

# Bulletin

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTY-EIGHTH  
ANNUAL MEETING  
NOVEMBER 1962  
CINCINNATI

Bulletin  
*of the*  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

CARL M. NEUMEYER  
*Editor*



Published by the  
National Association of Schools of Music  
Office of Secretary, Thomas W. Williams  
Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois

## CONTENTS

Officers of the Association, 1963.....	v
Commission Members, 1963.....	v
Committees, 1963.....	vi
President's Report, <i>Thomas Gorton</i> .....	9
The History and Rationale of Music Accreditation in the United States, <i>Earl V. Moore</i> .....	16
Accreditation in Higher Education, An Example of Social Cooperation, <i>William K. Selden</i> .....	28
Coordinate Responsibilities of NASM and NCATE, <i>Chester C. Travelstead</i> .....	36
The Function of the Regional Association in the Accreditation of Specialized and Professional Programs, <i>F. Taylor Jones</i> .....	47
The Eastman Philharmonia in Europe, the Near East, and Russia, <i>Howard Hanson</i> .....	59
Report of Commission on Curricula.....	66
Report of Graduate Commission.....	68
Report of First Vice-President.....	71
Report of Secretary.....	72
Report of Treasurer.....	73
Report of Nominating Committee.....	73
Curriculum for the degree Bachelor of Music Education.....	74
Workshop for Examiners.....	78
Panel Discussions.....	78
Meetings of Committees.....	79
Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting.....	79

# OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1963

*President:* C. B. Hunt, Jr., George Peabody College

*First Vice-President:* Duane Branigan, University of Illinois

*Second Vice-President:* LaVahn Maesch, Lawrence College

*Secretary:* Thomas W. Williams, Knox College

*Treasurer:* Frank B. Jordan, Drake University

## *Regional Chairmen:*

Region 1. Crawford Gates, Brigham Young University

Region 2. Jay L. Slaughter, Ricks College

Region 3. Ralph E. Hart, Central Missouri State College

Region 4. Carl M. Neumeyer, Illinois Wesleyan University

Region 5. G. Gene Taylor, Capitol University

Region 6. A. Kunrad Kvam, Douglass College of Rutgers University

Region 7. Eugene N. Crabb, Converse College

Region 8. Sigfred C. Matson, Mississippi State College for Women

Region 9. Harry M. Lemert, Northeast Louisiana State College

## *Council of Past Presidents:*

E. William Doty

Howard Hanson

Price Doyle

Harrison Keller

Thomas Gorton

Earl V. Moore

## COMMISSIONS

### COMMISSION ON CURRICULA:

Earl V. Moore, Chairman, University of Houston

Robert L. Briggs, University of Tulsa (1965)

Henry A. Bruinsma, Ohio State University (1963)

Melvin H. Geist, Willamette University (1964)

Thomas Gorton, University of Kansas (Ex officio)

Warner Lawson, Howard University (1965)

Paul M. Oberg, University of Minnesota (1964)

Clemens Sandresky, Salem College (1963)

John Flower, Executive Secretary, University of Michigan

### GRADUATE COMMISSION:

Howard Hanson, Chairman, Eastman School of Music

Leigh Gerdine, Washington University (1965)

Robert Hargreaves, Ball State Teachers College (1964)

George Howerton, Northwestern University (1965)

Raymond Kendall, University of Southern California (1963)

Everett Timm, Louisiana State University (1964)

Himie Voxman, University of Iowa (1963)

#### COMMISSION ON ETHICS:

Sister M. Gabriella, *Chairman*, Marymount College (1964)  
Jackson K. Ehlert, Butler University (1963)  
J. Paul Kennedy, Bowling Green State University (1965)

### COMMITTEES

#### AIMS AND OBJECTIVES:

Thomas Gorton, <i>Chairman</i>	A. Kunrad Kvam
Karl Ahrendt	Carl M. Neumeyer
E. William Doty	Edwin E. Stein
Robert W. House	Daniel Sternberg
Warner Imig	James B. Wallace
Raymond Kendall	

#### MUSIC IN GENERAL EDUCATION:

Leigh Gerdine, <i>Chairman</i>	Warner Lawson
Earl Beach	Lee Rigsby
Arthur Fraser	Thomas Williams

#### STATE CERTIFICATION AND LEGISLATION:

Thomas Stone, <i>Chairman</i>	Michigan, David Strickler
Alabama, Wilbur Rowand	Minnesota, Russell Harris
Arizona, Andrew Buchhauser	Mississippi, Sigfred Matson
Arkansas, Gene Witherspoon	Missouri, O. Anderson Fuller
California, Hartley Snyder	Montana, Charles Bolen
Colorado, Warner Imig	Nebraska, Emanuel Wishnow
Connecticut, Samuel Berkman	New Hampshire, Karl Bratton
District of Columbia, Warner Lawson	New Jersey, A. Kunrad Kvam
Florida, John Bitter	New Mexico, Joseph Blankenship
Georgia, Max Noah	New York, Craig McHenry
Idaho, Hall Macklin	North Carolina, Earl E. Beach
Illinois, Fred Denker	Ohio, Lee Shackson
Indiana, Robert Hargreaves	Oklahoma, Milburn Carey
Iowa, Myron Russell	Oregon, Melvin Geist
Kansas, Millard Laing	Pennsylvania, Gerald Keenan
Kentucky, James E. Van Peursem	South Carolina, Eugene Crabb
Louisiana, Harry Lemert	South Dakota, Usher Abell
Maryland, Gerald Cole	Tennessee, Edward Lewis
Massachusetts, Robert Buggert	Texas, William Mathis
	Utah, Leroy Robertson

Virginia, L. Wayne Batty  
Washington, Bruce Rodgers  
West Virginia,  
Richard E. Duncan

Wisconsin, La Vahn Maesch  
Wyoming, Allen Willman

RESEARCH:

Robert Hargreaves, *Chairman*  
Peter S. Hansen

Daniel Sternberg

PUBLICITY AND PUBLIC RELATIONS:

Walter A. Erley, *Chairman*  
Edward A. Cording

George McClay  
Arthur Wildman

JUNIOR COLLEGES:

C. Burdette Wolfe, *Chairman*  
Eugene B. Addams  
Floella P. Farley  
Carimae Hedgpeth

Richard S. Johnson  
Franklin B. Launer  
Jay L. Slaughter  
Rodney Townley

PREPARATORY MUSIC:

Jackson K. Ehlert, *Chairman*  
Samuel Berkman  
Eugene Crabb  
Harold J. Cadek  
Archie N. Jones  
Robin Laufer

William McPhail  
Jani Szanto  
Hugh Thomas  
James H. Wood  
Alle D. Zuidema

LIBRARY:

Edwin Gerschefski, *Chairman*  
Bruce Benward  
Leroy Robertson

Wilbur Rowand  
Virgil Smith  
David Strickler

TEACHER EDUCATION IN MUSIC:

Robert House, *Chairman*  
C. Buell Agey  
Charles Aurand  
Earl E. Beach  
J. Russell Bodley  
Allen Cannon  
Elwyn Carter  
Kenneth Cuthbert  
Francis Diers  
Walter Duerksen  
Richard Farrell

Ralph Hart  
Duane Haskell  
Gene Hemmle  
Helen Hosmer  
Clifford Julstrom  
James Paul Kennedy  
Max Mitchell  
Myron Russell  
Lee Shackson  
William Spencer

**IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING:**

Everett Timm, *Chairman*  
Orville Borchers  
Kenneth Cuthbert  
Roger Dexter Fee  
Archie N. Jones

Lee Rigsby  
Leslie Spelman  
Kemble Stout  
Rogers Whitmore

**LIAISON COMMITTEE:**

Henry Bruinsma, *Chairman*  
Wilfred Bain  
Willard Bassett  
Arthur Byler  
Katharine Davies  
Charles Finney

Bernard Fitzgerald  
Crawford Gates  
Stanley Glarum  
Rexford Keller  
John Kendall  
Wendell Rider

**SUB-COMMITTEES OF COMMISSION ON CURRICULA**

**BACHELOR OF ARTS:**

Clemens Sandresky, *Chairman*  
Peter S. Hansen

Dale Moore  
Cecil Munk

**CHURCH MUSIC:**

Melvin Geist, *Chairman*  
Arthur Becker

George Koski  
George McClay

**MUSIC EDUCATION:**

Henry A. Bruinsma, *Chairman*  
Robert N. House  
Lee Shackson

**MUSIC THERAPY:**

Robert Unkefer, *Chairman*  
E. Thayer Gaston

**MASTER'S DEGREE:**

Paul Oberg, *Chairman*  
Allen Britton  
William Doty



## PRESIDENT'S REPORT

My report this year would be in the nature of a valedictory had not the Association some years ago seen fit to provide a haven for the retiring president as a member of the Commission on Curricula, where his comments, benign or acidulous, can be heard for a time.

It does seem appropriate, however, to present a brief résumé of the tallies scored by the home team during the four-year season and a few comments on the future of the National Association of Schools of Music. These are neither particularized specifications nor blueprints, for the new firm of architects will be engaged in these details, but we do propose to call attention to some matters which we believe should be of concern to the Association in the immediate future.

As we take a retrospective glance over the past four years the two most significant areas of NASM activity are those of curricular study and the implementation of the working agreement with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, which was brand new in 1958.

In the field of curriculum there have been major reports presented on the Bachelor of Music degree, the Church Music program, and the Bachelor of Music Education degree. The last-named will be presented for appropriate action during this meeting. There has been a study by the Research Committee on the "Liberal Arts and Professional Education Content of Music Curricula". The Graduate Commission has undertaken a continuing study of doctoral degrees in music which has culminated in the action of the Association in approving a plan of this commission for on-campus examination of institutions now awarding the Doctor of Musical Arts and Doctor of Music degrees, and in reassigning the responsibility for master's degree programs to the Commission on Curricula, so that the Graduate Commission might be freed for this vital and difficult task.



We have reported to you annually on the operations undertaken jointly with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education in the accreditation of programs in music education. It was the decision of the National Commission on Accrediting that NASM should play the role of hand-maiden rather than master of the household or even a spouse with community property rights. We have accepted the decision of this powerful arbiter with reluctance but, we hope, with good grace and have bent every effort to cooperate with NCATE. We believe that it is possible to operate successfully within this framework to aid in the maintenance and upgrading of musical standards in the preparation of music teachers for the public schools providing that NCATE is continually sympathetic to NASM's concern for a professional program. NCATE and NASM have established good lines of communication and a great deal of the initial mutual mistrust has been dissolved. We have, accordingly, upon the recommendation of your Executive Committee, renewed our working agreement with NCATE for another three years, subject to review on September 1, 1965.

Since we believe accreditation to be the most important of the functions of this Association we have devoted a major portion of the program of this meeting to a study of accreditation from the standpoint of the professional accrediting associations, the regional associations, the National Commission on Accrediting, and a workshop for the upgrading of examiner techniques and evaluations. We must enlarge our pool of skilled evaluators and improve the technique of those already engaged in this activity if the work of the Association is to advance.

Other important matters which have been given consideration during the past four years are the development of the new Annual Report forms, the revision of the Code of Ethics, reports of *ad hoc* committees and panels on copyright law, early admission, the music library, music in the land-grant colleges and universities, professional music study in the junior college, stringed instrument study, the proliferation of music degrees, the placement of graduates, and the role of the federal government in the arts.

Now for a moment, let us leave the present and dip back to a period some thirty years ago when, under the aegis of the Carnegie Foundation, Randall Thompson made a report in a volume published as *College Music: An Investigation*.

If Applied Music cannot get around the campus without credit for a crutch, it is too infirm to play the college game at all. Taking away credit will not

affect seriously the behavior of students with a genuine interest in music; and those who are taking lessons with credit as their primary inducement would be better off doing something else.

One reason given by Thompson for this point of view was, "Private instruction in applied music . . . contributes little to the social discipline of a college undergraduate." He also mentions the "unkindness of giving credit for Applied Music in a college course because many college students of applied music are allowed to nourish the belief that they will become great virtuosos." Again, "It is unnecessary to give credit for membership in a good organization; credit never has to be offered for participation unless the Group Music is managed badly, either personally or musically."

He concludes, "Everything in my experience leads me to condemn Applied Music as a subject for college credit; but nothing in this report is to be construed as hostile to the study of Applied Music or to the many admirable musicians engaged in teaching it."

It is evident that Randall Thompson, despite his great personal creative gifts, was much more interested in having *his* college student study *about* music rather than to study *music* itself. The idea was, as one of our colleagues succinctly put it, "It's alright to talk about it, but don't do it."

Naturally the Thompson report echoed across the American educational scene with a resounding boom. Stalwart leaders of NASM, like Howard Hanson and Earl V. Moore, and spokesmen of other national music associations, quickly rose up and spoke vehemently against the philosophy and conclusions of the report. So well did they present the case for credit for the study of musical performance that today this is a dead issue. The Thompson report might be said to have had the effect of deep-freezing the *status quo* in his own university and its satellites, but thanks to the vigorous counter-reaction of leading music educators it was not able to lay a dead hand on the development of a sound, well-balanced program of music in higher education generally in the United States.

Thomas Carlyle dourly observed, "No man lives without jostling and being jostled; in all ways he has to elbow himself through the world, giving and receiving offense."

We have been jostled again, once more by a report issued with the subvention of the Carnegie Foundation. This report, co-authored by Willis J. Wager and Earl J. McGrath, is titled *Liberal Education and Music*. It purports to be an "account that is intended to be basically reportorial" yet a major section of the report is drawn from an incredibly small sample of six schools visited.

As far as we have been able to determine no officer or commission member of NASM was consulted at any time during the preparation of this report which deals largely with the operations of this Association. We cannot conceive of such "research" which omits solicitation of current ideas and actions by officers so readily available as those who work with NASM.

The authors have set up a number of straw men which they manage to demolish with comparative ease. They ask with respect to the Bachelor of Music Curriculum: "Is the possibility of its (the general education component) being still further reduced to almost one-seventh of the total, desirable?" and later they state: "Consequently the general area in the program has been creeping, *de facto*, in the direction of one-eighth." The facts are that in the last NASM convention the liberal arts requirement for the Bachelor of Music degree was raised from the old minimum of eighteen hours and a maximum of thirty-six hours to a new minimum of forty hours, or approximately one-third of the total program.

It is true that included in this component are courses in music history and literature. The position of the NASM in this regard is that the study of music as an academic discipline, i. e. the scholarly approach to music, has validity as a general cultural subject matter field as it is currently taught in most of our institutions, and should be classed in the humanities. The actual situation is that most of our schools require from six to ten hours of music history, leaving some thirty to thirty-four hours in non-music courses as a minimum.

A survey made by our Research Committee in 1959 showed that, on the average, NASM institutions were requiring in non-music courses an average of forty-one hours plus eight and one-half hours of music history for the Bachelor of Music degree. The requirements in general education were still higher, an average of forty-four hours, for the music education degree and, of course much higher still, sixty-eight hours, for the Bachelor of Arts degree in music.

The authors of the book give a far different impression of current practice and we find difficulty in seeing how they arrived at their figures. Particularly ridiculous is the suggestion that "in terms of the *By-laws* revisions that go into effect in 1962 it would be possible for a school to claim that it had sanction for going as far as it wished in wiping out the non-music part of the B. M. curriculum, allowing a student to sign up for music literature, music appreciation and/or history . . . in all the hours when he was not occupied with applied or music history and theory courses." Did the authors read the statement with respect to the new general education requirement? If they

read it, did they understand it? NASM's commitment to the principle of general education is clearly and unequivocally stated in the curriculum description of the B. M. degree and again in the new music education curriculum.

It may be time to ask our friends in the liberal arts if they feel that they can assume the prerogative of drawing up a model curriculum for a student preparing for a career in such a highly professional field as music. If so, do they believe that there is a "package" of general education which will enlighten every music student, regardless of individual differences and interests? Have they considered the implications of the upgrading of high school education which has taken place in the last decade, to the end that our best secondary schools now offer work in the sciences, mathematics, and foreign languages at a level that used to be considered collegiate? Or that, in fact, our music students have been involved in a general education program for twelve years before they come to us, and are only beginning, as college freshmen, serious work in their professional preparation; that this is the time when they must specialize as well as continue their general education? Do they know that many of our schools have a Bachelor of Arts curriculum which is approximately two-thirds general education and one-third music for the student desiring a broader, less professionally-oriented program? We hope that some of these questions will be raised at the panel discussion later in this meeting on "Liberal Education and Music" and that some of the glaring errors and misconceptions contained in the study may be cleared up.

In concluding this report there are some recommendations which we should like to propose for the consideration of this Association:

1. That we continue to cooperate with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, guarding zealously the place of music content in the curriculum for the education of the music teacher, and the standards of courses which have to do with the development of musicianship. We must continue to resist the concept that all teacher training programs should be essentially the same and insist that the education of a music teacher is a special problem; that this must be centered upon a significant corpus of professional courses in music if music education in the United States is to continue to advance.

2. That we continue to explore the possibility of establishing a full-time professional secretariat in Washington for more effective liaison with other national agencies. At the present time we obviously lack the financial resources for such a move but it is not too early to

make long range plans. Possibly there are evolutionary steps which we can take toward this goal.

3. That we move rapidly in the direction of a regular program of on-campus re-examinations of member schools. Evaluation by self-survey reports alone has serious limitations and few other accrediting associations rely on this technique alone.

4. That we take steps soon to implement the Graduate Commission's recommendation for a visitation of each NASM institution awarding the Doctor of Musical Arts or Doctor of Music degree, such visitations to culminate in the eventual publication of a list of institutions offering accredited professional doctorates in music.

5. That we consider approaching the Carnegie Foundation which, in addition to sponsoring the Thompson and McGrath-Wager Reports mentioned earlier, also provided the "seed" money some forty years ago to assist in the formation of the NASM, with a view to a study in depth of music in higher education. Such a study should deal not only with curricular practices in many institutions of varied types and sizes but should also survey a wide range of graduates who are presently engaged as performing musicians and music teachers, to elicit from them the strengths and weaknesses which they believe they find in their backgrounds. The study should be done with no preconceived assumptions nor any curricula to be superimposed, but should be a factual reportorial study of the training of the professional musician in our colleges and universities. An important section of such a study should survey the rapidly growing graduate field in music, with special attention to the Doctor of Musical Arts programs. Another important section of the study should deal with the contributions of the music school or department to the development of musical insights in the non-music major and in the university community.

6. That as an Association we rededicate ourselves to the aims and objectives so eloquently stated in the foreword of the *By-laws and Regulations*:

To provide a national forum for the discussion and consideration of problems important to the preservation and advancement of standards in the field of music in higher education.

To develop a national unity and strength for the purpose of maintaining the position of music study in the family of fine arts and humanities in our universities, colleges and schools of music.

To guard the freedom of leadership in music training and to insure the right to protect the vital growth of the artist.

To establish standards of achievement with no desire or intent to curb or

restrict an administration or school in its freedom to develop new ideas and to experiment or to expand its program.

To recognize that inspired teaching may rightly reject a *status quo* philosophy.

To establish that the prime objective be to provide the opportunity for every music student to develop his individual potentialities to the utmost.

To use the influence of the Association to further the cause of music by bringing to bear whenever and wherever the need is deemed appropriate the combined strength of all member institutions.

THOMAS GORTON, *President*

## THE HISTORY AND RATIONALE OF MUSIC ACCREDITATION IN THE UNITED STATES

EARL V. MOORE, *Chairman*  
COMMISSION ON CURRICULA

Despite repeated suggestions to C. B. Hunt, Jr. that others were more competent and had a more objective point of view, the persistence of our Vice-President prevailed and reluctantly I face you. I am sure you have heard all or most all of the history and rationale of accrediting that has been presented from time to time at our meetings. The saving grace for this present recital is perhaps the fact that some of you may have come onto the music administration scene recently, and therefore, like the children born after the first world war, do not know of an era of relative peace, contentment in creative activities, and great independence of action. Hence there may be justification for this presentation.

The vision, the struggles, the patience and persistence of individuals; the adolescence and the maturation of an idea in the minds of just a few and then the many; the pioneering spirit; the adventures along the thirty-eight year history of achievement; the drama of learning to work together first as an independent body and later as a group in a society of related groups devoted to other disciplines in higher education; the acceptance of larger and more challenging responsibilities—these are some of the great moments and crucial decisions that I wish to recount for you. You will hear them expressed in the words of our distinguished presidents set forth in their annual reports, beginning with *Bulletin Number One*, January, 1934.

For the ten earlier years, only mimeographed reprints of discussions and actions taken at the Annual Meetings were issued. It seemed that as this young organization was feeling its way in matters of interest primarily to those present, and with relatively few decisions arrived at, the continued growth would not be seriously inhibited if the ebb and flow of the tides of discussion, sentiment, and recognition of future needs were not too widely publicized.

For a beautifully phrased memoir of those days I quote from the words of our first president, Kenneth Bradley, presented on the occasion of our silver anniversary meeting on February 25, 1950 at Cleveland, Ohio. He entitled his remarks, which were read by proxy, *Lest We Forget*.

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

This is the succinct statement of one of the reasons for the initial meeting of seven heads of conservatories in Cincinnati, June 11, 1924. This was a more or less secret meeting and Kenneth Bradley observes, "We realized the enormous task ahead of us."

On October 21, 1934, a larger group met at Pittsburgh, in which college and university schools as well as conservatories were represented. It was apparent that many meetings of a curricula commission would have to be held before comprehensive conclusions could be arrived at. The emphasis shifted from scholarships to saving from disgrace the professional degree Bachelor of Music. This involved obtaining funds, for those present were there as individuals and not as institutional representatives. President Bradley later obtained \$15,000 from the Carnegie Corporation to finance the meetings.

Until our organization was formed we were only a self-appointed group of individuals. Elihu Root, speaking for the Carnegie Foundation, stated in approving the grant, "This is the first time the Foundation has given money to an organization not yet fully organized". Perhaps this evidence of faith in the purposes of our group gave them, and should still remind us since some of that money is still a part of our bank balance, of the obligation to carry on our important task.

The request for help on matters of constitution and by-laws, directed to some of the founders of the North Central Association, was graciously heeded and President Bradley continues; "So armed with a draft of organization, a nice check from the Carnegie Foundation, and faith in the future we went to our next meeting in Rochester."

So carefully were preparations made and the ground work laid



through correspondence in advance that, said Bradley, "we were fortunate in having present the directors of most of the representative schools and leading universities. We met at 10:00 a.m. and before adjourning that night, the constitution had been approved, officers elected, commissions outlined their programs, and our splendid member, Charles N. Boyd (Pittsburgh), our first treasurer, was given a check to meet our necessary expenses."

There you have, in the words of an eye witness, the account of the accouchement of the baby—The National Association of Schools of Music.

One moment and one remark still lingers in my memory of that historic occasion. The meetings were held in the then new and splendid marble edifice which was the gift of George Eastman to the University of Rochester. It was the home of the Eastman School of Music just established, with our beloved Howard Hanson as the new director. As the group moved through the spacious marble-walled lobby at the end of the long day, George W. Chadwick, Director of the New England Conservatory of Music, turned to Frank Damrosch, Director of the Institute of Musical Art, and with all personal modesty and justified pride in the older institution to which he was giving his devoted efforts, as he gazed about him overwhelmed in amazement at the magnificence and splendor of the lobby, said, "I am content to be an humble doorkeeper in the house of the New England Conservatory."

In that historic meeting the first link was forged in the long chain that connects us to this, the Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting. A new organization was born to serve a function that was also in the infant stage. In addition to the officers and commission members who had been charged with forging other links, there were a goodly, and may I say "godly" number of godparents present without whose advice, counsel, faith and continued support, the infant might have foundered and died.

Long before accreditation became a recognized function, a series of statements had to be fashioned, based on a realistic consideration of what would be the next steps. The infant must creep before trying to walk, even with adult help.

The Constitution provides:

The object shall be to establish closer relationship between schools of music, and between them and the state boards or commissions, and also to cooperate with the various educational associations which may directly or indirectly affect the course of music.

With changes in labels are we not, thirty-eight years later,

carrying out the envisioned purposes of the founding fathers?

A second provision in the Constitution is equally important to an understanding of the role of the National Association of Schools of Music throughout the years.

It is understood that all decisions of the Association bearing on the policy and management of schools of music are to be advisory in their character.

The National Association of Schools of Music continues as a voluntary association of those institutions which believe that there is strength in union, that through mutual understanding and devotion to high principles the quality of music instruction at the college level may be raised continuously, and that the integrity and autonomy of any member institution shall be preserved. It has ever been the policy to assure full understanding of any new forward step before presentation for adoption by vote of the Association. Such deliberation often seemed to slow down desirable progress, but it was justified by absence of sabotage once the Association adopted the advanced step. This procedure has characterized the development of curricula in the several areas of concentration; first, at the baccalaureate level and later it undergirded the foundations of graduate work at the master's and doctoral levels. A leaf has been taken from the processes of medicine: the identification of symptoms of weakness and strength of new proposals similar in process to diagnostic checks by the physician; temperatures of the educational body politic are taken; consultations are held with other interested organizations and individuals; eventually a prognosis is reached and specific recommendations of treatment are presented for appropriate action.

The crystallization of this philosophy of operation was a slow process requiring patience and continuing education of our diverse types of music schools to the end that a step once taken was recognized by all the members as important and necessary to the welfare and health of our profession.

The problems concerning our profession are somewhat different than in other professional accrediting bodies such as in nursing, architecture, medicine, and law where legal procedures and requirements to practice are of long standing.

In his presidential address at the meeting in St. Louis in 1940, Howard Hanson summed up in the following words the accomplishments since 1928 when NASM became an organization of institutions granting degrees in music:

Most of the more elementary problems involved in our task as an accrediting agency have been successfully solved and NASM now represents the great majority of important schools of music in the United States.

Looking back to 1940 from the vantage point of 1962 we can see how relatively simple our problems of accreditation were at that juncture in our history. We were solely concerned with compatibility of an applicant institution with the NASM curricular standards, faculty competence, and with quality of product that received the professional degree Bachelor of Music. We were quite independent of other accrediting associations and had not arrived at the requirement of accreditation by a regional association as prerequisite to membership in NASM, though a considerable portion of our institutional members was so covered. The Graduate Commission had not yet come into existence. The problem of training teachers for vocal and/or instrumental music positions in public schools was only a faint shadow on the horizon in 1930 and was to grow more confused in the decade of the forties.

President Hanson further pointed out in 1940 two functions:

- a. We must continue to be zealous in the carrying out of our primary responsibility as an accrediting organization.
- b. We can now make an equally valuable contribution by serving as a clearing house for the dissemination of different philosophies in music education, and as a laboratory for the testing of new and experimental ideas on the pedagogy of our subject.

To carry out the first function, a *Manual of Accrediting* had been developed under the leadership of Rossiter Cole (Chicago), and examiners were appointed to serve in visitations of schools. In order to keep expenses low, examiners carried on examinations in their own geographical areas. We were conservative of our limited income from dues.

For the second function, a Research Council was established to carry on studies that are related to the work of the Commissions and yet require greater objectivity and more time than can be given by members of the Commissions.

At that meeting of 1940 Alonzo Myers of New York University and Chairman of the Accrediting Committee of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, spoke on possible cooperation between that organization and NASM. A few sentences from his address will set the tone of this introductory step in our next problem, i.e., the sharing of complementing responsibilities.

I represent the American Association of Teachers Colleges which has an equal interest in the education of teachers. We have certain interests in common, we share certain problems, and we can be of considerable help to each other. The two associations should complement each other. You know more about music and what education in music one needs in order to teach it than we do. Perhaps we know more about the professional education of teachers than you do. It is fair to assume that we are both completely serious and honest with reference to those interests. We are aware we have a special problem in accrediting institutions, mostly teachers colleges, in relation to the so-called special fields . . . The best single basis for cooperation would be to make *your* standards in relation to the education of teachers in public schools *our* standards, in the case of our member institutions teaching public school music.

There is the statement of the problem we are still struggling with today. It is the first printed acknowledgement of the problem in publications of the National Association of Schools of Music, dated December 27, 1940.

The American Association of Teachers Colleges initiated several conferences which later developed into the formation of several joint committees to study the problem projected by Alonzo Myers. Price Doyle, Wilfred Bain, and Edwin Kurtz acting for the NASM on the joint committee recommended a program of studies for approval of both associations. NASM adopted the proposals in 1943. At a meeting in February, 1943 AATC "decided to inform AATC member institutions of the negotiations of the joint committee and to send the institutions a copy of the curriculum as an acceptable and desirable curricular pattern."

Chairman Rowland of the AATC Committee on Cooperation in Special Fields stated that this was usual procedure, since AATC respected the autonomy of its member institutions. The joint committee sought \$30,000 to carry out a two-year survey of AATC members on this curriculum. No funds were found, however. Joint approval by MENC was also sought. A joint committee with MENC headed by President Marguerite Hood of that organization was appointed to serve in this tripartite negotiation.

As the debate on curricular patterns developed, G. W. Dienur, President of Central Missouri College and President of AATC, said in December of 1947:

I do not believe all music schools should be accredited by AATC or that all departments of music in teachers colleges be accredited by NASM. . . . There are many member schools of AATC that should not attempt to offer the Bachelor of Music Education degree.

Under conditions then and now, who is to issue the order to "cease

and desist?" Certainly not NASM, unless as a member school its program does not meet minimum standards. Certainly not AATC which accredits on the "total program" and can only "advise" a member of its weakness in any subject field.

In 1948 when the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education succeeded AATC the same joint committees were continued in operation. In 1950 NASM established another committee with Luther Richman as chairman to work with State Departments of Education to acquaint them with criteria approved by AACTE and NASM. Thus a new group of interested parties, the certification offices in each state, was brought into focus. At this same time the rumblings of a coming storm were pictured by A. J. Brumbaugh, Vice-President of the American Council on Education. His complete statement found in *Bulletin Number Twenty-Nine*, 1950 is worth reading. There is space for only a few salient observations here.

Many educational administrators these days view with grave concern the rapid growth of the accrediting movement in the United States. . . . In spite of efforts to check this growing importance of external influences, there continue to be more and more accrediting agencies, each endeavoring to apply its own self-formulated standards.

When the number of the agencies was few and procedures simple, they provided a means of easy evaluation of colleges and universities, for the purpose of interchange of students and admission of students from high school or to graduate study. These purposes were served adequately by regional associations and, for graduate accreditation, by the Association of American Universities. Today there are more than thirty major accrediting professional organizations, not counting the licensing boards, state departments of education, etc.

He summarizes both benefits and criticisms and sets forth four proposals to alleviate the tensions: first, an extensive survey; second, improvement of present accrediting procedures by avoidance of fixed standards and shifting from quantitative to qualitative standards; third, joint control by five large groups of institutional types. These three proposals resulted in the formation of the National Commission on Accrediting. He stated:

This commission itself will not accredit institutions, but it will review the procedures of accrediting agencies; will make recommendations to member institutions concerning their relationship with accrediting agencies; and will formulate methods for bringing about agreement between the practices of accrediting agencies and approve principles of accreditation to be formulated by the Commission.

There is no need to mention the fourth proposal. It did not eventu-

ate. The drama of accreditation has now reached the fourth act. Dramatic were some of the scenes in which officers and commission members of NASM participated. AACTE, MENC, and NASM were continuing their joint conferences, as it were, off stage. They were attempting to achieve unanimity of approval of certain minimum achievements in performance skills and in musicianship for all-grade level certification of teachers, elementary and secondary, instrumental and vocal. Constant pressure was exerted from various sources to reduce the courses in music content in order to provide room in hours credit for more courses in general education and in professional education. It was proposed that this all be achieved within the framework of the accepted one hundred twenty to one hundred twenty-eight hours credit in the baccalaureate degree. These pressures were in evidence before the advent of Sputnik and forcefully increased by the all but crushing rush to find and develop mathematicians and scientists. Peter Agnew, Chairman of the AACTE Coordinating Committee on Collegiate Problems of Teacher Education, reaffirmed at a conference with NASM and MENC committees: "the determination to have these supplementary schedules for special subjects including music ready for the February, 1952 meeting of AACTE."

Now back to the main stage. Price Doyle, President of NASM, reported at the meeting of November, 1951:

Your attention has been called in the past to certain aspects of accreditation. Our Association was invited to Washington last Spring to meet with the National Commission on Accrediting. To date nothing has happened.

Harrison Keller, then Director of New England Conservatory, assumed the presidency of NASM in 1952 and his report in 1953, almost two years after President Doyle's succinct report, described the thunder and lightening of the early meetings with NCA in 1951 and the peace and calm that ensued after a subsequent conference in Chicago. He notes that the NCA was organized and authorized to make a study of the present evils incident to accreditation practices and to present a plan which would correct all evils. He describes in detail the initial memorable meeting cited by President Doyle.

Group by group various professional associations such as the American Bar Association, American Medical Association, Engineers Council for Professional Development, National Architectural Accrediting Board, were invited in turn to meet in conferences with the Commission for the purpose of ascertaining information regarding activity of each group. The representatives of music organizations, including the American Musicological Society, College Music

Association, Music Educators National Conference, Music Teachers National Association, National Association of Schools of Music, and Society for Music in Liberal Arts Colleges were thus summoned to Washington. May I state that the initial contact with this Commission was quite shocking and, to say the least, baffling. The opening and indifferent attitude was, as in a legal trial 'to show reasons why we should exist; why accredit music at all'. I have never quite understood the psychology behind this action in view of subsequent events unless it was comparable to the alarmist doctor who tells his patient that he is hopelessly ill and on the brink of death and then proceeds to cure him and earn his everlasting gratitude. I shall pass quickly over this initial meeting in 1951.

At the Commission's request an *ad hoc* committee was selected to draw up a statement of aims and purposes. Dr. Moore was made chairman. The report brought forth one commendation from the Commission, namely, that we were more united than any group reporting.

A second meeting was called in January in Chicago. Prior to this a disturbing document was issued by NCA to the president of each college saying that certain professional organizations, NASM among those listed, 'would cease and desist at a given deadline and that no dues should be paid to these organizations thereafter nor should these Associations issue membership lists.'

Dr. Earl Moore, who had been in constant touch with the situation from its inception, joined me in Chicago and we found many representatives of other fields having pre-meetings to plan how best to combat what they anticipated would be an arbitrary plan to limit or abolish their services.

The atmosphere of this meeting was dramatically changed from the preceding one and what we heard from Dr. Gustavson, Chairman of NCA, was a reasonable, calm statement of objectives, plans for cooperative procedures, and at this time he enunciated a policy of putting this program into the hands of the Regional Associations, who would be asked by NCA to invite each so authorized professional association to consider a cooperative plan to be worked out in conferences in each area.

A brief explanation is in order. An authoritative source told us that the NCA officers found that as a result of their "cease and desist" pronouncement they had a "tiger by the tail". The conservative members of the Commission prevailed upon their firebreathing colleagues to restudy the responsibilities of NCA. From this emerged the plan of turning the whole problem back to the regions and to assign to a single agency for each field the responsibility for accreditation in that area and to report to the region appropriate action. This was a happy solution for both parties and thus provided Chancellor Gustavson with the basis for his peace-producing announcement at the Chicago meeting. President Keller continues:

Dr. Moore and I prepared a report based on our interpretation of the aims

and purposes as outlined at this meeting and presented it to Dr. Gustavson for his approval. This he gave and it was duly circulated.

In substance, NASM relinquished its self-assumed responsibility to accredit all music schools, whether independent or associated with colleges and universities. In return, NCA delegated to it the responsibility of accreditation of music schools, and obtained from the regional associations the promise to open the door to specialized schools and colleges.

Under the new plan, NASM reports the findings of the several commissions concerning music departments or schools to the appropriate region. NASM member schools gained materially in this new procedure, and several strong independent schools have been added to our list of members of NASM and a regional association as a result.

In the intervening years, each region and NASM have worked out procedures for visitation and reporting. The executive secretaries of the regional associations have been most cordial and helpful in achieving in so short a time a *modus operandi* that is a vast improvement on the limited type and breadth of information we were able to obtain when NASM was an independent agency and solely concerned with the quality of the professional degree Bachelor of Music. The importance of the delegation to NASM by NCA of the sole responsibility for accreditation of music was set forth by President Doty at the 1958 meeting in these words:

The Thirty-Fourth Annual Meeting of NASM represents the completion of one mission and the beginning of an opportunity for wider service to music. Such a moment in our history is consequently one fraught with more than ordinary gravity both for the present status of the Association and for its future.

Did President Doty envision the high drama of the next act which is now still on stage? We are seated in the theatre as deeply concerned observers though there is no thunder and lightening to inflame the senses. There is just a long drawn out and steady increase of tension arising out of a conflict of interest, initiated by NCA, probably without overt intention.

In the interim, AACTE had yielded its responsibility as an association of colleges of teacher education to a newly organized and differently constituted National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. NCA had designated NCATE as the single accrediting agency for teacher education. Immediately the area of conflict became apparent. Presentations were made to NCA by NASM to leave with NASM the



responsibility for Music Education along with all other music courses. NCA ruled that Education is a professional area and thus included Music Education. A second request for review was made and a hearing granted. The original delegation of separation of responsibility was reaffirmed in principle but modified to the extent that NASM would certify to the region and to NCATE on the quality of music content courses. NCATE was to be responsible for accreditation of all courses in music education and for the program of courses leading to certification in teacher education. To clarify working procedures and sharpen the lines of responsibility, the officers of NCATE and NASM drew up a *Memorandum of Agreement*. Copies will be distributed at a later session. Recently some minor revisions arising out of two years of operational experience have been ratified and are a part of this document.

Questions of interpretation of statements of policy or in announced curricula have arisen from time to time. Joint visitations are relatively new accreditation procedures and examiners for both agencies gain experience best in specific confrontations with problems in individual institutions. The training of visitors for this type of reporting is somewhat different from that required formerly when the only issue was membership in NASM.

One final quotation from President Gorton's address one year ago seems appropriate here.

Our relations with NCATE, with whom we cooperate in matters relating to music education, remain congenial and mutually helpful. It is heartening to report that your President received not a single answer to his invitation to NASM members to furnish him with specific evidence of cases where pressure had been brought by NCATE on an institution to move music education from the music department to the department or school of education. We have received a clear statement from W. Earl Armstrong, Executive Director of NCATE, that his organization has no intention of suggesting such internal change in any college or university.

Whether we are near the end of this act or awaiting dramatic tableau is not for this speaker to prognosticate.

Before concluding this document your speaker would like to ask the indulgence and correction of the next speaker, where necessary, for any statements about NCA which may be inaccurate or have an improper connotation. William K. Selden in his position as Executive Secretary of NCA is the authority on the entire history and rationale of accrediting. At all times he has been gracious in studying our problems, generous in counsel, and an inspiration in interpreting the

basic philosophy of the agency he so ably represents. We in music owe him a great debt of gratitude and we welcome him to our midst.

My sincere thanks to Vice-President Hunt for allowing me to relive with you our birth and some of the great moments in our maturation as an active and creative instrument in furthering the art to which we are giving our devotion and our lives. You, the present representatives of member institutions, are writing the history that may be relived by another speaker in the year 2002. We of the passing generation can only say that we had a great opportunity. You have an equally adventuresome one. We have done our best. May the Lord bless you and give you grace for stronger leadership and greater achievement.

# ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

## *An Example of Social Cooperation*

WILLIAM K. SELDEN, *Executive Secretary*  
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ACCREDITING

It is my desire to share with you today some ideas for which I do not necessarily claim originality but on which I am forced to reflect by the position that I happen presently to be filling. There is no organization anywhere like the National Commission on Accrediting, and there are few positions which provide an opportunity for an incumbent to have official and unofficial relations in matters of policy with so many educational associations and to be exposed to their common but diverse interests. As a result of these factors I am stimulated to do what human lethargy would otherwise discourage. I am stimulated to think and to observe some of the social developments and influences which are at play on educational organizations, and to analyze the desires of these organizations to have some say in the quality and type of education provided in their special fields of interest. Let me present to you some of these observations to which you can respond individually in the general discussion which I hope will follow.

My first observation is that education is a manifestation of the social aspirations of a people. In other words, education develops not as a distinct element in society but as a result of the influences of many forces, including the political philosophy of a nation. I will indicate one example among a number which could be chosen.

For many years the United States has supported the theory that every individual is entitled to as much education as he is individually capable of absorbing. The fact that this theory is not fully attained in practice does not detract from the fact that the nation believes in this philosophical principle, and that the principle has been an important factor in shaping our pattern of higher education. It has encouraged the creation of numerous colleges, universities, art institutes, technical institutes, conservatories of music, correspondence schools,

schools of hotel management, cosmetology, mortuary science, and almost everything else. As one of our sons comments about television advertising — you name it, we have it.

Lest one inadvertently assumes that the philosophy of education for everyone according to his capabilities has been the single factor to encourage a proliferation of institutions and programs of study, it should be noted that there have been and continue to be other equally important influences. We must recognize the significance of our non-centralized, federal form of government with its indirect Constitutional delegation to the states of authority for education. We must recognize the influence of our Protestant denominational heritage with its diverse sectarian interests in education. We must appreciate the effect of the geographical expanse of this country and the corresponding local stress on and desire for autonomy, a human reaction not limited to educational matters. And we must recognize how the former economic policy of *laissez-faire* permeated most of our other social concepts. In fact, we continue to find some individuals espousing the position that any group should be free at any time to create any kind of educational institution and be subject to no external check or restrictions.

These examples should be sufficient to demonstrate the validity of the observation that education is a manifestation of the social aspirations of a people, and that it reflects the many forces in society, as well as affecting, in turn, these same forces. However, in our discussions this afternoon we are not primarily concerned with all of education, nor even all of higher education, but more particularly with accreditation in higher education. In speaking of this subject I wish to indicate that, as with education, there are forces at play on the organizations which are conducting or wishing to conduct programs of accreditation. With your indulgence I would like to describe some of these forces and to be bold enough to suggest developments which we would do well to anticipate.

\* \* \* \* \*

The growth of enrollment in higher education is a fact with which all of us are familiar, so familiar that we may fail to analyze carefully the dimensions of these changing conditions. Despite the possibility of surfeiting you with too many figures, I am presenting the following statistics because of their relevance to the growth and development of educational organizations.

In 1919-20, when medicine was the only field which could claim to be conducting professional accreditation, the colleges and universities of the country awarded a total of 48,622 bachelor's and first professional degrees, 4,279 master's degrees, and only 615 doctor of

philosophy or equivalent degrees. By 1959-60 the number of bachelor's and first professional degrees had increased to 394,889, in other words eight times as many as forty years earlier; 74,497 master's degrees, over 18 times as many; and 9,829 doctor of philosophy and equivalent degrees, or 16 times as many.

Approaching these developments in a different way we note that in 1948-49 there were 1,295 officially listed degree granting institutions, which figure by 1960-61 had grown to 1,415, an increase of 120. The significant feature of these figures is that during this twelve-year period those institutions which offered the bachelor's or first professional as their highest degree actually decreased by almost one hundred, from 834 to 741. In contrast, the number of master's degree granting institutions grew from 307 to 455 and the Ph.D. or equivalent degree granting institutions increased from 154 to 219.

All of you are undoubtedly familiar with the growth in the number of degrees in music, but it is pertinent to include them with these other figures for purposes of comparison: 5,284 bachelor's of music in 1947-48, and 7,593, or an increase of more than forty per cent, in 1959-60; and 1,043 master's in music in the former year compared to 2,240, or more than twice as many, in 1959-60.

Although not immediately relevant to the point which I hope to demonstrate, you will also be interested in certain references to degrees in teacher education, especially because of your long standing and understandable concerns with the accreditation of music education. In recent years of all the earned degrees awarded, teacher education has accounted for approximately twenty-two per cent of the bachelor's and first professional, forty-six per cent of the master's and seventeen per cent of the doctorates. This last figure, seventeen per cent of the doctorates, is surpassed in percentage only by the degrees at this level awarded in the physical sciences. In other respects the degrees in teacher education surpass in numbers those in other fields of study.

And now only a few more statistics, all of which have been obtained, incidentally, from reports of the Office of Statistical Information and Research of the American Council on Education. From a study of certain selected universities it has been ascertained that in 1897, when only a relatively few graduate students were enrolled, seventy-one and three tenths per cent were in humanities and social studies. By 1957 almost fifty per cent were enrolled in the biological and physical sciences. These ratios have special significance when we appreciate that the bulk of government sponsored research is concentrated in the biological and physical sciences at one hundred major universities, the ones which offer most of the advanced degrees. In

1959 the research and development performed for the government by educational institutions was supported by federal funds totalling \$616,900,000. Within three years, that is in 1962, this figure had grown to \$1,156,500,000, which represented twelve per cent of the federal funds allocated for research and development this year. The federal funds which have been assigned to educational institutions for basic research have grown from \$228,600,000 in 1959 to \$540,500,000 in 1962.

The United States Office of Education Bulletin Number Five (1963) entitled *A Survey of Federal Programs in Higher Education* emphasizes that "substantial proportions of the operating budgets of schools of medicine, public health, engineering, and divisions or departments in the natural sciences are now derived from Federal funds." This report observes that "current Federal activities tend to increase the gap between the strong and the less strong institutions, to further the separation of graduate from undergraduate instruction, to increase the reward and prestige of research in comparison with teaching, and to lower morale of faculty members in fields not well supported."

So much for most of the statistics. Let us next try to interpret them for the purpose of our discussions this afternoon. We find that there are now almost twice as many graduate degrees being awarded each year as there were bachelor's and first professional degrees forty years earlier. Obviously this means that there are more students enrolled in graduate study; that there are more professors and faculty personnel teaching graduate students; and that there is more attention concentrated on the growing professional and specialized fields of study.

General liberal education, which comprises much of undergraduate education, is intended to prepare students for their individual self-development and for a broad place in society. In contrast, professional education is customarily intended to prepare students for a specific type of position in society for which identified skills and knowledge are required. And the model of these identified skills and knowledge is usually prescribed by a national society which is invariably formed whenever there are even a few individuals with the necessary attributes to band together and to speak of themselves as comprising a profession. It is this increasing professionalization in our society to which I am calling your attention.

What are some of the factors which are encouraging an increase in professionalization? Advanced study and graduate work are a major factor, and we have seen to what extent the number of institutions offering graduate work has been growing, as well as the total enroll-

ment in them. We have an indication of the amount of support given by the federal government for research and advanced study in our universities. And we are aware of the accelerated growth both in depth and breath of human knowledge which encourages specialization.

At this point we should recognize that it is much easier, and often more satisfying, for the scientist whose special field is, let us say, plasma physics, to converse with his colleague in the same field located on a campus several hundred miles away than it is for him to explore not merely scientific questions but most educational issues with a fellow professor of music whose office may be located in an adjacent building. This sense of identity with a specialized field of study is accentuated as the fields become progressively more specialized, and as the size of faculties increases. Between 1950 and 1960, in only ten years, the total number of college and university faculty personnel in the country expanded from 248,749 to 382,664, an increase of more than fifty per cent.

Grants from federal funds, which we have already mentioned, further encourage the strengthening of national professional organizations and disciplinary societies. In some cases the impetus may arise even within a department or agency of the government for the creation of a national organization representing a specific field of study in order that officials of the government may be able to hold conferences and discussions with representatives of a formally organized group. In other cases, as is presently the situation of the National Association of Schools of Music, the members of the already organized association recognize the need for a permanent staff to represent their interests on a continuing basis in Washington and throughout the country. This need involves representations before various groups, including Congressional committees and other professional organizations or disciplinary societies with whom there may be common interests, or even conflicting interests. The members of NASM can easily identify both kinds of interests which prevail in the field of music.

But these are not the only factors which encourage professionalization. The industrialization of society has stimulated the organization of groups representing various interests, as has also the extension by government of many needed social services. A visitor to Washington is usually appalled at the number and diversity of organizations which have office space, if not buildings of their own, in that center of national and international importance. On reflection one can realize that democratic societies with their higher and higher standards of living require complex organizations to operate the numerous social functions, to provide citizens with the means of expressing their diverse interests,

and to make it possible for individuals to develop a feeling of identity. The larger our population grows the more readily sub-groups become defined. This fact is apparent whether in industry, labor, the arts, education, the professions, the country club sets, or the politics of civil government.

Of course there is the factor of social status which presents a psychological influence on individuals and groups. A case in point is the influence of the profession of medicine. Every other profession or would-be profession aspires to the position which medicine has attained; and every other profession, consciously or unconsciously, endeavors to pattern its organizational structure and functions along the lines of the first professional association to undertake accrediting. But more about accrediting in a few minutes.

Social status for individuals and for organizations is also a factor of greater influence during periods of stress and strain and during times of marked social change. A reference to the emergence of a dominant communist state within our lifetime is sufficient to indicate one type of stress which indirectly influences individuals to seek identity with groups, including professional societies, as a means of attaining further social status. A reference to the changed agricultural conditions of the past one hundred years will portray one of the major social revolutions of all times, as well as another significant force for group identity and professionalization. This month the United States Department of Agriculture issued a report which indicates that in only five of the fifty states does farming provide fifteen per cent or more of the total employment. Today the farm labor force for a population of 188 million people is no larger than it was in 1860 when there was a population of thirty-one million. And further, there are only three and one half million farmers and farm workers living in rural areas compared to five and one half million skilled and semi-skilled blue collar workers who reside in such localities.

Turning to "the fruits of technological progress" the *Monthly Economic Letter* for November, 1962 issued by the First National City Bank of New York states:

Technological advances have gone forward over the generations. While creating transition problems — very real to the individuals and industries affected — they have produced a revolutionary improvement in the welfare of people. They have not created ever-rising pools of unemployment. In 1900, we had twenty-seven and one half million persons employed. Today we could produce the 1900 national income with only eleven million workmen. The population meanwhile has risen one hundred forty per cent. We have more people to support. It would take twenty-eight million workmen to produce the



1900 *per capita* national income. But employment today is neither eleven million nor twenty-eight million. We have no less than seventy-one million persons employed. The proportion of the population that is working has actually increased, from thirty-six to thirty-nine per cent, while the average work week has shrunk from fifty-three hours to less than forty.

What are these extra forty-three million workers doing? They are producing all the marvelous conveniences unknown to people in 1900 — modern motor cars, airplanes, radios, televisions, electrical appliances of a thousand varieties, and so forth. No one wants to go back to the horse-and-buggy days. The march of history insists we continue forward.

That it does, but as we continue forward during this present revolutionary period, history shows also that we look to organizations and groups to provide the economic, the political, the social, the professional support and protection which we as individuals are incapable of providing for ourselves, and which no government, even in a socialized state, can furnish equally to all its citizens.

It is to his professional association that the professional man turns, and it is this organization from which he expects a number of services, including professional protection. In this era of stress and strain and rapid social change we find a higher degree of expectancy that the profession will not only assist and stimulate the individual in his continued professional education, but that the profession will protect him from entrance into the profession of inadequately and shoddily trained men and women. What is more, society supports this expectation by assigning sometimes formally and sometimes informally to the profession the responsibility of identifying the qualities, and the type and extent of education needed to prepare an individual to qualify for professional practice. It is at this point that we return to the question of accreditation on which I wish to close.

\* \* \* \* \*

Early in this talk I indicated that there were certain developments which we should anticipate and which we might be able to identify. The first is that we must expect a continued expansion of knowledge with corresponding specialization in the fields of study. We must expect a growing number of professional organizations and disciplinary societies to be formed, all of which will be concerned with the education offered to future members of the societies. And we must expect fortunately that all of these associations will not wish to express their interests through formal programs of accreditation. However, many will make plans to do so, and some will actually initiate programs of accreditation to meet not only their own professional desires but also, and more importantly, the needs of society.

We may anticipate in our lifetime no lessening of the pace of social revolution. Rapid social changes will continue for some decades, and the accompanying human stress and strain will further support professionalization. With growing professionalization we must collectively guard against undue conservatism with its animosity against new methods, against rigidity with its emphasis on procedure, and against selfishness with its desire for exclusiveness and with its interest in status and remuneration.

Accreditation improperly conducted could support professional conservatism, rigidity and selfishness. It could prevent the introduction of new methods, and it could indirectly place limitations on enrollment.

In contrast, accreditation properly conducted can and does provide, even with all its limitations and inadequacies, a protection for the public and an assurance to the profession. It can and does offer stimulation for continued improvement. And it can and does indicate, sometimes after too much of a social lag, the proper direction for the education of the future members of the profession.

For accreditation to be properly conducted the professional association must recognize that its social obligations include cooperation: cooperation among its members, cooperation with other professions, and cooperation with the universities. On behalf of the National Commission on Accrediting I am pleased to state that we have found a spirit and desire for only this type of cooperation among the officers of the National Association of Schools of Music.

## COORDINATE RESPONSIBILITIES OF NASM AND NCATE

*A Joint Venture in Perspective*

CHESTER C. TRAVELSTEAD, *Dean*  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION  
UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO

I feel honored to be invited to participate today in the convention program of the National Association of Schools of Music. I value this opportunity very highly for several reasons: *First*, because I know well and respect deeply many of the individuals seated in this audience; men and women with whom I have been closely associated in the field of music education for many years; men and women who as teachers, performers, or administrators have made significant contributions to music education in this country; *second*, because I appreciate very much the fact that this Association is devoting the major part of this convention program to accreditation in higher education, a topic of crucial importance in our society today; and *third*, because I consider my connection with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education one of my most important and pleasant professional responsibilities; a connection which involves close cooperation with your Association in our joint concern about the need for better music teachers for America's children and youth.

I should also mention in these introductory remarks that in reality I am substituting for W. Earl Armstrong, Director of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. He was asked some time ago to speak to you at this convention, but due to a conflict of dates he was unable to accept the invitation. He has asked me to convey to you his best wishes for a successful convention. I would like to add here in passing that it is my considered judgment that all those in this country interested in obtaining larger numbers of competent teachers for our children are deeply indebted to Earl Armstrong for the excellent and dedicated work which he has done during the last

eight years as Director of the Council. His efforts, coupled with those of hundreds of others who have worked closely with him during this time, have led to new dignity, better processes, and considerable improvement in accreditation of teacher education programs in this country. NCATE still has its critics, its problems, and some short-comings as has been indicated in somewhat exaggerated form in an October issue of *Saturday Review* by an author who, let us say charitably, was not in possession of a number of relevant facts about this matter. At the same time, this Council has helped perhaps more than any other single agency in the last fifty years to elevate the entire teaching profession, particularly the education of teachers, to a new high level of which we can all be proud. The *Saturday Review* author chose to say little or nothing about this more favorable and positive side of the picture. Whether this obvious omission was the result of his having at his disposal only inadequate and incorrect information, or whether it was the result of his using only carefully selected facts to support a preconceived notion which he may have had about both the Council and the education of teachers in general, is a question for each reader of the article to decide. I would suggest, however, that before any one comes to conclusions about the matters under question, he read some other materials in the *Saturday Review*. Several letters in answer to the article have already been carried in a November issue. These were written by W. Earl Armstrong of the Council, William K. Selden, Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Accrediting who is in the audience today, and by Donald Davies, Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Then I understand that a December issue of the periodical will carry an answering article written by Richard Gilman, Dean of Carleton College, one of the institutions mentioned in the original article. A complete, broad, and objective view of the matters involved is possible only if all of this material is read. May I request, therefore, that those of you here today who may be interested read these three letters and Dean Gilman's article at your earliest convenience.

Now to my topic for this morning: *NASM and NCATE, A Joint Venture Viewed in Perspective*. In considering what should be said about this, I decided to group my remarks into three general categories:

- 1) *The Formal Statements of Agreement between NASM and NCATE*, both the original one completed in 1959 with the help of William Selden and the National Commission on Accrediting, and the revision made and signed in 1962. I shall speak of the extent to which these agreements are serving the purposes of our two groups,

the problems connected with implementing these agreements, and possible improvements which might be made in them.

2) *The Seven Standards of NCATE* and their applicability to preparation programs for teachers of music in our elementary and secondary schools. Related to this matter is that of the specific standards or guidelines for music education programs thought by NASM and MENC to be minimal and necessary in the evaluation of these programs for teachers of music.

3) *Trends and Problems in Teacher Education and Its Accreditation*, as viewed by NCATE, and the relationship of these trends and problems to both present and possible future programs for the preparation of music teachers.

### NASM-NCATE AGREEMENTS

The 1959 and the 1962 agreements between our two organizations seem to be serving very worthwhile purposes. Actually both of these agreements are substantially the same except that under the provisions of the more recent one an institution may request and get a joint evaluation by NASM and NCATE even though the institution is already a member of NASM and has been examined by it within the past five years. The remainder of the two documents is about the same.

I am sure all of you know that the essence of both these agreements is for NASM to have the responsibility and authority to examine and accredit all collegiate programs of study in music except Music Education, and that NCATE has the responsibility and authority for examining and accrediting all Music Education programs.

There were and are cogent reasons for separating these responsibilities and authorities and I believe the soundness of these reasons is becoming more and more apparent to both our groups. Problems and questions which arise from time to time about these delegated responsibilities seem to be relatively unimportant when viewed in relation to the advantage of such separation and delegation.

The standing agreements also call for NASM to develop and make available to NCATE a list of qualified persons in music education upon whom NCATE can draw for team members when music education programs graduating ten or more students in music education each year are to be evaluated. Such persons have been used on NCATE teams frequently, even in some cases when the institution being visited graduates fewer than ten music education students each year. As far as I know, this agreement has been working out very well. I am sure some improvements might be made in this particular procedure, but

I suspect such improvements can best be made separately when dealing with each institution involved.

One distinct advantage of having the NASM panel member serving on an NCATE team is the assurance that a competent person in the field of music education will be on the spot to observe and describe the preparation programs for prospective teachers of music in our schools. Another even more important advantage of this agreement, however, is the fact that the NCATE team as a unit, including the music educator, views and evaluates teacher education on the campus being visited as a whole, i.e., as an entity or umbrella, if you please, of which music education programs are only a part. This broadly representative team of NCATE does, as most of you know, look at the whole quilt as well as at the individual pieces. This means attention to several aspects of teacher education on that campus including objectives, organization and administration, admission, continuous screening, faculty, programs (including balance among general education, subject-matter specialization, and professional education), professional laboratory experiences, facilities, and instructional materials. The music educator, then, not only looks at details of the music program itself but is expected to view, along with the team as a whole, the entire image of teacher education on that campus.

Another problem connected with this entire visitation procedure has to do with the relatively short time the team is on the campus of an institution. It is indeed difficult to do all that should be done on such a visit in only two and one-half or three days. Then writing down what one sees and finds in such a way as to be altogether fair, both to the institution and to the profession, is a challenge to the most able and dedicated person. All accreditation efforts are beset with these same difficulties. Our hope here in the NASM-NCATE joint venture is that we can and will get only the most competent and dedicated persons to serve on these teams and on the committees and Council which review the team reports and in turn make judgments about the institution involved. In this connection, I might tell you that several hundred professional people are involved in this NCATE process each year. In fact, during the academic year 1962-63 NCATE will send teams to visit ninety-one institutions. With each team averaging about six or seven members this means at least six hundred persons giving their time absolutely free to serving on teams alone. Then we have a Council of nineteen members and a visitation and appraisal committee composed of thirty-one members. Each of these people will give several days of their time this year to this important professional cause. Equated into dollars, this would be a staggering

sum. So, I am sure you realize the difficulties involved in carrying out the functions of the Council in ways which are altogether satisfactory to all parties concerned.

### NCATE STANDARDS

Now to a consideration of the second category; the seven NCATE standards, their strengths and weaknesses, and their applicability to preparation programs in the field of music education. A little earlier I referred briefly to these standards. Now I would like to describe them more in detail and to point out the general philosophy underlying them so that you might understand them more fully.

To begin with, NCATE's standards are somewhat broad and general in nature. They lend themselves to flexibility but at the same time uphold firmly certain basic principles thought to be highly important. None of the standards lists particular and specific requirements, such as a minimum number of books in the professional library or materials center. Neither is a minimum or maximum number of semester hours of professional education courses stipulated. The standards do not even outline what kinds or how much course work should make up the general education block of the teacher education programs. Standard V, however, says that each program must be a well balanced one with respect to general education, subject matter specialization, and professional education. This leaves to the individual institution the way in which it sets up this balance. This characteristic of flexibility is a strength in the eyes of those who believe in considerable flexibility and diversity, but others consider this very point a weakness inasmuch as various interpretations of such general and flexible standards can and quite often do result in the accreditation of institutions with great and broad ranges of requirements and electives.

Right or wrong, and I am among those who believe it is right, the Council has stated its standards in such a way as to allow each institution much variety, individuality and diversity in its teacher education programs.

Standard I, *Objectives of Teacher Education*, is designed and worded so as to be useful in measuring the image in which teacher education is held on a particular campus. By means of this standard the Council wishes to determine how strongly the institution views its commitment to teacher education, how many programs and degrees in teacher education it offers, and the extent to which the central administration and faculty of the institution consider their responsibilities for teacher education to be central or peripheral.

In general, this Standard helps both the visiting team and the council to get a bird's-eye view of the hopes, aspirations, and present status of teacher education on the campus being visited. Even more important, it is instrumental in getting at the tenor, the atmosphere, the flavor, and the conditions in which these programs are carried on. Another way of putting it is this: Does teacher education on the campus (its purposes, its faculty, its facilities, its graduates) have the respect and support of administration, faculty, and students? Is it deemed a dignified and worthwhile activity at this institution? Such questions are obviously most important. If the answers are negative, then it follows that the other six Standards become hollow, meaningless, and useless. This point is particularly significant with reference to music education programs. For example, if a music department views its music education program only as a "bread and butter" program carried on principally to support its conservatory-type activities, then that institution's music education program should not and usually will not be accredited.

Standard II, *Organization and Administration for Teacher Education*, is intended to be a measure against which the institution's plan for organizing and administering its teacher education program is viewed. The important question for which the Council seeks an answer is whether all relevant resources at this institution are being marshalled in support of teacher education programs and how this matter is handled. What representative group, council, or advisory committee is responsible for doing this? What person, if any, speaks authoritatively for and about teacher education as a whole on this campus? To what extent are his authority and responsibility understood and supported by the central administration of the institution?

According to an article in the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, President Dickey of the University of Kentucky, made some rather peculiar suggestions concerning teacher education this last week in a speech delivered at a meeting of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities: 1) That Colleges of Education be eliminated on the university campus and that teacher education responsibilities be put in the hands of the liberal arts departments, because, he is quoted as saying, there is such a rift between Colleges of Education and the subject matter disciplines; 2) That national accrediting agencies are forcing teacher education programs into a single, inflexible mold and that they are stifling efforts of institutions to experiment with new and different kinds of teacher education programs.

I have two reactions to President Dickey's suggestions and they are both negative. 1) In the first place, putting all aspects of teacher



education programs back into the liberal arts departments would be turning the educational calendar back forty years, at least. President Dickey not only knows it would be turning back, but he also knows the reasons why it did not work then and will not work now or in the future. Liberal arts and subject matter specialization are important and necessary for all the professions; not only teaching, but medicine, law, nursing, and engineering as well. Long ago we passed the point in this country where the liberal arts colleges or departments in universities could be expected fully to educate persons for any of these professions. If we eliminate Colleges of Education, then we must eliminate Colleges of Medicine also. The so-called rift or feud between the professional educator and the liberal arts faculty is fast disappearing on the campuses of leading universities throughout the land, and I was of the opinion that the University of Kentucky, my own *Alma Mater*, was one of these. Now more than at any other time in our history, are institutions marshalling all their relevant resources to the support of teacher education programs. Now, more than ever, are the departments and Colleges of Education working closely with the subject matter disciplines in developing broader and more effective teacher education programs. In my opinion, NCATE is largely responsible for this wholesome development, because its Standard II requires this broad, cooperative approach. Perhaps President Dickey has not read or does not understand this Standard. If not, perhaps he should become aware of it, in all fairness to his own institution which is fully accredited by NCATE. 2) Second, if President Dickey is referring to NCATE when he says national accrediting agencies are putting teacher education into a single, inflexible mold and are stifling efforts of institutions to experiment with new and different kinds of teacher education programs, he should consult the 1962 list of 385 institutions accredited by NCATE. He would find there; a) Liberal Arts Colleges, large and small, public and private, secular and religious; b) State Universities, large and small, most very complex in nature and organization; c) Land Grant Colleges and Universities; d) State Colleges of all types, and e) Teachers Colleges. Furthermore, he would find a wide range of types of teacher education programs, some of them experimental but all adhering to the seven basic and sound standards to which I have referred.

In my opinion, President Dickey has merely muddied the waters unnecessarily either with his tongue in his cheek or because of misinformation.

Colleges and universities ranking high on both Standard I and Standard II have an excellent foundation upon which to build. Our

experience in NCATE shows that the institutions which have taken care of these fundamental principles outlined in these two statements usually measure rather high on the other Standards too unless they are in deplorable financial circumstances. A lack of money, of course, gets many of them in trouble. If, for example, a school has little or no money for additional buildings, equipment, faculty salaries, or instructional materials it cannot have creditable teacher education programs no matter how strong the moral commitment to these programs may be.

Standard III, *Student Personnel Programs and Services for Teacher Education*, includes a consideration of admission standards to teacher education, advisement, continuous screening throughout the program, recommendation for certification, placement, and follow-up services. The need for all these things is so obvious that I consider it unnecessary to elaborate. I would say in passing that too many students throughout the country, including some in music education, are deprived of many of the services mentioned here.

Standard IV is concerned with *Qualifications of the Faculty in Professional Education*, including those responsible for music education courses and seminars and the supervision of student teachers having music assignments. The education and total experience of these faculty members are studied carefully in the light of their assignments at the institution. Quite frequently we find that some of the faculty members are assigned to areas of teaching for which neither their formal education nor their experience qualifies them. In such cases the institution is told it must correct the situation before it can be fully accredited.

Standard V, *Curricula for Teacher Education*, deals with the nature, scope, and balance of each preparation program offered. Like the other Standards, this one is also broad and general; too much so, in the eyes of many. Because it deals with elements which are usually counted and measured in numerical terms such as semester hours, it is subject to a wider variety of interpretation by visiting teams than is any other one Standard. As a matter of fact, Standard V is now in the process of being revised in the hope that a somewhat more specific statement will make it easier for visiting teams to measure and at the same time to cut down somewhat on the extremely wide range of requirements and electives. The proposed revision of this Standard will be submitted to interested groups for their reactions and suggestions before it is finally adopted. This means, I believe, that your Association will be invited to view the proposed revision as it may relate to Music Education degree programs.

Standard VI is concerned with the nature, quality, and scope of *Professional Laboratory Experiences*, including student teaching. The questions asked here are: How early in their programs do the students begin to observe and participate with children at work and at play? What is the sequence of these experiences? What classroom study precedes and accompanies them? What supervision is available for such activities? How and when is a student admitted to student teaching? How long does this experience last and under what conditions? The Council is of the opinion that the area of professional laboratory experiences is about the most important one in which the student engages, and therefore, the Standard by which these things are measured is considered also to be of major significance.

Standard VII, *Facilities and Instructional Materials for Teacher Education*, is concerned with the physical quarters in which various aspects of the teacher education programs are carried on and with the professional materials available to the students in these programs. Even though it would be conceded by any thoughtful person that it is possible to carry on an adequate program in poor quarters and with inadequate professional materials, it is the experience of the Council that continued neglect and deficiency in this area are the forerunners to action of denial of accreditation, or at least to only provisional accreditation until the matter is corrected.

I hope that you and your colleagues in the field of music education agree that all these seven Standards are sound ones and that their application to preparation programs in this specialized field is appropriate and helpful in judging the quality of these programs. Certainly it must be agreed that any serious violation of even one of these broad Standards would jeopardize any teacher education program, including programs in Music Education.

What about the use of the more specific *Guide* for the development of music education programs? I am sure you are acquainted with the *Guide*, published and distributed by NCATE at the request of representatives of both NASM and MENC. Its chief value is for institutions to use it, far in advance of an NCATE visit, as a general pattern for the development of their music programs. There have been suggestions from several quarters that this or some other more specific pattern for music education be used directly by NCATE teams at the time of the visits. The Council does not believe such a practice would support or enhance the basic objectives of accreditation in this field. The same is true of other specialized fields such as home economics, art education, industrial arts, business education, and physical education. The Council does not now use, nor does it expect in the future

to use, or attempt to enforce several sets of standards developed by and for these special fields. The Council can apply and enforce only its own Standards; those which it and its constituent organizations have developed and approved together.

### TRENDS AND PROBLEMS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The third and final category is that of trends and problems as viewed by NCATE, and the relationship of these trends and problems to NASM and those responsible for development of preparation programs in the field of Music Education. There are several minor and perhaps unimportant problems related to the development and accreditation of teacher education programs including those in Music Education. I shall not even mention these here. I do wish, however, to mention and speak briefly on two or three trends and at least one major problem and the particular implications of these for the development, operation, and accreditation of Music Education programs.

First, I want to discuss the matter of duration of these programs. In recent years, nearly all states in this country have based teacher certification on four years of collegiate preparation usually culminating in the awarding of a baccalaureate degree. It seems reasonable to assume that many of these states will continue on this same basis for a number of years. Yet there is definitely a trend, even though only a gradual and slow-moving one, toward five years of preparation. The old feud of how to slice and reslice the "four-year pie" has just about run its course. Within the usual 120-124 semester hours in a baccalaureate program, the only way to increase one segment is to decrease another segment. For example, if you and your colleagues in Music Education wish to increase the amount of applied music, you can do it only by cutting down the amount of music theory, general education, or professional education. One then finds that already these other segments are at a minimum level and therefore should not be tampered with. As a matter of fact, still other groups believe that general education or professional education should be increased in scope and yet few are willing at the same time to make corresponding reductions in applied or theoretical music. The next step, then, has been to plan five-year programs. New Mexico has recently adopted such a program and is definitely of the opinion that all aspects of these preparation programs will be greatly improved through a planned five-year program of study. A person in New Mexico can still teach, but for a limited time only, when he has completed four years of work. He can get permanent licensure only after successful completion of a planned five-year program culminating in the master's degree. Cer-

tain stipulations included in the new regulations assure a better balance than ever before among the several segments of the preparation programs.

I not only suggest, therefore, but I urge all of you to begin definite plans for five-year programs in music education. It is not only desirable and wise to do so. It is imperative. Teachers of the future will have at least five years of preparation and music teachers must not be left behind.

Another trend which I commend to you is that of total campus planning and development of teacher education programs, including those in music education. The time is past when a single isolated department can with effectiveness and success plan, develop, and operate a program separately and without the help and support of the rest of the campus. NCATE has as one of its basic principles that teacher education is a total institutional responsibility. If it is not so now on your respective campuses, I suggest that you begin immediately to work toward such a goal. I can assure you that the rewards are rich and most worthwhile.

Finally I want to speak briefly about admission to teacher education programs. As I mentioned earlier, this admission is over and above admission to the institution. This is a real problem on any campus, but proper attention to it is imperative not only for NCATE accreditation but because no program of preparation can be successful if the students admitted to it are not required to meet or surpass certain standards thought to be important.

This matter is even more crucial for music education programs chiefly because of the great deficiency in musical skill found in most students wishing or hoping to enter these programs. It is quite obvious that certain minimum levels of performance (vocal and/or instrumental) must in the future be expected and required before a student is given full admission to music education programs. Failure to recognize and take action on this point has brought on many problems in these programs. Especially is action along this line imperative in admission to music education programs if institutions expect to continue the four-year pattern of preparation. Extending the total period to five years would help to alleviate this problem but would not eliminate it.

In closing I would like to express to all of you the appreciation of NCATE for the opportunity to work with your fine organization as all of us together continue our efforts to improve preparation programs for prospective teachers of music for this nation's children and youth. Finally, I want to thank you for your courteous listening here today. It has been a distinct pleasure for me to be with you.

# THE FUNCTION OF THE REGIONAL ASSOCIATION IN THE ACCREDITATION OF SPECIALIZED AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

F. TAYLOR JONES, *Executive Secretary*  
COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION  
MIDDLE STATES ASSOCIATION

## I

You know, of course, that there are six regional associations of colleges and universities in the United States, each of which is autonomous. They have much in common, but each began as a local response to local area needs and problems, needs and problems which were not and are not in all respects alike over the country. Some of the regional associations have been at this business of accrediting considerably longer than others. With a few exceptions on the West Coast, their memberships do not overlap. Until rather recently, not feeling the need for much intercommunication, they have developed somewhat differing traditions and ways of doing things. They are decidedly not monolithic. So one who tries to speak for all six regional associations has certain difficulties and his hearers should have parallel reservations. Both he and they are aware that he does not know it all.

Yet on a philosophical level it is possible to represent the six regionals with reasonable assurance, and in many respects this may be done on the procedural level too for nowadays there is a good deal of communication among them and a continuing effort to coordinate their views and their work. There is no interest whatever in merging them into one national body, or even in resolving all the discrepancies among them. Their regional quality and responsibility is one of their great strengths, with its resultant flexibility and responsiveness. But this unabashed individuality creates problems when one tries to explain to a national organization what "the regionals"

think about a given matter. Like professors, they sometimes think otherwise. Furthermore you must also make a correction for the speaker's bias and background, mine being that of the Middle States Association, as you know.

How did the regional associations get involved in accreditation in the first place? They did not invent it, and to this day they do not consider it their main function or reason for being. Fundamentally the regional associations are interested in facilitating the exchange of ideas. They do not want to control anything. They are less and less willing to establish or subscribe to formulas, rules, and requirements, or standards, in the old sense. The essential purpose of the regional associations is to increase the free exchange of ideas and experience among higher institutions of all sorts, looking toward a clearer understanding of the nature of education, seeking to draw upon the richness of our tremendous variety in America to evolve more effective means of carrying on our great task, and constantly striving to enlarge the horizons and the educational opportunity of the people.

Then how did we get into accreditation? Strictly as a means to that end. The burgeoning diversification of higher education by the time of the first world war cried for sorting out. That was followed, logically, by recognition within the profession of the institutions which were able to give practical effect to the ideas seized upon in the exchange. And there you had accreditation.

It all began on a quantitative basis, as apparently it has to anywhere until painfully won experience enables the evaluating agency to move toward a qualitative approach. The regional associations, by and large, have practically accomplished that transition. They are completely committed to the principle of subjective, qualitative evaluation in their work.

In fact, purposeful orientation toward qualitative assessment is discernible in the earliest accreditation criteria of the regional associations, although their progress toward achieving it was discouragingly slow. One other characteristic of the first years of regional accrediting is worth noting, for it still is a cardinal principle today; they wanted, and still want, their lists to be inclusive rather than exclusive. Their governing bodies and operating agencies are actively engaged in helping institutions gain accreditation. They have no interest whatever in creating an elite, and they refuse to separate evaluation from consultation.

In the evolution since those first days half a dozen major points of view and operating principles have emerged in the thinking of

the regional associations about accrediting. They began to realize years ago, and are now firmly convinced, that liberal or general education is and has to be an important aspect of all higher education which is worthy of the name. They hold that the purview of evaluation in higher education must be the entire institution, not isolated parts of it, for they see an institution as an organism whose whole is greater than the sum of its parts. The regionals draw a sharp line between accreditation and licensure, applying one to institutions, the other to individuals. They declare that accreditation is properly the function of groups of educational institutions, not the professions, while licensure is the function of the state advised by the professions.

In the last generation the regional agencies have made a complete about-face in their attitude toward uniformity. The earliest terms for accreditation, you know, were "classification" and "standardization." A good many people still think of accreditation as a certificate of conformity, as a seal of equality, meaning interchangeability. Now some of the specialized accrediting agencies feel that this principle, carefully defined, still has relevance for them, their view being that professional accreditation should justify employment in the profession anywhere in the United States with assurance of comparable preparation. The regionals tend to question this position, as confusing accreditation with licensure, and are inclined to think that some of the specialized agencies may abandon it before too long. The opposite position, the one the regionals take, is that uniformity is as undesirable among colleges as it is among students. We want each institution to reach as high as it can in service to its own particular constituency, working in the most intelligent way its trustees and staff can devise for themselves at the bewilderingly complex task of higher education. The regionals are highly interested in and eagerly encourage individuality.

This distinction, generally speaking, between the philosophies of general and specialized accrediting explains why it is perfectly possible, and properly so, for a regional and a specialized agency to take opposite accreditation actions on the same institution. They are looking for different things. One wants comparability, which to the other is quite unimportant. Regional accreditation implies no comparison, similarity, or rating on a scale.

This idea of seeking an institution's own genius rather than bringing a set of requirements to it is often spoken of as evaluation in terms of an institution's own objectives. That is what it is, and the regionals adhere firmly to it, although they realize quite well that the concept is a tricky one. You do not accept just any old set of phrases the



institution puts before you. You apply critical intelligence and discernment to the objectives too, making sure they are appropriate, precise, and realistic before you examine their implications and implementation.

Obviously if your point of reference in evaluating an institution is that institution's own declared educational objectives for its students, your concern centers on the institution's educational program. Buildings, organizational patterns, endowment, administrative services and the like fall into perspective at the back of the picture, deriving their significance from and appraised only in respect to their effect upon the educational program. This places accreditation upon a considerably more sophisticated basis.

Now you see what this begins to add up to. Accreditation, as the regionals see it, is a highly subjective business. We have largely abandoned, except in the general climate of our thinking, the convenient and reassuring concretions with which we began. This means we are wide open to the charge of inconsistency in our judgments. We must accept that. We could go far to eliminate it by having a small employed staff do all our evaluating, but we reject that as fastening upon higher education the very thing we wish to avoid; the promulgation of any doctrine with a pretense of *ex cathedra* authority. We would rather risk inconsistency than rigidity.

While subjective evaluation cannot hope to attain the simple additive beauty of the credit system, there are ways of safeguarding its validity, although this is not the occasion to deploy them in detail. Carefully chosen and balanced personnel and experienced team leadership are major ones. Giving the institution an opportunity to comment on the draft of the team's report before its final editing is another. Having all the reports studied and discussed by a competent, rotating central board, with the chairman of the team whose report is being reviewed always present, is important. A board of appeals is no doubt a good idea, although ours has never been called upon. Probably the greatest safeguards, though, are intangible ones. When you lay the main emphasis on self-evaluation, making the team's function principally stimulation and consultation, you introduce a perspective which considerably changes the atmosphere. When you abandon the notion of comparability, you can be much more realistic.

"That is all very well," you may say, "if evaluation is to be only a high-level consultation on mutual problems, but can accreditation have any real meaning under these circumstances? Does such a consultation-evaluation actually yield a searching appraisal of an institu-

tion, reliable and comprehensive enough to support accreditation?"

Strangely enough, it does. Speaking out of Middle States experience alone, now, where we have probably carried this concept about as far as any, our Commission finds itself, rather to its surprise, more acutely aware of the quality of an institution's performance and of the precise conditions which enhance or retard it when an evaluation is planned and conducted along these new consultation lines than it was as a result of the older, more formal approach. This may not sound wholly reasonable, but it is true. A good deal depends upon the kind of open-minded, objective, professional atmosphere the colleague relationship fosters. Nobody is attacking or defending. It becomes a project in group research, around a common table.

## II

What does this all imply as to regional accreditation of professional schools and professional programs?

The regional associations think of an educational institution as an organism, as I have said, that has important connotations for professional schools and for professional programs within larger institutions. Turn for a moment to Webster's definition of an organism in the philosophical sense. He says it is "a structure composed of distinct parts and so constituted that the functioning of the parts and their relation to one another is governed by their relation to the whole."

Is not a college or university just such a structure? Its various departments, schools, institutes, and administrative services have specialized functions, but they gain their full significance only as integral parts of the whole. You cannot realistically study the music department just by itself. Also you cannot intelligently comprehend the college without taking full cognizance of its music department. The functioning of each part, and their relation to each other, are governed by their relation to and within the college or university.

The regional associations believe this profoundly. They not only believe it; they see it in practical terms as they make their visits. So they long ago concluded that the significant unit is the institution as a whole. They cannot limit their concern to any part, or exclude any part from it. No question arises, therefore, as to whether the professional schools and departments are included, specifically and directly, in regional evaluation and accreditation. The regionals do not sign over any part of an institution to the professional agencies. The regional associations prefer to work with the specialized agencies and to rely heavily upon their judgment in technical areas, but the regionals draw their own conclusions and form their own judgments. They

are quite prepared to uphold their judgment with accreditation action contrary to that of a specialized agency if they believe the facts warrant it.

So the first implication of the regional associations' philosophy supplies a forthright answer to the question whether they accredit specialized schools and departments with a university or college. They do and they must.

Whether they accredit independent professional schools is another kind of question. Without going into the reasoning, the fact is that now they all do. They still differ a little as to the absolute inclusiveness of this policy, but not on the principle. The principle is that the whole body of higher education is in a sense an organism, which must function properly as a whole if its parts are to reach their full potential. So now regional accreditation can apply to autonomous professional schools, and in a great many cases does, provided only that their programs are basically involved in or are dependent upon liberal or general education.

Would a regional association accredit a professional school which the relevant professional agency refuses to accredit? To give a direct answer, yes, it might, and in fact some have. They would regret having to do so, and they would do it only after careful evaluation by qualified professional people in the field, but in the end they insist on the possibility and propriety of exercising independent judgment.

The reason this possible diversity of action exists is not that the regional associations have the illusion that they know better than the professionals. It is simply that the basic purposes of regional and specialized accreditation differ. The regionals have little interest in comparability, and have no intention of imposing like requirements on differing institutions. The function of the specialized agencies obliges them to look for comparability.

It follows, therefore, that the regional associations must evolve their own criteria for accrediting specialized units or areas. Much as they respect NASM and NCATE standards, they will not subscribe to them or base their evaluations upon them, although they cannot overlook them. Complete fulfillment of NASM or NCATE requirements is interesting information to regional evaluators, but it by no means assures their favorable judgment. Conversely, regional accreditation or rejection of a college of music or school of education does not and should not determine the action of NASM or NCATE. Their purposes are different. Neither party necessarily or by predilection disagrees with the other's requirements; they just do not necessarily accept them as definitive. Each has to frame its own concept of what

a school or department of music or education should be. The specialized accrediting agency can generalize; the regionals are chary of generalization.

Let us note in passing an important corollary of this principle. We insist, and I think likely that our friends of the professional agencies would also insist, that the college has to maintain the same prerogative of independent decision. It cannot surrender its philosophy or practice of education to any accrediting body, our own included. The institution's integrity is more important than its accreditation. A really good institution has to be prepared to tell its accrediting societies at any time that their services are no longer required, because the institution disagrees with them.

If the expectations of the regional association and the specialized agency look in different directions, where does that leave the institution? It is left with three choices, obviously. It can choose which accreditation to seek, or it can say "a pox on both your houses," or it can seek a way to satisfy both. The chances are that the expectations of the regional and the specialized agencies will not conflict with each other; they will just differ. Fulfilling one set rarely precludes meeting the other. But it may be so expensive and time-consuming to satisfy both agencies that an institution really may feel itself forced by practical circumstances to choose one or the other. The differences, to repeat, stem from the differing functions of regional and specialized accreditation.

You know, however, that the regionals and the professional agencies often do work closely together in actual evaluations. What are the ground rules and the mechanics?

We have a general agreement that the regionals and the professionals visit an institution together when, and only when, the institution wants both specialized and regional accreditation. The joint visits are organized variously; sometimes as single joint teams, sometimes as two teams working together, sometimes as one or two representatives of one agency accompanying a larger team of another. The ideal arrangement is probably one in which the specialized agency people wear two hats, reporting directly to their own organizations and also serving as the regional's evaluators for the professional area.

The success of this plan in practice varies. In Middle States experience it works out better with some agencies than with others. Our field relationship with NASM representatives has been very good. You send us good men, they know what they are doing, and they are wholly cooperative. We may not altogether approve their basis of judgment, but each side respects the other, and neither tries to coerce

the other. Sometimes we supplement the specialized agency's delegation with a man or two of our own in their field, not implying distrust of them but simply recognizing the effects of the differing functions of the two groups. This area of inter-agency cooperation needs more study and experimentation.

In evaluating teacher education, frankly, the regionals sometimes have their difficulties. NCATE and they are apt to differ considerably on the purpose of their visits, how they conduct them, the functions of their evaluators, the kind of institutional preparation they want for the visit, and the type of report they write. In Middle States experience, however, the actual situation when they work together is often not as horrendous as from this calamitous list you might think. A lot depends on the ability and attitude of the team leaders. Both sides give a little, each side sensibly adapts the strict letter of its instructions, and, I think NCATE would agree, both sides gain importantly in the exchange; all three sides, rather, for the institution gains also.

One of the frustrating problems in joint Middle States-NCATE evaluations is time. Each team has a lot to do for its own organization. The NCATE members must make a meticulous report on prescribed matters, a task which leaves them little time for the kind of observation, reflection, and evaluation the Middle States Association wants. Insofar as other regional associations use joint teams, they no doubt find the same problems.

But the conflict of interests which really needs serious work on the part of all of us arises when not only teacher education or music is involved in a joint accreditation evaluation, but also Music Education, as it virtually always is nowadays with any school or department of music. The tension, as we all know, is on both practical and theoretical levels. On the one hand there is an uneasy *modus vivendi*, when NASM and NCATE interests overlap. In a sense this jurisdictional dispute does not concern the regionals, but of course it really does, because it embarrasses us in our professional relations with both parties.

On the other hand, and more seriously, we are all concerned, the institution most, with the massive competing time demands of the two combined professional programs for a Music Education major which must be superimposed upon a fundamentally necessary liberal or general education, for without that no professional program is acceptable today. This problem has a highly practical side. It is a very real question whether a student, in four academic years, can possibly accomplish all the two professional organizations insist he must accomplish, and also obtain the solid grounding and thoughtful

maturing in much broader areas which regional accreditation assumes.

Candidly, if you interpret your requirements strictly, I doubt that most students can. The schools which want both regional and professional accreditation may be nearing an uncomfortable choice; either to reduce the music requirements, or to discover means of accomplishing them and of meeting state education stipulations more efficiently in less time, or to change to a five-year program. The latter may well be the way it will turn out, as it has in pharmacy.

If Middle States experience is typical, no easy solution of this dilemma is in sight. There are colleges represented on this floor today which are caught on the prongs of it, and more that may be. We look at a college of music in its own chosen frame of reference, distinguishing it clearly from a liberal arts college or any other kind of institution. But we are interested in it as a *college* of music in the American sense, not as a conservatory whose sole task is to train interpreters and performers of music. The seminal fact to keep in mind is that the regional associations are organizations of a wide variety of collegiate institutions whose common ground is one basic conviction: that liberal education is the necessary root of the professions, the bed-rock on which all higher education worthy of the name has to rest. We hold this conviction so firmly that we are not willing to compromise it.

We are not willing to quantify it, either, for our interest is in the spirit and not in the letter. We are not interested in semantic arguments about the liberal bearing of professional courses. What we want in any total program is a solid introduction of the student to man, his environment, his society, and his cultural tradition. We are not prepared to settle for part of it.

I hope such a forceful statement does not sound belligerent. It is not meant to be. It is dogmatic. This is our position. Remember that I am speaking officially for only the Middle States Association, although I believe I am fairly representing the general views of the other regionals also.

Naturally the question which legitimately follows an assertion of this position is just how much liberal education, what proportion of non-professional courses, the regional societies expect in a technical curriculum.

The only possible answer on our part sounds like an evasion. The regionals are no longer willing to quantify their criteria in any area. We are hoping to find in each program a comprehensive philosophy of education and its realistic implementation. We are looking for emphasis, relationship, a sense of proportion. We want graduates of

professional as well as liberal arts curriculums who are aware of the record of man's intellectual, cultural, emotional, social, and political development; who have apprehended the beginnings of knowledge of man's self, his environment, and his fellows. We believe the scientist has as great a need for music as the musician has for science.

We are not much concerned about the form and organization of general education in professional programs. We are really not greatly interested in arguments as to whether a course in the history of music is history or music. Does either make sense without the other? What we want is a product, the graduated student, who is a citizen of the intellectual world as well as a competent practitioner of his art.

You have grappled with this problem for many years, of course, and you have made too many notable contributions to thought and practice in this area to be unduly disturbed by published analyses and opinions with which you do not wholly agree. Even poorly founded criticism leads thoughtful men to continual reassessment of their own positions. So does the experience of other professional bodies which are working seriously on the same problem. The American Society for Engineering Education is one. It has moved ahead of the practice of many engineering schools, as NASM has moved ahead of some schools of music. The ASEE 1956 report on *General Education in Engineering* recommends that a minimum of approximately twenty percent of an engineering students' educational time be given to humanities and social studies. This does not sound like a particularly heavy involvement in general education, about one course each semester until you discover that they exclude from their twenty percent for engineers, science and mathematics, English composition, any other communications courses which deal with technical material, and such technically-related subjects as accounting, management, industrial finance, marketing, and personnel administration. In addition to all these things, the ASEE wants at least twenty percent of the student's whole curriculum for the humanities and social sciences. So you see you are not the only ones struggling with the prickly problem of where to draw the line.

Most of us in the regional associations understand the hard squeeze in which you are caught. We have no illusion that we know the way out, or that we have any wisdom to give you on your own affairs. We feel strongly that the specialized and the general accrediting agencies must each define their positions independently, with a single eye to the good of the student and the integrity of the profession as they see it. We hope there will be a large measure of agreement in our

conclusions, but we can respect each other if we disagree, even if some institutions are forced to choose between us.

### III

Even raising the possibility of a choice makes one wonder why professional schools and programs are interested in regional accreditation at all. You who have sought it can answer that question better than I. Part of the reason, of course, is social pressure based on false premises: that accredited institutions are *ipso facto* better than unaccredited ones; that membership in the regional associations confers a certain prestige; that regional accreditation implies uniformity. While recognizing the pressure, we can brush these aside. But I think there are reasons why independent professional schools of many types are increasingly drawn toward the regional associations, as those associations themselves awake to new possibilities of usefulness.

I hope it is not purely speculative to infer that one reason professional schools are joining the regional collegiate societies, and are surely being welcomed in them, is our growing awareness that the hiatus between liberal and professional education is much less than we had thought. As new knowledge over-reaches the bounds of our traditional disciplines, so new realization of the mutual interdependence of the liberal arts and the professional brings us together. All higher education has ineluctably moved into a larger frame of reference, in which the professional schools are caught among three increasing pressures: the strides of technology, the concurrent necessity for broader theoretical preparation to cope with the rapidity of change in our day, and the realization that even at best, technical education alone is not enough. So more and more we are forced to see higher education as a unity in which institutions no longer have mutually exclusive functions.

We not only need to examine the common task, but we have much to learn from each other. The regional associations exist primarily to furnish the ground for that meeting of minds. Accreditation is not our main business at all. We consider it quite secondary; simply one means to an end, the end being that exchange of ideas and experience for which the regional associations were founded.

Many of the professional schools have sensed this, and have also sensed the important contribution they can make to such a larger understanding. In a sense, liberal education is an end in itself; knowledge for knowledge's sake is still a valid concept. But it alone is not a sufficient preparation for American life in the twentieth century. One needs both liberal and professional education, and liberal education



needs the fine arts and music as much as it needs science and the social studies. So the movement of the professional schools toward the main stream of higher education from one side is matched by a movement of liberal education toward it from the other, while the regional associations abandon their circumscribed outlook of earlier days to welcome a new awareness that we are all working at a common task, and have much to learn from each other.

If this is not why the professional schools and the regional associations are drawing closer today, it ought to be, for this is where their interests truly meet.

#### IV

So by a circuitous route we come in the final paragraphs of this paper to the topic which was assigned to me: The function of the regional associations in the accreditation of specialized and professional programs, with special reference, of course, to music and music education.

Their task, as they themselves see it, is to foster in every way a commitment to wholeness in education; to protect the integrity, unity, and individuality of each institution; and to insist upon uncompromising quality in the performance of each institution's chosen task. Accreditation is simply their recognition, after as careful study as they can make, that these are the characteristics of a given institution. The accreditation is not the important thing at all. It is a by-product of a highly useful process which no institution can go through unchanged.

The regional associations know better than anyone else does that their work is imperfect, uneven, inconsistent. They do not pretend to know the answers to the important questions in higher education. They have a conviction that we are more likely to find useful answers together than separately, that the answers to the big questions probably apply to all of us, and that the accreditation process can be a useful instrument in the search.

## THE EASTMAN PHILHARMONIA IN EUROPE, THE NEAR EAST, AND RUSSIA

HOWARD HANSON, *Director*  
EASTMAN SCHOOL OF MUSIC  
UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak to you on the subject of the Eastman Philharmonia as musical ambassadors under the cultural exchange program of the Department of State. I shall not attempt to give a résumé of our long three-month musical safari through Europe, the Middle East, and behind the iron curtain. I am sure neither you nor I have sufficient time to try to condense three months into a few minutes. Rather I shall try to indicate some things which we learned and then, if I may, try to relate our experiences to the broad cultural exchange program of our country.

First, a brief summary might be appropriate. The orchestra consisted of eighty-seven players ranging in age from three freshmen, seventeen years of age, to a graduate student of twenty-six years. The tour presented fifty concerts in sixteen countries in thirteen weeks including four weeks in Russia. We played in such sophisticated cities as Madrid, Brussels, West Berlin, Warsaw, Moscow and Leningrad and in places such as Aleppo, Syria where in the many centuries of its existence no symphony orchestra had ever been heard. We played in the magnificent concert hall of West Berlin, the Tschaikowsky Hall in Moscow, the Hall of the Nobles in Leningrad, and in motion picture theatres where the large orchestra could hardly be properly seated including one smoke-filled hall in Cairo which will always live in our memories.

We traveled, mostly by plane, over many national boundaries and through what seemed to be innumerable customs barriers. We traveled also by bus through the cold winter of Poland and by train over the vast spaces of Russia. We entered the concert hall in Beirut between lines of Lebanese soldiers following the abortive revolution. We

felt the tension of pro-Nasser and anti-Nasser forces in Syria. We limped into peaceful Sweden with one engine out. We played for the students of the University of Brussels who that morning had stoned the American embassy in protest against our stand on colonialism in the United Nations.

But in the concert halls all was beauty, peace, enthusiasm, and friendship with packed audiences and cheering crowds—behind, as well as in front, of the iron curtain. Everywhere we met not only admiration for the artistry of our young people but also human warmth and the feeling of universal brotherhood.

From this experience I learned a number of things. The first was, of course, the importance of the arts as a means of spiritual communication. I must admit that I had always been somewhat skeptical of the cliché which refers to music as an international, universal language, a language which transcended the boundaries of speech differences. But I found that, at least in Western civilization, music does indeed know no barriers. The music of Beethoven, Schubert, Ravel, Respighi, and our own American composers seemed to communicate equally well in Spain, Egypt, Syria, or Russia.

The second lesson was not in a sense a lesson, for it is something of which I have been very conscious for many years; the priceless value of the work which is being carried on in the art of music in the public schools of our nation. For it should be emphasized and reemphasized that the triumph of the Eastman Philharmonia was in fact a triumph for the theory and practice of music education in the United States. Time and again the music critics, from Spain to Russia, compared this student orchestra with the great professional orchestras of Europe. On a number of occasions foreign critics bemoaned the fact that their countries could not produce youth orchestras of this calibre.

But the credit for such an orchestra belongs not solely to the Eastman School of Music but to the public schools from which these young people came, to the high school orchestras in which they had received their early training, to the devoted supervisors and teachers of music in the schools of the United States without whom this development would not have been possible. Sometimes I feel that we as citizens of the United States take this development too much for granted. It is a priceless gift and, in this age of the pressure of the sciences and the so-called "solid" studies in our high school curricula—and I put "solid" definitely in quotation marks—we cannot afford to discard it lightly.

Third, I learned that the response of the ear and the heart are pretty much the same in Portugal, Germany, and Turkey, or Poland.

The music which stirs the heart of the man and woman in Rochester seems to have the same effect in Athens, Warsaw, or Kiev. A particularly interesting example was the reaction of the Russians to Sousa's great march, *Stars and Stripes Forever*.

Did the tremendous enthusiasm of Russian audiences for Sousa's famous march have any extra-musical connotations? I do not know, but I like to think so. Among the many encores demanded by the audiences *Stars and Stripes Forever* had been a universal favorite. We hesitated about playing it in Russia. We did not wish to be accused by the Russians of "waving the flag." After all, we were there to make friends, not enemies. However, after considerable thought we decided to use the same encores in Russia which had been so successful in Europe and the Near East, including the *Stars and Stripes Forever*. At the first concert in Moscow the enthusiastic Russians demanded that the march be repeated—an encore to an encore.

From that point on throughout our tour of the U.S.S.R. the fame of the march spread like wildfire. If we did not play it by the fifth or sixth encore, members of the audience would call out something that sounded like "Amerikanski Marsh" and were not satisfied until it had been played at least once, and sometimes twice.

I have been asked many times, "Did the Russians know the title of the march they were so enthusiastically applauding?" Undoubtedly some did. Perhaps the majority did not. But I believe that all sensed in this great march played by a brilliant young orchestra something of the American spirit of youth and freedom. I believe they were saying to us through their applause, "We like your young Americans; we like your music;" and even, "We like America."

But there was another aspect of our experience which was equally important. I am sure that we who have received our musical heritage from Europe brought back to that continent a fresh concept of music and music education from which they will profit. But we also learned much from them. There are many aspects of musical and artistic life in the old world from which the new world may profit.

The most important lesson is, I believe, their concern with the importance, I would say almost the sacredness, of human talent. And curiously enough it was in Russia where we learned our greatest lesson. I have always heard the Soviet Union described as a completely materialistic nation, a society devoted to materialistic ideals and concepts. And yet as we visited the conservatories, the orchestras, and the opera houses of Russia we could not help but notice the generosity with which opportunities were afforded the young Russian musician. In rather sad contrast we noted the number of young American singers, includ-

ing many of our Eastman School of Music graduates, who were singing in the opera houses of Europe because their own country was either too poor or too disinterested to offer them opportunities in their own country.

In Poland, not a rich country, we performed in four cities in four acoustically superb concert halls. In Russia we saw superb opera houses not only in Moscow and Leningrad but in smaller cities such as Lvov, Odessa, and Kiev. And yet in our own nation's capitol in Washington we have no symphony hall, no opera house, and no national theatre. It is true that, at long last, we are now embarked on a campaign to construct a cultural center in Washington. In the capitols of Europe governments have erected beautiful buildings to house their orchestras, ballets, and opera, but in Washington—where buildings grow like mushrooms in the damp forest—there is no money available for such luxuries unless it can be raised by public subscription. Billions for a flight to the moon, but nothing for those delicate arts which may contribute to man's spiritual development. When we charge other nations with materialism we should, I believe, speak softly, or, perhaps, not at all.

There is one area in the field of cultural activities in which I believe our government in recent years has made great progress, the area of cultural exchange. Here we have at long last realized the importance of the arts as a medium of communication between peoples of the world. In the tour of the Eastman Philharmonia we had the great privilege of following some of America's great orchestras, the orchestras of Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and New York. We were proud of the artistic prowess of our young people. I was equally proud of their ability as young ambassadors, of their ability to bring not only art but friendship to the people of the countries visited.

This kind of exchange is, I am convinced, of unique value. It differs from some other forms of communication in that it is both non-political and non-materialistic. It differs even from the exchange of scientists and professionals in other fields for they, for the most part, come in contact with their opposite numbers, colleagues in their own field. The young musicians meet not only their fellow musicians but speak through the communicative power of music to thousands of people in audiences of many different races and beliefs and speak in a language which surmounts conventional barriers. This is particularly true when the musicians are young, enthusiastic, well-disciplined, and motivated by a sincere belief in the purpose of their mission.

This last point is, I believe, of paramount importance. In speaking to the graduating class of St. John Fisher College, I tried to sum

up my basic philosophy about the exchange program in the following paragraph:

No approach is valid unless its first purpose is the specific purpose of friendship and understanding. If the tour of the Eastman Philharmonia did make the impact with which it is credited it is because of the warm friendly interest which these young people extended to their new friends behind the iron curtain. It was necessary for them to play well, to play brilliantly, for this was their card of admission, their means of introduction, but their playing, no matter how brilliant, would not have been enough had it not been for this search for friendship and understanding.

It is a commonplace to say that the first task of the days ahead will be to prevent the "cold" war from becoming a "hot" war. The second task will be gradually to dissipate the atmosphere of the "cold" war with all its frustrations and its negative and evil philosophy. I have no illusion that this task can be accomplished by the beneficent power of music, or by the powers of all the creative arts in unison. On the other hand I also do not believe that it can be accomplished by the diplomats alone. If the goal is to be realized it must be achieved by all the benign forces working together toward this end. It is my hope that the creative arts make their own contribution.

If this aim is to be realized, I believe that several points of view are important. First of all is the point which I have just emphasized that an exchange of persons, an exchange of art, is important only if the aim of that exchange is completely understood, if those taking part in the exchange are sincerely dedicated to the goal of world peace rather than to purposes of ambition, self-aggrandizement, or even the entirely laudable aim of intellectual cooperation.

Second, I have become convinced of the importance and the validity of President Kennedy's accent on youth. I remember a number of years ago filling out a questionnaire for a Fulbright applicant. In answer to the question, would the student be a good ambassador for his country, I wrote, with tongue in cheek, that I would prefer ambassadors a little older than twenty-one years.

I have changed my mind. Young people, well-trained and with the idealism of youth—and I am sure there is much idealism remaining in youth even in our materialistic age—may prove to be highly effective ambassadors. They are perhaps more open-minded and less prejudiced than we of the older generation. They also have the most at stake for if the quest for peace fails and war comes it is the young who must make the greatest sacrifice.

Third, I am increasingly concerned with the character and the

quality of our cultural exports, of the image of the United States which these exports present. For one of the purposes of any cultural exchange program must be, I believe, to dispel the stereotype of the "ugly American," the picture of the American as a gum chewing, loud-mouthed boor whose only interest is the acquisition of wealth and power.

And here I feel impelled to say something which may not, in some quarters, be popular. I realize that honesty is something which must be indulged in with discretion but I also believe that at times we must give our honest opinions if for no other reason than to keep in practice.

In the choice of our cultural exports I am somewhat disenchanted with the apparently growing advice that we export to Europe certain types of American popular music. I have nothing against many forms of popular music. Much of it has charm and character. Some of it on the other hand is, in my opinion, cheap, vulgar, and meretricious. When used as a medium of cultural exchange, it is likely to confirm any prejudiced observer in his belief that Americans are without taste and lacking in any sense of values.

What I am talking about is, I am sure, clear to all of you. I refer to the trumpet players headed for the stratosphere blowing the bells off their horns, the trombones headed for outer space, drummers in a new-primitivistic orgy, and singers "belting it out" with supreme disregard for pitch, quality, or good taste. This type of "music", whether or not it is called "rock and roll," in my opinion bears the same relation to good music that pornography bears to good art.

There are some who consider this "art" to be typically American. I consider it to be a fad which pleases the youngsters for a little while but which, like other fads, will soon happily pass. I do not believe it has any value as a medium of cultural exchange. Quite the reverse is true. As far as I am concerned, it raises in my heart only one ambition—to shoot the trumpet player, with hopefully extra ammunition for the trombonist, the drummer, and the singer.

Finally, in pleading for creative and performing arts as valuable ambassadors, I have no illusions that art and the artist can ever take the place of the dedicated work of men like Lucius Clay in West Berlin, Ambassador Thompson in Moscow, or our own William MacComber in Jordan. I do believe, however, that the challenge is so great and the task so important that every possible, appropriate means of communication by which people speak to people must be utilized.

One scene will always remain in my memory. It was our final concert in Leningrad following thirteen weeks of this exciting but grueling experience. The audience, which packed and overflowed

by hundreds the concert hall, demanded encore after encore. Finally, since we had to catch a midnight train to Moscow and then a plane to Amsterdam and back to Rochester, I left the stage and motioned the orchestra to follow me.

As I was changing to street clothes in my dressing room, perhaps five minutes later, I realized that there was considerable noise coming from the auditorium. Quickly slipping on my overcoat, I went out to investigate. To my surprise I found the audience in that great hall standing and applauding an empty stage. I hurriedly found my associate conductor and we went out on the stage to acknowledge the demonstration, whereupon hundreds of people rushed to the stage, some with their hands outstretched to clasp ours, some with little bouquets of flowers, in a moving gesture of friendship. It seemed to me that they were saying, "We like your young people, we like your music, and we like America."

This is, I believe, cultural exchange at its best. This is communication between peoples. This is the use of the arts for world understanding, and eventually for "peace on earth, good will to men."



## REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON CURRICULA

During the past year the work of the Commission has expanded to the extent that three meetings have been held: Chicago, March 16-17; Detroit, June 24-26; Cincinnati, November 19-28.

The responsibilities of the Commission include: (a) consideration of applications for Associate Membership, (b) promotions from Associate to Full Membership, (c) approval of new curricula in member schools, (d) review of Self-Survey reports as part of the ten year cycle of checks on maintenance of standards for continuance of membership, (e) review of reports of music representatives on joint visitation teams sent by the regional associations or by NCATE, (f) study of structural changes in the Commission to meet the new and added responsibilities, (g) to render counsel and information to members or to representatives of schools on matters of admission, (h) to review the several statements on curricula in light of demands in the next decade, (i) to restudy the role and scope of the several programs at the master's degree level in relation to their function as a terminal degree or as a highway to the doctorate.

To facilitate these diverse yet interrelated problems several subcommittees have been appointed by the President to cover specific areas: (a) Music Education curricula, (b) Music Therapy accreditation working jointly with the National Music Therapy Association, (c) Church Music curricula, (d) Program for the Bachelor of Arts degree. These subcommittees are chaired by a member or a former member of the Commission on Curricula whose special interest is in the area for which his committee was appointed. The other two members are selected from the institutional representatives who also have a special interest and experience to bring to bear on problems presented to them. These committees have been in session the day preceding this meeting and without their counsel and considered judgments the Commission on Curricula would not have been able to meet all of its responsibilities.

The Commission on Curricula has been most ably assisted again this year by John Flower, whose attention to the myriad details of correspondence and preparation of materials for the several meetings has been invaluable and deeply appreciated by all who have worked with him.

The actions of the Commission hereby presented for your consideration are as follows:

New programs approved

Church Music

1. Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma
2. Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas
3. Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois

Music Therapy (jointly approved with NMTA)

1. Loyola University, New Orleans, Louisiana
2. Request of University of Southern Mississippi to discontinue program in Music Therapy approved.

Action on the basis of Self-Survey and Joint Visitations

Continuance of membership approved

1. Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia
2. Friends University, Wichita, Kansas
3. Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio
4. Meredith College, Raleigh, North Carolina
5. Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pennsylvania
6. Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania
7. State University College of Education, Potsdam, New York

Tabled for further information

1. Saint Mary College, Xavier, Kansas
2. University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia
3. Ohio University, Athens, Ohio
4. Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma
5. Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays, Kansas
6. Ouachita Baptist College, Arkadelphia, Arkansas
7. Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pennsylvania

Placed on warning

1. Judson College, Marion, Alabama

Admission to membership approved

Junior College Membership

1. Pueblo College, Pueblo, Colorado. Rodney Townley, Chairman

Associate Membership

1. Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Gordon Ohlsson, Chairman
2. Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois. Leo Dvorak, Chairman
3. Nyack Missionary College, Nyack, New York. Lee Olson, Chairman
4. San Diego State College, San Diego, California. J. Dayton Smith, Chairman

5. Tennessee State University, Nashville, Tennessee. Edward C. Lewis, Chairman
6. University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee. Alfred Schmied, Chairman
7. University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont. Frank Lidral, Chairman
8. Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana. Theodore Hoelty-Nickel, Chairman

Change in membership status approved  
 Promotion to Full Membership

1. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. Crawford Gates, Chairman
2. Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, California. Sister Mary Brigid, Dean
3. North Park College, Chicago, Illinois. Wayne Balch, Chairman
4. San Jose State College, San Jose, California. Hartley D. Snyder, Chairman

Twelve institutions holding Associate Membership have indicated the desire for re-examination in 1963 for promotion to Full Membership.

To the many Deans, Chairmen, and Directors who generously gave of their time and experience as members of the visitation teams to the numerous institutions for purposes of new membership, continuance of existing membership, or promotion to full membership, the Commission on Curricula wishes to express sincere gratitude for this service to NASM.

EARL V. MOORE, *Chairman*

## REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COMMISSION

In the Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting of NASM in November, 1960 the Association, upon recommendation of the Graduate Commission, authorized the Commission to undertake the examination of member institutions offering the doctorate in music. It was agreed at that time that such examinations could be effectively undertaken only through visitation of the institutions by competent examiners. It was agreed also that such visitation should be preceded by the preparation and study of questionnaires on graduate study leading to the doctorate in member institutions.

Because at the time of the Association meeting of 1961 the Chairman of the Commission was traveling through Lisbon, Madrid, Valencia, Seville, and Barcelona, Himie Voxman generously undertook the

preparation and distribution of the questionnaires and the Graduate Commission is greatly indebted to him for this important work.

The Commission's first task was to study these questionnaires, to attempt to analyze the developing patterns in the doctorate in music, and, where appropriate, to attempt to indicate, where possible, our judgment and advice on developing trends.

The first portion of the questionnaire had to do with the control of and the responsibility for the doctorate in music. Seven schools have not yet responded and the information on one is incomplete. Of the schools responding seventeen report the Ph.D. in music under the control of the graduate school of the university with proper representation of the interests of the school of music. Only one institution reports its Ph.D. degree under the direct jurisdiction of the school of music.

Musicology seems to be the area most favored as a suitable field for the Ph.D. degree. Many schools include music education and theory as a special field. A rather surprising percentage, nine of thirty-one schools, list composition as a major for the Ph.D. degree. Several list Church Music as a special field. Only two admit performance as a suitable area for this degree.

Six universities place the professional doctorate (Doctor of Musical Arts or Doctor of Music) under the control of the graduate school of the university while in four universities the professional degrees are the sole responsibility of the school of music.

The areas which predominate in these curricula are those of composition, music education, and the dual field of performance and pedagogy. Seven Doctor of Education degrees in music are under the control of the graduate school, one is under the college of education and one under the school of music. Observing this pattern the Commission recommends that, unless the school of music has great national prestige, the doctorate in music be granted through the graduate school of the university rather than through the school of music.

The portion of the questionnaire dealing with admission to graduate study revealed, at least on paper, rather uniform practices: the study of transcripts and recommendations, auditions, interviews, placement examinations in theory, history and applied music, and in rare cases the use of the Graduate Record Examinations.

In the light of the above the Commission wishes to emphasize its belief that, both for the sake of the school and the student, a strong admissions policy is of the utmost importance. We believe that admissions practices should be re-studied, and that admission to doctoral

study be the concern of the most representative members of the faculty in addition to the admissions officer and the administration.

A study of catalogue statements quoted on the questionnaires indicates the requirement of a minimum of three years full-time study beyond the baccalaureate degree, or two years beyond the master's degree, one of the years or its equivalent beyond the master's degree to be in continuous full-time residence. An examination of transcripts, however, indicates that in actual practice the strongest departments usually demand two to three years beyond the master's degree.

The Commission does not think of the doctoral program in terms of specified time periods but rather in terms of the quality of the program and the attainment of the candidate. The Commission recommends however that the above statement on residence be approved.

In dealing with the area of performance and pedagogy the Commission believes that the question of the specific instrument which constitutes the major applied field is less important than the quality of the candidate and the strength of the instructional staff teaching the specific instruments. The Commission believes that there should be further clarification of the meaning of "performance and pedagogy". The Commission believes that this major is not primarily for the concert artist but rather for the artist-teacher whose ability as a performer, teacher, and musician will be of value to the American college and university.

In the field of music education it seems logical to the Commission that the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Education, and Doctor of Musical Arts have different orientation, The Doctor of Philosophy would appropriately remain a research degree, the Doctor of Education might properly concentrate on organization, methodology, supervision and guidance, while the Doctor of Musical Arts might concentrate on content in music literature, performance, history, theory, conducting, and the pedagogy of those subjects.

The Commission recommends that the qualifying examination for the doctorate be comprehensive in character and include both written and oral sections.

In the personal examination of institutions awarding the doctorate it is the belief of the Commission that the examiner should concentrate on faculty in the major area; adequate guidance in "core" fields such as history, literature and theory; curricular organization; supporting work in peripheral fields; the objectives of the institution; equipment, library, and the like; special facilities such as, for example, performance laboratory for composers. In making judgments it will be helpful if the Commission will solicit the opinion of the Commis-

sion on Curricula on work in the areas leading to the master's degree.

It was further suggested that the Commission advise the individual institutions as to the areas in which the examiner believes the institution has particular strength.

The Commission believes that all doctorates in music should be the province of the Commission. It is deemed wise to begin the study with a survey of the professional doctorates usually denoted by the titles Doctor of Musical Arts and Doctor of Music. With this in mind the Commission is requesting all institutions now accepting candidates for such degrees to meet with the members of the Commission today (Friday, November 24) at 4:15 P.M. in Room J.

The Commission recommends that the publication of titles of all doctoral dissertations in music should be the responsibility of the Graduate Commission of the Association. The following schedule is suggested:

1. The publication of all Doctor of Musical Arts and Doctor of Music dissertation titles from 1954 to 1961.
2. The publication of all Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Musical Arts, Doctor of Music, and Doctor of Education in Music dissertation titles in 1961-62.
3. Beginning in 1962-63 the issuance in mimeographed form of all dissertation projects in progress leading to all doctorates in music.

It was further suggested that the facilities of this annual publication and survey be afforded to all institutions granting the doctorate in music regardless of membership in the Association. The problem of financing the visitation of institutions granting the doctorate in music has been presented to the Executive Committee for its decision.

HOWARD HANSON, *Chairman*

## REPORT OF THE FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

There has been much activity within the nine regions of the National Association of Schools of Music during the past year. Regions six, seven and eight held interim meetings. During the Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting there was excellent attendance at each of the sessions under the direction of the several Regional Chairmen. In addition to the representatives of member institutions there was a large number of interested visitors.

The main topics for discussion in the regional sessions were related to the theme of the convention itself; "Accreditation" and "Liberal Education and Music". Other topics submitted included the following:

1. A five-year degree program
2. Fee structure for applied music teaching
3. Group instruction in applied music
4. The use of teaching machines
5. The work load for administrators who teach
6. Accelerated programs
7. Employment of accompanists
8. Grading procedures in performance
9. Ethics in student recruitment
10. Restructuring degree requirements

General commendation was expressed for the work of the chairmen during the 1961-62 season and on behalf of the Association these individuals were thanked for their contribution to the work of the Association. Elections were held in each of the regional meetings. The list of newly elected regional chairmen appears with the list of officers in the preliminary pages of this *Bulletin*.

DUANE BRANIGAN, *First Vice-President*

## REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

The duties pertaining to the office of the Secretary of our Association are varied and manifold. With an ever increasing membership and an awakening interest in our organization these duties over the past year have shown a marked increase. The splendid cooperation of colleagues who are devoted to their assignments and the friendly response of representatives of member institutions to requests from this office do much to lighten the load.

A brief reflection of the past year leads me to point up the following trends:

1. Letters of inquiry regarding membership have shown a decided increase.
2. There is a marked increase in demand for Association publications available through our office.
3. There is ample evidence of the high regard we hold in the eyes of other professional educational groups.
4. The immediate future calls for responsible leadership which our Association must assume.

Five faithful and loyal members are missed at our meeting this year. In tribute to their service to music and our Association may I request that you rise and remain standing for a brief moment after

I have read their names: Theodore Kratt, Frank Marsh, Ralph Squires, Donald Swarthout, and Charles Vardell.

At a later date John Flower, Executive Secretary of the Commission on Curricula, will present to you pertinent information on the Annual Report Forms which normally have been mailed to you early in the academic year. The new form, after a number of changes over the past several years, now requests pertinent data which is important and significant to all. We continue to attempt to keep abreast of the changes in listing of Chairmen and Directors of member institutions and if you have detected any errors in the 1962 *List of Members* please notify me at this meeting or by mail at your earliest convenience.

Your continued support and interest in our Association bears witness to the role we assume in American higher education. In a true sense you are the Association. Your suggestions and comments on the conduct of this office are always welcome. Our desire is to serve you as capably and effectively as possible.

THOMAS W. WILLIAMS, *Secretary*

## REPORT OF THE TREASURER

A detailed report was distributed to the representatives of member institutions. The financial condition of the Association is revealed in the following summary:

Receipts for the year totaled \$16,780.85. Expenses for current operation totaled \$16,525.11. The cash balance at the close of the fiscal year August 31, 1962 was \$809.51. The funds invested in Bank Stocks, Treasury and Savings Bonds totaled \$37,687.50. The report was approved by the auditing committee and accepted by the Association.

The above figures show that the income for the past fiscal year exceeded the operating expenses by \$255.74. The Association is in sound financial condition. It is not possible, however, for the Association to increase its expenditures materially without depleting its securities or finding additional means of income.

FRANK B. JORDAN, *Treasurer*

## REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The nominating committee, consisting of five of the nine regional chairmen under the chairmanship of Samuel Berkman, presented a



slate of nominees to which was added a number of nominations submitted by representatives of member institutions. An official election ballot was presented containing names of all nominees and the following officers, commission chairmen, and commission members were elected:

*President:* C. B. Hunt, Jr., George Peabody College

*First Vice-President:* Duane Branigan, University of Illinois

*Second Vice-President:* LaVahn Maesch, Lawrence College

*Secretary:* Thomas W. Williams, Knox College

*Treasurer:* Frank B. Jordan, Drake University

*Chairman, Commission on Curricula:* Earl V. Moore, University of Houston

*Chairman, Graduate Commission:* Howard Hanson, Eastman School of Music

*Members of Commission on Curricula* (elected to three-year terms terminating in 1965):

Robert L. Briggs, University of Tulsa

Warner Lawson, Howard University

*Members of Graduate Commission* (elected to three-year terms terminating in 1965):

Leigh Gerdine, Washington University

George Howerton, Northwestern University

Robert Hargreaves, Ball State Teachers College (to complete unexpired term of James Aliferis 1964)

*Member of Commission on Ethics* (elected to three-year term terminating in 1965):

J. Paul Kennedy, Bowling Green State University

## MUSIC EDUCATION CURRICULUM\*

The Bachelor of Music Education, Bachelor of Music in School Music, Bachelor of Science in Music Education, and the Bachelor of Arts in Music Education, are some of the terms applied to degree programs designed for teacher education in music. These typically comprise 120-132 semester credits (180-198 quarter credits).

Whatever degree is offered, preparation for music teaching must include certain specialized forms of learning designed to develop the basic musicianship of the student, extensive skills in performance applicable in teaching, and ability in the teaching process. It is deemed impractical to try to specify here the course titles, content, and credit allotment, for there is much variation in the needs of students, the types of institutions, types of classification within the institutions and

---

\*By action of the Association November, 1962, the Music Education Curriculum was adopted and therefore becomes a part of the *By-Laws and Regulations* replacing Section G of Article III, pp. 25-27, 1959. — Editor

state certification laws. It is important, however, to outline the type of background needed by students who are to teach music and the broad means by which this may be achieved; this outline can be used as a standard in the construction and evaluation of programs of music education.

## 1. GENERAL EDUCATION

The future music teacher needs a comprehension of the more important elements of our cultural heritage. These include:

- a. Habitually effective use of written and spoken English.
- b. Broad acquaintance with and appreciation of great literature.
- c. Acquaintance with the development of man, his social and economic institutions, and of his rights and responsibilities as a citizen.
- d. A sense of historical perspective.
- e. A sense of moral, ethical, and aesthetic values.
- f. An understanding of scientific thought and method.
- g. Ability to use and interpret basic mathematical concepts.
- h. A continuing attitude of intellectual curiosity.

Depending upon the individual's pre-college background, these qualities may be developed by judicious selection of courses from:

English composition and literature  
Speech  
History and Social Studies  
Fine Arts  
Natural Science and Mathematics

Such a process implies recognition of effective pre-college studies through testing, counseling, and much flexibility in the curriculum. It should occupy 30-35% of the total curriculum. Where institutional patterns include music courses as part of General Education, this proportion may be revised accordingly.

## 2. MUSICIANSHIP

A. *Basic Music.* The future music teacher must possess broad musicianship worthy of serving as a basis for his task in the schools. Such a background would include:

1. Functional knowledge of the language and grammar of music.
2. Ability to hear and grasp the basic elements of musical compositions — rhythmic, melodic, and harmonic.
3. An understanding of the methods by which music is conceived, constructed and scored.
4. Knowledge of the development of the art of music.

5. Intimate acquaintance with a wide selection of good musical literature from the principal eras, forms and idioms.
6. Maturing standards of musical taste and discrimination.

Objectives of this type are ordinarily emphasized in courses in:

Harmony and Ear Training (or Music Theory)  
 History and Literature of Music  
 Form and Analysis  
 Orchestration and Arranging  
 Composition  
 Counterpoint

There is no particular division of courses and credits which will satisfy every situation. Indeed, these same goals are also promoted in the area performance. In any case, it is strongly suggested that these important concepts and generalizations be developed through a process of practical and intimate contact with living music. This task should occupy 20-25% of the curriculum. Where institutional patterns include music courses as part of General Education, this proportion may be revised accordingly.

**B. Musical Performance.** The prospective music teacher must be a thoroughly competent performer in order to understand and deal with the problems of his students. Practical and thorough development in this field implies:

1. Fluency in sight reading.
2. Ability to perform from memory and "by ear".
3. Technical facility and depth of repertoire in the principal applied field sufficient to meet the needs of artistic self-expression and demonstration.
4. Functional ability in those applied fields (piano, voice, orchestral instruments) appropriate to the student's future teaching needs.
5. Thorough understanding of musical interpretation combined with adequate conducting and rehearsal skills.
6. Appreciation of the values and problems of musical groups through effective participation.

Music students generally enter vocational preparation with some performing ability in one, two or possibly three fields. Skill in at least one of these should be developed to the utmost level through private instruction, solo performance, ensemble participation, and intensive practice. Such competence is essential for artistic music teaching and contributes greatly to the teaching of those fields related to the needs of the prospective band, orchestra, or choral teacher. The foundations of technique in these latter fields may be acquired through private or class instruction.

Similarly, the future music teacher needs to participate throughout this period in the ensemble of his choice, but should have opportunity also to acquaint himself with the special literature and techniques of other types of musical organizations. The mature student deserves the opportunity to observe and participate in the operation and conducting of such organizations.

The work in this area thus comprises:

- Private instruction in one's principal performing field
- Class or private instruction in appropriate secondary fields
- Appropriate large and small ensembles
- Conducting

Because of the great variety in the performing experience of entering students and their different needs for specialization, specific requirements in the area of performance need to be interpreted quite broadly. It is necessary to reserve 25-30% of the curriculum for the work in this field.

### 3. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

The task in professional education is to develop competence in applying one's musicianship in school situations. It involves:

- a. An understanding of human growth and the learning problems of students.
- b. Working knowledge of effective methods, materials and facilities for musical instruction.
- c. An enlightened philosophy of education and of music education.
- d. Acquaintance with school patterns, procedures, and professional relationships.
- e. Understanding and skill in the teaching process.
- f. Ability to plan, lead, and cooperate in the work of the school.
- g. Desire for professional growth and stature.

The professional phase of teacher education is usually undertaken in courses in:

- Educational Psychology
- Historical and Social Foundations of Education
- Curriculum
- Music Methods and Materials
- Observation and Student Teaching

In the judgment of this association, most of these matters are best dealt with in a musical rather than a theoretical context, with much opportunity for the student to examine, test, and report his findings. Professional education should occupy 15-20% of the curriculum.

#### 4. ELECTIVES

By applying the minimum percentages recommended above, as much as 10% of the curriculum may be reserved for electives.

### EXAMINERS' WORKSHOP

Prior to the Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting an announcement of an examiners' workshop was issued to a number of representatives of member institutions. More than sixty invited participants and observers attended the session which had been planned by the Commission on Curricula. First Vice-President C. B. Hunt, Jr. presided. Statements were presented by Earl V. Moore, Chairman of the Commission and by John A. Flower, Executive Secretary. The discussion which followed dealt with techniques of examination, reporting visitations, the responsibilities of examiners to NASM, and working relationships with other accrediting bodies.

### PANEL DISCUSSIONS

Two major sessions of the Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting were devoted to panel discussions. The first of these, *Liberal Education and Music*, was moderated by William K. Seldon, Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Accrediting and centered about the findings reported in a recent study entitled *Liberal Education and Music* published in 1962 by the Institute of Higher Education. Willis J. Wager, co-author of the study with Howard J. McGrath, was a member of the panel. Other participants included Allen P. Britton, Howard Hanson, and F. Taylor Jones.

The second panel discussion, *Music's Responsibility in the Education of the Public*, was moderated by Thomas Gorton, President of NASM, and dealt primarily with the areas of mutual concern in matters of accreditation among the specialized, professional, and regional organizations. Members of the panel responding to questions raised by delegates of NASM were: F. Taylor Jones, Executive Secretary of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; Earl V. Moore, Chairman of the Commission on Curricula of NASM; William K. Seldon, Executive Secretary of the National Commission on Accrediting; Chester C. Travelstead of the University of New Mexico representing the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Tape recordings of these panel discussions were made and transcripts are on file in the office of the Secretary of the Association.

## MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES

In addition to the scheduled meetings of the Executive Committee, the Commissions, and the various Sub-committees of the Commission on Curricula, meetings of a number of standing committees, not presenting formal reports to the Association as a whole, were held during the Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting. Committees and chairmen were as follows: Improvement of Teaching, Rogers Whitmore; Junior Colleges, C. Burdette Wolfe; Library and American Music Recordings, Edwin Gerschefski; Preparatory Music, Jackson Ehlert; State and Federal Legislation, Wilbur Rowand; Teacher Education in Music, Archie N. Jones; Liaison Committee, Duane Haskell.

Reports of the work of a number of these committees are on file in the office of the Secretary.

## THE THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING

A total of two hundred forty-three member institutions were represented in the Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting held in Cincinnati, Ohio November 23 and 24, 1962. This was the largest registration in the history of the Association. In addition to official delegates of member institutions there were sixty delegates representing forty-nine non-member institutions, six individual members, and numerous interested guests. A major portion of the principle addresses and panel discussions centered about the theme of accreditation.

Careful planning and local management of publicity by J. Laurence Willhide working with the Publicity Committee, Walter Erley, Chairman, resulted in extensive coverage of the meeting by both press and radio. The report of the Publicity Committee is on file in the office of the Secretary.

The Thirty-Ninth Annual Meeting will be held in Chicago, November 29-30, 1963.