

## Fifty Years of Comprehensive Music Education: Is It Déjà Vu All Over Again?

John B. Hylton  
University of Missouri, St. Louis

---



### Introduction

I live in St. Charles, Missouri, just across the Missouri River from St. Louis, and have worked at the University of Missouri, St. Louis for the past twenty-six years. Over the years, St. Louis has been the home of many notable artistic and literary figures, including Maya Angelou, Scott Joplin, T. S. Eliot, Eugene Field, and Tennessee Williams, among others. Since the St. Louis Cardinals won the World Series last October (and since, like most St. Louis area residents, I am a Cardinals fan), I would like to turn to another native St. Louisan who is noted for both his prowess at baseball and his off-beat but highly quotable wisdom—Yogi Berra. Yogi Berra was born in St. Louis's Italian-American neighborhood known as "The Hill," and is noted for the unique logic of statements such as:

"When you come to a fork in the road, take it."

"You better cut the pizza in four pieces because I'm not hungry enough to eat six."

"He hits from both sides of the plate. He's amphibious."

"This is Like Déjà Vu All Over Again."  
(*Baseball Almanac*, 2006)

The most effective music education has always been comprehensive in nature, so there *is* some sense of déjà vu about the continued influence of a comprehensive approach on the profession, and the continual re-discovery of its importance by generations of music educators. Since the curricular reform era initiated by Sputnik began in 1957, there have been some particularly notable efforts to implement a comprehensive approach to music education through seminars, curriculum projects, publications, and workshops.

Although I am not primarily a philosopher or aesthetician, each of us in music education has a philosophy that is made evident through our actions, even if we do not articulate it, not even to ourselves. Even for those of us who are not primarily philosophers, an important part of our education and continued growth as educators has to be the development of a personal philosophy and approach to music instruction.

For the past fifty years I have been a music student, a choral conductor at the secondary and then collegiate levels, and finally, an academic and arts administrator at a university. My perspective is that of a

practitioner and a teacher of performing ensembles, among other responsibilities. I believe that a *comprehensive* approach to music education is critical to effective teaching and learning. But exactly what does comprehensive music education entail? Comprehensive music education is a multi-faceted way of approaching the teaching and learning of music.

The word *comprehensive*, according to my dictionary, is defined as “including or comprehending much; large in scope or content; capable of understanding or perceiving easily or well” (Morris, 1969). At the most basic level, the idea of comprehensive music education is quite straightforward and would almost seem to be common sense. Certainly, we wish for our teaching to “include or comprehend much and to be large in scope or content,” and don’t we wish to make our students “capable of understanding or perceiving easily or well”? Wouldn’t this be common sense? Unfortunately, as Voltaire observed, common sense is not so common (*Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*, 1999). As music educators, it is all too easy to be caught up in the superficial trappings of teaching music (particularly performance ensembles) such as trophies, contest ratings, and public praise. These things can obscure and nullify important dimensions of music education that are not immediately visible to the casual observer, but which are critical to the effective musical education of our students.

Important principles of comprehensive music education, as I defined them in my 1995 choral methods text, included the following:

1. Comprehensive music education focuses on the student (i.e., the students in a school performing ensemble, and their individual musical and personal growth, are more important than the reputation of the conductor, attaining the “I” rating at festival or other competing priorities).

2. Comprehensive music education focuses on a rich and varied repertoire of musical literature, whose characteristics are understood by the students, through a range of carefully planned, appropriate experiences that connect students to the basic elements of music and to the deep places of their own humanity.
3. Comprehensive music education is aesthetic. I relied for my definition of aesthetic education on the work of Bennett Reimer. As I wrote (Hylton, 1995, p. 273):

Successful choral music education has always heightened students’ aesthetic sensitivity. However, the publication of Bennett Reimer’s *A Philosophy of Music Education* in 1970 (followed by a second edition in 1989), has helped focus the attention of music educators on the importance of providing students with an aesthetic education. Although there has been a tendency to focus on the general music class when aesthetic education is discussed, it has important implications for the performing ensemble and is an important aspect of comprehensive choral music education.

A basic premise of aesthetic education is that the meanings that music produces reside in its intrinsic expressive qualities. The musical experiences provided for students through our programs should enhance their perception of musical events and evoke a resultant feelingful reaction to those events.

4. The results of comprehensive music education can be and are evaluated.

These four principles are the crux of comprehensive music education, as I understand it. The remainder of this paper will expand on these basic ideas and will focus on three areas: I will describe a few personal examples of comprehensive and non-comprehensive music education that I experienced as a music student and teacher. Then, I will review some pivotal events in the history of comprehensive music education, particularly since 1957. Finally, I will describe some current issues related to comprehensive music education, and attempt to draw some conclusions.

### **Triumphs and Tragedies of a Music Student and Teacher**

I was born in 1950, and was a student in the public schools of the U.S. in the 1950s and 1960s. We lived in three different states, as my father's work took him to different parts of the country. I began my teaching career in the early 1970s. Three examples from my personal experiences will help to illustrate the differences between comprehensive and non-comprehensive music education.

My first example is an elementary school orchestra experience in 1961, in western New York State. I began clarinet lessons in the fourth grade. In the sixth grade my school music teacher and band director announced in our elementary band rehearsal that some of the wind players would be joining the orchestra for a few rehearsals, and performing with them for part of the upcoming concert. When my fellow wind and percussion players and I reported to the orchestra class, on the music stand was a piece entitled *Bach Brandenburg Concerto*. I would be playing the first clarinet part.

I dutifully learned which keys to push and which holes to cover, and I ultimately performed an approximation of what was indicated in the musical score. In

due course, the piece was performed. We received an enthusiastic reception from the audience at our concert. Was this a positive experience for me, the young clarinetist? Yes, it was. Was it effective comprehensive music education? No, it was not. We did not learn anything about Bach. We did not know what a concerto was, or that this selection was a concerto grosso. Although we did receive feedback from the teacher concerning the various dynamic markings in the score, and how they should be played, we were not told about the interplay of the forces involved nor did we understand the concept of conflict/contrast or the juxtaposition of contrasting forces in Baroque music. We did not even know that there was such a thing as the Baroque era, nor did we know that the piece we were playing was part of that era. We did not know why it was called a *Brandenburg Concerto*. We did not know that when the piece was created it did not include a clarinet part. All of this knowledge would come years later. Were all of these concepts too advanced for sixth graders? If woven into the fabric of rehearsal and presented at the appropriate level of complexity, I believe these concepts could have been taught in an intellectually honest fashion, that they would have enhanced our learning, and in fact would have improved both our performance skill and our understanding of the music.

The second scene from my life as a music student takes place in the Nathan Hale Junior High School band room in the spring of 1965 in Norwalk, Connecticut, where once again clarinetist John Hylton, now a ninth grader, can be found in a rehearsal, this time with the Norwalk, Connecticut All-City Junior High Band. Standing on the podium in front of the band is a young composer, Dr. Gregory Kostek. He had attended some of our rehearsals the previous fall, and now he had written a composition

just for us. He knew our strengths and weaknesses, and he had talked with us about why he was a composer, why he approached the musical elements in the composition in a particular way, and how our playing would bring to life the marks on the pages of the scores on the stands in front of us.

I learned a lot from my experience in the band under Dr. Kosteck's direction. Perhaps the most important thing I learned was that music wasn't just written by people who are long-dead, and impossibly far-removed from my world. This was clearly an experience in comprehensive music education and it had a profound influence on me.

Our last autobiographical scene focuses on young music teacher John Hylton, host of a choral festival, with a number of visiting choral ensembles performing. The choral festival involved a competition, with trophies for everyone. The largest trophy would go to the Sweepstakes winner, the ensemble that received the highest rating from the three judges. I will always remember a scene from that festival. It did not occur on stage, but in the warm-up room. I went to the warm-up room to alert the director of one of the choirs that in a few moments it would be time for the choir to move to the performance area. At that point the director gathered his choir around him, and made a speech more or less along the following lines:

All right people, this is it. Please focus, and don't let a mistake on your part cost the choir points off of our rating. This is the moment that we have been working toward for the entire school year. The whole year comes down to the next twenty minutes, and every one of you is on the line. We've worked on these selections for the past seven

months so that we could perform them here at the festival. Etc. Etc.

I cringed as I listened to this pep talk. Is competition that important? Does the success or failure of an entire school year come down to a single performance at a festival? Is summary execution the answer for students who make a mistake in performance? Unfortunately, the point of view articulated by this choral director to his students is not at all uncommon. Is this comprehensive music education? Definitely not. Of course, we want our ensemble to perform at the highest possible level, and of course we want to bring home a large trophy, but should this not be accomplished at the expense of the musical education of the members of the ensemble.

All of these examples were part of my personal experience as a student or teacher involved with musical ensembles. Because of the intensive experiences with music afforded me by ensemble classes I decided upon a career in music education. Although I did not know it at the time, my junior high school band experience with Dr. Kosteck was sponsored by the Contemporary Music Project, one of the most important early initiatives related to comprehensive musicianship to be developed in the second half of the twentieth century.

### **Comprehensive Music Education: Historical Developments**

Of course, since the early days of music education in the United States, we have sought to establish the relevance, validity, and appropriateness of the musical education of our citizens. Over the past three hundred years, various developments have included aspects of comprehensive music education.

In the Colonial period, singing schools were an early example of accountability in music instruction. The singing master depended upon remuneration from the citizens in each town visited to provide a roof over his head and food to eat (Birge, 1966, p. 12). At the conclusion of a few weeks' work, the singing master was compensated and moved on to the next town. The primary goal of instruction was improved hymn singing in colonial churches and the results were subject to immediate public scrutiny. Although this instruction certainly was not comprehensive in many respects, it did exemplify a process with definite goals and objectives developed by the community. Whether or not the objectives were attained was evaluated, providing an immediate basis for teacher accountability.

The first public school music program in the United States was initiated in Boston in 1838. Through the remainder of the nineteenth century, music education in the schools consisted of singing activities of various kinds, including group recreational singing, glee clubs, and oratorio performances. These initial approaches to singing in the schools evolved into choral programs and general music classes. During the first two decades of the twentieth century, school bands and orchestras became part of the curriculum, along with music appreciation, history, and theory. By the last half of the twentieth century, performing ensembles in American schools were second to none in terms of the sophisticated level of performance achieved. However, we ensemble directors have not done as good a job as our colleagues who teach general music classes, in developing a comprehensive approach to instruction.

As the early years of the twentieth century unfolded, communication and transportation in the United States developed and improved, facilitating the

sharing of ideas and methodologies among music educators. With the creation of the Music Supervisors National Conference in 1907, regular meetings of music educators from around the country began to take place, including discussions of various aspects of music education and its role in the public schools of the United States.

At the conclusion of the Second World War in 1945, the attitude in the United States was one of complacency regarding our technological and educational superiority. Our former ally, the Soviet Union, quickly became an adversary. It was felt that the Soviets were relatively primitive and that the aforementioned superiority and industrial might of the United States made us invulnerable to any potential Soviet threat. On October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union successfully launched Sputnik, a basketball-sized satellite that orbited the earth approximately every ninety minutes. The subsequent alarm felt in the United States over this sudden and unexpected evidence of Soviet technical prowess resulted in new attention and additional resources focused on U.S. schools. Consequently, the federal government began to assume a larger role in the education of American children.

Although the public's attention focused initially on science and mathematics education, in time music education received additional attention and support. A pioneering effort to bridge the gap between composers and the people who performed and listened to their music was the Young Composers Project, begun in 1959 and funded by the Ford Foundation. The goal of the Young Composers Project was to place composers in settings around the country helping them gain an understanding of the people for whom they were creating music and helping the students and community members in each setting to understand that composers were not necessarily long-dead European men. This effort had far-reaching

implications for the development of the concept of comprehensive musicianship in U.S. music education.

The Young Composers Project continued until 1968 and the Music Educators National Conference became involved in its administration. Out of the Young Composers Project grew the Contemporary Music Project, which continued until 1973 (Hylton, 1995, pp. 261-262). The Contemporary Music Project issued publications, held conferences, and sought to explain and promote the concept of comprehensive musicianship. As I have mentioned, Dr. Kosteck came to my junior high school and composed music for the junior high band, as part of the Contemporary Music Project. Other curriculum projects initiated in the 1960s, focused on the development of comprehensive musicianship and included The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project, 1965-1970 and The Hawaii Music Curriculum Project, 1968-1972 (Mark, 1978).

The Yale Seminar, in 1963, sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, was a meeting of thirty-one musicians and scholars. The Yale Seminar concluded that the quality of repertoire being performed by school music ensembles was inadequate and did not represent the diversity of excellent musical materials available for study. The Seminar participants also believed that students were not developing individual musicianship through their music education performance experiences, but were simply being taught to develop technical skills to enhance ensemble performance (Palisca, 1963). Unfortunately, professional music educators were notably scarce among the participants in the Yale Seminar, and as a result the report issued did not have the impact intended by its organizers for music teachers in U.S. public schools.

The Tanglewood Symposium, in 1967, was sponsored by MENC, Boston University, the Theodore Presser Foundation, and the Berkshire Music Center (Choate, 1968). It examined the role of music in American society and reaffirmed the importance of a rich variety of diverse musical repertoire in the teaching of music in the U.S. public schools, including contemporary music from a variety of cultures.

One of the best current examples of the continuing influence of comprehensive musicianship on the music education scene is the Wisconsin Comprehensive Musicianship Through Performance Project, which was initiated in 1977, and which has continued to the present. It is a partnership between the Wisconsin Music Educators Association, the Wisconsin School Music Association, and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Participants in this project initially developed models for the teaching of comprehensive musicianship. This information has been disseminated over the years to music teachers in the public schools through convention sessions, as well as in-service sessions and week-long summer workshops (*Comprehensive Musicianship Through Performance*, 2006). The model for comprehensive musicianship developed in Wisconsin includes selection of repertoire, analysis, outcomes, strategies, and assessment (O'Toole, 2003, p. xi). This initiative is notable for its longevity, which may be attributable to the fact that from the outset, it involved master teachers from the K-12 sector in developing and implementing the model.

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education issued its report, which received widespread national attention, entitled *A Nation at Risk*. This report concluded that American children spent less time in school than students in many other countries, and that the

curriculum in American schools was too flexible, allowing too many electives, and failing to focus students' attention on language arts, mathematics, and science. Among the responses to *A Nation at Risk* was *Toward Civilization*, a 1988 study of arts education by the National Endowment for the Arts. Interestingly, an important conclusion came from this report: that music education programs were too narrowly focused on the technical education of students in performance groups, rather than developing children's musical understanding. Conrad (2006) states that these two reports "... sparked discussions of what kind of content should be taught by music educators." He also points out that *Toward Civilization* "found that American music education focused mainly on performance ensembles and performance skills, while largely ignoring musical understandings" (p. 32).

In the 1980s, Howard Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences, described in his 1983 book, *Frames of Mind*, captured the attention of the music education profession, and its influence continues to the present day. The fact that Gardner included musical intelligence as one of the intelligences that should be nurtured through experiences in the schools, was seized upon by music education advocates as strong justification for the place of music in the curriculum.

Gardner was for many years the co-director of Harvard's Project Zero, a research group that investigates learning processes in children, adults, and organizations. Project Zero, in conjunction with the Educational Testing Service and the Pittsburgh Public Schools, created a five-year program called Arts PROPEL, in which students developed artistic skills and understandings through production, perception, and reflection. According to the Project Zero website:

In an Arts Propel classroom, students approach the art form along three crisscrossing pathways that give Arts PROPEL its name:

- (1) production—students are inspired to learn the basic skills and principles of the art form by putting their ideas into music, words, or visual form; (2) perception—students study works of art to understand the kinds of choices artists make and to see connections between their own and others' work; (3) reflection—students assess their work according to personal goals and standards of excellence in the field.

Arts PROPEL is relevant to this discussion because of the musical understandings it sought to develop, and the authentic assessment provided in the model.

Another indication of the influence of comprehensive music education was the development, in the mid-1990s, of national standards for the arts, including music, by a consortium of arts organizations including MENC, along with the National Art Education Association, the American Alliance for Theatre and Education, and the National Dance Association. The National Standards for Music Education include the following content standards as well as achievement standards related to each, arranged by grade level groupings (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994, pp. 26-29):

1. Singing, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music.
2. Performing on instruments, alone and with others, a varied repertoire of music.
3. Improvising melodies, variations, and

- accompaniments.
4. Composing and arranging music within specified guidelines.
  5. Reading and notating music.
  6. Listening to, analyzing, and describing music.
  7. Evaluating music and music performances.
  8. Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts.
  9. Understanding music in relation to history and culture.

According to the document's Summary Statement (p. 131):

Students work toward *comprehensive* competence from the very beginning, preparing in the lower grades for deeper and more rigorous work each succeeding year .... These Standards provide a vision of competence and educational effectiveness, but without creating a mold into which all arts programs must fit. The Standards are concerned with the *results* (in the form of student learning) that come from a basic education in the arts, *not with how those results ought to be delivered*. Those matters are for states, localities, and classroom teachers to decide. In other words, while the Standards provide educational goals and not a curriculum, they can help improve all types of arts instruction.

The National Standards are concerned with the behaviors that should be the focus of music education activity. They focus on individual students and what those students should achieve as a result of music instruction. Implicit in the Standards (and explicitly alluded to in some of the achievement standards) are the basic elements of music and heightened student perceptions of each. Thus, they are aesthetic

in their approach and they are anchored in the bedrock structure of music. They contribute to a comprehensive approach as defined here.

In 2002, President George W. Bush signed a re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that has come to be known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). It set goals related to the measurement of student achievement in language arts, mathematics, and science, to be tested by the states. It also established benchmarks which school districts have had to attain in order to avoid sanctions including the closure of schools and districts. It should be noted that the arts are considered a core subject by NCLB. However, the key to whether a subject thrives or withers in a curriculum is the testing of outcomes. Thus far, there has been limited testing of arts competencies, due to funding constraints and failure to recognize the true validity of the arts as a core subject. While it is important to test the results of music instruction, along with other core subjects, it is also a challenge to be certain that all of the results of instruction are tested, and that we as music educators do not succumb to the temptation to "teach to the test" and let the content of a state mandated test dictate what is taught.

David Myers, in a keynote speech (2005) to the International Conference on Music and Lifelong Learning, at The University of Wisconsin-Madison, discussed his concerns with the failure of music education to provide experiences that are relevant to the post-high school lives of American students. Myers states that:

What is not clear is whether people perceive tangible links between school arts experiences and the lasting intrinsic values of arts education (p. 3).



Myers believes that the recommendations of the Yale Seminar and Tanglewood Symposium could have portended a new era in music education but that instead:

Even by the 1970s when American music educators began to be pink-slipped and long standing school music programs began to disappear, the profession demonstrated little willingness to alter its image toward more holistic, lifelong considerations (p. 6).

Although he cites several recent examples of innovative research and programming pertinent to music as lifelong learning, he is deeply concerned about a crisis of relevance for U.S. music education.

### **Comprehensive Music Education in the Twenty-first Century**

So what does this all mean in 2007? We live in a world of iPods, Blackberries, 9/11, Play Station III, Columbine, distance learning, and other words, phrases, and events that would have been incomprehensible even ten years ago.

How is the concept of comprehensive music education impacting the profession today? Let me begin by discussing just a few examples of ways that the ideas of comprehensive music education impacted my own choral teaching. Some examples include the following.

#### *Use of questioning techniques.*

Students are perceptive listeners, and they can often identify what needs to be done to improve a performance. After they have sung a portion of music in rehearsal, ask *them* to identify the trouble spots, and what needs to be done to improve them. When working with a particular section, ask the students who are not singing to listen to the sections of the choir who are, and to identify

strengths and weaknesses in the performance.

#### *Diverse, high-quality repertoire.*

There has been an explosion of performance editions of music from various cultural traditions, and a new emphasis on learning the appropriate tone quality to be used for the music of a particular cultural tradition. As the world has continued to shrink, there are increasing opportunities to hear fine ensembles from around the world.

*Opportunities for students to make musical and aesthetic judgments.* In my choral ensembles, I provided opportunities for students to try a particular selection at varied tempos, with varied phrasing, and varied dynamics. Opportunities were provided for them to articulate why they prefer a particular way of performing a piece or a section of a piece of music. Selected students were also given a chance to conduct.

*Discussion of style, composer, period, and how the basic musical elements interact.* These discussions should occur as part of the regular flow of rehearsal.

*Formal and informal evaluation of results.* As a choral music educator and as a choral student, listening is a key component of success. I frequently recorded rehearsals and performances and provided opportunities for students to articulate both their evaluation of the technical aspects of performance and their reflection on the impact of the music on them as performers.

Over the past fifty years, there have been many symposia, conferences, publications, and projects that have embraced the concept, and attempted, with varying degrees of success, to disseminate and implement a comprehensive approach. The idea of comprehensive music education has withstood the test of time.

In fact, effective music teaching has always been comprehensive. Looking back over my career as a learner and a teacher

(not that teaching and learning are mutually exclusive, of course), the music education experiences that have had a significant impact on me as a person and a musician have connected me to the deeper things in life, and in making that connection, have helped me discover the deeper aspects of my own identity.

Comprehensive music education connects us to the very structure and essence of music by focusing our attention on the bedrock elements that define it. In so doing, it conveys us to the deepest and most satisfying wellsprings of a meaningful life. When the connection between instructional activities and the essence of the music is lost, music education becomes a trivial matter worthy of consignment only to the second or third tier of educational priorities, or worse. No one wants to be part of a third-rate enterprise. When the connection with musical meaning is lost in the pursuit of the superficial we have traveled into dangerous territory.

To implement a comprehensive music program, one must focus on the *totality* of the class, the course, and the curriculum. There is a time in a choral rehearsal, for example, when rote learning is effective and appropriate--an obvious example would be in the teaching and learning of a foreign pronunciation. However, as one looks at the totality of the particular rehearsal, the particular semester of choral classes, the total choral program, and the total music curriculum from kindergarten through high school and beyond, there should be a thoughtfully constructed sequence of appropriate musical understandings which, taken as a whole, offers students the opportunity to tap into the power of music by elucidating music's structure and the interrelatedness of its various dimensions.

The problem with the vast majority of music curricula today is that they are

truncated around the middle school level. By high school, the offerings for music students tend to consist largely, though not entirely, of performing ensembles. These courses meet the needs of the musically talented students, but often the school music education experiences for most of the student population ended in the sixth grade. Since the school population comprises the taxpayers, school board members, and elected officials of the next generation, this does not portend well for the future, and it has already had negative consequences for music education programs.

This is not to say that students' personal, out-of-school musical experiences end in the sixth grade. My ninth grader has an iPod that is loaded with music, and which is seemingly attached to her head from the time she arrives home from school until bedtime (aside from a few mandated periods of conversation with her parents). Forty years ago the Tanglewood Symposium focused on the need to incorporate a diversity of music into our programs that included the music that our students experienced as part of their culture.

Do we have an obligation to provide more than ensemble experiences for the students in today's high schools? Should we be educating students with attention to the musical life they will lead beyond high school? Twenty-five years ago an MENC national meeting had as a focus, "Music as Life-long Learning." There has been limited work done since to address the appropriate role, if any, of music in adult learning. Twenty-five years ago, it was clear that the demographics of the U.S. population would experience a dramatic shift. By the turn of the century, as the baby boomers began to move into their senior years in increasing numbers, this shift would create many societal implications. My university has developed a program of courses that we market to residents of senior housing that we

offer on-site, including courses in music and the other arts. Although there are some relatively limited efforts being made to develop music education programming for adults, work needs to be done to assess the needs of adult learners at various stages of life, and to meet those needs with well thought out, comprehensive programs in music education.

How can we, as music educators in the first decade of the twenty-first century, assure that comprehensive music education will continue to meet the needs of learners? How do we connect our students to the essence of music and its basic elements?

First, we must model comprehensive music education in our own teaching. In our teaching, the primary objective should be to increase our students' understanding of the structure of music. Our teaching should illustrate for them the interwoven connections of the musical material we deal with to the structure of music itself, and to the other courses they are taking. Music theory, history, performance ensembles, and applied music all tie together through the basic structure of music. This is not a new idea, but in an era of increasing specialization, it must be recognized and reflected in the instruction we deliver.

Second, the focus of our teaching should be high-quality, diverse repertoire. With the abundance of high-quality music available, representing a huge range of cultures, there is no reason to settle for anything other than excellent musical materials in the work that we do with our students, whether in ensembles, general music, applied study, or any aspect of music education.

Third, we must guard the integrity of our teacher education programs and seek to provide our students with the tools and materials they need to be comprehensive music educators. There are many vexing challenges confronting music education

programs today, including alternative certification programs, expanded general education requirements in schools of education and elsewhere, and expanded requirements imposed by state departments of education.

Fourth, we must continue to evaluate the multi-faceted results of our efforts. Calls for accountability in music education have been a feature of the professional literature for the past fifty years. Evaluation is a double-edged sword. The simplest evaluative instruments are paper-and-pencil tests of cognitively oriented material. We have always been publicly accountable for some aspects of our music programs. Just as the colonial singing master was held accountable for the results achieved, our performing groups have been evaluated on their technique, style, and interpretation. However, we need to continue our efforts to evaluate the affective education of our students, for the way students feel about music as a result of our instruction will have an impact on their adult lives.

Fifth, we need to examine the music curricula that are in place in the public schools of the United States. A comprehensive approach to music education must be part of the totality of the curriculum.

Sixth, and last, we need to continue to apply technology to our music instruction as appropriate. Our students have grown up with sophisticated technology. Technology has continued to impact music in numerous ways, from the instructional support software that has become commonplace on college and university campuses, to the popularity of downloading music to iPods and other devices, to the implementation of courses in distance learning.

In 2007, fifty years after the era of curricular reform began in the wake of Sputnik, and a hundred years since the first meeting of the Music Supervisors National

Conference in Keokuk, Iowa, it is appropriate to reflect on the importance of comprehensive music education, the role that it has played in U.S. music education efforts, and the potential for its future. As arts educators, each of us is involved in important work. Each of you is a VIP. I

appreciate the opportunity to speak to you for a few minutes today, and to spend time learning from each of you throughout the remainder of this Symposium. And remember, when you come to a fork in the road, take it!

---

## REFERENCES

- Arts Propel*. Retrieved October 27, 2006 from <http://www.pz.harvard.edu/Research/PROPEL.htm>
- Baseball Almanac: Yogi Berra Quotes*. Retrieved October 20, 2006 from <http://www.baseball-almanac.com/quotes/quoberra.shtml>
- Birge, E.B. (1966). *History of Public School Music in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference. (Original work published Bryn Mawr, PA: Oliver Ditson, 1928).
- Choate, R.A. (1968). *Documentary Report of the Tanglewood Symposium*. Washington, DC: Music Education National Conference.
- Comprehensive Musicianship Through Performance*. Retrieved October 20, 2006 from <http://www.wmea.com/CMP/>
- Conrad, D. (2006). American music education: A struggle for time and curriculum. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*, 86, 31-34.
- Consortium of National Arts Education Associations. (1994). *National Standards for Arts Education*. Washington, DC: Music Education National Conference.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hylton, J. (1995). *Comprehensive Choral Music Education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mark, M. (1978). *Contemporary music education*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Morris, W. (Ed.). (1969). *The American heritage dictionary of the English language*. New York: American Heritage Publishing Company.
- Myers, D.E. (2006). Freeing music education from schooling: Toward a lifespan perspective on music teaching and learning. *International Journal Of Community Music* [on-line] 4. Available: <http://www.intljcm.com/current.html>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Endowment for the Arts. (1988). *Toward civilization: A report on arts education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- No Child Left Behind*. Retrieved November 10, 2006 from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml>
- O'Toole, P. (2003). *Shaping Sound Musicians*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*. (1994). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Palisca, C.V. (1963). *Seminar on music education: Cooperative research project No. G-013*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Reimer, B. (1970, 1989, 2003). *A philosophy of music education*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.