Edward Cording, Franz Darvas.

## REGIONAL MEETINGS

Six of the nine regions of NASM held meetings in the spring or the early fall at which representatives of 174 schools were in attendance. A number of non-member schools were included at each meeting. Most of the regions also held meetings at the appointed time as part of the Los Angeles convention. At those meetings the following vice presidents were elected by their respective groups:

Region 1:—Raymond Kendall, University of Southern California

Region 2:—Melvin Geist, Willamette University

Region 3:—Rogers Whitmore, University of Missouri

Region 4:—Carl Neumeyer, Illinois Wesleyan University

Region 5:—Cecil Munk, Baldwin Wallace College

Region 6:—Virginia Carty, Peabody Conservatory

Region 7:—Edwin Gerschefski, Converse College

Region 8:—Mark Hoffman, University of Mississippi

Region 9:—Max Mitchell, Oklahoma A. & M. College.

Those attending the regional meetings urged that, as policies are defined by the various Commissions of NASM, they be published as promptly as practicable and be thus made available to the regional officers for their guidance in discussions with inquiring non-member schools.

The regions also asked the question of what had happened to the general re-examination of the member schools, a question which was brought to the floor of a general meeting by Vice-president Doty. Chairman Moore of the Commission on Curricula answered by giving a brief history of the postponement of the project and the reasons therefor. These included the war conditions and the after war pre-occupation with extraordinary enrollments and finally the uncertainties created by our negotiations with the National Commission on Accrediting. Inasmuch as we are now working through the regional associations, the task will now be approached from that angle as quickly as plans with each of the six associations reach the stage of action. Member schools may request visits separately or in connection with the general re-evaluations conducted by the regional associations. A self-survey blank will be sent to any school requesting it; through these the Commission on Curricula will secure the greatest amount of information at the least cost to NASM.

## LIBRARY COMMITTEE

The Committee on Library is currently undertaking the compiling, revising and editing of the original List of Books on Music and the nine Supplements for a one-volume publication. Much of the material of the List and early supplements is now obsolete or out of print. Important items, inadvertently omitted from the supplements, will be added. Many other editorial tasks confront the committee in rearranging materials to make the List of Books on Music a uniform and valuable reference work for general libraries as well as for member schools.

The publication of the Ninth Supplement had been delayed, pending the decision whether to include it in the projected unified list. The Committee on Library, with the concurrence of the Executive Committee, has concluded that it should proceed with the publication of the Ninth Supplement separately, so that the member schools can have the benefit of the latest listings of books and music during the period that will be required for the preparation of the unified list. The Ninth Supplement is now ready for distribution.

Hugh Miller, Chairman

## WIND INSTRUMENT LITERATURE

Burnet Tuthill, chairman, reported that the two works, one each for trumpet and trombone, which had been commissioned on behalf of NASM by the preceding chairman, Kenneth Kincheloe, after the composers had been selected by vote of his committee, had not yet been completed by the composers. These gentlemen are Bernard Fitzgerald and Kent Kennan. Both hope to deliver their manuscripts early in 1955, when they will be forwarded to the publisher. Meanwhile it is hoped that the member schools will make greater use of the works already completed and published. As a reminder of their existence, the works are listed here:

Sonatas for horn and piano by Quincy Porter and Anthony Donato

Sonatas for trumpet and piano by Leo Sowerby, and Burnet Tuthill

Sonatas for trombone and piano by Robert Sanders and George McKay

Concertos for trumpet and orchestra (piano reductions printed) by Vittorio Giannini and Wayne R. Bohmstedt

The above have been published by the Remick Music Corporation of New York.

The bulletin 31, Solo Literature for Wind Instruments, is still available at 30 cents per copy. This was published in 1951 after extensive research by a large committee of experts. The Committee plans to assemble information on wind solos which have become available since 1951 and if there seems to be enough new material available, to print an addendum to the original booklet.