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THOUGHTS ON ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP
IN A MUSIC UNIT

In thinking about what I might submit for consideration by the *Journal of Performing Arts Leadership in Higher Education*, I pondered various topics. The difficulty with creating a “10 Top Tips for Successful Chairing” is that chairs, especially those new in the job, have little time to read. (Indeed, here let me add: If you don't have time to read this article, please just skip to the last paragraph at the end.) In examining the journal’s mission and goals, I found:

... dedicated to the *enrichment* of leadership in the *performing arts* in higher education.

and

... to disseminate information, ideas and *experiences* in performing arts leadership [my emphasis].

The words *enrichment*, *experiences* and *performing arts* attracted my attention, leading me to think I could in fact offer some ideas toward those worthy goals. The observations I make are not intended to be the last words on the subjects, but rather to be opening thoughts — to increase the reader’s awareness of areas of importance in administration, and to stimulate an appetite to learn more, through reading, workshops for chairs and conversations with others. These thoughts reflect upon experiences in a number of roles: as a young faculty member who began as instructor and gradually moved to the rank of professor; associate dean of a college of fine arts, and then of a college of arts and sciences in a private, Midwestern university; and as a music department chair at a land-grant university. Sound familiar? I suspect this is a route followed by many administrators. (But the curious thing: As we embark on this path, usually with optimism and enthusiasm, we quickly realize that nobody gave us a map or instruction book.) Finally, at the end of the day, I returned to that honorable place from which administrators begin: the faculty. Not all in administration stop after a successful (or unsuccessful, for that matter) term as chair, of course. Some continue the journey, becoming deans, provosts and higher. My major teacher in graduate school followed such a trajectory, ultimately becoming chancellor, first at Nebraska and then at Chapel Hill. Imagine: UNC being run by an organist!

Some of these senior administrative titles originated in the church — cathedrals in particular. The dean was (is) the head of a cathedral or other major (often collegiate) church. The provost has authority over things musical and liturgical. After these offices were taken into academia, the dean assumed the role of vigorous advocate for the departments in his college; and the provost was the chief defender of the university’s academic enterprise. A problem nowadays for chairs is that many deans and provosts seem to be ensnared in upward
drafts, like antigravity: Some deans want to be provosts; many provosts want to be presidents or chancellors. This occupies much of their time, thoughts and priorities. Many music units are headed by a dean, of course; and some of my good friends are or have been provosts, so no offense intended. But new deans: Please resist requiring visions, niche plans, assessments etc. from your already overworked chairs. Too many departments are called upon to carry the heavy burden of producing these repeatedly, as a procession of new deans seek to learn about the components of their units. And new provosts: Is it really necessary to reorganize the institution's collegiate structure? I've recently noticed a new term in academia: “transitioning." It’s what happens when a dean's great ideas don't work out and he is moved south-laterally to another position in the institution. In the business world he would, of course, simply be sacked.

The Work of the Chair

Lists are quite popular these days. The top-10 this and that, Letterman's, and many more. I considered making “The Top 10 Tasks of the Department Chair,” but, as it happens, that wasn't necessary. Instead, consult “Advice for Chairs”1 in a book by Deryl R. Leaming. The skills and actions he details in the opening chapters are complete, comprehensive and right on the money. The book also contains useful information on a variety of legal issues, including copyright.

A chair, of course, is the head of a department, the leader of an academic unit. I often thought of the chair as an army captain, down in the trenches with his troops, where the shelling is, getting orders from the general up on the hill (and out of harm's way). Leadership Among Peers2 is the subtitle of Alan Tucker's book, and gives a good suggestion of the tricky role that chairs play – part scholar, part teacher, responsible both ↑ to his superior and ↓ to his faculty. (Keep in mind: The chair doesn't have a faculty; the faculty have a chair.) Michael C. Munger, who writes frequently for the Chronicle of Higher Education, offers “Ten Suggestions for a New Department Chair”3 (even the Chronicle makes lists!), of which I like the first one best: “You will never have more friends than you have right now.” I asked an acquaintance, who had recently stepped down following a long term as chair of music at a major state university, how he was enjoying his new life. “It’s wonderful,” he replied. “Now when my colleagues wave at me they use all five fingers!” (Our history department has a bylaw: A department chair may serve for only a single five-year term. One can see both pros and cons in this, and you are free to debate these with our historians.)

There was a time when the work of the chair was easier than today. This is not “good-old days” thinking, but simply recalling a less-stressful time before budget crunches, “Revenue-Based Budgeting,” litigations (from without and within), and parents who believe that because they are paying for the education, their student should get an “A.” When I came to my institution in 1987 it was
just at the end of the time when little work was expected from chairs in the summer, something unimaginable in 2013. But let us not lament: Now is the time in which we live and work. And just as we make music in the present, we offer leadership for the present, and into the future. We asked for the job; it’s important not only to do well in it, but also to enjoy it.

Do not be discouraged by the huge number of tasks and responsibilities detailed in articles and job descriptions. Be not dismayed by the titles of the many books and articles ready to come to your aid (I took these off the Internet today): “Working with Difficult People,” “Best Practices in Faculty Evaluation,” “Leading Academic Change,” “Moving Talk to Action” and more. I once read a notice in a British newspaper, advertising a conference for what we would call junior high school music teachers, called “Making Music With the Unwilling.” In one book’s title the author suggests our work is an art: The Art of Administration (Kenneth E. Eple). I’ll stop now.

The Chair As Communicator

Few skills are more important to success in nearly every endeavor than communication — written and oral. Making things clear is not always an easy task. As Bernard Shaw stated, “The single biggest problem in communication is the illusion that it has taken place.” Chairs must communicate in order to inform, defend, advocate, solicit money, report and more. Some experts advise saying important things at least five times, in different ways.

As suggested earlier, the role of chair is a tricky one to balance. He must communicate the department’s needs, ↑ to the dean and provost. And then, he must interpret the senior administrator’s response, ↓ to the faculty, who don’t always grasp, or care about, institutional priorities. It is your responsibility to advocate for your department’s needs as effectively as possible. But it is also necessary for you to know and understand the needs and priorities of the organic whole, which is the college and university, and when necessary, explain to the faculty why something is not going to happen or be approved.

Be truthful to your faculty: If it can’t be done say so, and explain why. Don’t say, “We’ll see.” That works no better with faculty than with 6-year-olds. And above all, do not say one thing to a faculty member and something else to another. If you lie: The end is near for you. If you are caught at it once, it will always be remembered. If it happens more than once, it’s time to think about “transitioning.”

There are times when back-and-forth emails are not effective: Situations can become muddled or inflamed. At that point, “Please stop by for a conversation about this” is a good next step. Otherwise, conversations are for small talk, encouragement, sunny chats and other nonbusiness topics. Everything else should be in writing: especially permissions (to depart from the ordinary or to spend money) and criticisms.
Time Management

Some suggestions:

• Enlist the aid of your clerical assistant — let’s refer to him/her as your secretary, whatever the title.

• Be in control of your schedule (to the extent possible!). Get your secretary to help with this.

• Begin making the schedule by blocking out your teaching times, assuming you conduct an ensemble or teach a class. Important: If your class is, say, MWF at 10, don’t block out merely 10-11. It takes time (and is a bit scary) to transform yourself from administrative head to professor. Prepare your text and materials for the following lecture immediately after class — it makes the transformation easier.

• Add regular times to work for yourself, dealing with the important for a change, as compared with the urgent. Set times to go to the gym (see below).

• And speaking of those “important” things: it is good to attend to these first thing in the morning, when you’re fresh and before the interruptions begin. Set certain times during the day for doing email; at other times, ignore it (and turn off the “ping” that announces the incoming). Seeing to emails can be done during your “down” times, when you’re lower in creative energy. If you’re afraid to allow your inbox to go unwatched, let your secretary view it and notify you if something comes in from the dean.

• The remainder of each day can be given over to the routine work of the chair, with two variants: door open and door shut. The former invites faculty to pop in for a chat. The closed door says, “I’m very busy; please arrange a time with Mrs. Wiggins.”

• You might say, “All this will never work,” but you won’t know if you don’t try. Perhaps add a humorous sign to the closed door.

• Reading — the Chronicle et al—may have to wait until evening, but that’s much preferable to taking office work home.

Delegate significant responsibilities to your secretary. This is very different from trying to avoid tasks. Delegation is good: It’s empowering, gets people involved and transforms spectators into stakeholders. Delegation is efficient: it takes care of an item that would otherwise have been on your to-do list. It often puts a task in the hands of somebody who may know more about it then you. Delegation does not (should not) mean “dumping.” Being comfortable in sharing authority is a mark of the confident manager. Are you spending time worrying about classroom assignments? Or course rotations? Why? There are others who
can do this task, perhaps even better than you. Nobody likes a meddler or micro-manager, so don’t be one. Delegate a responsibility, arrange what is necessary for success and then get out of the way.

Ask your secretary to be the keeper of your calendar. Put the secretary’s desk between you and the faculty oops, I mean the door (refer to the “open door” bullet, above). Have the secretary keep a file of tasks and responsibilities that recur regularly (sometimes called a “tickler file”), and have him remind you of these ahead of time. Indeed, I’ve been blessed with secretaries who take on many of these tasks themselves, bringing in a draft for review. Also in this category are thank-you notes of various types. Your secretary can bring in the completed letter for a signature and perhaps a friendly, hand-written P.S. Some chairs, for reasons I cannot imagine, do not wish to empower their secretaries, dumping mere drudgeries upon them instead. I know one chair who, when he goes out, doesn’t tell his secretary where he’s going or even when he’ll be back. That’s crazy.

As a newly appointed assistant dean, my first mentor was the dean. He immediately impressed upon me the importance of being a dictator. By which I mean, of course, using dictation equipment. He promptly equipped me with a handset and my secretary with a playback transcriber. I resisted initially, as I often do with new technology. And then I tried using it — it was great! It saved me much time and, even better, brought my secretary into my work because she was now aware of issues with which I was dealing.

The Care and Protection of the Faculty

One of the most critical responsibilities of the chair is overseeing the recruitment of excellent faculty. I suggest that nothing is more important, then, than the subsequent support and nourishment of their success — through the increasingly frightening P&T process, and the beginning of their professional lives. Expectations for promotion and tenure should be laid out clearly even before the first day of a new faculty member’s appointment. I suggest assigning a mentor to each new person, a senior faculty member from the same area. But the chair must be personally involved as well. In many academic departments it is customary to protect young faculty from committee assignments and to assign lighter–than–average loads. Chairs of music, however, seldom have the opportunity of doing this: Young people are often needed to energize committees’ thinking, and seldom can we spare anybody from a full load.

The faculty must see the chair as their best friend — really. If not, forget it. Consider establishing a weekly newsletter: for announcements and, especially, for the blowing of faculty horns. Seriously: It’s very important to celebrate colleagues’ accomplishments, and it costs absolutely nothing. My initial newsletters were printed on paper, of a conspicuous color, chosen to stand out from all those
white sheets in faculty boxes. Now, of course, these would be digital. The newsletter was published every Thursday at noon, and there was a reason for this. At the top of every issue was a listing of all student, ensemble and faculty concerts for the weekend and coming week. You see, I would try anything to increase the number of faculty attending recitals. Preparing the newsletter was a simple matter. As news, including details of accomplishments by faculty and their students, came to me, I inserted them into a running computer file, which I then sent to my secretary (the publisher of this great weekly) every Thursday morning. I enjoyed doing this; you might not, however, in which case ask your secretary to be the editor.

It is OK to make a jackass of yourself, very occasionally, and when that happens you might as well laugh, since the world is already laughing with at you. It’s easy for me to name my career’s most embarrassing moment. Can you top losing the entire university wind ensemble, on foot, in a small town in Germany? And no, I hadn’t found them by noon so couldn’t give the expected speech at the lord mayor’s luncheon, because I didn’t know where it was!

Suffer with the faculty when necessary. Rail against the ignorance and tyranny of those who afflict the faithful (i.e., those who don’t allocate sufficient lines or funding for the “important” and “essential” needs of the unit). Once or twice a year it’s OK to lose it: Rage against the forces that impede the good work of the unit. If you are successful you will perspire, change color and get raspy in the throat. Afterward you can apologize for being so emotionally involved in the faculty’s problem. Take a stand. I would not go out of my way, of course, to antagonize the president of my university, who was basically a nice guy and did much good for the place. But there were a few occasions when I thoroughly ticked him off by digging in and refusing to do something he wanted. Each case was a small matter that I considered to be inappropriate interference and so declined to do as told. I considered occasionally standing up to the president as much a sacred duty as separating the dean from her money (but not at the department’s peril of course!).

Administrators should have a “servant mentality.” *The chair does not have a faculty; the faculty have a chair*, remember? Our job is to support and facilitate the work of others. And that is the responsibility of all others in the office as well. “How can I help?” is a good beginning to a conversation with a faculty member with a need or problem. Facilitate the faculty’s work; help solve their problems; then get out of the way.

One hopes that administrators do not seek positions in order to possess authority. Authority is a risky commodity. To paraphrase holy writ, *The love of authority is the root of all kinds of evil*. A good friend of mine is a bishop within the Anglican Communion. A question once asked of him on an interview has stayed with me for some 20 years: He was asked to talk about the way he would
use authority, *mindful of its fragile nature* [my emphasis]. Priests, of course, have the solid rock of canon law behind them; we, alas, do not. Areas of authority typically given department chairs are: budget allocation and spending; teaching assignments; and the most fun of all, faculty performance appraisals.

**The Care and Protection of the Chair:**

*Some suggestions, defensive and offensive*

At the end of a meeting, or at the end of the day, make a note of the people you’ve met with, what was discussed and the outcomes. It’s absolutely vital to have records of meetings and conversations. These will be key ingredients in the event you must begin a “paper trail” for any reason. You will impress faculty if they see you taking notes during a meeting. The more voraciously the better.

In the occasional conversation with a “difficult” person, especially if it involves matters serious enough to impact on appraisal or future employment, invite the assistant chair (or other appropriate person) to sit in. Mention beforehand that he is to sit there, say nothing and listen (for the record). When the matter is substantial and there exists a faculty union (as in my situation), the rules for the meeting are quite different, of course. I frequently outline in bullet points on a 4x6 card the main points I wish to get across. Place the card against an item in the middle of the desk, and you can refer to it while maintaining eye contact with the person. Try this if confrontations make you nervous or uncomfortable. Not having to memorize the essential points lessens the stress for me.

A related technique: When there is a matter that seems to completely take over your mind, the resolution of which will require a conversation with a difficult person, try jotting down the bullet points of what you intend to say. Otherwise, you may find yourself thinking about it all the time — composing in your head and revising it, day and night. Jotting down the basics of your “speech” is helpful in excising it from your thoughts.

A different kind of conversation is the three-person discussion, in which you invite two people who are quarreling or complaining about each other to come in, with the hope of thrashing things out. This has never worked for me: In spite of all each has said to you, they often have little to say to each other. In these cases, a decision from the chair will be necessary to bring about a truce.

Go to the gym. *Make* time (it’s unlikely you’ll often *find* time) for physical exercise. I was never particularly thrilled to discover the dean swimming in the lane next to me, but oh well … perhaps this exemplifies the symbiotic relationship between chair and dean, as advocated by many. Those two or three times each week when I made it to the gym were significant investments in my physical, emotional and mental health. I recall one difficult day when my secretary was delegated by the rest of the office staff to put one foot in the door and say,
“The office thinks you need to go for a swim.”

Seek the company of others and find a mentor. I hope your university has some sort of “chairs caucus” — regular occasions when we assemble ourselves, without deans, and set our own agendas for discussion. Identify a few chairs you would like to know better and ask if you could meet with each for coffee and a chat. Senior chairs will feel honored to do this. This is especially helpful for chairs new to the university who take office in September and have so many important tasks to accomplish before Thanksgiving, their first day off. Learn institutional secrets from the old guys: how to get things done, approved, paid for and more. As I was sorting through the business of merit salary increases for the first time, I sought advice from one of the old guys, asking, “In merit increases, do you allocate dollars or percentages?” “It depends on who you want mad at you: the senior faculty or the junior faculty!” he replied.

Try not to be rattled by disputes with nasty people. I wish I had followed this advice early in my tenure. In cases involving the union, the grievance officer sitting opposite you is just doing his job, as you do yours. Perhaps that’s easier said than done, but when your position is correct and you have your facts prepared, right should prevail. If you find yourself with litigation threatening, try not to be fearful. Although it may be difficult not to feel threatened or offended, these are not personal issues, so do not allow thoughts of your opponent to go home with you. It may seem that you are the personal target for these actions, but keep in mind: Chairs are indemnified by their schools against legal peril. Let the attorney worry. This situation that has run on for over a year, consumed immemorable energy, caused you to bark at your dog at home, and kept you from really important work, is to the lawyers but the removal of a carbuncle. “Don’t worry, we’ll take care of it. It will hurt for a while, but then all will be well.” Useful information on legal issues related to harassment or discrimination (sexual and other), civil rights, insurance matters, faculty with chemical or alcohol dependencies, and legal liabilities can be found in Enhancing Departmental Leadership.5

A new chair sometimes has an initial “honeymoon” period in which to get some essential work done. The first change I made was reducing the number of faculty meetings from one per week [!] to one per month. This, believe it or not, upset the faculty a great deal. The reason for the weekly schedule: The faculty didn’t trust one another. There had been open warfare in one applied area for nearly a decade. A chair cannot legislate good behavior, nor can he cause people to like each other. He can, however, mandate that people are respectful of each other. Progress in this area was slow but sure. A good sign that things were going well: More and more faculty began to leave their office doors open. Another initiative was creating an executive committee, elected by the faculty (modifying the department’s bylaws in the process). This allowed for faculty involvement and
contributions to decision-making processes. It also gave me a little protection and insulation, so I could leave my door open.

One more resource deserves a mention: The Department Chair As Academic Leader\textsuperscript{6} provides useful chapters on a number of topics. Of particular interest are those on faculty recruitment and managing the search process; encouraging and facilitating the professional development of faculty; and leading a strategic planning process.

Credentials As an Artist

Many of these comments are general in nature and could, of course, apply to a variety of administrative tasks. You may have heard it said of some senior academic, “He might just as well be running a Kmart!” But we are faculty in the performing arts, and, as such, more is expected of us, and consequently of our chairs. Professors of music are unusual people. No, no — I’m not perpetuating the old “temperamental artist” canard. I’m referring to those specialized needs necessary for artists to thrive and remain creative. For many years I attended a meeting of state university music executives in which each day was devoted to roundtable discussions of various issues. One year a university temporarily without a music executive sent its chair of anthropology instead. He said little, instead watching and listening intently. Toward the end of the week he was finally heard from, usually beginning his remarks with, “In observing the behavior and actions of musicians, I have noted that … .” I expect the week’s experience gave him ingredients for an interesting paper.

Just as music faculty have heavier teaching loads (sometimes of our own volition) than faculty in most other departments, so do their chairs. Music faculty must be excellent teachers but also successful performers or scholars — requirements in common with those in other disciplines. But there is much more. Music faculty in addition must be ever diligent in recruiting students, to ensure a sufficient population of students for their studios and the department’s ensembles. (Many of them have way too many students in their studios and will spend considerable time complaining to you about this surplus, as if it is your fault. Why did they accept so many in the first place?) Who else in the university, other than those in athletics, must recruit their own students? After the students arrive, faculty must teach but also nourish, nurse, support, cheer, counsel and encourage them, while also preparing them for countless recital appearances. And when it’s all done, we do our best to find them jobs. The chair works right alongside the faculty in all these activities. In addition (and, unfortunately, unlike most faculty I’ve known), the chair strives to be present at as many student, faculty and ensemble concerts as is humanly possible. Someone from the department, in addition to the studio teacher, should be at the senior
recital! When the sheer number of students inhibits this, well … we do our best. Something that helped me greatly: I asked the department’s tech person to run a wire from the recital hall to the audio system in my office. I could do routine paperwork at my desk while listening to the first half, then during the half-time applause run out into the lobby to mix with the audience.

In the great majority of cases, music faculty work very hard to manage these time-consuming responsibilities effectively. The fact that your faculty are performing musicians does not make them odd (as believed by some administrators I’ve known). The perception problem, if there is one, is that some in the university may not know or understand what we do or how we do it. It’s tiresome, but necessary, to continually explain the nature of our work to deans and their bean counters.

The Administrator in the Performing Arts

It is essential that the chair demonstrate evidence of professional accomplishment as well — at least when going into the position, difficult as it may be to maintain after a time. This is important not only for the faculty and students, but also for members of the community, especially those who may become supporters of the music program. I once interviewed for an administrative position at an “institute of music” (conservatory) and was pleasantly surprised when told I was required to perform on the organ as part of the process.

A new president came to my university in the same year as my arrival. (This was just at the end of the Good Old Days but a year or so before the advent of email.) The new president assembled the chairs and gave his views of their roles and responsibilities. During the subsequent question time one chair said, “You’ve detailed the various tasks of the department chair, but you haven’t referred to our responsibility for teaching and scholarly/creative activities.” He responded, “Well, I can imagine you could do a little of one or the other; but certainly not both and still be an effective chair.” That created quite a stir at the time, but reflecting upon it, he was correct to some extent. I believe the chair should teach (or conduct) and always managed to do so. And, as referenced above, this required more than merely the time necessary to prepare for and teach class. It also involved pulling one’s self out of the chair’s skin and being transformed back into a teacher.

It was even more difficult to be a department chair and maintain credible skills in performance. I found no time for practicing, so I had to make time (evenings, weekends). And when a performance approached, a defensive instinct would kick in, causing me to get up and close the door in the middle of the afternoon, saying, “I’m going to practice; I’ll be back tomorrow.” Nonetheless, as difficult as it is to find time, scholarly/artistic accomplishment must be
demonstrated and revealed before the faculty, and yes, the students. It’s a very
good thing that, as we gain age and experience, we also develop the ability
to practice more efficiently, getting the job done in less time. As mentioned
earlier, my major (organ) teacher in doctoral study subsequently became dean
of fine arts at the University of Kansas. And he continued performing. He then
became dean of arts and architecture at Penn State. He continued performing,
even persuading the Penn State folks to purchase a fine pipe organ for his
use, installing it in a room next to the dean’s office. He was elected national
president of the American Guild of Organists, and continued playing recitals.
He subsequently became provost of the University of South Carolina, and then
came the shock: He announced in his AGO president’s column that he was
giving up performing. Through all those years we thought, If he can, we can. But
finally, as he moved on to successive chancellorships, he just didn’t have enough
time. We can only do our best.

These are thoughts of a chair reflecting back at the end of a career. I know
that current chairs and deans face new realities in the present and for the future.
Looming large: accountability, assessment and revenue-based budgets, especially
at land-grant universities where those in the academy must explain and interpret
their work to state legislators. I hope new chairs enjoy the work, which I found
rewarding and fulfilling. In closing, I offer that final paragraph, mentioned at the
beginning. It comprises a list of suggestions that, I hope, will enrich the work of
those in performing arts leadership, perhaps even making it easier.

Protect your faculty • Protect yourself • Advance your programs • Separate the
dean from her money • Work harder than you expect your faculty to work • Let
them see you being a creative musician • Don’t charge ahead — there may be
nobody behind you • Don’t push from behind — nobody likes that • Instead,
stand aside, out of the way and let things happen • Empower! • Get Out! (Of the
office, that is: to the gym or to have coffee and a chat with a fellow department
chair) • Enable! • Try to be funny in faculty meetings • Be honest with the faculty •
Deal with the urgent but not at the expense of the important • Don’t move/handle
papers on your desk more than once: act, file, or pitch; the pile will not compost
itself • Don’t take work home (easier said than done) • Bear in mind that most
problems are not of your making, and there are some problems you just cannot
solve • A goal of having everybody be happy is unattainable. Settle for everyone
(including yourself) not being unhappy! • It sometimes takes courage to tell the
truth — to say what needs to be said, as compared with what people want to
hear • So, BE BRAVE!
David Herman is Trustees Professor of Music and university organist emeritus at the University of Delaware.

Endnotes

4 Delegating authority, however, is another matter. Asking your secretary to assume control of tasks may be OK, but not of people, especially faculty. That puts the secretary at risk. And you don’t have that much authority to spare.
7 This was a while ago, so it really was a wire. Such a transmission would be even easier now.
8 When is the last time you saw a poster on campus advertising that a chemistry professor will be performing public experiments in his lab on Tuesday night at 8 — admission $10, free to students with ID?
DO IT ALL AND LIKE IT: REALITIES AND EXPECTATIONS FOR 21ST-CENTURY MUSIC IN HIGHER EDUCATION

One decade into the twenty-first century, in a complex global community of which one part is a diverse and politically polarized America, the climate in much of higher education is such that professors of music might easily feel confused, overworked and underappreciated. We work in a time when governments speak almost exclusively of primary and secondary education, of head-start programs and vocational/professional education, or of science and technology. STEM (science, technology, engineering, math) is one of the acronyms du jour.\textsuperscript{1} We work in a time, too, when funding for the arts is a frequent political football, even a scapegoat as parties bicker over aesthetic choices and suggest reforms to limit creative expression that does not conform to the ideals of particular constituencies.

On campus, we listen while university administrators pronounce many of their public initiatives, investments and their most public praise for science and technology, recognizing that these disciplines claim the national spotlight for the moment and supply a principal source of revenue for university coffers. Take the leadership to one side, however, and they are frequently generous in their praise of the arts on campus as a source of pride that brings great value to the university, particularly in outreach to the community. A professor of music can indeed feel valued, but only so much, and mostly out of print and off-camera.

New faculty in music should begin their careers in higher education fully aware of this climate. Yes, the arts bring status and value to a university. Money, however, attracts money, and STEM disciplines have federal granting agencies in place from which to solicit considerable monetary inflows for a university. The current reality is that music often appears to serve more as a loss leader than as a revenue generator in higher education: The majority of collegiate music faculty will never bring to campus multimillion dollar research initiatives in the arts; neither will they publish the kinds of research that generate significant citations. It is not from lack of effort or desire, but rather because few granting agencies exist to support multimillion dollar proposals in music, and most music research generates substantially fewer citations than do the sciences.

In spite of this environment of unequal research and funding potentials, universities will expect\textit{ both} their music and science professors, prior to tenure or promotion, to develop equally competitive research/creative activity portfolios that indicate increasing or sustained national visibility. The administration will also expect all faculty to contribute service time to the university. The difficulty for music professors arises when they must accomplish these expectations against four strong headwinds:
1) government disinterest or antipathy in their subject, as mentioned above, with its attendant scarce funding (which makes grant-funded course buy downs very difficult)

2) a national environment in which statistically 2 percent or less of the population is interested enough in classical music to support it consistently, resulting in a young generation that has so little knowledge of the art form that they matriculate with significant remediation needed

3) a recession beginning in 2008 that eroded both individual discretionary spending and corporate donations, causing some orchestras (historically one of the principal post-collegiate career tracks in music) to enter bankruptcy, while many performing arts series were reduced or eliminated and audiences wilted, thereby curtailing many of the off-campus opportunities for faculty to build a creative activity portfolio

4) an academic work environment in which music professors frequently carry larger course loads than their research colleagues are expected to carry and at substantially lower pay, which can contribute both to considerable work fatigue and to a need to work additional hours off-campus to support a family

These headwinds exist nationwide. In an effort to keep the context more local and human, however, let me provide some specifics closer to home. I was approached for this article because I am on the music faculty at a doctoral-granting research university where I teach a five-course annual load in music history (2-3, where each course carries three credits and meets three times weekly). My position responsibility statement reads, in part:

- that I am a member of the department’s resident chamber ensemble, and maintain an active performing and recording schedule with it
- that I teach music history courses as part of the music major curriculum
- that I serve as the departmental liaison to the main library and organize the department’s diversity seminar series
- that although my primary efforts are directed toward teaching, I am expected to continue my scholarship principally through concerts and master classes presented nationally, and additionally through publications, grants and as a member of professional organizations.
I pursue a trio of specialties that collectively contribute to my research and creative activity portfolio:

- I perform as the concertmaster of the Des Moines Symphony (55 services a season on evenings and weekends, requiring an average monthly workload of 21 rehearsal/performance hours and 15 driving hours)
- I perform also as the violist in the internationally acclaimed Amara Piano Quartet (formerly the Ames Piano Quartet), which requires 6 weekly hours of rehearsal and an average of six to 12 concerts and master classes a season, across America and internationally
- I research and publish in the field of musicology and higher education

Over the past 15 years, in the areas of outreach and service, I have also maintained a private teaching studio ranging between two and 10 students, and have been a member of the Iowa State University Faculty Senate and its Judiciary Appeals Committee. I have assisted on department committees, and spent the necessary hours meeting with students outside of class. Additionally, I practice five to 10 hours weekly. Most weekdays during the academic year begin at 6:30 a.m. and end at 10:30 p.m., and I work the majority of weekends in a concert season. I have no children, which helps, but outside of the additional writing projects I do, my workload is not dramatically different from several of my colleagues in the department who do also have families. My wife, who teaches as a lecturer in my department and performs with the symphony as well, teaches more weekly contact hours in class than I do, but without the research and service obligations.

Outside employment fills the dual role of adding both to family income and to the substance of many music professors’ creative activity portfolios. Since the pay received for work done in music often occupies one of the lowest salary rungs at a public research university, the context in which music faculty and colleagues in other disciplines are remunerated for their work is best discussed next.

Full professor salaries at Iowa State University range widely between individuals and depend upon many varied criteria (as they likely do elsewhere); nevertheless, one sees a noticeable disconnect between full professor salaries selected from each of three departments: music, chemistry and economics. In fiscal 2011 the approximate salaries for three professors, all of whom had achieved international research or creative recognition in their individual fields, were $66,000 (music), $145,000 (chemistry) and $250,000 (economics).
Market forces usually lie behind such wide salary disparities, especially at the hire: We know it costs considerably more to hire and retain an economist, research scientist or engineer out of private enterprise than it does to buy a performing classical musician. The costs manifest in more than base salaries as well. Universities hiring new faculty in STEM disciplines frequently foot the multimillion dollar startup bills for laboratories and research initiatives unique to the new hire, along with graduate assistants and even additional adjunct faculty to teach some portion of the curriculum while the new hire conducts research.

No such laboratory costs attach to the typical applied music professor hire. (And I have yet to hear of a university purchasing a multi-million dollar instrument to jump-start a new applied music professor’s creative activity portfolio.) Additionally, departments such as music pay virtually 100 percent of their costs from tuition-generated income, while departments such as economics or chemistry may receive assistance in their costs either from indirect cost government subsidies derived from federally funded grants or state appropriations, or from excess tuition revenue from other departments within the college.4

History

The 21st-century collegiate music professor has inherited a workload that has arisen from nearly 50 years of change in higher education. Historically, the profile of music in higher education was Euro-centric, and many colleges and universities offered music classes only on a non-degree track. Students wishing to try for an exclusive performing career went to a conservatory, if they even required higher education at all.5

As the Baby Boomers began attending college, enrollments grew, and with them grew an increase in guidelines and regulations for new degree programs that were created to meet the increased demand for education across all disciplines. A second and more recent surge in diverse ethnic populations prompted another round of self-study across American universities to ensure diverse cultures were represented. Administrators and faculty grew in number to accommodate these changes, and faculty workloads expanded to cover new subject material.

Meanwhile, American culture was evolving away from its earlier Euro-centric ethnic roots and toward an American ethnic popular music, but higher education did not easily adapt alongside this popular shift. It remained true to its earlier traditions and perpetuated its historic ideals, while simultaneously finding ways to bring new topics, required by standards and regulations, as additions into the curriculum. Twenty-first-century music instruction in higher education has tried to accommodate both teaching emphases — historical and diverse — and must therefore frequently support an enlarged curriculum that requires at least
some of its faculty to teach a much wider field of information than they taught
50 years ago, and to teach it to audiences possessing a decreasing background
knowledge of the field at the time of their collegiate matriculation. For music
faculty, the reality of this unique moment in academic time is complex and often
exhausting.

Teaching: Principal Work for Music Faculty

In a discussion of an evolving overall teaching profile over the past 50 years,
Leonard Cassuto notes three examples in which the profile of American higher
education has changed:

1) in the early 1970s at Cornell University, senior faculty in history
typically taught a heavier course load than their junior colleagues to
assist the younger professors in their career development (often the
opposite of a 21st-century model)

2) in the 1960s at the College of William & Mary, professors
routinely taught five courses a semester (a load he notes is now
typically encountered only at community colleges)

3) in the 1970s barely 3 percent of the nation's English departments
taught loads as light as 3-2 (which is commonly encountered in
21st-century English departments at research universities)⁶

In a 2012 article on faculty workloads across all disciplines, George M.
Dennison wrote that “surveys of time expended by regular faculty members
invariably range from 55 to 65 hours per week, higher for faculty at research
universities, not the 40-hour week usually assumed.”⁷ He continued by showing
the wide disparity of possible workloads at major research universities and cited
examples ranging between

One class per year for a full-time faculty member supported by the
instructional budget, with 90 percent of the time and the associated salary
assigned to externally funded research; to eight classes per year, with 80
percent of the time allocated to teaching supported by the instructional
budget. The average consists of four classes per faculty member, with 40
percent of time allocated to teaching, 40 percent to research (partially
funded externally) and 20 percent to service; and the median is five classes
per faculty member, with 45 percent of time allocated to teaching, 40
percent to research (partially funded externally) and 15 percent to service.⁸

In light of this multiplicity of work environments, the best I can do
here is to generalize regarding the current teaching loads of music faculty
across America. Employees at smaller colleges and associate-degree-granting institutions tend toward teaching loads that overbalance research obligations. Annual class loads of 5-5 are more common than 2-2 in such environments. Applied lessons, however, still tend to reference National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) guidelines of 18 student contact hours per week, and if studio loads do not meet this expectation, courses are often added to fill the void. John Dressler writes: “Very commonly those applied music teachers with less than full studios are given classroom instruction, academic advising, student teacher supervision, committee responsibilities, and duties involving the recruitment of new students in varying degrees of combination.”
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The norm at departments within research universities is both similar to and divergent from this model. Classroom loads lean toward 2-2, with increased research and publication expectations assuming the extra hours devoted to teaching at the schools mentioned above. NASM guidelines for studio loads remain at 18 weekly contact hours, but flexibility is frequently negotiated to allow for off-campus concerts or presentations. Missed lessons are either made up following a professor’s return, or are covered in absentia by teaching assistants.

Almost never are applied teaching and classroom teaching assigned in combination to the same professor. Major music schools tend to hire professors with specialized backgrounds, and in sufficient numbers to meet the students’ diverse educational needs without requiring professors to assume diverse teaching duties.

On the topic of teaching, it therefore seems that only the most general observations may apply across the entire spectrum of American colleges and universities: The National Association of Schools of Music suggests fair workloads in music, and while these are referenced relatively consistently, variety appears in how they are implemented or balanced with other institutional expectations, particularly in reference to the size and quality of a faculty member’s research/creative activity portfolio. There really can be no way to create universal paradigms and classifications because reality continually interferes; each position is tailored to the applicant who best fits an institution’s individual need at the time of hire, and some faculty may find success in federal grant-supported projects that allow them to buy down their teaching loads for the project’s duration. That said, the vast majority of music professors across the nation teach, and their typically heavy teaching commitments push their additional research or performing workloads into the personal hours of the week. 10

We can make some small general claims, however, when we compare teaching loads across disciplines at the same institution. Using this filter, we will likely find that expected annual teaching workloads in many non-music disciplines require one-to-two fewer courses per year (2-2 or 1-2) than are
expected of music faculty (2-3) at the same institution. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Iowa State University seems to follow the guideline that departments with graduate programs hire faculty to teach 2-2, while departments without graduate programs maintain a 2-3 load. Successful external funding, of course, may alter a faculty member’s teaching load, and it more frequently does so in other fields other than the arts.

Clearly this is not an unfair practice; national research funding that is available in STEM disciplines but not in music is simply a reality. If, however, a university expects its music faculty (with little access to teaching reductions through external funding) to produce research/performance portfolios of equivalent quality to its faculty in other disciplines who do have access to such teaching-load reductions, and then also expects the musicians to teach additional courses because they lack the external funding to buy out of that obligation, one begins to see how music faculty can experience a disproportionately busy working environment.11

We all are aware, additionally, that teaching does not cease at the classroom door. Courtney Crappell, assistant professor of piano at the University of Texas at San Antonio, reminds us that teaching at a university “includes much more than contact time spent in the classroom or in applied lessons. It includes time for office hours, student mentoring, course preparation, curriculum and assessment development, grading, managing online course materials, and more,” and he suggests that the usual division of labor into 40 percent teaching — 40 percent research — 20 percent service exists, for music faculty, in reality at levels closer to 100 percent — 100 percent — 100 percent.12

H. Christian Bernard found, in a 2007 study of university music faculty, that “academic faculty who typically teach 12 hours per week with class sizes ranging from 20 to 100 students, and performance faculty who typically teach 18 private lesson hours per week all experienced a degree of workload burnout,” although applied faculty experienced lower levels of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization than those teaching academic or a combination of academic and performance classes.13 Larger class loads, lower pay, lip-service praise and the administrative priorities mentioned earlier combine to create for music faculty morale a large hill to climb against a stiff headwind, and we haven’t yet explored university expectations for developing a national image through a strong research/creative activity portfolio.

Research/Creative Activity: Building Reputations

In spite of disconnects between salaries and teaching loads for music versus STEM faculty at many institutions, one parallel between the disciplines can be asserted: A university’s expectations for its research faculty to achieve national
recognition often parallels expectations for its music faculty to achieve similar success. As we again draw upon local specifics, the Iowa State University Faculty Handbook states the following about research across all disciplines for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Faculty need to meet these expectations regardless of whether they accomplish them in the context of a 1-1 or a 3-2 teaching load.

The candidate must demonstrate … excellence in scholarship that establishes the individual as a significant contributor to the field or profession, with potential for national distinction; effectiveness in areas of position responsibilities, and satisfactory institutional service.

For promotion to full professor:

The candidate must demonstrate … national distinction in scholarship, as evident in candidate’s wide recognition and outstanding contributions to the field or profession; effectiveness in areas of position responsibilities, and significant institutional service.14

The research agenda in music assumes a variety of guises that depend upon individual interests and expertise, but which generally conform to one of four classifications:

1) data-driven studies that shed new light on faculty/student roles, aptitudes, attitudes and work environments — often conducted in the field of music education

2) explorations into a deeper understanding of music and composers from the recent or distant past — typically done in the history and theory disciplines

3) performances and recordings from the applied faculty

4) new compositions from the theorist-composers

Typically the quantitative studies conducted under the first classification most resemble research in STEM disciplines, and therefore typically attract external funding with greatest success. Monographs on historical figures, their compositions or practices from their time periods may bring book advances from publishing houses, yet less frequently win support from granting agencies. New compositions face daunting challenges in getting published and receiving multiple performances — all too frequently a new composition, born after
months or years of creative labor, receives an on-campus world premiere, self-publication by the composer and a long shelf life. For performing faculty, off-campus concerts are often judged using the criterion of association: The prestige of other invited performers to the same series validates the concert.

The area of performing opens the door to another ambiguous aspect of music faculty work — the faculty chamber ensemble — that has its own profusion of incarnations. Typically an institution with a resident ensemble will hire new faculty with the understanding that performing in the ensemble is expected. Load credit, however, is not always granted to the assignment, because the ensemble is viewed within the research component of the faculty member’s workload, not teaching.

Donald Bullock’s 1984 research into the role of faculty ensembles indicated that 44 percent of typical faculty chamber ensembles — woodwind quintets, piano trios, brass quintets or string quartets — receive no workload recognition, while 24 percent receive 1-10 percent release from teaching, and only 12 percent receive 11-15 percent release from teaching in order to engage in chamber music activities.¹⁵

There are arguments for and against the fairness of teaching-load release for faculty ensembles that have been written about elsewhere, but to summarize they are:

Against teaching load release

• for applied faculty, performing builds their creative activity portfolio, and the ensemble creates that opportunity, and therefore should be considered as research
• faculty performances, especially on-campus ones, should fall under the heading of community outreach, not research or teaching. Since, some argue, little direct teaching occurs in a concert, and — if older repertoire is emphasized — little in the way of new material is presented to bring an audience to new knowledge, a concert fulfills neither the research nor teaching roles a faculty member should assume.¹⁶

For teaching load release

• traditional research ebbs and flows, while resident ensembles often maintain weekly rehearsal obligations that more closely approximate a classroom workload commitment. A six-hour weekly commitment, for example, should carry some attendant release time from other weekly obligations.
• rehearsals cannot begin until individual parts have been learned through practice, and while it may be fair to equate either practice or rehearsal to research or teaching as a time commitment, it is not fair to
I am sure there are many other arguments _pro_ or _con_; however, it is not the purpose of this article to lobby for or against this particular argument. It is reasonable to assert, however, that any performing that embraces excellence requires substantial preparation, and the complexities of commissioning new musical compositions, combined with the complexities of preparing and performing them, creates an even greater time strain on music faculty that, I hope by now, are being viewed as already stretched quite thin.

**Service: Keeping the Department Running**

Service work typically ebbs and flows during the course of an academic year. At times it barely interrupts a faculty member’s teaching and research agenda, and at others it nearly paralyzes any outside work. Faculty committees within a department meet as needed and, unless a major change is imminent, tend not to interfere with regular weekly teaching and research obligations. Periodic stressors such as curriculum changes or new mandates from government or accrediting agencies can wrinkle a faculty member’s schedule. The time-intensive work of a search committee for a new hire, or an accreditation review, however, can derail almost any creative activity agenda for the duration of the process.

Every institution will expect this kind of labor from its faculty in order that the department and college continue to run effectively. It is uncommon that a faculty member with a strong research and teaching profile will be denied promotion for insufficient service; however, notice of inadequate service is not without potential repercussions, often experienced through lower merit raises.

For music faculty, service must necessarily include two time-intensive commitments that professors in other disciplines experience less frequently: collaborating in on-campus concerts (including practice, rehearsals and performances with colleagues), and attending student recitals (from both one’s own and one’s colleagues’ studios). My experience has been that no other discipline produces anywhere near the number of monthly public events expecting faculty attendance as does a music department. Upward of 20 monthly events, each lasting one to three hours, can add a minimum of 10 unremunerated service hours to a music faculty’s workload on top of teaching, research and committee work.

Service obligations are a workload reality, and faculty need to understand and assimilate these both musical and non-musical obligations. Several research projects in higher education have shown that faculty who do understand these various roles and their responsibilities toward them early in their careers achieve a higher level of job satisfaction. ¹⁷ My own succinct statement to my students is
that music is not a “career” as much as it is a “way of life.” While we within the profession may grow to understand that in time, it is difficult to convey to an administrator who comes from a different field just how time-intensive our way of life is.

**Changing Expectations: The Present**

As 2012 came to a close with several major orchestras in lockout or bankruptcy, with many orchestras governed by a management at odds with its union players, and with the rite of entry to such orchestras relying upon five-minute-long, applicant-expensed auditions with slim chances of success — all to win a position that too often pays under $40,000 a year — music graduates with a post-baccalaureate degree who do not choose public school careers have come to view higher education as one of their most viable employment choices. Higher education provides a modest but livable wage and a stable life environment that encourages creative activity through the diverse avenues of performing, recording, research, publication, composition and conference presentations.

The atmosphere has therefore changed dramatically from the late 1970s, when a music career in higher education carried a silent stigma: One taught only if one had been unable to make it as a performer. The line I remember from that time, which came from an adaptation of a line from George Bernard Shaw’s *Man and Superman* (1903), “Maxims for Revolutionists” (maxim #36), was: “He who can, does; he who can’t, teaches; he who can’t teach, teaches music.” In those days, however, all the major performing talents could be heard frequently in well-attended sonata and chamber music recitals, in addition to their appearances with orchestras. A living in music could be made through several avenues outside the gates of academia.

The 21st century reveals the traditional sonata recital to be essentially dead outside of annual on-campus faculty performances; chamber music is dominated by a select few specialized ensembles, which are themselves dominated by string quartets and piano trios. The few orchestral soloists (in turn dominated by violinists and pianists) only rarely make enough to live entirely off their concerto appearances, and many orchestras are struggling, as I just mentioned.

Academia is replacing the public concert stage as the career of choice among musicians, and it only makes sense that, as it becomes more desirable it also demands competitively more from its members. I have personally witnessed the competition for mid-level university positions that now includes performers with very established international careers. And since departments and schools of music continue to matriculate music majors and graduate them into the difficult and increasingly marginalized world of classical music, the marketplace has become glutted with talented and well-trained music graduates looking for work. With few other viable options, the supply/demand equation indicates salaries
need not be high, nor workloads light, in order to make a position attractive.

The present scene, therefore, suggests that for the foreseeable future higher education will recruit new faculty to positions that continue the current trend: higher teaching loads with equal research expectations at lower pay compared to what is offered elsewhere in the university. The fact that American culture has shifted its interest away from traditional music and no longer cries out in objection to a decreased presence of the classical arts in society only solidifies the likelihood of the present reality continuing into the future.

One small indication of the decreased value music and the arts are experiencing in higher education manifests in the near impossibility of finding data, especially online, that places a quantifiable value upon music departments (or creative arts departments) in ranking a university internationally. QS World University Rankings®, for example, provides subject areas for its university rankings that include arts and humanities, engineering and technology, life sciences and medicine, natural sciences, social sciences, and management. It then divides the “arts and humanities” subject heading into philosophy, modern languages, geography, history, linguistics, and English language and literature. Performing arts are not included.¹⁹

Are the arts overlooked because they do not contribute a statistically meaningful data set for ranking a university? Or are they omitted because criteria for evaluating the arts across a nation are nebulous when compared to the standard objective metrics in the sciences that use articles published and their attendant citation trails? How does one count, for example, the number of times a recording is referenced as a listener discovers the best way to interpret a piece, or the number of times a performer or performance is mentioned as representing the ideal? Why the arts are overlooked is a mystery to me, but that they are overlooked is a reality and provides a substantial headwind against which music, as a discipline, must struggle in 21st-century America.

Changing Expectations: The Future

In spring 2012, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Iowa State University welcomed a new dean to campus. During the prior dean’s administration, the nation underwent the fiscal crisis of 2008, during which time many universities cut any perceived excess from their budgets in order to remain financially viable. Iowa State University survived that time better than some institutions; yet during those self-studies, music at Iowa State was classified as a teaching-dominant unit of the college, offsetting the more research-centric units like economics, mathematics, chemistry and physics.

Fast forward to the present day, and the new dean, during her visit to the
music faculty in September 2012, stated her hope that all departments in the college — music included — would increase their external grant and research profile. The reason given was the university’s desire to remain a member of the American Association of Universities (AAU), which places a premium on research faculty and faculty receiving Fulbright awards. Has the music department at Iowa State University had the principal emphasis of its working environment modified by successive administrations within the space of two short years?

The new dean is also in the process of establishing a set of five “signature themes,” which she believes will give our college’s research enterprise a strategic focus and a recognizable identity, and which will define the college’s scholarly vision and provide a framework for faculty hiring and collaborations, strengthening our national and international recognition. These themes, which have now appeared in two separate drafts circulated to faculty, include labels such as “biological structures and systems,” “complex materials,” “data-rich environments,” “economic, environmental and societal sustainability,” and finally “global citizens, education and technology.”

Nowhere in the titles or in the descriptive text for these themes do the words “arts,” “music” or any similar wording appear, and these themes are to represent the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. It remains to be seen what tangible results will accrue once the new administration finds its footing and establishes its priorities, but this moment at my university speaks to the tenor of this issue of JPALHE.

We are working in a time when expectations for faculty in the performing arts at American universities is in flux, and in a time when the administration sends frequent and consistent messages that the arts may be valued verbally, but not in print. The conflict between expectation and reward has just intensified. It appears we will likely continue with high teaching loads, with increased research expectations, all within the environment of a published set of “themes” that completely ignores us. Has this arisen because we chose to emphasize historic values and topics in a modern world? Have our choices caused us to be left behind?

In 2006 Richard Colwell alluded to a 1992 speech by Nel Noddings that suggested an ideal world in which the present music curriculum that has effectively been obsolete for at least two centuries was completely eliminated. He countered that, while he believed Noddings’s suggestion was too aggressive, the idea of teaching others exclusively how to repeat one’s own vocational competency seems to be a dying educational paradigm. The need for many Tchaikovsky violin concerto performances has decreased (and is met by fewer celebrity musicians), while the need for new ideas, interdisciplinary thinking, multitasking in the arts, identifying and ameliorating new musical directions has increased. He asserts instead that:
Teachers need to be able to take the diverse elements of the student’s world and that of the world of the arts and merge those elements into a coherent whole (p. 25), [and] they need to think critically and creatively, they need to be problem solvers, they need to be able to establish priorities among experiences and values, they need to be able, to some extent, to relate music to the rest of American culture and relate music to the other arts.\textsuperscript{21} (p. 26-7)

Conversations and debates are also beginning to arise on the Internet, raising concern that too many music majors are granted in America with too few traditional positions available to be filled by the new graduates. The current arts climate in America essentially renders a student’s four-plus years of study valueless from the point of finding employment in the field.\textsuperscript{22} From the other side of the coin, employment at schools anywhere below the very top tier often requires new hires to possess diverse abilities in order to cover multiple departmental needs. Many music graduates, who have navigated a music degree that highlighted traditional paradigms and historic topics, are not adequately trained to fulfill these multilateral obligations.

Where does all this leave us? It appears that the early 21st century finds collegiate music faculty arriving as new hires with old-fashioned training only to work long hours teaching a wide spectrum of music (which they may not be qualified or prepared through their education to teach), while simultaneously serving on committees, performing concerts, composing, and writing articles in an effort to keep their jobs and gain promotion.

The field of music in higher education needs (and soon) a thorough data-driven study done across a spectrum of universities that studies music faculty teaching loads alongside their expectations for research/creative activity, average weekly hours spent at work, and average salaries, and compares them — using similar criteria — to the expectations for professors in other disciplines. Hard data presented in a clear and authoritative way would supply the conviction of objective fact to the more general observations I make here. Perhaps my effort can be considered an opening salvo to a project that begins with carefully devised questionnaires and consultation of university budgets, and applies statistical analysis to provide the kind of study that ultimately reveals reliable, quantifiable and recent information about our field of work.

Suffice it to say, in conclusion, that the time has probably again come to scrutinize the field of music in higher education and ask painful questions. Does the international market for the arts justify the education we currently offer? Have we reached a time of “adapt or die”? And if not, how do we convince an administration with its attention focused on the lucrative sciences that the salary-to-labor ratio for music faculty is unbalanced? None of these questions offers easy answers. If the role music once held as a part of the \textit{Quadrivium} in
500 A.D. could be re-established — describing in part how the universe worked — music could reign supreme once again. Without something on that order, however, I see rough roads and long workdays ahead.

Jonathan Sturm is Professor of Music at Iowa State University (ISU), concertmaster of the Des Moines Symphony and violist in the Amara Piano Quartet (formerly the Ames Piano Quartet). He has performed internationally; recorded for the Dorian/Sono Luminus, Albany and Cesky labels; published articles in *American Music Teacher, American String Teacher* and *Journal of Performing Arts Leadership in Higher Education*; written entries for music encyclopedias; and has a chapter in a forthcoming book on the topic of “Faust in Music” to be published by Oxford University Press. He serves on the faculty senate at ISU as the chair of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences caucus.

**Endnotes**

1 The NGA (National Governors Association) has initiatives that emphasize science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) as important skills, but also has initiatives pairing the arts and economic growth. See the NGA Center for Best Practices website: [www.nga.org/cms/center/edu](http://www.nga.org/cms/center/edu).

2 Patricia Cohen wrote in 2009 that at Washington State University the department of theater arts and dance had been eliminated; at Florida State University the undergraduate program in art education and two graduate theater programs were being phased out; the University of Arizona was cutting three-quarters of its funds (more than $500,000, for visiting classical music, dance and theater performers); Wesleyan University’s Center for the Arts would lose 14 percent of its $1.2 million budget over the following two years, and the Louisiana State University Museum of Art would see 20 percent of its state financing disappear. See: Patricia Cohen, “Arts Programs in Academia Are Forced to Nip Here, Adjust There,” *The New York Times*, August 10, 2009 Monday, section C, pg. 1.

3 This information is public knowledge at Iowa State University, since it is a public institution. It will require another article to delve into the details of faculty salary inequities for full-time workloads, not to mention the two-class system that many universities have adopted by titling some of their hardest-working faculty as lecturers or adjuncts. These faculty often possess a similar knowledge base to many of their tenured colleagues, and while they may sidestep the service and research components of a tenure-line hire, they teach extra course loads, work as many if not more hours, and yet for only 50-70 percent of the salary devoted to their tenure-line colleagues.

4 The most recent year for which I have data is 2009, when the music department at ISU generated 100 percent of its budget from tuition, while chemistry generated 57 percent and economics generated 70 percent. As I understand it, revenue from departments that exceeded 100 percent of their costs in tuition dollars helped to subsidize departments that had insufficient revenue of their own, either from tuition dollars or the indirect cost portion of federal grant funding. Thus, faculty in departments such as music not only were paid less than their colleagues, but indirectly subsidized their colleagues’ higher salaries and lighter teaching loads.

5 See Elliott Schwartz, “The Composer in the Liberal Arts College,” *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, vol. 19, no. 1 (Spring 2011), 37-51. Schwartz presents a concise history and supports the viewpoint that, in spite of heavy workloads he finds the work he does emotionally and professionally satisfying.


The closest most universities come to hiring a music professor who performs almost exclusively and does little consistent teaching (paralleling perhaps the research science hire who works almost exclusively in a lab) is the glamour hire seen with few exceptions at only the most prestigious schools of music. These artists-in-residence are a distinct minority across American higher education, and serve mostly to add prestige, visibility and the hope of attracting high-caliber students. One colleague of mine in philosophy recently admitted an official 1-1 teaching load, though he stated he regularly exceeds that. His work is full time, but his teaching commitment is lower than a 3-2 academic music faculty load, while the salary is considerably higher.


See sections 5.2.3.2 and 5.2.3.3 of the* Iowa State University Faculty Handbook*, accessible at www.provost.iastate.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/fh/2012a-faculty-handbook.pdf. The university recognizes (in section 5.2.2.2.1 “The Meaning of Scholarship”) that, “The nature of scholarly work at a diverse university necessarily varies. In the promotion and tenure review process, however, evidence that a significant portion of a faculty member's scholarship has been documented (i.e., communicated to and validated by peers beyond the university) is required of all.” (italics mine)

Donald Bullock, “A Model for Faculty Performing Ensembles,”* College Music Symposium*, vol. 24 no. 2 (Fall 1984), 16.

Donald Bullock argued that faculty ensembles should really only claim “research” status if their work produced new compositions or ways of approaching historic compositions. A faculty ensemble that predominantly revived old masterpieces, he maintained, contributed nothing more to furthering the field of knowledge in its discipline than reporting on old research discoveries would do in the sciences.


The original maxim by Shaw can be accessed online at: www.bartleby.com/157/6.html.

See the criteria for inclusion in the* QS World University Rankings* at www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2011/subject-rankings/.


BUDGETING FOR THE ARTS AT A PUBLIC LIBERAL ARTS UNIVERSITY

What! – You need another marimba! – Didn't the university purchase one two years ago? A $2,500 sewing machine! – What does it do that a $1,000 sewing machine cannot do? How wonderful that the marching band has an invitation to march in the Macy’s parade on Thanksgiving Day, but who is paying for it? The pottery kiln is broken and needed for classes, and physics says they need a new laser! Academic affairs budget managers face these requests and many more on a monthly basis. This article looks at how one public liberal arts institution funds programs in the arts: music, theater and dance, and fine art.

Economic Recessions and Arts Education Funding

Since the United States and the world are currently in a recession and working toward getting beyond it into a normal economy, it seems reasonable to start with how a recession can affect budgets, in particular arts budgets. National, state and local economic recessions have a dramatic effect on all budgets but are particularly hard on arts budgets, especially PK-12. When PK-12 education experiences budget cuts, the number of faculty and staff are decreased, equipment purchases are scrutinized, and building maintenance is deferred. But budget cuts hit PK-12 arts offerings harder than other subjects like English and mathematics. When funds are limited, many think the money should be used for what they consider more important than teaching the arts. As Slaton states about music programs, it is the high cost of music education programs that makes people want to eliminate it when budgets are tight.¹ And when arts programs are not funded, there is a concomitant negative economic impact on the school music retail industry.²

Recessions impact PK-12 budgets, but public higher education budgets are similarly impacted. When faced with decreased state funding, universities must make strategic decisions about where to make cuts, but the university’s mission and ability to assess tuition and fees make higher education funding of the arts different from PK-12 funding.

University Arts Funding

The first difference between arts funding in PK-12 and liberal arts universities is related to the university mission, which guides all aspects of the university: curriculum, number and kind of faculty, buildings and budget. In fact, regional accreditation requires the university to connect everything to its mission. Christopher Newport University’s mission states: “We are committed to providing a liberal arts education that stimulates intellectual inquiry and fosters
During the severe recession in 2002, this mission guided the university to cut professional programs because they did not meet the liberal arts mission. No arts programs were cut.

The objective at the heart of the liberal arts university is educating the whole student through a core curriculum that includes courses in many disciplines: science, social science, humanities, languages, literature, writing and the arts. Those who believe in the importance of a liberal arts education understand the importance of arts programs.

PK-12 education does not have the same mission as a liberal arts university, and some might consider the mission of PK-12 education as preparing the student for university or for employment. Most universities set admission requirements that delineate the minimum level of high school mathematics or years of English, but seldom set arts requirements. Without a mission that promotes the arts, the arts are an obvious but not always popular choice for budget cuts during a recession.

The other major difference between PK-12 and universities that affects funding is universities assess tuition and fees. Other than private schools, PK-12 is totally dependent upon revenue from taxes (federal, state and local). When state funding decreases, the university can increase tuition and fees to cover costs essential to providing the education the mission says it will provide and students expect. In the last four years, state funding for higher education has decreased in most states, and to overcome this loss of revenue, the cost of higher education has ballooned to a point that people are questioning the value of a university education when compared to the expense. Naturally, there is a limit to how much tuition and fees can increase before students, or their parents, will decide to go elsewhere or forego a college education, and that limit is based on the students’ perception of the value of the education they are getting and what the same education will cost at another university. There are numerous online articles that discuss the exploding cost of a college education and whether the cost is worth attending college.

It is clear that arts programs at a liberal arts university have a better chance of surviving budget cuts than those at PK-12 schools. Knowing that liberal arts university arts programs are supported by the mission of the university, and tuition and fees are sources of revenue, the foundation is now set for looking at how the university allocates funds to academic affairs and how arts budgets fit into the academic affairs budget.

**Budgeting in Academic Affairs**

The budgeting process begins at the department/office level. In the spring, departments and offices are asked to project their budget needs for the next two years. Department chairs receive some training on how to project their budget
without making a wish list that has no chance of being funded. The college dean reviews the projections and can amend them. The projections are sent to the manager of the academic affairs budget who uses the information in the fall to project the academic affairs budget for the following year. The university has a Budget Advisory Committee whose membership is predominately faculty, and responsibility is to make tuition, fee and budget allocations recommendations to the university president. To determine the funding sources and funding need, in the spring this committee reviews the budget requests from all areas of the campus. The manager of the academic affairs budget prepares the projected budget, and the provost and deans present it to the Budget Advisory Committee.

Simultaneously, the state legislature and governor are negotiating the budget for the new fiscal year that begins 01 July. The university lobbies the legislature and governor to get the largest allocation possible, and all state institutions are lobbying for the same purpose. Once the legislature and governor agree on how much money to allocate to the university, budgeting begins. The Office of Planning and Budget allocates each university division with its allocation from university revenue streams. Each year the budget is unpredictable, and academic affairs has no idea of its allocation until it is received. Some years are very good ones for the academic affairs budget, and other years are very lean.

For FY13, instruction is 50.6 percent of the entire university budget, and the greatest part of the budget is salaries, wages and benefits. Within academic affairs, 85 percent of the budget is salaries, wages and benefits, leaving 15 percent for non-personnel services (travel, supplies, equipment, etc.), but there have been years when salaries, wages and benefits were 90 percent of the academic affairs budget. Before making any other allocations, the budget manager allocates all the salaries, wages and benefits with provision for at least one faculty hire at the beginning of the year to cover events like an increase in the number of students attending or number of majors in a discipline. The academic affairs budget must account for the university’s responsibility for retirement and health-care costs: costs that change every year and seldom favor the university. When academic affairs increases the number of faculty, salaries and benefit totals increase at a greater rate than when the faculty FTE stays level.

In addition, the budget must account for unfunded mandates from the state. For example, the state can grant all state employees a 2 percent raise, but tell institutions the state will cover 20 percent of the raise and the rest must be covered by the institution. Christopher Newport University staff and faculty have not had a raise in four years, but the state has allowed bonuses. Even these bonuses are not fully funded by the state, and the university must allocate funds from tuition and fees to cover part of the bonuses.

Once salary, wages and benefits are allocated, the other 10-15 percent of the budget is allocated to colleges, centers, administrative offices and activity accounts. The budget manager uses the budget projections to make allocations
for non-personnel services. Although faculty consider their salaries important, they have a vested interest in attending conferences for their professional development and having the supplies and equipment they need to teach their classes. The budget for non-personnel services is particularly important to retaining faculty, especially in years when there are no salary increases. If the total funds for non-personnel services is less than the projections, every office, department and center has its projection cut by the same percent – the pain is evenly spread across academic affairs. The provost has final approval of all allocations.

The Arts As a Piece of the Academic Affairs Budget

The mission of the liberal arts university dictates funding for the arts, but does not dictate the amount of funding. In some years non-personnel services allocations are very lean and other years more abundant; however, there is never a year when departments/offices receive funding for everything requested, and when there are budget cuts, arts programs are never cut more than any other program. For instance, the university understands that pianos need tuning for music performances, and cutting the tuning technician from the budget leads to an inferior music program. As Weirich states: “I would argue that if a school has any standards at all, it cannot cut back on piano maintenance.” Just as a science program cannot operate effectively without laboratories and a computer science program without computers, arts programs have requirements that are necessary for offering a sound program.

No one is going to argue that arts programs are not expensive, but there are other expensive programs in higher education, and the sciences are most often cited. No doubt many arts faculty feel that their budgets are small because sciences budgets are large; however, a comparison of the budgets for the two programs (arts and sciences) at Christopher Newport University actually shows otherwise. This year, a good budget year, both programs have equal non-personnel services budgets. To put this into perspective by comparing the two programs, the non-personnel services budget for the science programs supports almost three times the number of arts faculty and almost four times the number of arts graduates. Additionally, the science programs teach more students in the general education program than the arts programs teach. Still, both programs have equal non-personnel services budgets!

Comparing the arts budget to the budgets for other academic areas shows strong funding for the arts. The ratio of total program budget (including salaries, wages and fringes) to number of faculty in the program is higher for the arts programs than for the humanities and the social sciences (includes business) programs. Despite the equal non-personnel services budgets in the arts and sciences programs, the sciences programs have a total-budget to number-of-
faculty ratio that exceeds the arts, only because science faculty salaries are higher. It is clear the arts and sciences programs are expensive, but science programs are not funded at the expense of the arts.

**Helping Arts Programs Understand Budgeting**

It is easy to understand the arts department chair’s motivation to request additional funds “to make the program even better.” There is the need to attract the best students to the arts program, and members of the faculty prefer to teach and be scholars at an institution where the facilities and resources are top notch. But these reasons are not unique to arts programs. Every program has identical needs, and each institution works hard to provide adequate funds for all programs.

The department chair has the responsibility of helping the department faculty understand the budget, but department chairs have very little, if any, training in understanding their budget. In their study of the training needs of department chairs, Azziz, Mullins, Balzer et al found department chairs need training in budgets and funding among other areas. In his article on faculty/staff development on the budget process, Chu states, “Department chairs complain that they don’t have enough money to provide travel funds to faculty members. They often say they can’t pay student help, fund sabbaticals or buy equipment.” Both articles relate to all department chairs and not just to department chairs in the arts, but it is both reassuring and depressing to know that department chairs have similar issues.

What follows are some suggestions for understanding the arts budget, as department chair and as a member of the department. Some are variations on Chu’s suggestions.

- Understand the college budget and how it is spent. Ask the dean or academic affairs budget manager to explain where the funds come from and how the funds are spent.
- Ask the academic affairs budget manager to explain how the department budget compares with other academic affairs budgets.
- Learn how to read the department budget and monitor it. Before signing a prior approval to travel or a purchase request be sure the expense is going to benefit the department.
- Make budget requests and projections that are reasonable and supported through documentation. If you need a large piece of equipment, explain how it will be used and where it will be kept. If the equipment has limited use and requires additional department space for storage, determine an alternative way of handling the need.
• Explain the budget to department faculty. When faculty understand all aspects of the budget, including the limited funds, they usually monitor and prioritize their own use of department funds.

• Tighten up the curriculum and concentrations so the department focuses on what it does best and is not spread thinly across many areas. Carefully project how adding faculty, students and curriculum will affect the budget. If a course is particularly expensive to offer, is there an alternative to the course that will save money for other uses?

Conclusion

Arts programs at liberal arts universities are somewhat protected from the vagaries of budget cuts during a recession, and these programs are expensive. However, until a student can learn to be a concert violinist, a dramatic actor or a non-starving artist by working at a computer in place of individualized instruction, arts programs will remain expensive. Despite being expensive, the arts programs at this liberal arts university are well funded when compared to the other expensive college program, the sciences, and when compared to funding for the humanities and social sciences. Understanding and monitoring the budget will help department chairs make the best use of the funding they receive.

Bobbye Hoffman Bartels is associate provost and professor of mathematics at Christopher Newport University in Newport News, Va. One of her associate provost responsibilities is managing the academic affairs budget. She holds a PhD from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in mathematics education. She supports arts programs by attending performances and exhibits and giving monetary donations. She also plays the French horn.

Endnotes
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SPRING MUSIC FESTIVAL ADJUDICATION –
THE IMPORTANCE OF QUALIFIED MUSIC EXPERTISE

Each year thousands of middle and high school students attend area, district, regional and national music festivals to be evaluated in their pursuit of musical excellence. Choral performances range from the traditional mixed choir to smaller select ensembles, including treble, men's, chamber madrigal and barbershop/beauty shop ensembles. Jazz choirs and the full Broadway style of show choir take in these events. The instrumental area features the traditional concert band and string orchestra most schools offer. Additionally some schools bring parade bands, jazz bands, full orchestras, percussion ensembles as well as the full complement of indoor groups (color guard, majorette, marching drumline, drill team and dance team). In order to provide these many groups the best educational experience during their spring trip at our festivals I search out the best and most well rounded set of adjudicators possible. This leads me into the ranks of college professors and instructors.

One of the first questions we receive each year as we organize our spring music festivals is, “Who are your adjudicators, and what are their backgrounds?” It is vitally important to high school/middle school directors that they receive a judge’s tape that will provide their students and them with information giving them insight on how to better perform the literature they have selected. When I hire judges for our events, I look for the following:

1. Director/instructor’s background/resume
2. Experience as a public school teacher
3. What literature their ensembles are performing on their campuses
4. Recommendations from colleagues or past participants

Most of the time I receive recommendations from other college directors as well as schools who have attended our past events. The music world has its own networking system that seems to work quite well. If a college director is getting attention, I seem to hear about him/her. Also part of the process has to be the director’s location. Transportation and housing costs have to be considered. For a local festival or very small festival, the cost of travel has to be part of the equation when determining if a college or “not local” adjudicator can fit into the festival budget. When we have a school travel to one of our festivals, from say New Jersey to Pigeon Forge, Tenn., or Myrtle Beach, S.C., teachers want to hear the same thing – critical and positive comments that can make their next performance even better. The fun part of this is when they sometimes need a translator for the Tennessee accent of the verbal comments. I am really kidding here, but, at the same time, Pigeon Forge is one of the few places where my
first name Dwight (one syllable) becomes Dee-Why-itt (three syllables). That is OK because we have some South Carolina schools travel to New York, and it happens to them, too, in reverse.

The adjudicator experience/expertise provides the following positive feedback for his/her respective college or university:

1. Gets their name in front of a large group of directors, students and parents who attend the event
2. Keeps the adjudicator current with the school repertoire
3. Networks with colleagues and the public school teachers
4. Shows public school teachers the value of having performance comments from active college professional musicians

Some of the comments (positive and negative) we have received from our festival participants and public school teachers have included:

1. “I was really concerned about attending a spring music festival because the last time we went to an event like this, the comments of the adjudicators really were of no help. Dr. _______, one of the jazz band judges, gave us many comments and concepts that can really help us get better right away. He realized that this was a young band and we were limited to a very few afterschool rehearsals. His clinic with us afterwards was very positive and really “jazzed up” my young band. We are a school out in the sticks, with little resources, and his clinic and comments were very helpful.”

2. “We returned home from your festival and as always listened to the judge’s comments. This is standard procedure, but this year one of your adjudicators really stood out. I want to thank __________ director of choirs at ______________ for her comments concerning my ladies vocal ensemble. This was the first time we have had this group perform, and they were very nervous. The best thing that the judge did was give them positive feedback but also tell them to have fun with their singing. She mentioned that they looked and sounded a little nervous but was impressed that they seemed to relax and let the music flow after they got settled in. She also told them to keep up the hard work and enjoy the rest of the trip but always remember to keep the music as the reason for your trip. Have fun but always be musical. That comment made the trip worthwhile.”
3. One high school orchestra director always sends us comments after each festival she attends (and she has attended our festivals eight out of the last 10 years at different sites). “I would like to comment on one of the instrumental judges at your Myrtle Beach Fiesta-Val—__________________’s comments were overall sparse, and I would like him to provide more detail, either written or verbal when he judges my group again. It is the basic tenet of judging that unless you give a perfect score, a comment should be made rationalizing any deduction in points. It is incongruous to write as the only comment, “exceptional” or “excellent!” and then issue a point value of 13 or 14 (out of 15). A comment should be made as to what caused that point deduction. Even if the recordings provide feedback, a written comment is appropriate. A one-word comment is not in the spirit of academia where we aspire to learn something with every festival performance. While I do not disagree with any comment or score, a more in-depth commentary is appropriate.” (This orchestra was the second of 17 instrumental groups performing that day, and she received a score of 96 out of 100 points. We tell our judges to make sure they do not give out a 100 score early as there may be another outstanding group later in the day. Her group was also Grand Champion at the festival.)

4. “Thank you for the outstanding experience we had at your Atlanta Fiesta-Val. We knew going in that we were the only show choir at the event, and my chorus parents were a little upset that we had no competition. I understand that you cannot guarantee there will be competition, but it was still disappointing there was none. Everything changed, however, after our performance took place on the small stage. All three judges came down and did a clinic, and each judge worked on a different part of the show, which was very helpful. They discussed in detail how much work had to take place in order to make the whole production work. One of my parents came up to me and said that she had no idea what I had to go through in order to make this 12-minute show. This clinic was fabulous and was the best part of the festival. I know that you do not normally provide a clinic; in fact one of the judges mentioned that because of the long schedule they normally do not do these. You should consider adding it as a part of the choral festival program. The gentleman from _____________ University was a hoot! My kids have not stopped talking about his clinic since we got back to Mississippi. Please pass on my thanks to all of the judges and staff for a well run and educational festival.”
There is a choral director that has come to our festivals many times over the years. This year he sent a two- to three-page email asking us to clarify our adjudication system, including asking us to change our system of judging, the forms used and giving written rubrics on what the scores should mean. He states that our company should be aware of new initiatives on the federal level (Race to the Top) as well as the National Standards for the Arts. “I know that the top of your adjudication form says, ‘Please evaluate/comment on each caption based on a national standard of performance for middle school/junior high and high school groups,’ but what does that actually mean? … I know no national standard exists – at least with some kind of document that explains what the various numbers mean.” Here is an example of our score sheets for band and choir:

Instrumental Performances

**Tone** – 15 pts, (Control – Beauty – Blend)  **Intonation** – 15 pts, (Melodic – Harmonic)  **Balance** – 15 pts, (Sectional – Ensemble)

**Rhythm** – 15 pts,  **Music Interpretation** – 15 pts, (Expression – Phrasing – Style – Tempo)

**Technique** – 15 pts, (Precision – Facility – Articulation)  **Other** – 10 pts (Stage Presence and Appearance – Choice of Music and Instrumentation)

**Total – 100 Points**

Choral Performances

**Balance** – 15 pts,  **Intonation** – 15 pts, (Melodic – Harmonic)

**Interpretation and Musical Effect** – 15 pts, (Expression – Phrasing – Style – Tempo)

**Diction** – 15 pts, (Clarity of Consonants – Naturalness – Vowel Consistency)  **Technique and Rhythm** – 15 pts, (Precision – Breathing – Accuracy)

**Tone** – 15 pts, (Control – Beauty – Blend)  **Other Factors** – 10 pts (Stage Presence and Appearance – Choice of Music – Discipline)

**Total – 100 Points**
This choral director asked a valid question, “What exactly does ‘13’ mean in the area of balance? What is the difference between a ‘13’ and a ‘10’? I don’t believe these questions can be answered by you right now – not unless Fiesta-Val (or any music festival company) has actually created a rubric or descriptor that clearly and definitively indicates/describes both to the adjudicator as well as the teachers/participants exactly what this means.” He goes on to state: “Research clearly indicates that a rubric or descriptor based on four or five levels is vastly superior and easier to use than those based on any other numbering system. Going even deeper, I would really question the use of .5 or even .25 by adjudicators. I question whether an adjudicator could adequately describe to any educator, let alone a building or district level administrator, the reason for a score.” He later states in his email: “I know that there is a ‘subjective’ side to music and all of the arts, but it is also true that many of the musical ideas, knowledge and skills that the students and groups are demonstrating can also be – and should be objectively graded. State Music Educators Associations throughout the U.S. have clearly defined rubrics used to grade all state and solo ensemble festivals.”

Our adjudication sheets were first written about 25 years ago when our company was started. We worked with more than 600 performing groups at our festivals last year, and this was the only person asking to change our whole system. I have been judging and working with middle school and high school bands for the last 35-plus years, and I understand the need for clarification, but at the same time the bands and choirs that I enjoy hearing are not scientific experiments that I can dissect and label to put a number on. Yes, Fiesta-Val and Musicale Festivals are competitive events, recognizing the best performances or outstanding soloist, but aesthetics and the emotional impact of music are lost if the adjudicators are only asked to tear apart and number everything. While a typical district or state music festival is only interested in a final rating, Fiesta-Val has numbers because of the competition and ranking of performances. That is the nature of the spring trip business.

Rubrics are important. I have been involved with our state Marching Band Assessment for the last 17 years. We have been making changes with rubrics and descriptors just about every year. Here is an example of the marching Music Sheet descriptors:

**Composition**

**Musical Content:** The ability to demonstrate a wide variety of musical styles and nuances

**Technical Content:** The degree of skill and stamina required to play the written book
Simultaneous Responsibility: The combination of musical and visual responsibilities

Clarity of Intent: The ability to deliver the clear and balanced intent of the written score

Variety of Musical Elements: The ability to demonstrate contrasting musical styles

Idiomatic Expression: The ability to convey the appropriate style of music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Superior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptors</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Consistently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical Range</td>
<td>0-15.9</td>
<td>16-21.9</td>
<td>22-27.9</td>
<td>28-33.9</td>
<td>34-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Steps</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Discover</td>
<td>Know</td>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>Apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Execution

Tone Quality: The ability of each segment and the whole to demonstrate proper timbres

Intonation: The ability of each segment and the whole to demonstrate proper tone to allow voices to be in tune

Balance and Blend: The ability of each segment and the whole to adjust timbre and volume to create an even proportion of sound

Dynamic Contrast: The ability of each segment and the whole to demonstrate a wide variety of dynamic levels

Phasing and Expression: The ability of each segment and the whole to demonstrate musical emotion

Ensemble Cohesiveness: The ability of each segment and the whole to implement consistent control in the chosen technical style

Rhythmic Accuracy: The ability of each segment and the whole to demonstrate vertical and linear rhythmic accuracy
We continue to look into ways of making our Fiesta-Val festivals more valid. Rubrics are being worked on for our festival adjudicators to provide them support when they determine ratings and placements for our festivals.

Finally we always ask our adjudicators to be positive on all judges’ recordings at our festivals. A typical tape should include the following:

1. Always tell the school your name and background to start the tape. Example: This is Fred Jones, director of bands at _____________ University and one of your adjudicators this evening for the Myrtle Beach Fiesta-Val. I have been at _____________ University for ___ years, but before that I was band director at ____________ HS (or whatever). I look forward to adjudicating you today.

2. When making critical comments try to give suggestions on how to improve on a future performance. Just saying the piccolo is out of tune does not help as much as saying: “The piccolo is out of tune – you might want to try using multiple pitches to tune to such as the middle F, G, A and Bb. Adjust and match with the other wind players, etc.”

3. On a spring trip event like ours many times the full complement of performers cannot make the trip. This is something all adjudicators should be aware of, but at the same time it is all right to comment on the lack of a particular instrument or section. Ex: “It would be really nice if there were more low brass sound.” This is always better than saying something negative about the lack of low brass players.

4. When the judge finishes his recording we like to have a positive comment to finish off the recording. Examples include:

   A. I hope my comments were helpful and will be of use for future performances.
   B. Have a great time here in Williamsburg and a safe trip home.
   C. Best wishes, and we look forward to hearing your group again sometime at a future festival.

The connection between public school teachers and students with the academia of the college directors and staff can be a source of mutual worth through the music festival experience for everyone involved. Public school teachers do not always have the opportunity for their groups to be adjudicated by
Spring Music Festival Adjudication –
The Importance of Qualified Music Expertise

a qualified college professional. For many of them a spring trip can be a very eye-opening experience, including long-distance travel, new surroundings (hotels/chaperoning), parent/student issues (always a lot of fun), and add to that the stress of performance at a new hall in a national festival. The qualified, positive-thinking, professional judge can make all the difference in their trip, a really important part of the music festival. We truly value our adjudicators and will always choose them carefully for this reason.

... 

Dwight Leonard received his undergraduate degree in music education from Old Dominion University and master’s degree in education from George Washington University. He taught at the elementary, middle and high school levels in Norfolk, Va.; Prince George County, Md.; and Virginia Beach, Va., school systems. Under his direction in 1991, the Kempsville Junior High Band was selected to perform for the prestigious Mid-West International Band and Orchestra Clinic in Chicago, Ill. In September 1992 Leonard started the band program at the new Tallwood High School. During his four-year tenure, Tallwood was recognized as a Virginia Honor in its second, third and fourth years of the program. In June 1996, he accepted a position with Spectrum of Richmond as executive director of Fiesta-Val and Musicale Music Festivals and as camp director for Mid-Atlantic Band Camps.
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CELEBRATING MORE THAN 150 ALL-STEINWAY SCHOOLS

All-Steinway Schools demonstrate a commitment to excellence by providing their students and faculties with the best equipment possible for the study of music. That is why the pianos owned by these institutions—from the practice room to the recital hall—are Designed by Steinway & Sons.
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- Central Conservatory of Music, School of Piano (China)
- China Conservatory of Music, School of Piano (China)
- Conservatorio de Música de Puerto Rico
- Leeds College of Music
- Conservatoire (England)
- Royal Welsh College of Music & Drama (Wales)
- University of Auckland—College Conservatory of Music

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

- Ball State University
- Belmont University
- Bemidji State University
- Blue Ridge Community College
- Bluffton University
- Boise State University
- Bowie State University
- Cumber University
- Cardinal Stritch University
- Curtin University
- Carnegie Mellon University—School of Music
- Chestnut Hill College
- College of Mount St. Joseph
- Columbia State University
- Concordia University—St. Paul
- Converse College
- Cuyamaca College
- DeVry University
- Duquesne University
- East Tennessee State University
- Fairfield University
- Florida Gulf Coast University
- Franklin & Marshall College
- Fuhui College of Music-Wuhan at Kingham University (Korea)
- George Mason University
- The George Washington University
- Georgia College and State University
- Gustavus Adolphus College
- Hastings College
- High Point University
- Humboldt University
- Indiana University of Pennsylvania
- James Madison University
- Kent State University
- Kennesaw State University
- Lehigh University
- Lewis and Clark Community College—Lincoln University
- Loughborough University
- Liverpool Hope University (England)
- Loughborough University
- Lone Star College—Montgomery
- Lone Star College
- Martinsville College Community College
- Middle Tennessee State University
- Midland College
- Missouri Western State University
- Montana State University
- John C. Cali School of Music New Jersey City University
- Nichols State University
- North Greenville University
- Oklahoma Christian University
- Oklahoma City University
- Oklahoma State University
- Old School University
- Penn State University—York College
- Peking University
- Pennsylvania State University
- Pennsylvania State University
- Peking University
- Pomona College
- Portland State University
- Principia College
- Radford University
- Rowan University
- Royal Holloway College
- University of London (England)
- Saint Mary’s University of Minnesota
- Santa Fe College
- Seton Hill University
- Shorter University
- Southern Adventist University
- Southern Utah University
- Southwestern Assemblies of God University
- Spelman College
- Spring Hill College
- State University of New York—Purchase
- State University of New York—Potsdam
- Teachers College—Columbia University
- Texas A&M International University
- Texas Christian University
- Telou University
- Union College
- University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa
- University of Arizona
- University of Arkansas
- University of Central Florida
- University of Central Missouri
- University of Denver
- University of Florida
- University of Georgia
- University of Minnesota
- University of Missouri
- University of Missouri—Columbia
- University of Missouri—Kansas City
- University of South Africa
- University of South Florida
- University of Tennessee—Knoxville
- University of Utah
- University of Victoria
- University of West Florida
- University of West London (England)
- University of Wolverhampton (England)
- Utah State University
- Utah Valley University
- Vassar College—Since 1912
- Waldorf College
- Wallace State Community College
- Weber State University
- Webster University
- West Chester University of Pennsylvania
- Westminster College
- Westmont College
- Wheaton College
- Youngstown State University

OTHER SCHOOLS OF DISTINCTION

- Amadeus International School of Music (Austria)
- Cecil I. Payne Community School of Performing & Fine Arts
- City of Edinburgh School of Music (Scotland)
- Conservatorium Liricale
- Cranbrook School (Australia)
- Cranbrook School
- Durham School (England)
- Episcopal High School
- Gold Academy
- Hamburger Konservatorium (Germany)
- Henry Mancini Institute of Music
- Lincoln Park Performing Arts Center
- Lurline School of Music
- Longwood Graduate School of Music (Iowa)
- New York University (England)
- Pacific Northwest Ballet School
- Pennsylvania College of Music
- Philadelphia High School for the Creative and Performing Arts
- Qatar Academy (UAE)
- Royal Conservatory of Music
- Royal Northern College of Music (England)
- Sonoma College (USA)
- St. Magnus’ Episcopal School
- Southbank Music Conservatory
- Tennessee School (England)
- Tenterbridge School (England)
- Valley Christian Schools
- Wellington School (England)

*Ensembles at All-Steinway Schools have over 40 yrs.