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 District Goals for 2010-2015

All students will show continuous progress toward their personal learning goals, developed in collaboration with teachers and parents, and will be prepared for post-secondary education and career success.

“If I were not a physicist, I would probably be a musician. I often think in music. I live my daydreams in music. I see my life in terms of music.” – Albert Einstein

"The greatest scientists are artists as well," said Albert Einstein. As one of the greatest physicists of all time and a fine amateur pianist and violinist, he ought to have known! (Calaprice, Alice, Ed. (2000). The Expanded Quotable Einstein.)
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**Preface**

Although the district is experiencing extraordinary financial challenges, it was determined that the community would serve as a proactive influence, working cooperatively for the implementation of music at all levels within the curriculum.

It is the desire of the community to provide a positive environment for student-centered decision-making and positively influence the inclusion of music in the curriculum. Therefore, an independent consulting firm was contracted to study the status of the current music program, determine the advantages of its continuation to the benefit of the student and district, and make recommendations concerning the strengthening of the curriculum and/or its delivery.

The process included meetings with music teachers and members of the community at large (parents). Content of these meetings included the following items:

* The collection of data related to current levels of student participation;
* "Brainstorming" sessions designed to provide...

...an overview of the recent history of the music program in the district;

...information related to configuration of the current music curriculum, including factors which may provide positive and negative influence on program health; and,

...suggestions for improvement in the delivery of the current music curriculum.

While it must be recognized that a quantitative analysis may provide information related to how "good" or "bad" a music program (or any of its parts) is, it is not the purpose of this study to provide for the qualitative evaluation of music teachers, or the curriculum.

It should be emphasized that there has been no intent to circumvent any process that may have been established by the administration and school board. Rather, it is the purpose of this study to facilitate a collaborative decision-making process through the provision of information related to the music program, which by the nature of its curricular and financial structure is to a great extent "centralized," and therefore may not provide for communication of the information contained in this study through site-based processes.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

* Historical reductions in the music program have resulted in declining enrollment in band, orchestra, and choir. These reductions have had a major cumulative negative impact on class size and the budget.
* Participation in music performance is a major factor in student success to the extent that it is endorsed a basic core education desired for all students in all grades.

Faculty Impacts

* Staffing allocations per school are currently at a minimal level; statistically no school has a full time music teacher in any single area of the curriculum.
* Student-faculty ratios are very high. (See Figures 5 & 6)

Curriculum Impacts

* The district has no clear definition of the distinction between the music curriculum as curricular, co-curricular, or extra-curricular.
* There is clear evidence that all students do not have equal access to a music education in all areas of the curriculum. This could become a significant legal issue for the district. Option schools do not remove the responsibility of the district to provide access to a music education.
* Music participation is a key element in the success of all students, particularly those considered “at risk.” Music can be a key component in closing the achievement gap. (See *The Georgia Project* Appendix B)

Student Participation Impacts

* Profiles (levels) of student participation in band, orchestra, and choir are extremely low compared to nationally recognized music programs of qualitative excellence.
* Total enrollments are: band (2367); orchestra (30); choir (2261)
* Low enrollments in band, orchestra, and choir demonstrate the impact of the elimination of the elementary instrumental curriculum, and the ineffectiveness of the current configuration of the elementary general music curriculum. (See figures 7a, 7b, 7c)

Economic Impacts

* Extensive national case studies indicate that the elimination of the elementary feeder system results in a minimum enrollment loss of 65% of grades 6-12 band and orchestra students. (e.g., Benham, *Music Advocacy: Moving From Survival To Vision,* 2011)
* The loss of large music performance classes in CSD exceeds 65% and has caused significant increases in the average sizes in non-music classes, and increases in budgetary costs for additional classroom teachers.

Summary

* While the community recognizes the difficult economic situation and the urgency of reducing class sizes, it also recognizes that to a great extent these are the result of decisions made by previous administrations.
* Therefore, the Central Friends of Music requests the restoration of the elementary instrumental music curriculum and the formation of a Task Force to study and make recommendations regarding the reinstatement of the music program.

INTRODUCTION

As the crisis in public school funding has spread across the United States and Canada, public school administrators and school boards have been faced with massive cuts in budgets. Coupled with a continuing panic for raising test scores in math and science and the concern for technology awareness and literacy, funding shortfalls have stimulated a seemingly voracious appetite for devouring arts curricula.

This panic has been so severe and irrational as to cause the discounting of significant studies indicating the importance of the arts in a balanced curriculum. Research by Regelski, Milley, Horne, Kaufman, Rees, Wilson, Gardner, Wilson, Levitin, et al, indicate that music is one of the basic intelligences and participation is vital to the intellectual development and academic success of the student. This evidence is corroborated by the SAT scores of music students. (See *The Value and Quality of Arts Education*, available at <http://www.nafme.org> )

Students of the arts continue to outperform their non-arts peers on the SAT, according to reports by the College Entrance Examination Board. The College Board recognized that while no causality could be established at this point, results indicate, "students' scores tend to increase with more years of arts study." And,

"Students who take arts courses have generally higher SAT scores than those who do not take arts courses. The more arts work a high school student takes, generally speaking, the higher his or her SAT scores. This is especially evident in students' verbal mean scores. This information suggests that ***students cannot justifiably be counseled to cease taking arts courses*** (emphasis added) because other courses can better prepare them for college and the SAT."

Research by Dr. Frank Wilson, a neurologist from the University of San Francisco School of Medicine, indicates that 80-90% of the brain's motor-control capabilities is devoted to the hands, mouth, and throat. He proposes that with the development of highly refined control in those areas, a child is stimulating a large portion of the brain, and that increased intelligence is therefore helped by participation in music performance. (Wilson 1986)

Dr. Daniel Levitin, a neuropsychologist at the same institution, suggests that the preponderance of research indicates music is such a strong component of human constitution that it may be even more important to the formation of our personal identity than the spoken language. He indicates that it is evident that acquisition of the music language begins during the fetal stage and that a child has learned the aural rules of music by the age of five. (Levitin 2006)

A project funded by the Florida Department of Education indicates that at-risk students who became involved in arts courses improved academically and were influenced to continue in school and graduate. When asked what specific aspects of their arts courses were most effective in retaining at-risk students, teachers most frequently mentioned the importance of performance and the social interaction and camaraderie that come from being part of an arts group or performing ensemble. ("Arts Education Improves At-Risk Students' Overall Performance, Study Finds." Music Educators Journal. November, 1992.) [Note: For additional documentation on the importance of arts study for at-risk students see <http://www.menc.org/documents/temp/benefits_of_music.pdf> .]

In a recent study by NEA, at-risk students who have a history of in-depth arts involvement in or out of school also tend to have better academic results, better workforce opportunities, and more civic engagement. [*The Arts and Achievement in At-Risk Youth: Findings from Four Longitudinal Studies,* National Endowment for the Arts, 2012]

In *THE GEORGIA PROJECT: A Status Report on Arts Education in the State of Georgia*, a state endorsed study involving 641,635 students and 33 school districts, regression analysis was used to examine relationships between levels of school district funding of arts programs and student achievement. A summary of major findings is listed in Figure 1.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Figure 1: The Georgia Project | | |
| Relationship Descriptor | p-value | Confidence |
| 1. Districts that make staffing and funding of their arts programs a priority tend to have higher overall rates of student participation in the arts and higher rates of arts student retention (lower rates of attrition). | .08 | 92% |
| 1. Such districts tend to have lower dropout rates in grades 9-12 and thus keep their students in school longer and graduate more of them. | .08 | 92% |
| 1. Their students tend to score higher on achievement and performance tests, such as the SAT, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Grade 8) and the Georgia High School Graduation Test (Grade 12). | .03-08 | 92-97% |
| 1. They tend to graduate more of their students with college prep diplomas, percentages increasing with diversity of arts curricula and percent of students participating. | .007 | 99+% |
| 1. The above relationships may not apply equally across socio-economic and ethnic groups. Specifically, the study found that arts student retention rates are negatively correlated with both ethnic minority percent of enrollment and percent of enrollment eligible for subsidized lunch (a measure of district affluence). | .003-.01 | 99+% |

(Note: An Executive Summary of the Georgia Project is available in Appendix B.)

While the above findings do not establish a cause and effect relationship, they do indicate that “...strong arts programs need not come at the expense of academic achievement. Rather, the arts are an important factor in achieving academic excellence.” (Benham/Helmberger 1997)

Excerpts from the report of ongoing research at the Center for the Neurobiology of Learning and Memory indicate the importance of including music training at the earliest possible time in the intellectual development of the child.

"Our...program with three-year-olds (including children enrolled in an inner-city daycare center) indicates that music training significantly enhanced performance on specific non-verbal age-appropriate spatial reasoning tasks!

"We suggest that music can be used not only as a 'window' into examining higher brain functions but as a means to enhance them. That music is universally appreciated, even at birth, gives it an enormous advantage as a means of developing higher brain function.

"Children were issued the Performance subtest of the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence-Revised (WPPSI-R) upon admittance to the school.

"Students' performance on the Object Assembly task was substantially better after receiving music training than before training...(and) scaled scores of the children in the (inner-city) daycare center increased dramatically over the three testing periods, from 6.4 prior to receiving music training to 12.2 six months after training began." ("Pilot Study Indicates Music Training of Three-Year-Olds Enhances Specific Spatial Reasoning Skills". Frances H. Rausher, Gordon L. Shaw, Linda J. Levine, and Eric L. Wright. University of California, Irvine. August, 1993.)

[Note: Subsequent reports indicate that "spatial reasoning skills increased 46% for those taking music, and only 6% for those who did not.” [MENC Today. November, 1994.]

And yet administrators have often been so involved with the adult issues of balancing the budget and manipulating class schedules that focus on the overall intellectual, personal, and social development of the student has been lost in the shuffle.

The attack on arts curricula has been so fierce that in March 1989, the 126,000-member Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) adopted the following resolution supporting the inclusion of the visual and performing arts in a balanced curriculum.

**"Integration of Visual and**

**Performing Arts in Curriculum"**

"With recent focus on specific subject matter, academic achievement, and a series of reform efforts/movements that emphasize raising test scores and graduation requirements, a balance of curriculum offerings is not being maintained. Dance, drama, ***music***, and the visual ***and performing arts*** are disciplines with ***aesthetic, perceptual, creative, and intellectual dimensions***. They foster students' abilities to create, experience, analyze, and reorganize, thereby ***encouraging intuitive and emotional responses***. The arts can increase self-discipline and motivation, contribute to a positive self-image, provide an acceptable outlet for emotions, and ***help to develop creative and intuitive thinking processes not always inherent in other academic disciplines.***

"ASCD supports the concept that ***arts education is essential*** in a balanced curriculum and urges educators to include the visual and performing arts at all appropriate levels of education. The Association encourages educators to explore opportunities to integrate the arts in an interdisciplinary approach to education and seek a variety of techniques to assess such an approach." [Emphasis added.]

Reinforcing the position of the importance of arts education for every child, ASCD subsequently published a book on the subject by Eric Jensen. In *Arts With the Brain in Mind*, ASCD provides credibility to the publication on the copyright page by clearly stating that "there was no financial support or any other potential conflict of interest from any of the many fine organizations that commonly support the arts." In stating his biases the author indicates that he is in no traditional sense an artist, but above all an "advocate for improving education."

The thesis of this book is that "arts are not only fundamental to success in our demanding, highly technical, fast-moving world, but they are what makes us most human, most complete as people." Further, from all the research the "facts are in: You can make as good a case, or better, for arts than you can make for any other discipline." Jensen states, "The fact is, humans are unique; and educators need different approaches and strategies to reach a wide range of learners. Believe it or not, many schools, districts, and states have been using a powerful solution (for improving student achievement) for decades. It's called the arts." (Jensen, 2001)

Providing further emphasis on the importance of the arts in education, the ***Council for Basic Education*** released its report "Academic Atrophy – The Condition of the Liberal Arts in America's Public Schools" in March 2004. Recognizing the great opportunity and substantial task at hand, the report affirms the positive aspects of the growing national interest in improving education stimulated by the No Child Left Behind Act. At the same time, it substantiates a coincident imbalance in curricular emphasis that is "***evidence of waning commitment to the arts…," leading to a disintegration of ‘educational excellence,’ and reducing equal educational opportunities for a liberal arts education. The combined impact of budget cuts and recent educational reforms are "narrowing the academic curriculum in our nation's public elementary and secondary schools."***

Research over the last several decades consistently indicates that children who make music perform better in all areas of academic endeavor. Whether research results are associative or causal, the fact is that music-making is an important academic endeavor for all students simply for its intrinsic intellectual, emotional and social values.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), originally passed by Congress in 1965. It was updated in 2001 as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). In 2015 it was changed to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

ESSA specifically identifies music as core education and an important component of a well-rounded education. In addition, the new bill makes it easier to use federal funds to support music programs at the local level, including Title I and Title IV funding. The language of ESSA makes it clear that music should be a part of every child’s education, no matter their personal circumstance. Specifically, the following components are part of the ESSA.[[1]](#footnote-1)

* The passage of ESSA is an historic victory for music education advocates, because it includes for the first time a specific and separate mention of music as an important component of a well-rounded education. The new bill will also make it easier to use federal funds to support music programs at the local level, including for the most vulnerable students with Title I funding.
* The “Well-Rounded Education” provision (previously known as “Core Academic Subjects”) is a section (Sec. 8002) within ESSA that lists courses, activities, and programming in subjects deemed critical when providing students a broad and enriched educational experience. The provision includes “music” and “arts,” which articulates the importance of music as a part of every child’s education. This provides an unprecedented step forward for music education, as “Well-Rounded” is mentioned in a variety of other significant provisions throughout the bill.
* Flexibility of Title I funds to support a well-rounded education. Title I programs are those that support academically vulnerable students. ESSA specifically allows Title I funds to be used to supplement state and local support for a well-rounded education, including music. This means that more low-resource schools will improve their ability to use their supplemental funding for music- and arts-rich curricula.
* More Professional Development for Music Educators: ESSA also states that funds may support professional development for music educators as part of supporting a well-rounded education, and clarifies that this money can come from three of the major areas of the bill—including Title I (vulnerable students), Title II (teacher preparation and development), or Title IV (wraparound and supplemental school programs).
* Flexible Accountability: ESSA language is very clear that states must now include multiple progress measures in assessing school performance. These can include music education-friendly measures like student engagement, parental engagement and school culture/climate. These measures can be very important in helping schools get a sense of how their school community is faring, and what kind of outside supports their students may not be getting that could help them be more successful.

History of Music in the Central School District

Residents in the Central School District (CSD) will remember when students were offered a music program that provided them with a well-rounded educational experience for the development of the whole child. Students were privileged to participate in an exemplary music program that had been developed to provide the finest in an educational system that prides itself in providing a balanced/total education for its children.

Great care was given to the selection of teachers to ensure that their education and experience coincided with the highly specialized elements of instruction required in each area of the music curriculum. As a result the program became widely recognized as an outstanding example of excellence in music education.

From 1988 to 1992 beginning instrumental instruction demonstrated consistent growth in enrollment as indicated in Figure 4.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Figure 4: ELEMENTARY BAND & ORCHESTRA ENROLLMENTS  (1988-1992) | | | | | | | | |
| School  Year | Band  Gr 5 | Band  Gr 6 | Subtotal Band | Orchestra  Gr 4 | Orchestra  Gr 5 | Orchestra  Gr 6 | Subtotal  Orchestra | Total  Instrumental |
| 1988 | 726 | 505 | 1231 | 417 | 112 | 94 | 623 | 1854 |
| 1989 | 922 | 514 | 1436 | 604 | 135 | 79 | 827 | 2263 |
| 1990 | 1011 | 575 | 1586 | 582 | 145 | 101 | 828 | 2414 |
| 1991 | 986 | 636 | 1622 | 631 | 163 | 115 | 909 | 2531 |
| 1992 | 1268 | 595 | 1863 | 672 | 140 | 117 | 929 | 2792 |

Observations:

1. In the years 1988-1992 the district maintained only 26 elementary schools as compared to the current 33.
2. Nationally identified programs of qualitative excellence consider 65% of eligible students as a minimum participation level for instrumental music instruction.
3. CSD grade 5 participation in beginning instrumental music instruction in1992 exceeded the national standard of quantitative excellence.
4. In 1992, student enrollment (2,792) in grade 5 instrumental music exceeds the current total enrollment for band and orchestra (2,397, including jazz bands) in grades 6-12.

However, since the early 1990s the music program has become a target for cuts by those who would deny the significance of research, and recommendations by their own professional associations, which indicate the importance of a strong arts curriculum in the social, academic and intellectual development of the total child. Some decisions that have directly affected the delivery of the music program are listed below.

* Changed grade structure to K-5 elementary schools, grades 6-8 middle schools, and grades 9-12 high schools
* Eliminated the position of Music Coordinator
* Eliminated grades 4-5 beginning instrumental instruction (band, strings), causing a one-year gap in instruction for grade 4 string students
* Moved beginning string instruction outside the school day
* Eliminated daily instruction in band, choir and orchestra at the middle schools
* Adopted the block schedule in 1994

The Music Department in the Central School District has been systematically dismantled by those in district leadership. Cuts have been unreasonable, inequitable, and administered without regard to long term effects on the curriculum, the students, class size increases, or the budget.

Assumptions

In times of budget crisis it is important to establish principles that provide for integrity of administrative function and management (fiscal responsibility). However, it is of primary importance to provide a process in which every decision is evaluated on the basis of its long-term effect on the student. With these factors in mind the following limited study provides for:

* Saving money
* Reducing class size
* Curricular integrity
* Student opportunities in music

Further, the following "Assumptions" have been applied.

1. The primary emphasis in the budget development process should be placed on maintaining the quality of instruction in the classroom.

2. Programs with fewer pupils impacted adversely should be reduced or eliminated before programs with lower cost/benefit ratios.

3. Long term financial savings are not guaranteed by program reductions, but may be realized by investing in those programs that have the potential for the greatest student-faculty ratios.

The degree to which an institution succeeds is in direct relation to its ability to focus the various constituent bodies on the achievement of its mission.

The focal point of the educational mission is the student, i.e., student outcome. In other words, what is best for the student is best for the institution.

The primary constituent of the CSD is the community. The community elects a Board of Directors to establish policy, which in turn employs a body of administrators and teachers to fulfill the educational mission.

The tradition of academic excellence within the CSD is a reflection of a community in which high standards are a result of cultural expectation.

The demand for academic excellence has historically included a strong music program. The historic strength of the CSD music program has been affirmed through local and statewide recognition of the high level of individual and group performance.

With that understanding and appreciation for the opportunity, we have done a brief study to examine the short and long term impacts of cuts targeting the CSD music program. Further, we will make recommendations as to program reinstatement and/or adjustment for the purpose of providing curricular stability and fiscal effectiveness.

**Short and Long Term Impacts**

Faculty Issues

There are currently 48 members of the music faculty in the CSD comprising a total of 44.566 FTE (full time equivalent) teachers. Assignments of FTE are allocated as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Elementary General Music | 19.265 |
| Elementary Band | 0 |
| Elementary Orchestra | 0 |
| Elementary Choir | 0 |
| Middle School General Music | 1.551 |
| Middle School Band | 5.832 |
| Middle School Orchestra | .084 |
| Middle School Choir | 3.999 |
| High School General | 1.000 |
| High School Band | 3.517 |
| High School Orchestra | .083 |
| High School Choir | 3.650 |
| Other Music | .075 |
| Non-music Assignments | 5.510 |
| Total | 44.566 |

Observations:

* No credit is given for a significant amount of "volunteer" work done by many teachers to maintain programs that are no longer funded by the district. This is particularly true at the elementary level. Included: elementary choirs, jazz bands, chamber music, non-music school activities, parking lot supervision, committee service, public service performances, musicals, festivals, study halls.
* Extra (non-music) duties or class loads constitute 5.510 FTE of the total 44.566 FTE music staffing. These include ALC, ADT, ELD, ESL, TECH, Library, PE, Media, BLC, study halls and other duties as assigned from time to time. All general music teachers assigned these duties have an additional 78 to 112 students added to their loads each day in a single hour.
* Elimination of the Music Coordinator position has rendered scheduling, budgetary decisions and the evaluation (professional growth assistance) of music faculty irrelevant. (See Appendix D for suggested roles for the Music Coordinator.)
* The movement toward decentralization of the decision making process tends to place the itinerant music teacher outside the participatory (site-based) decision-making process, if for no other reason than by default.
* This may be in part because the music teacher is perceived as part-time at any given site, or required to be at another site during the decision-making process, or that the administrator and/or music teacher is unsure who "owns" a given music teacher.
* Elementary General Music teachers are primarily allocated through teacher preparation time ratio points, and therefore are not or should not be considered as part of the music budget FTE allocations.
* Actual FTE allocations are listed by name in Appendix A.

The average allocation of FTE for music instruction per school by teacher category is demonstrated in Figure 5.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Figure 5: Music Faculty - Average FTE Available**  **per School and Area of Instruction** | | |
| **Music Teacher Category** | **Total FTE Available** | **Average FTE per School** |
| Elementary General Music | 19.265 | .58 |
| Elementary Band | 0 | 0 |
| Elementary Orchestra | 0 | 0 |
| Elementary Choir | 0 | 0 |
| Middle School General Music | 1.551 | .14 |
| Middle School Band | 5.832 | .53 |
| Middle School Orchestra | .084 | .01 |
| Middle School Choir | 3.999 | .36 |
| High School General Music | 1.000 | .14 |
| High School Band | 3.517 | .50 |
| High School Orchestra | .083 | .01 |
| High School Choir | 3.650 | .52 |

The student/faculty ratio (SFR) for each category of music instruction is demonstrated in Figure 6.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Figure 6: Student/Faculty Ratios (SFR)**  **by Area of Instruction**  **(Based on the Number of Students Eligible)** | |
| **Student to Teacher Ratio Category** | **SFR** |
| All Students (K-12) to All Music Faculty | 973:1 |
| \*Elementary Students (K-5) to General Music FTE | 965:1 |
| Eligible Students to Instrumental Music (Gr 5) | 0 |
| All Secondary (6-12) Students to All (6-12) Music Faculty | 1060:1 |
| Eligible Secondary (6-12) Students to General Music Faculty | 8195:1 |
| Eligible Students to Band Faculty (6-12) | 2236:1 |
| Eligible Students to Choir Faculty (6-12) | 2733:1 |
| Eligible Students to Orchestra Faculty (6-12) | 125,179:1 |

\*SFR does not include the ADT, ESL, ALD, etc., students, which include additional student loads from 78 to 112 students, sometimes without additional aides in the classroom.

Curriculum Issues

It has often been said that "good students take music," and while that is certainly the case, research indicates that children who make music become better students. Several observations may be made concerning the music curriculum in the Central School District.

There is apparent disparity in the perception of music as curricular, co-curricular and/or extra-curricular. The severity of the situation is increased by a movement toward site-based management and the lack of a full-time music coordinator.

* Generally, **"curricular"** refers to music classes and performing organizations that are held during the school day and apply music as a tool in the intellectual, emotional, and social development of the student.
* **"Co-curricular"** refers to those outcomes of curricular music instruction that result in music performance outside the school day, e.g., the performance of a Brahms Symphony by the orchestra at an evening concert. This performance may equate to the "final exam" for a music organization.
* **"Extra-curricular"** is a term applied to those activities of a musical organization which are or may be the result of curricular involvement in music, but which are primarily service or public relations in nature, e.g., the orchestra performing at a function for the local Kiwanis or Lions Club.
* The district needs to adopt these standards and definitions, or develop its own to assist in the decision-making process and the development of curricular policy.

The music curriculum should be considered as a single curriculum with separate but equally important tracks, not as individual programs. In this way a music curriculum resembles a mathematics curriculum in which algebra, trigonometry or calculus may be perceived as different courses, but as part of the same discipline.

In fact, there is no written music curriculum in the Silver Falls School District. Therefore, there is no guide for instruction, expected learner outcomes, or means of assessing student achievement. Consequently, there is no tangible means of demonstrating or justifying the music program as an academic entity. Further, with no system of assessing student music achievement, there is no means of evaluating music teachers to provide professional growth or justification of dismissal for incompetence.

“Pullout” Scheduling of Elementary Instrumental Music

Historically, one of the primary motivations for suggesting the elimination of elementary instrumental music programs is to reduce or eliminate the perceived problem of “pullout” lessons for instrumental music. The common misconception is that these "pullouts" are detrimental to student success in other academic areas of the curriculum. Although the "pullout" system of instruction is a normal practice (nationally) at the elementary level, research indicates that students are not negatively impacted. In fact, music students continue to maintain the highest levels of academic achievement. (Hash, 2004)

While the classroom teacher may be required to make schedule adjustments in the presentation of materials, the best teachers understand the academic (and social) advantages of music participation to the student. Classroom teachers also understand the importance of small group instruction (class size) and have come to see the advantages of using that time when the music students are "pulled out" of class to work with smaller groups on review, remediation, or other special projects that may need more individualized attention.

Equal Access Issues

Participation in the arts has been widely recognized as having significant positive effects on student development. The elimination of the music program can only have the opposite effect, leading to mediocrity in student achievement in all areas of the curriculum. The district cannot afford to ignore the research.

Equal access to a music education in the CSD is a major issue, potentially leading to legal liability. Inaccessibility to an equal education in music is evident in the following factors.

* Orchestra is a curricular offering only at ACMA. The “lottery” system is preventing students from the opportunity to participate. This factor combined with the elimination of the elementary string curriculum has reduced participation in orchestra to 30 students. In essence, the orchestra program has collapsed; yet there are at least 150 elementary students studying strings in private after-school programs, giving evidence of the potential for reinstatement of the program as a viable curricular and financial investment.
* There is no option for students to participate in choir at Five Oaks, Highland Park, Stoller, and Whitford Middle Schools and no grade 6 choir at Raleigh Hills.
* It is evident that band and choir is not an all-year option for students in some middle school(s).
* It is not evident that the district is providing equal access to the music curriculum and may not be adequately serving the various socioeconomic or ethnic groups within the community.
* Elementary students are not provided with a consistent system of delivery in general music. Inequities include:
* the failure to provide general music to all kindergarten students;
* extreme diversity in contact time, with classes meeting two times per week, once every six or eight or twelve days, or cancelled for some grades at will because of general music teachers being required to perform non-music duties (ADT, or similar assignments).
* While elementary general music teachers are responsible for supervision of ELD and BLC students, there is no evidence that this instruction is provided by licensed or certified music therapists.
* It appears that students in “option” schools are not provided the opportunity to participate in general music or performing aspects of the music curriculum at Community School, Health & Science, and Science & Technology.

Student Participation Issues

Extensive national case studies indicate that when elementary instrumental instruction is eliminated or started later than grade 5, the subsequent decline in student participation will be a minimum of 65%. Comparison of historical enrollments in instrumental music in the CSD with current levels of participation indicates that the decline of participation in instrumental music exceeds that figure. As noted earlier, enrollment in elementary band and orchestra in grades 4-6 in 1988-1992 exceeds the current total level of participation in grades 6-12. (See Figure 4)

While similar national data is not available for choral programs, research indicates that those districts in which students are not provided with a consistent and adequate scope and sequence in general music have 50% lower rates of participation in music performance at the secondary levels. It is evident that the declines in participation in choir in the CSD exceed that figure.

Current enrollments in music performance are listed in Figures 7a, 7b, and 7c.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Figure 7a: STUDENT PARTICIPATION - BAND | | | | | | | | | |
| School | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 | 36 | 24 | 25 |  |  |  |  | 85 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 71 | 52 | 44 |  |  |  |  | 167 |
| Middle School |  | 75 | 40 | 43 |  |  |  |  | 158 |
| Middle School |  | 48 | 12 | 25 |  |  |  |  | 85 |
| Middle School |  | 82 | 61 | 45 |  |  |  |  | 188 |
| Middle School |  | 131 | 51 | 29 |  |  |  |  | 211 |
| Middle School |  | 72 | 44 | 53 |  |  |  |  | 169 |
| Middle School |  | 124 | 59 | 40 |  |  |  |  | 223 |
| Middle School |  | 81 | 59 | 52 |  |  |  |  | 192 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 26 | 21 | 15 | 18 | 80 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 47 | 11 | 8 | 15 | 81 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 29 | 37 | 15 | 15 | 96 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 32 | 20 | 25 | 15 | 92 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 56 | 41 | 25 | 33 | 155 |
| Arts Magnet School |  | 4 | 13 | 14 | 21 | 16 | 13 | 8 | 89 |
| ISB |  | 73 | 43 | 45 | 13 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 202 |
| Science & Tech |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTALS** | **0** | **797** | **458** | **415** | **224** | **160** | **110** | **109** | **2273** |
| District Enrollment | 3029 | 3049 | 3042 | 2981 | 2976 | 2926 | 2842 | 3089 | 39488 |
| 1% of Dist Enrollment |  | 26% | 15% | 14% | 8% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 6% |
| 2Enrollment Disparity |  |  | -43% | -9% | -46% | -29% | -31% | -1% |  |
| 3Minimum Loss 15% |  | 797 | 677 | 576 | 489 | 416 | 354 | 301 | 3610 |
| 4Enroll 65%+15% | 1969 | 1674 | 1422 | 1209 | 1028 | 874 | 743 | 631 | 9549 |

Observations:

* The total number of students participating in band is 2273, which is 519 fewer students than were enrolled in grades 4-6 in 1988-1992. In addition, there are 94 students registered in high school jazz bands.
* Band is not a curricular option in grade 5 or in the following schools: Community, Health & Science, and Science and Technology.
* The percentage of students enrolled in band1 in all grades is well below national standards of excellence.
* National music programs of excellence have established a benchmark that attrition in instrumental music between any two grades is unacceptable when exceeding 15%. Enrollment disparities2 in a single year are closely related to attrition rates. If the district reduced these levels to a maximum of 15%, enrollment in band would be 3,610 students, an increase of 1,337 students.
* National music programs of excellence have established 65% of eligible grade 5 students as the minimum level of participation. If the district acted to restore the elementary music program beginning with grade 5, and assumed the minimum 65% level and maximum acceptable attrition rates of 15% between grades, student participation in instrumental music would be 9,549.4 This would provide significant financial benefit to the district. (See Economic Impacts)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Figure 7b: STUDENT PARTICIPATION – ORCHESTRA | | | | | | | | | |
| School | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Arts Magnet School |  | 3 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 30 |
| ISB |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Science & Tech |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTALS** | **0** | **3** | **2** | **6** | **9** | **5** | **1** | **4** | **30** |
| District Enrollment | 3029 | 3049 | 3042 | 2981 | 2976 | 2926 | 2842 | 3089 | 39488 |
| % of Dist Enrollment |  | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Observations:

* The total number of students participating in orchestra is 30. This is less that .5% in all grades.
* Orchestra is a curricular option only at ACMA and not in grade 5 at any school. It does not appear to have been a successful decision.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Figure 7c: STUDENT PARTICIPATION – CHOIR | | | | | | | | | |
| School | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 | 0 | 29 | 24 |  |  |  |  | 53 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Elementary | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 41 | 83 | 76 |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| Middle School |  | 46 | 120 | 174 |  |  |  |  | 340 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 51 | 103 | 78 |  |  |  |  | 232 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 71 | 96 |  |  |  |  | 167 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Middle School |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 29 | 37 | 26 | 21 | 113 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 22 | 27 | 31 | 25 | 105 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 26 | 59 | 43 | 40 | 168 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 50 | 39 | 42 | 38 | 169 |
| High School |  |  |  |  | 57 | 32 | 52 | 93 | 234 |
| Arts Magnet School |  | 95 | 37 | 14 | 12 | 7 | 2 | 10 | 177 |
| ISB |  | 87 | 52 | 59 | 45 | 37 | 14 | 9 | 303 |
| Science & Tech |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **TOTALS** | **0** | **320** | **495** | **521** | **241** | **238** | **210** | **236** | **2261** |
| District Enrollment | 3029 | 3049 | 3042 | 2981 | 2976 | 2926 | 2842 | 3089 | 39488 |
| 1% of Dist Enrollment |  | 10% | 16% | 17% | 8% | 8% | 7% | 8% | 6% |
| 2Enrollment Disparity |  |  | 55% | 5% | -54% | -1% | -12% | 12% |  |

Observations:

* There are 2,261 students enrolled in choir in grades 6-12.
* Choir is not a curricular option in the elementary grades, although several teachers offer it as an after school option.
* The percentage of students enrolled in choir1 in all grades is well below national standards of excellence.

Economic Issues

The concept of Reverse Economics lies in the principle that the long-term effects of the elimination or reduction of a program are more costly than the initial savings anticipated. The ramifications of low enrollment or the loss of student participation in the music performance program are significant, having major impacts on class size and the district economy.

When students are eliminated or drop enrollment in large music performance classes, there are only two ways to accommodate them: 1) Transfer them to the non-music classroom, causing increases in class size; or, 2) Hire additional faculty to keep class sizes down. Normally a combination of two is implemented.

Current average class sizes are indicated in Figure 8.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Figure 8: Current Class Size Averages | |
| Elementary School | 28 |
| Middle School | 26 |
| High School | 26 |

[Source: Central Administrative Office]

The primary cost factor in education is personnel. The most cost-efficient personnel are those who provide instruction to the largest number of students in a given class period and/or who carry the largest student loads. Several observations may be made regarding the cost efficiency of restoring the music program in the Central School District.

With enrollments in large music classes typically greater than average class sizes, it is normal that the average 1.0 FTE music performance teacher carries a student load equivalent to 2.0 FTE classroom teachers. This is illustrated in Figure 9.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Figure 9:AVERAGE STUDENT LOADS (Secondary Example) | | | |
| FTE | Classification | Classes x Students | Student Load |
| 1.0 | Non-music Classroom Teacher | 5 x 26 | 130 |
| 1.0 | Band, Choir, Orchestra Teacher | 5 x 51 | 255 |
| 2.0 | Teachers |  | 385 |
| 1.0 | Non-music Classroom Teacher | 5 x 26 | 130 |
| 1.0 | Non-music Classroom Teacher | 5 x 26 | 130 |
| .6 | Non-music Classroom Teacher | 5 x 25 | 125 |
| 2.6 |  |  | 385 |

Observations:

* The student load of the average secondary band, choir and orchestra teacher equates to 2.0 FTE non-music classroom teachers.
* The average secondary music performance teacher bears a 2.0 FTE financial value to the district. Therefore:
  + Any circumstance that causes a decline in student enrollment or prevents students from participation in music performance will have a negative cost effect on the district budget and/or average class sizes.
* It may be demonstrated that the excess FTE value of secondary music performance teachers:
  + Covers the cost for any small group or individual lessons provided to secondary students by the music teachers.
  + Justifies the inclusion of any music classes in the curriculum that may be under the normal minimum number.
  + Pays for the number of elementary instrumental teachers equivalent to the total excess load (FTE) of secondary music performance teachers.

In the CSD, however, the situation has deteriorated to the point that the reverse economic advantage no longer applies. Because of the elimination of large music performance classes, many non-music class sizes have dramatically increased to be similar in size to the large music performance classes formerly in place.

It is financially advantageous to the school district to increase enrollment in the music program through the facilitation of student participation. The following observations should be noted.

* Maximum student load averages of 200 are a viable option for music performance teachers.
* It is anticipated that average student loads for choir teachers may be greater than other music performance teachers and that average student loads for orchestra teachers may be less.
* The positive financial advantage of large music classes is minimized when they are offered for no credit, are placed outside the school day as an extra-curricular activity, or do not meet daily.

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

While the wisdom of the historical cuts in the music program are at best questionable from the aspect of their financial validity, the resulting devastation to the music curriculum, and the lifetime loss of opportunity to the students is without justification.

The community recognizes the need for fiscal responsibility within the school district in a time of difficult funding.

The community recognizes that a strong music program is important to the image and economy of the school district and the community.

The community recognizes the importance of maintaining a strong music program for the social, academic and intellectual development of the total student.

The community recognizes that parents of music students make significant financial investments in the school district with the rental, purchase and maintenance of their own music instruments, and the raising of funds to assist in the operation of the extra-curricular music program.

The community recognizes that there will continue to be a significant decline in student participation should the district consider any further reductions in the music curriculum.

The community recognizes the potential for the collapse of the entire music program, as observed with the orchestra curriculum.

The community recognizes the potential for increasing student participation in band, orchestra, and choir along with its financial advantage to the district.

Therefore, it is with careful consideration that we request the formation of a Task Force to study and make recommendations regarding the structure of the music curriculum. We recommend that the constituency of that Task Force include balanced representation of the following constituencies.

Administrative Representation:

Central Administration (1)

High School Administration (1)

Middle School Administration (1)

Elementary School Administration (1)

Instructional Staff:

Elementary General Music (1)

Secondary General Music (1)

Secondary Vocal Music (1)

Secondary Band (1)

Secondary Orchestra (1)

Elementary Classroom Teacher (1)

Secondary Classroom Teacher (1)

Community Representation:

\*Elementary Music Parents (1)

\*Middle School Music Parents (1)

\*High School Music Parents (1)

Former Music Teachers (1)

Community Member-At-Large (1)

[\*NOTE: Provision should be made to ensure balanced representation for General music, Band, Choir and Orchestra]

Further, we recommend that the administration rescind its recommendation and/or consideration of any reductions in the music curriculum and examine the following issues related to the strengthening of the music curriculum to the advantage of the student, the district, the community, and the budget.

* Reinstatement of the 5.510 FTE music teachers assigned to non-music classes to the music classroom.
* Reinstatement of the elementary instrumental program beginning in grade 5.
* Reinstatement of the elementary general music positions to provide a viable music experience for elementary students.
* Reinstatement of the option for band, orchestra and choir at all schools in the district from grades 5-12.
* Establishment of the music program as a regular part of the curriculum, meeting daily during regular school hours from grades 6-12, including general music.
* Collaborative decision-making in which parents and music teachers work together with administrators and guidance counselors to facilitate a scheduling process that will accommodate student participation in all music classes, provide for student-centered decision making, and enhance administrator-teacher-parent communication.
* The establishment of maximum average loads of music performance class teachers (grades 6-12) at 200 students. Further, such student overloads should be considered in part as paying for the elementary music performance program and secondary small group lesson programs; and be recognized as assisting in maintaining lower class sizes in non-music classes.
* The scheduling of music classes to minimize teacher travel time, thereby reducing classroom interruptions and increasing student contact time, including consideration of horizontal time blocking.
* Perform exit interviews of all students who discontinue participation in music performance, in order to provide accurate statistical data for program improvement.
* The reduction of factors which contribute to attrition in the music program, including scheduling, conflict with classes in which only one section is offered, and other factors which may surface during the study.
* Examine options for students to fulfill requirements for physical education credits, including extra-curricular sports and adoption of marching band as "PE Band" at the high school level.
* Advising students of the possibility of fulfilling requirements for grade 9 and/or grade 10 physical education in the junior and/or senior years.
* Development and adoption of a district-wide policy statement regarding the philosophical purpose and curricular content of the music program and its role in the total social, academic and intellectual development of all students.
* Allocation of a 1.0 FTE Music Coordinator to facilitate coordination, cooperative decision-making and communication within the department, other departments, the district, and the community at large. This position could be an administrative or teacher level position.
* Centralized management of the music curriculum, including staffing and budget allocations, scheduling, and a central Music Resource Center, thereby providing for equal opportunity for all students in the district to participate in music.
* Reinstatement of the music program in order to maintain enrollment in CSD schools.
* Elimination of those factors present that are preventing equal access for all students to the music curriculum.
* Study other issues that may arise during the operation of the Task Force.

APPENDIX A

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MUSIC FACULTY FTE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | ELEM | Middle School (Gr 6-8) | | | | High School (Gr 9-12) | | | | Other  Music | Non-  Music | TOTAL  FTE |
| Gen | Gen | Choir | Band | Orch | Gen | Choir | Band | Orch |
| 1 | 0.500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.500 |
| 2 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 3 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 4 |  |  | 0.333 |  |  |  | 0.167 |  |  |  |  | 0.500 |
| 5 | 0.584 |  |  | 0.416 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 6 |  |  | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.333 | 0.667 |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 8 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 9 |  |  | 0.500 |  |  |  | 0.333 |  |  |  |  | 0.833 |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.333 | 0.667 |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 11 |  |  |  | 0.250 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.750 | 1.000 |
| 12 |  | 0.167 |  | 0.250 |  | 0.333 |  | 0.250 |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 13 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 14 |  | 0.500 | 0.500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 15 | 0.900 | 0.100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 16 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 17 |  |  |  | 0.667 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.333 | 1.000 |
| 18 |  |  |  | 0.500 |  | 0.167 |  | 0.333 |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 19 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 20 |  |  | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 21 | 0.500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.500 |
| 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.500 | 0.333 |  |  | 0.167 | 1.000 |
| 23 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 24 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 25 |  |  |  | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 26 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 27 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.333 |  |  |  | 0.667 | 1.000 |
| 29 |  | 0.084 |  | 0.249 |  |  |  | 0.667 |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 30 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.600 |  |  |  | 0.600 |
| 32 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 33 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 34 | 0.900 | 0.100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 35 |  |  |  | 0.833 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.833 |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.167 |  |  |  |  | 0.833 | 1.000 |
| 37 |  | 0.500 | 0.166 | 0.167 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.167 | 1.000 |
| 38 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 39 | 0.900 | 0.100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 40 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
|  | ELEM | Middle School (6-8) | | | | High School (9-12) | | | | Other  Music | Non-  Music | Total  FTE |
| Gen | Gen | Choir | Band | Orch | Gen | Choir | Band | Orch |
| 41 | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.167 | 0.667 |  |  | 0.166 | 1.000 |
| 43 | 0.500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.500 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 45 |  |  |  | 1.000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.150 |  |  | 0.075 | 0.075 | 0.300 |
| 47 |  |  | 0.500 | 0.500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  | 0.084 |  |  |  | 0.083 |  | 0.833 | 1.000 |
|  | 20.784 | 1.551 | 3.999 | 5.832 | 0.084 | 1.000 | 3.650 | 3.517 | 0.083 | 0.075 | 3.991 | 44.566 |

Appendix B

THE GEORGIA PROJECT:

A Status Report on Arts Education in the State of Georgia

Executive Summary

*THE GEORGIA PROJECT: A Status Report on Arts Education in the State of Georgia* is a 155-page statistical profile of arts education in Georgia public schools (GPS). Data for the report were gathered from:

1. 33 study districts (17 over 10,000 student population; 16 under 10,000)
2. 841 schools (K-12)
3. 1,705 arts teachers
4. 641,635 students (51% of total GPS student population)

The report details student participation rates, course offerings and curriculum, and staffing and funding of arts programs. In an *Addendum* to the report, selected data from the *Georgia Public Education Report Card* (GPERC) are compared with data gathered for the *Status Report*. Statistically significant relationships were found between arts program profiles in the *Status Report* and demographic/academic data in the GPERC.

Results

Analysis of the arts programs in the 33 study districts reveals the following:

Arts Staffing

1. Arts staffing ratios vary tremendously from district to district, with no apparent consistency among large or small districts, suggesting a lack of any uniform and/or adequate standard for staffing of the arts curriculum.
2. Nearly $2 million are spent annually for 47.09 FTE of arts teacher time allocated to non-arts duties, including travel time, instruction of non-arts subjects, hallway supervision, etc.

Arts Curriculum

1. As with arts staffing, variability in the offering and scheduling of arts curricula among and within districts suggests a lack of standards for the arts.

In general, there appear to be significant issues of inequity for student opportunities to participate in arts programs within the study districts. Inequities pertain to the variety and extent of arts courses available, and may be correlated with district size and other factors such as socio-economic and ethnic characteristics of each district.

Student Participation

1. Student participation in the arts is generally low and varies widely from district to district.
2. Two-thirds or more of eligible students do *not* participate in elective arts in any way.
3. Attrition rates in music performance (band, choir, orchestra) classes are generally high, especially between grades eight and nine (middle school to high school), where they averaged 43%.

Economics

1. Average student load for music performance teachers in the 33 study districts is 171 students, compared to an average student load of 144 for all teachers. Actual student loads vary drastically from district to district.
2. The excess student load for music performance teachers equates to a 1.2 FTE value to the district; i.e., they carry the student load of 1.2 FTE for each 1.0 FTE paid.
3. The 1.2 FTE financial value of music performance teachers helps to maintain smaller class sizes in other academic areas, and saves over $3.6 million annually.
4. Increasing student participation in music performance would multiply this economic savings; just reducing student attrition in Band to a level more in line with national standards of excellence (15% maximum per year) would result in 68,496 additional Band students and potential savings of over $4 million annually.

Correlation with Georgia Public Education Report Card

The *Addendum* used regression analysis to examine relationships between data from the *Status Report* and the GPERC. The analysis found statistically significant relationships as indicated in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Relationship Descriptor | p-value | Confidence |
| 1. Districts that make staffing and funding of their arts programs a priority tend to have higher overall rates of student participation in the arts and higher rates of arts student retention (lower rates of attrition). | .08 | 92% |
| 1. Such districts tend to have lower dropout rates in grades 9-12 and thus keep their students in school longer and graduate more of them. | .08 | 92% |
| 1. Their students tend to score higher on achievement and performance tests, such as the SAT and the Georgia High School Graduation Test. | .03-08 | 92-97% |
| 1. They tend to graduate more of their students with college prep diplomas, percentages increasing with diversity of arts curricula and percent of students participating. | .007 | 99+% |
| 1. The above relationships may not apply equally across socio-economic and ethnic groups. Specifically, the study found that arts student retention rates are negatively correlated with both ethnic minority percent of enrollment and percent of enrollment eligible for subsidized lunch (a measure of district affluence). | .003-.01 | 99+% |

While the above findings do not prove a cause and effect relationship, they do indicate that “...strong arts programs need not come at the expense of academic achievement. Rather, the arts are an important factor in achieving academic excellence.”

Further studies are recommended to clarify issues raised in the *Status Report* and the *Addendum*, especially regarding issues of equal access by students to opportunities in the arts.

APPENDIX C

What Makes a Strong Program

Professor Robert Culver

The University of Michigan

Based upon findings of 1990 Research Project involving 50 districts, 113 instrumental music teachers from 27 states.

I. TEACHING:

A. Schedule

1. Frequency of teaching opportunities are in direct relationship with program quality.

a. Elementary Instrumental Program

• Begin in 5th grade, sometimes in 4th for strings and 5th for the winds and percussion

• Have no fewer than 2 meetings per week, most preferably 3 to 5 per week

• All classes are in the regular school day

b. Middle or Junior High Instrumental Program

• Daily instruction is the majority pattern

• Provisions for full orchestra with winds exist for at least two grading periods per year

c. High School Instrumental Music Program

• Daily instruction offered

• Provisions for regular full orchestra with winds begins after marching band season ends.

• The finest instrumental music programs always had provisions for private instruction, provisions for sectional instructing of like instruments and a small ensemble program.

2. Routine

a. Directed aspects

Planning obvious:

• Anticipatory set

• Quality plans available

• Class outcomes are related to planning

• Time envelope is controlled with consideration of pacing, energy profile, and starting and ending times

b. Self-directed aspects

• Students are aware and responsive to routine

• Students involve themselves in appropriate activity quickly and efficiently

3. Methodology

a. Strategy choice

• Ear to hand beginning instruction

• Non-verbal teaching used extensively

• Experiential teaching devices

• Multiple strategies and teaching devices employed in every class session

b. Modeling

• An instrument, voice, gesture, media or proxy is used to demonstrate as opposed to verbal description.

4. Delivery elements

a. Ratio is maintained at a maximum of 15% verbiage to 85% activity.

b. Teacher demonstrates awareness and use of proxemics

• Eye scan is used evenly to all parts of the room and is direct to the student

• Proximity to students spread evenly around the room

• Pedagogical or supportive touch is used appropriately

• Names of students are used

c. Pacing elements

• Pace consistent and controlled between instruction and response

• Energy profile is controlled by teacher

d. Prioritization

• Teaching interventions follow a sense of priorities

1. Posture

2. Format or mechanics of playing

3. Sound

4. Intonation

5. Rhythmic structure (Intonation and rhythm may be switched for older students)

6. Style/Speed

e. Curriculum

• A printed curriculum is available

• There is common understanding among the staff

• There is skill-based grading in use

II. ORGANIZATION OF SYSTEM

A. Chain of command/decision making

1. Parents

2. School Board

3. Superintendent

4. Assistant Superintendents

5. Area Supervisors or Coordinators, including building principals

6. Teachers

B. Meeting function and structure

1. Access to agenda

2. Meeting is run efficiently

3. Minutes are kept

4. Contentious problem solving process in place

C. Paper work

1. Computer is used extensively

2. Curriculum/planning is an ongoing procedure

3. Grading is based on skill acquisition

4. Cumulative file for music program]

5. Memo process

D. Data gathering/use

1. Cost per student

2. Percentage of student body in program

3. Drop out rate analyzed and kept to under 15% any year

4. Schedule disruption and cause

5. Skill acquisition over time

6. Course election patterns

E. Budget

1. Predictable

2. Based on student count and activities

3. Managed by music department or building principal

4. Based upon an amortization rate of equipment replacement costs

F. Inventory

1. Maintained on a schedule

2. Storage and access is adequate

3. Is renewed upon an amortized base

G. Schedule

1. A central calendar is maintained district wide

2. Secondary music classes are scheduled before single section classes

3. Elementary music classes are scheduled by a music administrator

4. Annual performances by major ensembles

High School - 8 to 11

Middle/Junior High School - 4 to 8

Elementary - 3 to 5

H. Library

1. Centralized library with staff

2. Computerized control and maintenance

I. Support Structures

1. Parent Boosters are music department wide

2. By-laws clearly delineate functions of teacher and supporters

3. Community resources include service groups, media, etc.

J. Interdepartmental politics

1. All areas of the music department are equally supported

2. Staff supports other areas than their own

3. Recruiting is a collective effort, especially between band and orchestra

K. Community

1. Private teachers role

a. Available as resource to school program, attitude development, sectionals, festival assistance, etc.

b. Support school groups

2. Professional musicians role

a. Positive performance model for student population

b. Available as resource to school program, attitude development, sectionals, festival assistance, etc.

3. Commercial music stores

a. Support school groups with maintenance visits, loaner program, economic support for special programs, tours, clinicians, etc.

4. Higher education

a. Available as resource to school program, attitude development, sectionals, festival assistance, etc.

b. Clinician and consultant availability

c. Student teacher availability

d. Demonstration resources to keep schools abreast of developments

APPENDIX D:

SUGGESTED ROLES FOR THE MUSIC COORDINATOR

1) Centralized supervision of music by musically qualified personnel, including:

Search, interview and employment of new staff in cooperation with principals

Coordination, assignment and scheduling of current staff

Evaluation of staff by professionally trained music personnel

Coordination of the mentor program

Providing for professional growth

Inter-staff communication

Allocation, coordination, and assignment of qualified substitute teachers

Music teacher advocacy

Providing administrative assistance for teachers, thereby relieving job stress and building morale

2) Centralized supervision of curriculum, including:

Development and implementation

Maintenance of curricular excellence

Providing advocacy for equal opportunity in music for all students in all schools

3) Maintenance of a coordinated district music calendar

4) Supervision of district "honors" music performance programs, including:

Festivals, contests

District-wide honor (select) groups

5) Centralized budget development and control (accountability)

6) Centralized development, maintenance and control of music teaching resources, including:

Audio and visual resources

Miscellaneous teaching materials

7) Coordinated, informed purchase of music and music instruments

8) Control and assignment (to schools) of music instruments, including:

Inventory control

Assignment to schools

Maintenance and repair

Piano tuning and repair

9) Music leadership for community relations, including:

Parent/teacher communications

Public relations

Documentation of religion in the school music program

Multicultural issues in music
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