

7-2003

Music Programs that Engage Our Communities: Making a Stronger Connection

La Gretta Snowden
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Snowden, La Gretta, "Music Programs that Engage Our Communities: Making a Stronger Connection" (2003). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/1482>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Music Programs that Engage Our Communities:
Making a Stronger Connection

by

La Gretta Snowden

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
Of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts
School of Music
College of Visual and Performing Arts
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Janet L.S. Moore, Ed.D.
John W. Richmond, Ph.D.
Sheila C. Woodward, Ph.D.
David A. Williams, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
July, 2003

(Keywords: music education, arts education, arts partnerships,
community-based arts programs, school development)

© Copyright 2003, LaGretta Snowden

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Chapter One – Introduction	1
Chapter Two – Music Education and the Community	7
Historical & Current Viewpoints	8
Needs and Resources	15
Needs of the School	17
Needs of the Community	19
Chapter Three – Arts Education in the Community	23
Community Perception	24
Arts Education Policy	30
Role of Arts Organizations	36
Collaborations and Partnerships	43
Chapter Four – Trends in Research	47
Research Studies	47
Models of Successful Partnerships	53
AGE	61
ArtsConnection	62
21 st Century Learning Centers	64
CAPE	65
Boston Music Education Collaborative	66
Chapter Five – Conclusion	70
Implications to Future Research	73
References	76

Music Programs that Engage Our Communities:
Making a Stronger Connection

LaGretta Snowden

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to review a significant body of literature that related to music and arts education in the context of community engagement. An examination of the literature identified several issues affecting the engagement of communities in arts education pertaining to arts education policies, the role of arts organizations and the relationship between schools and communities. The summation of this research included an overview of models of successful collaborations between the public school and community institutions at national, state, and local levels in the United States with implications of future reform to the arts education policy.

With such a vast array of program offerings initiated through the collaborative partnering of schools with communities and local arts agencies, valuable insights can be gained from concerted research efforts in the field of music education as to the unique opportunities afforded through purposeful community engagement.

Chapter One

Introduction

Traditional views of community interaction have long served as strategies for pedagogical emphasis among institutes of higher learning. However, current trends in educational reform have caused disciplines outside of professions, such as healthcare and business, to expand upon existing service learning models (Barnes, 2000; Swick, 2001; Taylor, 2002) in favor of a more creative integration of classroom theory and practical application in life settings. With much discussion and renewed interest in the area of community-based learning and service learning (Boethel, 2000; Checkoway, 2000; Dodd & Lilly, 2000; Hollander and Saltmarsh, 2000; Jay, 2000; Lowe and Reisch, 1998; Soep, 2002), it is important at this time to consider the impact of such research in the context of music education.

For the field of music education, the extent of such engagement has been quite limited. Interaction typically revolves around performances in local concert halls, auditoriums, parks, arenas, and nursing homes. While the value of this type of community involvement is not in question, research may lead us to

view these as mere precursory events for establishing engagement in education rather than entertainment.

Is it true to say then, that music educators have lost touch with their communities? In some respects they have, which may be a contributing factor to the ongoing struggle for support of arts programs in the public school system. As one author suggested:

There is a feeling abroad in the land that while we've done a terrific job training professionals over the past fifty years, we've failed to engender a public enthusiasm and demand for their services. Our preoccupation with quality and excellence within our institutions has caused us to lose sight of a larger and perhaps more elusive goal: the development of a musical culture in America. (Wendrich, 1982, p.13)

Looking for alternative ways to bridge the gap between the community and formal music education provided the fundamental conception of this research. It is the intent of this researcher to discover new knowledge that will inform educators and policy makers to move beyond the stereotypical roles of community music programs and look towards designing curricula and programs that support experiential learning models embracing a more holistic approach to the developing child. Learning, in this case, would be

viewed as a continuum and all experiences as being inclusive, inter-linked, and supported by a shared philosophical framework.

At present, there is an extensive amount of literature in support of community-based programming enhanced by arts instruction. However, much of this literature and research represents an interdisciplinary approach to the arts as opposed to discipline specific. Hence, the literature identified in this study has emerged from a cross section of varying publications including scholarly journals, such as the *Arts Education Policy Review*, *Music Educators Journal*, *Bulletin of the Council for the Research in Music Education*, *School-Community Journal*; as well as sponsored research by national arts agencies and advocacy groups, including the Arts Education Partnership, President's Committee for the Arts and Humanities, and the National Endowment for the Arts. The methodology used included a review of bibliographies in major research distillations including *The New Handbook of Musical Teaching and Learning*, *Research in Music Education*, and *A Guide to Research in Music Education*; keyword search in major research literature databases such as International Index to the Performing Arts, International Index to Music Periodicals, Music Literature Abstracts, FirstSearch, ArticleFirst , ERIC (Webluis), Expanded Academic ASAP, IAC Expanded Academic Index, Wilson Select Plus

Dissertation/Abstract, and Arts Abstract; and a review of published research syntheses in music and arts education. Keyword searches included areas such as music education and community, community music, community-based arts programs, community education, music outreach, service learning, and arts education.

How then should one approach the aspect of engagement?

One form of engagement would constitute community-based musical learning experiences that enhance the music program within a particular community's school. Key components of such a relationship would be: 1) shared curricular objectives geared towards unique experiences; 2) shared resources such as facilities, space, and arts professionals operating both in and outside of the school, etc.; 3) collaboration between schools, arts agencies, organizations, universities, community colleges, etc.

Other instances of engagement would also encompass the development of community teachers (Murrell, 2001) and community-based service learning models (Dodd & Lily, 2000). A community teacher would be identified as a person who lives and works in the community with a successful track record of working with students in a particular area of expertise, in this case, music. Such individuals would serve as a vital link to any collaboration or partnering whether initiated from within or outside of the formal

school setting ascribing to the role of communitarian. Historically, ideas of the communitarian placed emphasis on the welfare of society collectively as opposed to the individual(s) within (Merz & Furman, 1997, p.24). In the context of this investigation however, the expansion of the music educator's role to include community engagement would bring into scope the impact of a comprehensive music program in the school and its surrounding community. It would also ascertain implications of future research as it relates to pre-service teacher training and professional development through community outreach and service learning.

As mentioned previously, community service learning has become an increasingly prevalent topic among colleges and universities across the United States as many educators look to strengthen teacher education and enhance community life (Swick, 2001). Other benefits associated with the service learning experience is that it fosters characteristics of altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, and sportsmanship in student participants (Glenn, 2002, p.10) as well as provides preservice teachers "with real-life opportunities to participate in the communities in which they live and actively prepare for advocacy roles" (Dodd & Lilly, 2000, p.77).

In this case, an investigation will be made of the role of music education within the community as it pertains to the assessment of community needs and policy reform. To do this, various approaches will be presented within the context of the school-community relationship. The first issue to be confronted is the historical and contemporary views of the public school music program. Secondly, an examination will be made on the extent to which arts education policy has impacted society through community engagement. Thirdly, an investigation will be made of the role of arts organizations and other sectors outside of the school in collaborative efforts with the community to developing community-based arts programs. Finally, exemplary collaborative models in existence today will be identified that link schools, school districts, and non-school institutions in community-based musical learning experiences.

Chapter Two

Music Education and the Community

Music is a phenomenon that permeates every culture of the world. Whether by oral tradition or intricate notational system, music has played an integral part in the transmission of the human experience throughout society. Many countries have devised extensive pedagogical methods to promote the preservation of musical traditions within their educational system.

Similarly, music education in the United States constitutes a rich, eclectic musical heritage which embodies diversity. This proves to be dually rewarding and challenging as music educators look for better ways to help students find meaningful and purposeful experiences in music, yet remain sensitive to the cultural needs of a multi-cultured society (Hinckley, 2001). Consequently, it is very important to examine more closely the role of music education in American society and how the changing social dynamics affect the relationship between the schools and their surrounding communities.

This chapter has been organized into two key areas: 1) historical and current viewpoints of music education and 2) needs and resources of the school and the community.

Historical and Current Viewpoints

In the United States, the relationship between formal music education and the community was inextricably linked at one point. Dating back to the time before music became integrated into the formal school curriculum, the community provided informal and, sometimes formal music education for children and adults alike. As the author reflected,

“During an earlier time in American history, when there was no school music, community music was the basis of virtually all music education” (Mark, 1992, p.8).

The development of singing schools and early performing ensembles (Mark, 1992b; Reimer, 1999) can be traced back to deep-rooted sentiments and strong community appreciation for artistic expression through music. Much of this can be attributed to the social and aesthetic functions served by music in the nineteenth century. During that time, expressions in music reflected national pride, moral and family values, as well as religious fervor. As support grew for public education along with a dedication to choral and instrumental music, music was introduced into the curriculum

of the elementary school in 1838 by Lowell Mason (Campbell & Kassner, 2002, p.9).

Over the years, as a result of the systematic changes within the public schools structuring and curriculum objectives, music has gradually assumed a lesser role in the educational process in many public schools. Early proponents for continued community engagement, however, believed that there were a host of issues, due to social and economic growth, that had direct bearing on school music programs and community relations. It is likely that many of these same issues still exist today. They included increased leisure time, more choices for leisure activities (Dykema, 1992), technological advancement (Kaplan, 1988; Wendrich, 1982), and absence of community leadership assumed by the music educator (Bliss, 1992; Eilert, 1940; Kaplan, 1992b; Leonhard, 1981; Sparling, 1992). For example, when one author commented about the impact of technology on education, he wrote:

Television, telephone, radio, phonograph and tape become our current means of communication replacing letter-writing and reading for general information. Adding machines, cash registers, and computers have reduced the essential need for even arithmetic skills. In other words—reading, writing, and arithmetic are not truly basic requirements for day-to-day

living in contemporary society. (Weindrich, 1982, p.6)

In response to these issues, music education would become a means for providing community constituents with viable options in improving leisure time activities and promoting cultural development.

Others argued that school music programs have failed to successfully train the amateur musician creating an inherent flaw in the instruction of music (Anderson, 1992; Drinker, 1992; Kaplan, 1992a). This argument stemmed from concerns that the demise of the amateur's role in the educational process has had a profound impact on the livelihood of music in our communities. As stated midway in the 20th century by one writer:

...how futile are many of our teaching efforts in music, concerning themselves primarily with perverted objectives of reading and technique, and failing to develop the will to make and hear music, which is the only legitimate reason for the reading and technical objectives.... (Eilert, 1940, p.59)

In the 21st century, the concept of community has taken on an entirely different meaning. Much of today's discourse about community is related to the development and expansion of the global community. From television to the introduction of the Internet, technological advances have revolutionized every aspect

of human existence. Never before has the dissemination of music and musical instruction been as fast, easy, accessible, or as extensive. With the increasing popularity of web-based instruction, interactive instructional software, video conferencing, and virtual classrooms, some educators predict that technology will completely transform the way we teach (Hutchens, 2000; Kassner, 2001; Lehman, 2000; Undercofler, 2000; Vincent & Merrion, 1996). Furthermore, many allude to the fact that public support and demands for music instruction will increase due to the fact that the arts will be viewed as foremost among the rare opportunities in life where people are actively engaged in a shared experience (Undercofler, 2000).

As the future foreshadows the arts being strategically positioned to combat the dehumanization and physical isolation of a computerized world (Jorgensen, 2003; Leonhard, 1980b), some contentions have to be made as to the pervading attitudes about music within the public. The growing interest in brain research and academic achievement, as it relates to musical study, has prompted a noticeable rise in public acknowledgement and support of the arts. Still, arts programs in American public schools assume the most volatile position in the fiscal budgets of school boards. As one author denoted:

The tighter budgets get and the more expensive resources and personnel become, the more likely it is that some school programs will be relegated to the 'cutting room floor'. Rural and urban schools cinch up their belts during these lean times and eliminate nonessential programs in favor of dedicating what few resources are available to the basics of instruction: reading, writing, and arithmetic. These are the key elements of education and are nonnegotiable. However, children in urban and rural environments may proceed through their school years learning only these key elements, possibly being denied an education in the arts and all that goes with it.

(Campbell, 2001, p.448)

It would not be presumptuous, therefore, to contend that viewpoints about educating America's school-aged children are still being influenced by the 'back to basic' education campaign which excludes arts education. The concept of a 'basic education' can be traced back to the ideas of the 17th century mathematician, Rene Descartes, who argued that emotions are separate and different from reasoning and thinking; thus, mathematics, conceived as being separate from involvement of the body and its unreliable senses and emotions, is the model for reasoning and for achieving pure intellect (Reimer, 1999, p.23). This assumption has greatly

influenced Western beliefs and educational systems, as commented by contemporary music education philosopher, Bennett Reimer. He further stated:

It has led to the assumption that there are "intellectual" or 'cognitive' subjects such as math, science, and languages that require intelligence and are therefore 'basic' and that other subjects such as the arts, being rooted in the bodily senses and attendant emotions, are decidedly not 'intellectual' or 'cognitive,' do not require intelligence, and are therefore not to be considered 'basic'. (Reimer, 1999,p.23)

The realization of basic education in the "back to basic" movement has created a need for drastic reform from within and outside of American public schools (Mahlmann, 1995). Such being the case, perhaps it would be more befitting to present the ideas of community engagement within the context of educational objectives extracted from a more "classical" approach such as that of the Paideia Program Proposal developed by Mortimer Adler.

In discussions about educational reform, the idea of "Paideia" is not a new concept (Goodlad, 1984; Gurley, 1999; Potter, 1997; Jorgensen, 2002; Roberts, 1998; Roberts, 2002). Based on Greek ideology of what it is to be educated, Paideia "is not absorption of

institutionalized knowledge but a preferred way of being human” (Gurley, 1999, p. 356). The first six of Adler’s fourteen essential elements of what constitutes the *Paideia School* provide a good starting place for building a comprehensive arts program with emphasis on culture and community engagement. These six elements state that the *Paideia School*(1) is student-centered which means that ultimately it nurtures self-reliance of the individual student by developing his/her own sense of responsibility; (2) includes student involvement in governance, both individual and as a member of a group; (3) requires that the teachers and administrators model lifelong learning; (4) is the center of a learning community that extends beyond the school; (5) cares about the instructional development of both students and adults; and, (6) requires that all children are expected to learn and succeed (Roberts, 1998, p. 4).

Difficult as it may be to ascribe a sole remedy for the problems that plague our current educational system, Adler’s model will be used in later discussion as a reference point for supporting a philosophical framework upon which collaborative efforts between schools and communities can be built. Before continuing, some acknowledgement of needs and accessible resources is crucial to the operation of a healthy inter-school and community relationship.

Needs and Resources of the School & Community

The educational landscape of America's public schools is changing rapidly. As our economy becomes more service driven, there is a growing trend for societal institutions, including the school, to be customer serviced-oriented and user-friendly (Schmitt & Tracy, p.5). National reform initiatives in children and family services have mandated policy revisions of all institutions that are directly involved in offering services to families (Council of Chief, 1998; Kirst & Kelley, 1995; Schmitt & Tracy, 1996). In response to these recent changes, some schools have begun to explore a variety ways for accommodating this new system of service delivery, realizing that by nature, the needs and resources of the school and community are reciprocal. Such links will provide avenues for "enhancing coordinated responses to interrelated problems" (*Coming Up*, 1996, p.8). One writer explained:

The movement to integrate services for children through collaboration among children's organizations has taken hold as a viable issue of interest to policymakers as well as school and program administrators. The multiple needs of children at risk make the provision of school-linked integrate services necessary to ensure access to quality education. (Kirst and Kelley, 1995, p.21)

In most instances of school partnering, the nature and quality of these connections are formed to promote successful development of each child (Davies, 1995, p.267). As a result, collaborating agencies work together by channeling available resources and providing opportunities in support of learning experiences that cannot be accomplished by the school alone. This type of relationship challenges traditional approaches to reform.

Usually, reform models are based on a linear continuum where the output (academic achievement measured by standardized tests) remain constant while the input (learning objectives, competencies, or standards) changes in comparison to the overall effect it has on the output (Goodlad, 2000, p.11). For example, academic achievement may be a desired output whereas arts instruction might serve as the input. To ensure success, Goodlad suggested that reform models be viewed on an ecological scale in which the school functions as part of an ecosystem. Such a system would be able to renew itself continuously with the best interests of self and the entire social and natural environment. The ecology model also supports the symbiotic relationship between the school and other social institutions, as noted:

The ecological model suggests that it is possible to distinguish the salient characteristics of the social

arrangement within which the schools are embedded as a means of better understanding the outcomes of the educational process. By extension, it also suggests that we can identify the support services that may need to be integrated into and coordinated with the educational process in order to improve educational outcomes, particularly in inner-city schools. (Bartelt, 1995, p. 161)

Future research agendas for academic institutions and funding agencies may very well be strongly influenced by topics such as community development, community-based research and community practice (Lowe & Reisch, 1998, p.296). Thus, understanding of the needs and resources of the public school and community provides the genesis to establishing community engagement.

The Needs of the School

Since their inceptions, schools have been created to meet the expectations of the students, parents, and local community constituents. Schools, however, are complex entities serving various and sometimes, conflicting purposes (Rigsby, 1995, p.7). While public outcry centers on school improvement and student achievement, schools have striven to maintain a commitment to make education accessible and equitable for all students. According

to Council of Chief School Officers, schools need assistance in: (1) enriching and accelerating the curriculum; (2) supporting professional development and school wide planning; (3) perfecting effective ways of teaching; (4) using new forms of assessment; (5) understanding the dynamics of the neighborhoods in which they are located; and, (6) identifying the opportunities and challenges presented by changes in policies and programs that determine the kinds of additional supports, services, and opportunities available to support young people's learning and development.

Despite best efforts, public schools in the United States are in a crisis. John Goodlad, in *A Place Called School*, (1984) made several recommendations for improving schools based on his assessment of each school's needs. He recommended that:

- The states provide the schools with comprehensive goals.
- The school districts decentralize authority and responsibility to local school sites.
- The preparation process be separated in teacher education
- Time and teachers be redistributed to provide a sufficient scope of curricula and balance the expectations of state goals.

- Ability grouping and tracking be eliminated to place a greater emphasis on mastery learning.
- Research and development be focused on curriculum design.

Whatever the needs may be, the future will demand that schools take a more proactive stance toward establishing new dialogue and opportunities for the equitable exchange of ideas and responsibilities in order for school programming to be relevant to their communities. Many schools have made considerable strides toward addressing their individualized needs through the implementation of new reform strategies (American Federation, 2000). Some of these strategies included higher standards, implementation of proven programs, improving professional development, reduction in class size, and providing additional help for students.

The Needs of the Community

Identifying the particular needs of any given community may present a complex challenge; because the social and economic structure of every community is different, it is difficult to assess specific needs. As societies continue to evolve, educational needs shift. Thus, the success of the school is closely linked with the success of the community. This relationship was more evident

when schools served as symbols of civilization of a particular community or nation (Punke, 1951) as well as an extension of family and church marked by close kinship ties and shared values (Merz & Furman, 1997).

Today's neighborhoods experience disengagement brought on by a host of social ills, such as poor community attachment due to high mobility rates; inequities in earning and housing opportunities; fragmentation of values and norms; fear and violence; and the lack of opportunities to gather, interact, and celebrate (Milstein & Henry, 2000). Coupled with the estranging effects of multiculturalism and diversification, many communities have lost their sense of identity.

However, the way in which a community identifies itself determines its needs. One writer describes the identification process in terms of the *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* continuum, a theory of community developed by the 19th century sociologist, Ferdinand Tonnies (Merz & Furman, 1997).

Tonnies asserts that there are two distinct ways to conceptualize community. *Gemeinschaft* represents traditional relationships that are extensions of family, tribal, or social groupings; whereas *Gesellschaft* represents relationships of mutual exchange usually nurtured by commercial trade or specified by a

certain role or task. The school in this instance would serve an institutionalized purpose:

Historically, then, the American public school developed a balance between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*. While a tension between these roles no doubt existed, a workable balance was the norm. The local community supported the “bridge” function of the school. They believed the school was a necessary supplement to the family and that education was the key to success in the larger society. (Merz & Furman, 1997, p.37)

The extent to which a community identifies with either end of the continuum will compromise any lasting efforts for achieving a healthy partnership or collaboration. Modern society seems to exhibit a greater tendency toward *Gesellschaft* in the school-community relationship. With national campaigns for ‘accountability’, much of our views have shifted:

Throughout the 20th century, several trends have eroded this workable balance of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* in the schools. The schools have drifted far closer to the *Gesellschaft* pole, and this drift has affected both the quality of life in schools and the relationship between schools and the communities they serve. (Merz & Furman, 2000, p.38)

New trends involving the collaborations between social services and public school mark the reconstruction of how schools will service their communities in the 21st century (Schmitt & Tracy, 1996, p.10). As social agencies begin to be housed on physical school grounds, the schools will become revolving doors to programming innovations. Opportunities for collaborations will be plenteous and the music education profession will need to respond accordingly (Undercofler, 1997, p.18). Some new considerations for music educators will be the impact of serving greater constituent to include the very young and adult learners and how present curricular objectives could support ideas of an educational continuum, or lifelong learning (Ernst, 2001; Leonhard, 1981).

Chapter Three

Arts Education within the Community

Presently, the arts education community is examining traditional modes of arts education in the schools (Volkman, 1999, p.55). New questions are emerging such as how are the arts being taught and by whom? Should the arts be disciplined-based? Do practicing artists, community volunteers and cultural organizations have a role in arts education? Many arts educators, in response to these questions and many more, are assuming greater responsibilities for the implementation of curriculum, seeing that it reflects the needs, resources, and interest of the students and the community (1999, 57). Some music educators have sought to address such issues by designing or adapting their programs with more focus on relevance, variety, and maintaining high expectation for students (Hinckley, 1995). Music programs around the country are being expanded to include nontraditional ensembles such as gospels choirs, salsa bands, and synthesizer ensembles. Other program extensions have involved creative partnerships with community organizations such as Elders Share the Arts (ESTA) and Community School Partnership for the Arts (C/SPA) (Perlstein,

1998; Rodgers, 1999). These partnerships have allowed music teacher opportunities to work with varying audiences while simultaneously building stronger relationships with the community.

Community Perceptions

In general, issues in education have been aggravated by the constant shifting of agendas in efforts to answer the rhetorical question, "why do we educate?" These shifts, whether attributed to social, political, or economic tension, almost instantly translate into curricular objectives that are centered on what has been described as a "basic education". However, much of what is defined as education is directly influenced by what society deems important to know.

Chapman and Aspin purport that being knowledgeable denotes an individual's ability to function successfully in society; thus, education becomes the gauge for measuring economic prosperity, social and political cohesion, and achievement (Chapman & Aspin, 1997, p.6). Other by-products of education are: reductions in crime; equality of opportunity, maintenance of cultural heritage, levels of cultural civility in polity; and a more egalitarian social world (Tooley, 2000, p.29).

Around the world, there is a shared sentiment that the future of economic prosperity, social, and political cohesion, and the

achievement of genuinely democratic societies with full participation depends upon a well-educated population. Therefore, one of the major aims of education is to be accessible to all students and a priority for the educationally under-served. (Chapman & Aspin, 1997, p.6) In the United States, the translation of such sentiment into curricular objectives and practices has often resulted in an alienation of the arts with respects to other academic subject areas when issues in funding and support arise. Thus, music and arts professionals have a more difficult plight balancing the educational demands from governmental and community constituents. While certain strides have been made in the hopes of accomplishing such a massive undertaking, some of the current practices and outcomes in arts education have worked in opposition to this goal, leaving a quagmire of uncertainty and disengagement. Furthermore, prominent educators, such as David Elliott, have attributed this ambiguity and instability to the underdevelopment of the philosophical aims in music education (Elliott, 1995). In *Music Matters*, he explained that, while philosophy intersects music education on three levels (the personal, the public, and the professional), it is the quality of a philosophy that lends itself to “logical consistency in relation to the natures and values of music

and education and to the professional practice of music education” (Elliott, 1995, p.11). He added:

Various members of the public hold beliefs about the form and the content of music education. However, vague or explicit, public beliefs are frequently packaged as promotional advertising or formulized in ‘mission statements’ by governing bodies (for example, school boards, federal policy makers, and parent organizations). (1995, p.11)

Another major issue for America’s system of public education is the inability to distinguish between education and schooling. If we are to look toward philosophy as a means for adding stability and validity to the arguments for the inclusion of arts education in the schematics of a basic education, we then need to consider the role of philosophy in the debates of education vs. schooling.

A brief overview of schools of thought about education suggests that education involves a meaningful and holistic approach to learning. This is in great contrast to current practices of today where much of what is perceived as education is reduced to a relatively simple process of a teacher “telling students what he or she knows about a subject and in response, students take notes and then periodically tested on whether they memorized the key lessons.” (Bowsher, 1989, p.13) However, our system of education

has been founded on four philosophical schools (Van Scotter & Haas, 1991). These schools view education as either:

- Promoting intellectual growth. (Essentialism)
- The continuous reconstruction of experiences; a living/learning process rather than a preparation for later adult life. (Progressivism)
- Promoting the development of rational person through teaching that helps students use their inherent power to think rationally by exhortation, explication, Socratic discourse, and oral exposition. (Perennialism)
- Leading society to the realization of its value through goals and programs of social betterment, thus the school becomes the agent of change and social reform. (Reconstructionism)

While educational ideology continues to provide some instances of polarization in educational reform, the practice of “schooling” often thwarts any real attempts for moving beyond the school walls to engage in purposeful learning experience with the school’s surrounding community.

Schooling, as differentiated from the educational process, accounts for how learning is defined and organized via competencies, graduation requirements, and the standardization of educational units. Unfortunately, as social pressure from business

and governmental arenas draw our educational system under more scrutiny, education becomes the “business of schools” (Goodlad, 1984, p.14).

Elliot alluded to the failures of philosophy, however, only as a contributing agent. He stated:

While the failures of past philosophy are numerous and profound, it is unrealistic to conclude that our curricular insecurity results entirely from philosophical misunderstandings about music education among ourselves or between ourselves and the public at large. This is so, I suggest, because in addition to the factors reviewed above, ‘security’ is a two-way relationship: Something becomes secure in, or secured by, something else. In our case, that “something else” is schooling: the context in which music educators attempt to educate children. I suggest that underlying all the above problems and their various combinations is a more fundamental problem. The functions, principles, and corollaries of schooling are incompatible with the ideals of education in general and the values of music education in particular. As a result, a central challenge facing our profession lies not so much in music or music education but in the nature of schooling. (1995, p.300)

Besides, as quoted from Elliot Eisner's, *The Kind of Schools We Need*, " the real test of successful schooling is not what students do in school, but what they do outside of school" (Eisner, 1998, 170).

In recent years, the music education profession has invested a great deal of time and effort toward providing a rationale for how and what students learn in the music classroom. The concern here is that this has not translated into cultural practice, and if so, only to a marginal degree. More qualitative and quantitative research is needed to address what kind of musical learning experience happens outside of the formal setting and how these learning experiences can inform the policy and practice in music education. This would require dramatic change in community perception and the way schools and music programs are operated; and change, according to one writer, is not always easy. She argued:

Tradition and familiar routines and practices of schooling are are easy to maintain and follow... In fact, schools really have not changed much in the past 100 years. Each attempt at educational innovation generally slips back into a traditional mode of educational operation that is safe and familiar.

(Speck, 1996, p.69)

In regard to the nature of the relationship between the school and the community as being mutually dependent on the other, then it

would be reasonable to argue that changes within the school music program will elicit changes outside as well.

Arts Education Policy

Another factor affecting community engagement is arts education policy. Since policy “represents an idea or array of ideas designed to guide practice” (Eisner, 2000, p.4), some consideration has to be given to current views in policymaking for arts education. The interdisciplinary focus of this section as opposed to music as a ‘stand alone’ component relates to the pluralistic representation of arts education policy with respect to perception and practice of constituents within and outside of the arts community.

Discussions about policies in arts education are both extensive and complex. Trends in policy issues range from being discipline specific to multi-disciplinary approaches with the arts. When it comes to community involvement, very little research has been done in the area of policy development that guides practitioners, within the field of music education, in community based programming that supports arts (music) programs within the public schools. What have been defined are objectives and standards that serve more communicative purposes rather than all inclusive arts (musical) experiences. Rising expectations in student achievement, school performance, and accountability spawned by

new research linking academic achievement to musical aptitude (Cutietta & Hamann, 1995, p.18) has led to the gross misconception of what music (arts) education should look like.

As Eisner commented:

The public interests in such consequences, in my opinion, a reflection of its shallow understanding of arts education. Of course, the "Mozart effect" (Rauscher, 1993) is intriguing, even if (perhaps because) the public does not have access to the studies on which the extraordinary claims about the connection between music and intelligence and school achievement is based. Hype replaces understanding, and because the public's view of arts education is naïve, such claims seem a reasonable and intriguing justification for teaching the arts at all. (Eisner, 2000, p.4)

The connection between the public and arts education has been shaped by many different forces during the course of the twentieth century, as Werner portrayed chronologically in his article, *Arts Education Policy in the Twentieth Century*. He encapsulated policy development and reform that took place within twenty-year periods beginning in the 1920's and ending in 2000. Before the 1920's, he linked policy development with parochial influences associated with the singing schools. The 1920's and 1930's saw educational policy

shift to embrace the ideas that supported “music for every child” which would increase their appreciation of the art form through personal participation.

By 1940’s and 1950’s, with the increased GI’s enrollment into universities and colleges and the creation of professional education for music teachers, music programs, especially at the collegiate level, were being designed to aid in the development of a national artistic culture. Unlike previous decades, the 1960’s marked a time of unprecedented support for the arts by public and private entities which called for reform of traditional practices and programs. Werner summarized:

New competencies were called for and accreditation standards in art and music were reviewed in light of the needs of teachers and professional artists as they worked more closely together in programs such as artist residencies in the public schools. (Werner, 2000, p.15)

This impetus would be short lived as the 1970’s would signal a decline in revenue and funding resources that were available to arts and redirected to programs whose aims addressed economic and social maladies such as drugs, crime, and unemployment. The encroachment of the information era, underway around the 1980’s up until the present with the advancements in digital and

multimedia technology, has transformed the ways in which instruction is delivered and the dynamics of the classroom. Other identified elements influencing policy decisions were demographic changes and multiculturalism.

Finding ways to connect community involvement with arts education policy and practice is somewhat difficult in terms of the traditional frameworks of formal education. This difficulty can be attributed to persuasive opinions of what constitutes the strengths and weaknesses of educational policy. At present, much of what guides formal practice in the arts policies directly translate to the National Standards for Arts Education. While the standards symbolize an important milestone in the history of arts education, references to civic or cultural involvement or the expansion of musical learning applicable to settings beyond the school walls are inadvertently implied. Any mention of cultural encounters allude to student activities that are latent with awareness and/or expedient participation which does not allow for a "lively music education transaction" as expressed by noted music educator, Keith Swanwick (Swanwick,1999, p.44). Swanwick further stated:

I am arguing, then, that musical discourse, while including an element of cultural reflection, also makes possible cultural refraction, seeing and feeling in new ways. We do not merely

'receive' culture. We are cultural interpreters. A conception of music education as a form of cultural studies or social reinforcement is likely to result in a very different curriculum from that which identifies music as a form of discourse. Music teaching then becomes not a question of simply handing down a culture but of engaging with traditions in a lively and creative way, in a network of conversations having many different accents. (Swanwick, 1999, p.30)

Being that the standards, as well as the inclusion of the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*, have tremendously impacted policy reform at the federal and state levels (Wilson, 2000, p.15), discourse and much debate is still limited to measurable outcomes or music literacy. The Director of the Eastman School of Music, James Undercofler commented:

The National Standards and their translation into state-level guidelines suggest a definition of musical literacy that includes the ability to sing and play music of average complexity; hear, place in a historical context, and analyze a variety of musical forms and styles, including those of one's own preference; compose and improvise melodies that convey personal meaning; and understand how music relates to other disciplines. Music is a complex discipline, and these

skills can only be gained through a consistent and sequential music curriculum. One can liken the study of music to the study of English. To be literate, both subjects require the ability to read, write, and understand a complex language. To be fluent, both require the ability to be creative, analyze formal structures, and place items in historical context. (Undercofler, 1997, p.17)

Another strengthening agent to arts education policy has been the inclusion of the arts in the 1997 NAEP Report Card. Because the fine arts have had a long history of distancing themselves from "ordinary life, civic issues, and the academic mission of school" (Chapman, 2000, p.27), arts educators have fought, and continue to fight, an unrelenting battle for relevance and importance. As Eisner pointed out,

"To be left out is to be disregarded and to be disregarded is no asset when it comes to competing for time and other resources to one's program." (Eisner, 2000, p.4)

Paul Lehman suggested that the two most positive outcomes of the NAEP Report were that it included the arts among the basic disciplines of the curriculum; and it also demonstrated that assessment in music can be done on a large scale (Lehman, 1999). Of course the report reiterated the basic notion that "what is

measured gets done”, thus “arts education is better off being included than being ignored” (1999, p.37). There are, however, limitations as to the degree of strength to which the NAEP Report Card adds validity to arts education policy. This holds true, especially when the assessment, itself, yields inconclusive evidence as to the overall condition of the nation’s music programs. Lehman further concluded that the results were not statistically significant and reveal very little about students’ abilities to perform, create, and respond to music (Lehman, 1999, p.35).

To some extent, arts education policies are not as forth-telling of the true nature of what music education is and how such an education is unique and necessary for us to live truly productive lives.

Role of Arts Organizations

Much of what is known as community-based arts programs have been created and designed by arts organizations. Arts organizations operate at the local, state, and national levels with a broad range of objectives and scope of services. In the case of music, these organizations can be divided into three general categories: those whose primary purpose is to support the creation and presentation of professional musical works; those who promote the furtherance of teaching in music; and those whose focus is to

support music and music teaching. (Hope, 1992, p.726) However, for the purpose of this paper, it would be more beneficial to focus attention toward arts organizations that have influenced musical learning in community-based settings.

To begin, the networks of arts organizations, agencies, foundations, public and private philanthropic organizations are intricately woven and quite extensive. Yet, all paths converge to a single entity, the NEA (National Endowment of the Arts). This is not to say that other arts organizations are of less significance or less reputable. But since its inception in 1965, the NEA has become a beacon for arts advocacy which is even more synonymous with arts education. Many arts professionals challenge this association of the NEA with respect to arts education, with sentiments that the NEA's education programs "amount to exposure rather than sequential instruction" (Myers & Brooks, 2002, p.911). As Laura Chapman, pointed out:

There can be little doubt that the NEA is the most visible 'bully pulpit' for the arts and has every political reason to be perceived as the source of authority on arts education—curriculum design, teacher education, assessment, and much more. The NEA has neither the authority nor the expertise to address such matters, and it has a long record of excluding

arts educators from its own policy formation. (Chapman, 2000, p. 28)

However, in 1983, under the direction of the new chairman, Frank Hodsell, the NEA underwent a cosmetic overhaul to re-design one its most prestigious educational outreach programs, the Artist in Schools. (Marks, 1996, p.96) The Artist in Schools program was created in 1969 for the purpose of pairing local artists with schools, allowing students opportunities to participate in the artist process with arts professionals. However, under much criticism, the Artist in Schools changed to the Artist in Education in 1980 and later to the Arts in Education program. The Arts in Education program currently works with states through three funding categories: State Arts in Education Grants, Arts in Schools Basic Education Grants, and Special Projects, which awards funding to a league of organizations including education agencies, school districts, institutions, and organizations. (1996, p.100) Still, there is inconclusive evidence as to the effectiveness of such community involvement where partnerships are with local artists. As Constance Gee stated:

The most important findings concerning the character of individual residencies and the effect of the artist residency program at the local level were:

- only a small percentage of U.S. students,

most of who reside in middle to upper-middle class suburban and urban communities, benefit from the residency program;

- residency quality and effectiveness is greatly dependent upon the existence and condition of the host school's related arts program;
- the introduction of new media and production/performance techniques provides the bulk of residency content—historical inquiry and discussion of the cultural context and ideological and aesthetic significance works of art are rarely included;
- the practice of bringing artists into schools to teach, create, and perform rarely results in the subsequent establishment of regular school arts programs. (Gee, 1994, p.9)

Again, as we look at the role of arts organizations and other sectors of society that are directly involved in developing arts education programs at the local or community level, there are a few more public entities that need mentioning at this time. The United States Office of Education continues to play an important role in shaping

arts education policy even though education is a primary function of the state and local municipals. As Gee continued:

Whether the federal government elects to address or ignore the needs of a specific constituency or area of the curriculum not only affects the character and quality of the education to which students have access, it often acts as an important factor in the determination of who will and who will not be afforded certain education opportunities. (Gee, 1994, p.11)

Other prominent agents of advocacy for arts education are the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, and the AEP (Arts Education Partnership). Even though they have strong ties to the NEA, these philanthropic groups have retained a great deal of autonomy with regard to research and advancement of arts opportunities within and outside of the school.

For example, a recent community arts initiative sponsored by the Kennedy Center's Alliance for Arts Education entitled, the Community Audit, was designed to be a measurement for assessing the real needs of the school in an effort to create the highest quality arts learning experience for all students. Some of the purposes of the Community Audit were to:

- Provide a report to the community on the status of arts education in the schools.
- Give an initial assessment of quality including the positives and the shortfalls.
- Serve as a planning tool to improve quality by examining known critical factors.
- Serve as a useful vehicle for community goal setting and implementation.
- Serve as a valuable tool for resource allocation.

(Community Audit, 2001, foreword)

The Getty Center, also served as major advocate of arts education as Eisner recounted:

The Getty came on the scene in 1983. During the course of its existence it provided the most continuous and programmatically diverse support the arts had ever received by any agency, public or private. Unlike the federal and state initiatives, which come and go with the political breeze, the Getty was a constant source of support for arts education advocacy, for teacher in-service education, for the compilation of research, for occasional papers and scholarly monographs, for biennial national conferences and an array of other forms of programmatic support. (Eisner, 2000, p.6)

Where the Getty Center left off, the Arts Education Partnership (AEP), has embarked on the scene giving arts advocacy a new face and added dimensions. The inception of the AEP in 1995 brought together a coalition of arts, education, business, philanthropic, and government organizations to advocate the essential role of arts education in the learning and development of every child, and the improvement of America's schools. The primary focus of the AEP was to assist all students in achieving the highest level of achievement and competence in the arts and other subjects. However, in as much as the role of the arts organization is an integral part of the educational process, educational programming should still be subject and shaped by arts education policy, as reiterated in the AEP Strategic Plan,

The expectations for what students should learn and be able to do in the arts are expressed in the National Standards for Arts Education, and counterpart standards established by states and local communities. These standards and related assessments at the national, state, and local level should be the benchmarks for student learning in the arts whether that learning occurs in school, after-school, or at arts and cultural organizations and institutions in the community. (AEP Strategic Plan, 2002)

As valuable as these relationships are to the community and the arts profession as a whole, there is still some speculation as to what is deemed the “highest quality”? Or, what are the real motives behind such partnering? And, does education fall victim to political and social agendas?

Collaborations & Partnerships

One of the unique and unifying elements that fortify the bonds between arts organizations and their surrounding communities is the spirit of collaboration or partnership, used interchangeably at this point. Collaborations have become a more prevalent aspect of school improvement and educational reform initiatives than ever before (*Arts, Education, and America*, 1980; Beyerbach, Weber, Swift & Gooding; Davies, 2000; Maxwell, 1999; Melaville & Blank, 2000; Mims, 1993). These partnerships, however, are not readily achieved because of how they are approached and the expected outcomes by partnering entities (Fineberg, 1994; Rakow & Robinson, 1997).

Donaldson & Kozoll postulate that there are four stages in the life of a collaborative relationship: a) Emergence, b) Evolution, c) Implementation, and d) Transformation. Emergence is described as the stage where there is an identification of partners, description of motivations and incentives, and problem setting (Donaldson and

Kozoll, 1999, p.13). Evolution involves direction setting, maintenance and growth, redesign, and/or termination.

Implementation refers to the engagement into action that will complete the vision or goals.

Transformation denotes changes that can occur at any time, at any stage of the cycle because change remains constant. In *Transforming Music Education*, Estelle Jorgensen described how transformation relates to music education. She stated:

I view music educational transformation as a dynamic process involving many voices. Music and education are dynamic, living things, in the process of changing and adapting to the wider society and culture of which they are a part. Any systemic intervention or action affects not only the system and its environment but also those who seek to change it. There are tensions between the status quo, which is itself a dynamic and gradually changing entity, and those ideas and practices that would radically, and systematically, or fundamentally alter the system and even its environment, between those who set out to make changes and the system that affects them and shapes their thinking and acting. Nor is this transformation ever complete. It is always ongoing. Its effects are both intended and

unintended, because its architects lack complete knowledge and perfect foresight. (Jorgensen, 2003, xiii)

As mentioned earlier, the basis of this research is to identify ways to engage the music program into the community via cultural resources, arts organizations, and/or community venues that are receptive to ideas of enhancement of musical learning for all students. Of course, this researcher is not suggesting that there should be total melding together into one superimposed entity, but rather to look to the attributes that make each entity inherently different to find a commonplace upon which to build integrated learning experiences.

There are challenges to such a proposal, or any collaboration for that matter, which have to be addressed. *Project Zero* researcher, Jessica Davis outlined a few areas of concern as follows: Expectation, Priorities, Out-of-School Settings, Artists as Teachers, Level of Caring, Students as Clients, and In-school Benefits (Davis, 1999, p.13). She also made a case for much broader issues of concern from three perspectives: the School, the Center, and the Collaboration.

There is a substantial amount of literature that supports the need and increasing popularity of school/community partnerships (AEP, Learning Partnerships, 1999; Davis, 1994; Deasy, 2002b;

Fineberg, 1994; Murfee, 1993; Stankiewicz, 2001). One timely and invaluable piece of literature for music educators was the 1991 Report of the National Commission on Music, *Growing Up Complete*.

This report attested to the need for the music community to:

- Become directly involved in and take responsibility for the success and growth of school music programs.
- Let Elected Officials know when local goals for education omit or slight the arts.
- Become matchmakers, bringing together the all-too-disparate domains of music-in-the-schools and music-in-the-community (1991, p.31).

Additional publications sponsored by the AEP stress the need for strengthening state-level partnerships and the creation-development of learning partnership (Arts Education, 1999; Arts Education, 2000). Arts partnerships identified as having the greatest effectiveness and impact attributed success to pooling resources, building strong relationships, and working together; all of which stems from a collective awakening as to the shared responsibility and ongoing commitment of each societal institution to the educational process.

Chapter Four

Trends in Research

A brief survey of current trends in educational research yielded a vast array of topics that include policy, economics, historical context, human development and learning, delivery of instruction, and issues involving the accommodation of differences (Aldridge & Goodman, 2002). In addition, there is an increasing amount of supportive evidence that substantiates the effectiveness of community-based and after school arts programs (Deasy, 2002a; Heath, 2001; Kay, 2000; Otterbourg, 2000; Weitz, 1996; Wolf, 2000). The body of literature that is available has been conducted by arts organizations and agencies outside of the school. Furthermore, most of the literature embraces an interdisciplinary approach to arts as identified in the following studies.

Research Studies

The President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities in collaboration with the Arts Education Partnership compiled the research findings of several studies targeting the impact of arts education on students as it relates to non-traditional settings and methodologies. The publication, *Champions of Change*, documented

these findings. The results of these findings provided evidence that students attain higher levels of achievement through engagement in the arts. One relevant study was conducted by Shelia Brice Heath, a linguistic anthropologist, and Aldema Roach, key researcher, involving the learning of arts during non-school hours (Fiske, 1999, p.20).

In the Heath and Roach study, samples were taken from 124 youth based organizations serving economically disadvantaged communities. Urban and rural sites were included as well as mid-sized cities. Students identified three types of organizations they viewed as effective. These organizations were athletic/academic focused, community-service centered, and arts based. An important component of this study was a comparison of responses of students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds participating in youth-based organizations to those surveyed in the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988.

The NELS '88, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, consisted of three main sets of observations: 1) involvement in the arts and academic success; 2) music and mathematic achievement; 3) theatre arts and human development. It should be noted that involvement in the arts included participation in arts-related classes in and out of school. While

there were several comparative differences between the NELS '88 and the Heath & Roach studies, the most significant findings pertained to the fact that the NELS 88' reported findings to support the relationship between arts involvement and academic achievement, whereas Heath & Roach demonstrated more specific outcomes of arts involvement such as the strengthening of communication skills, youth/adult interaction, use of discretionary time, and pro-civic and pro-social values.

Another important study was conducted by Barry Oreck, Susan Baum, and Heather McCartney, researchers from the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, documenting talent development of underserved populations of students in three phases of schooling: Elementary, Intermediate, and High School/College/Semi-Professional & Professional (1999, p.64). This provided evidence of the impact of serious arts involvement over extended periods of time and the effects of such involvement on the talent, educational, and personal development of economically disadvantaged students.

Students were sampled from 400 students of the New York City Public Schools, currently participating in the Young Talent Program provided by the Arts Connection. Offerings included introductory experience and advanced instruction in dance, music,

and theatre. Some of the distinguishable features of the Young Talent Program were staff development workshops for classroom teachers, after-school assistance for students in academic areas, and the leadership of a site coordinator. The latter's responsibilities included maintaining contacts with teacher and parents; supervising the school programs (performances); and, providing information about instructional opportunities. Of the 400 students, 23 students were selected for this longitudinal multiple case study with data collected over the course of a two year period.

Methodology included interviews, field observations, and a systematic collection of standardized achievement test scores and progress evaluations. Results of the study helped researchers identify interrelated factors and outcomes affecting talent development. In instances where students encountered obstacles, whether family circumstances, lack of instructional opportunities, peer pressure, and harsh realities of future endeavors, there were equitable success factors that served as a counterbalance: family support (family sacrifice, extended family); instruction (talent identification, professional instructors/role models, professional environment); community support (adult supervision, peer group, school support); and personal characteristics (early interest, cultural values, sense of professionalism). Such factors were

fostered by learning environments that nurtured artistic development and strengthened it through the collaborative process.

One other study mentioned in *Champions of Change* was conducted by a Professor of UCLA's Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, James Cattrell (1999, p.48). Cattrell and his colleagues reported findings describing the impact of collaboration and partnering of local artists and arts agencies with local schools. The CAPE (Chicago Arts Partnership in Education) was founded in 1992 to aid arts programs in the Chicago Public Schools. With assessment playing a major role in the program's funding, the NCREL (North Central Regional Laboratory) was contracted to provide evaluative services via interim reports and one final report.

Much of the data collected by NCREL was to inform future planning, gauge the extent of the program on the participants and school/community constituents, and measure school/community based support. The representation of this data took the form of student achievement scores in reading and mathematics. Instruments used were the ITBS Test (Iowa Test of Basic Skills), IGAP Test (Illinois Goals Assessment Programs), as well as teacher and student surveys.

Furthermore, a certain portion of the data collected was to compare CAPE schools and non CAPE schools that were socio-economically equivalent. Results of the study were categorized in four areas: Impact on the Classroom; Impact on the Teachers and Artists; Impact on Students; and the Degree of Support from School and Community-Based Groups. Significant findings were reported in student achievement in reading and mathematics at the elementary and high school levels and the support of the arts integrated programs by the school and community. The NCREL report concluded that the CAPE project was instrumental in: the positive change of the school climate; gaining the principal's support; getting teacher and artists to collaborate especially with regards to co-planning; and changing teacher's perception of arts-integrated curriculum and its benefits in the learning, attitudinal, and social development of children.

Other studies yielded valuable insights as to early explorative and alternative models of school and community partnerships such as the development of cultural enrichment programs (Okaloosa County Board, 1970); the need for the arts in the local community in conjunction with the Fine Arts Association (Ackroyd,1989); and the localization of institutional resources to build upon cultural heritage (Payne, 2000).

Models of Successful Partnerships

The research revealed a plethora of collaborative programs that bridge schools and local communities together in artistic learning experiences. The relative size and varying cultural needs of a given community apparently affect the depth and breadth of the range of services that a program provides. While the primary focus of this research has been dedicated to the review of literature and identifying models of educational partnerships in music, a vast majority of the programs have incorporated the arts as a means of enhancing academic performance in subject areas such as reading and mathematics or the use of the arts as after-school enrichment. However, there are a number of models which lend themselves to comprehensive integrated musical experiences such as AGE (Remer, 1990, p.200), ArtsConnection (Remer, 1996, p.126), 21st Century Community Learning Centers (*Otterbourg*, 2000, p.3), and the Boston Music Education Collaborative (Myers, 1996, p.47). To begin, it is necessary to establish a referential framework from which these models were selected based on philosophy, theory, and practical application.

First, the philosophical undertones of each the above programs were derived from a classical approach to education similar to that of Adler's *Paideia Program*. Adler made a strong

case for school reform in the areas of restructuring perceptions and the individual learner, as in the case of the models listed above. He suggested that there are several misunderstandings that affect our efforts to school a whole population for life in a democratic society that need to be corrected.

First, is the error of supposing that only, not all, of children are educable and that only some, not all, have a human right to aspire to become truly educated human beings in the course of their lives ... Second, is the error of thinking that the process of education takes place and reaches completion in our educational institutions during the years of basic schooling and in advanced schooling after that ... Third, is the error of regarding teachers as the sole, primary, or principal cause of the learning that occurs in students ... Fourth, is the error of assuming that there is only one kind of teaching that consists in teacher lecturing or telling and the students learning what they hear said or find in textbook assignments ... Fifth, is the error of maintaining that schooling, basic or advanced, is primarily preparation for earning a living. (Adler, 1984, p.4)

Again, the effort here is not to prescribe a panacea to remedy the challenges facing our nation's public school system. Rather,

program models that ascribe to philosophical principles similar to the Paideia Program are cited as effective in aligning arts education with realistic goals of the individual learner without being compartmentalized by preconceived expectations or pre-delivered outcomes. Like Paideia, these models have sought alternative ways for addressing what is to be learned, why it is to be learned, and how it is to be learned.

Adler inferred that the “what is to be learned” can be categorized into three areas 1) kinds of knowledge to acquired; 2) the skills to be developed; 3) understanding and insight to be achieved (7). The “why it is to be learned” responds to three objectives of basic schooling: earning a living, being a good citizen, and living a full life. Finally, the “how it is to be learned” manifests itself through three modes of instruction: Didactic teaching (lecture, textbook assignments, etc.); Coaching (exercises, supervised practice, etc.); and Socratic teaching (seminar questioning, discussion, active participation). The latter of these instructional modes, according to Adler, provides the most durability.

On average, little time or resources within the school can be devoted to the development of learning experiences that are conducive to the coaching and Socratic modes of delivery. Instances where these modes are evident are few and far between,

with the exception of arts education, in which they are a natural occurrence. Consequently, it is within such contexts that engaging activities with community partners can provide opportunities to bridge educational gaps created by programming deficiencies and can generate favorable outcomes for both the school and community.

Mary Palmer, professor and director of innovative learning at the University of Central Florida, identified possible outcomes when involving community resources in the school music program such as:

- enrichment of programs through opportunities and experiences that otherwise would not be available
- enrichment of the community through opportunity for its members to serve one another
- increased support for music programs
- the joy of successful collaboration
- opportunities for students to give back to others
- financial support for programs and ideas that might not have been possible otherwise. (Palmer, 1997, p.63)

Another aspect considered in the selection of the programs is the presence of a shared theoretical basis which supports the design of programming and instructional activities. Charles

Leonhard, a prominent figure in music education and arts advocacy, postulated a theoretical design for a contemporary music program embracing engagement between the school and the community (Leonhard, 1980a, p.6). Leonhard felt that today's music programs need to be updated to reflect a more contemporary approach to music education. To achieve this, change must occur in three main areas: 1) reshaping the general music program at the elementary, middle, and high school levels; 2) initiating a program of arts and aesthetic education in the middle/junior high school through active participation, production of, and studying of a variety of exemplars in each art; 3) extending the music program to the community, which is of particular interest.

He alluded to the fact that planning for a contemporary music education program involved consideration of factors such as reduction in the number of school-aged children and young people, the increase of the median age of the U.S. population, and trends in the availability of future funding.

This combination of factors...means that the time has come to broaden the clientele for the music program to include young adults, people of middle age, and senior citizens. This must be accompanied by a comparable broadening of the base of financial support to include not only the school districts, but

also city, townships and county governments, arts councils, park districts and recreation commissions in cooperative sponsorship of a comprehensive music program designed to appeal to the musical interest and aspiration of the total program. (1980a, p.8)

Other characteristics of such a program encompassing a multi-aged constituency include a variety of performing ensembles, class instruction using an array of instruments, and financial support channeled through school districts and appropriate government agencies. A network of facilities would serve as educational and performance sites including school buildings, community centers, arts centers, senior citizen centers, etc. Teachers would serve both the school and the community with partial appointments between the school district and the partnering community agency. Finally, a director would coordinate and administer programs with joint agency authority and responsibility. Leonhard concluded that there are number of advantages to a program design of this nature such as,

- the total community having access to music instruction and enriched experiences through performance, study, and literacy.

- the school is being enabled to have full quota of skilled music specialists (1980a, p.9).

Ambitious as this may seem, many of the selected models share similar attributes of the Leonhard's paradigm, which warrants further exploration and could possibly serve as a basis for future research especially in the area of music education as it relates to lifelong learning.

Lastly, practical application provided a definitive component in the selection of model programs. While much of the discussion has been aimed toward referencing models according to attributable qualities, practical application takes a closer examination as to the scope and impact of these programs on the host school, the community, and the school district.

In 1999, the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities along with the AEP published a report entitled, "*Gaining the Arts Advantage: Lessons from School Districts that Value Arts Education*". The report offered strong support with detailed descriptions of ninety one school districts that included strong arts education programs. It described data that covered a range of topics, including student performance, breadth and depth of arts education offerings, staffing, access, innovation, community involvement, resources, leadership, and the use of guidelines such

as local, state, or national standards (President's Committee, 1999, p.7). Critical success factors were identified that contributed to the achievement of district-wide arts education which included:

- The Community
- The School Board
- The Superintendent
- Continuity
- District Arts Coordinator
- Cadre of Principals
- Teacher as Artist
- Parent/ Public Relations
- An Elementary Foundation
- Opportunities for Higher Levels of Achievement
- National, State, and Other Outside Forces
- Planning
- Continuous Improvement (1999, p.11)

With regard to community engagement, district interaction was displayed in the following areas: active parent and community involvement in school arts programs; interdisciplinary teams involving arts specialists in the development of curricula; arts faculty involvement in community arts events; artist residencies; and student exhibition and performances for community audiences.

Many of the programs to be described in the following section involve several of the nation's school districts featured in the report, whether referred to explicitly or implicitly. The factors outlined provide a gauge for valid practice in arts education and indicate that school and community collaborations in the arts can influence the practices of local school districts.

The following model descriptions include information about the program inception, collaborating partners, program design and goals, and distinguishable components.

AGE (Arts in General Education)

The Arts in General Education program began in 1972 involving the collaboration of the New York City Public School's Learning Cooperative and the JDR 3rd Fund's Arts in Education Program. It was designed to be an Urban Resource Linkage Prototype that would help create ways for teachers to use historic sites and the resources of financial, business, and cultural institutions. Project expansion included 32 schools in the "League of Cities" based in Hartford, Little Rock, Minneapolis, New York, Seattle, and Winston Salem. Other aliases are Arts for Learning, Arts in the Basic Curriculum (ABC), and Arts in Basic Education. The goals of this program are long range with aims to unite local school governance with a comprehensive developmental program

that offers first rate regular school and community-based teaching and learning experiences in all the arts for all children, K-12. There is a school selection process and the arts curriculum is a disciplinary and an interdisciplinary continuum designed and taught by resident arts specialists, classroom teachers, resident visiting artists, and interdisciplinary teams. Because participation in the AGE program is voluntary, each school, school district, local arts and cultural institutions and the community have to make a strong commitment to the philosophy and purpose of the program. The AGE model is unique in that it demonstrates the impact arts education can have on a school system dedicated to school development and comprehensive arts education programs.

ArtsConnection

Founded in 1979 by the collaborative efforts of the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs, NYC Dept. of Youth Services and the NYC Board of Education, this program was created in response to the financial cutbacks in New York City arts program.

The aims of ArtsConnection, a non-profit organization, are to:

- 1) identify and provide sustained nurturing to at-risk children with artistic potential to help them succeed in and outside of school;
- 2) to develop teacher confidence and competence in the arts;
- 3) to involve parents and the community;
- 4) to have an impact on the

total school climate, to document the process, and to distribute the results widely, both locally and nationally. Through the arts exposure programs, students are offered extended, deepened arts instruction through new thematic program designs that place increasing emphasis on collaborative planning, interdisciplinary teaching, learning among artists and teacher, teacher-artist-ArtsConnection staff training—referred to as arts connectors, improved curriculum resource materials, student assessment and program evaluation, and parent-family support activities.

One of its featured programs, since its inception, is the Young Talent Program which offered, and still offers today, nontraditional training and development in the various art forms. Teachers are trained to identify talent and potential in the most unlikely students via a lengthy auditioning process. Other distinguishable features associated with the ArtsConnection program are the identified student outcomes in the areas of: Flow, Self-Regulation, Self-Identity, and Resilience. ArtsConnection is an example of how arts partnerships strengthen the learning process for students who are considered at-risk and help to reinforce relationships between the schools, parents, communities, and local arts organizations that share in the development and growth of the students living in under-served or impoverished neighborhoods.

21st Century Community Learning Centers

With a new wave of research in the area of after-school learning experiences (Campbell, 2001; After School Protocol Task Force, 2000; U.S. Dept. of Education, 2000), the federal government made funds available to support President's Bush's "No Child Left Behind" Act with the 21st Century Community Learning Center as a key component.

Each Community Learning Center provides children with access to homework centers, intensive mentoring in basic skills, drug & violence prevention, counseling, help for preparing to take college prep courses, academic-artistic-cultural enrichment activities, technology education programs, and services relating to disabilities. Some of the innovative projects with arts emphasis supported by the CCLC include the Young Curator Project and the Mars Millennium Project. The Young Curator Project based in Ogden, Kansas, involved the collaboration of the Kansas State University's Beach Museum of Art and a local middle school where sixth graders created a public exhibition. The Mars Millennium Project partnering the W.T. Neal Civic Center and the Blountstown Middle School (Calhoun County, Florida), combined science, the arts, and technology in a creative way challenging students to design a human community for the planet Mars. 21st Century

Learning Centers illustrate the variety of creative ways schools and local communities can support learning experiences in the arts during and after regular school day.

CAPE (Chicago Arts Partnership in Education)

CAPE, founded in 1992, was a six year project consisting of a cluster of twelve neighborhood-based partnerships between fifty-three professional arts organizations, thirty-seven public schools, and twenty-seven community organizations. Each cluster was made up of approximately four arts organizations, three schools, and two community organizations. The goal of the partnership was summed up by CAPE Executive Director, Arnold Aprill:

For CAPE, partnerships are not about 'bringing the arts to the school'. Partnerships are bridges for bringing falsely separated partners back into conversation. A successful partnership helps integrate the artist, the teacher, and parent, in each one of us, so that all of our children grow up in a world with possibilities, know that they are whole and ready to make choices we cannot even imagine. (Aprill, 1996, p.139)

This six year project was divided into two distinctive phases: planning and implementation. Implementation plans were developed after the first year and evaluated based on qualitative

criteria including sequential instruction within comprehensive programs; recognition and support of the central roles of both classroom teachers and in-school arts specialists; curriculum integration that maintains artistic integrity; in-service training for artists on work in educational settings; training for educators in dance, music, theatre, and visual arts; on-going planning; parent inclusion; assessment built into instruction, and the teaching of African, Latino, Asian, and Native American arts in equal status to European-dominant art forms.

Implementation, the second phase of the project, took place over the next five years with vigorous commitment to secure funding and the integrity of the collaborative relationship. CAPE continues to serve as a model of successful integration of artistic resources within and outside the school and demonstrates how bridging curriculum objectives can prove instrumental in school improvement.

Boston Music Education Collaborative

Orchestra partnerships have long served as vehicles for the school music programs promoting community outreach. However, the scope and magnitude of musical experiences vary from school to school. In 1995, Georgia State University, led by David Myers and funded by the NEA, conducted a study called *The Orchestra*

Education Project that examined orchestra education partnerships. Data collected ranged from literature review, surveys, telephone interviews, site visits, and regional meetings.

Findings were reported in the areas of: number of K12 programs and their target population; education committees; program goals and objectives; formalized partnerships; professional consultants; financial support and program administration; and program effectiveness. While a large percentage of the orchestras worked collaboratively with schools and school districts, it was only to the extent of scheduling, funding, and transportation logistics. However, there were nine partnerships profiled in the study that satisfied the partnership profile criteria: 1) Evidence of an ongoing and systematic relationship between an orchestra and local schools; 2) Inclusion of structured professional development for teachers that supported the implementation of curriculum materials; and 3) Evidence of broad-based support from both the orchestra and the schools. Of the nine, one partnership characterized an integrated approach to musical learning experiences with extensions to an institute of higher learning.

The Boston Music Education Collaborative (BMEC) began in 1993 as a partnership between the Boston Symphony Orchestra, the New England Conservatory, the WGBH Educational Foundation

(public broadcasting), and the Boston Public Schools. The work of the BMEC was driven by ten benchmarks or 'measures for school implementation':

- Music Instruction
- Professional enrichment and sustained networking
- Transformation of the total curricula experiences
- Contact with professional musicians
- Community building/parental involvement
- Student self-assessment
- Events at the BSO, WGBH television & radio stations and the NEC
- Special mentoring and career activities for middle school students
- Continuation of the experience outside the school year
- Ongoing program assessment

Some innovative aspects of the planning and implementation included: curriculum design teams (teacher and consultants) that develop curriculum resource packages; grade specific resources; supporting interaction between music specialists and classroom teachers; use of NEC student aids who serve as technical assistants in the classroom with responsibilities that include instrument demonstrations, petting zoos and instrumental lessons for middle

school students. Within BMEC was also the Godparent Program, which created another opportunity for individual musicians of the BSO to adopt a partner school, sharing activities that range from instrument demonstrations to student compositions. Overall, the BMEC demonstrates the collective benefits of developing collaborative partnerships between the public schools system, universities, and community arts organizations.

The five innovative models cited in this research demonstrate the wide range of approaches to school and community engagement through music and arts learning experiences. Each model reflects the varying possibilities and benefits to be gained from purposeful engagement and offers insight as to a number of ways arts educators can build upon existing arts curriculum.

Chapter Five

Conclusion

The purpose of the investigation was to examine the role of music education within the community as it pertained to the assessment of community needs and policy reform. The literature reviewed was divided into three main areas: Music Education in the Community; Arts Education in the Community; and Trends in Research.

The literature suggested that the role of the music education has changed since its first inclusion into the schools. This was attributed to changing social dynamics that shaped the relationship of the school music program and the community, such as increased leisure time, technological advancement, and the absence of community leadership assumed by the music educator. Other aspects were characteristic of the evolving needs and resources of the schools and the communities.

This study revealed that historical viewpoints, community perception and arts education policy have had a tremendous impact on what is considered arts education in America. The literature provided evidence that arts education policy

strongly influences the curricular objectives and practice of the schools with only marginal inferences to community involvement or outreach. Thus, much of what represents arts education in the community has been largely supported by arts organizations. The literature also suggested that partnerships and collaborations between the schools and community constituents will serve as a hallmark for future educational reform.

Trends in research indicated that formal music programs that engage the community can be successfully created. However, the results of this study were inconclusive as to the extent to which school-based and community-based musical instruction can be linked because much of the research up to this point has represented the arts as an integrated component.

The five models of successful partnership cited in this research provided evidence that arts education can have an extensive impact on a school system dedicated to school development and comprehensive arts education programs. Arts education programs that have full 'buy in' from their local school governance often attract national interest and depending on the cohesiveness of the collaborative design, can be duplicated in other states.

Secondly, arts partnerships strengthen the learning process for students who are considered at-risk and help to reinforce relationships between the schools, parents, communities, and local arts organizations that share in the development and growth of the students living in under-served or impoverished neighborhoods. Learning in the arts has been attributed to positive student outcomes in the areas of flow, self-regulation, self-identity, and resiliency.

Thirdly, there are a variety of creative ways schools and local communities can support learning experiences in the arts during and after the regular school day. For example, the lengthened time frame for instruction provides students with more opportunities for exploration and skill development in varying art forms while maximizing the use of facilities and resources between collaborating entities.

Additionally, successful integration of artistic resources within and outside the school can be achieved. The bridging of curriculum objectives accompanied with a strong commitment to the collaborative process can prove instrumental in school improvement.

Finally, there are collective benefits of developing collaborative partnerships between the public schools system,

universities, and community arts organizations. Some of these benefits included changing attitudes to awareness and openness; sharing of institutional agendas to broaden educational mission; development of fully staffed music and arts education programs; and closer community connection.

One of the greatest challenges for music educators in the years to come will be transformation and change in perceived roles. Music educators will need to redefine personal philosophy and practice to ensure that the school music program is in alignment with the needs of the school and the surrounding community. Community engagement functioning in the scope of a comprehensive music program will be contingent upon unified beliefs and a commitment to the education of the 'whole child' by those within and outside of the school.

Implications for Future Research

For the field of music education, there are many unanswered questions in the area of community engagement. For instance, while there is a substantial amount of literature that supports the development of music skills in the classroom; research pertaining to the effect of length and usage of time in the music classroom on skill acquisition and development is sparse.

As we look for ways to expand school music programs to include community engagement, how can music educator and community constituents make efficient use of time and set realistic goals within that time? What is the effectiveness of traditional approaches to musical learning in nontraditional settings? How does environment affect musical learning? What is the impact of continuous study music via group instruction? Short term (after school)? Long term (lifelong learning models)? What is the effect of sustained interaction with community based partners on the music program in areas such as audience development, school improvement, student achievement, teacher turn-over and parental involvement? Furthermore, can music educators transition into active roles within the school's surrounding community and, if so, how and to what degree? Can music educators create wholesome avenues of opportunities, within the context of the school music program, for amateur musicians? Lastly, what would be the effects of community engagement, with an emphasis toward lifelong learning, on audience development efforts by schools, universities, and professional arts organizations?

The implications of such research would have a profound effect on the field of music education especially in the areas of curriculum development and implementation and arts education

policy. Another area affected would include pre-service teacher training and professional development. Colleges and universities would have to expand curriculum models to create more avenues for community outreach and service learning. Teacher training and development would also change significantly with the additional charge of making the arts more a part of lifelong learning; considering the vitality of amateur and community music groups in relation to the livelihood of academic programming and arts advocacy.

The depth and breadth of community engagement has immense implications to research in the field of music education, general education, and community development; it warrants further investigation.

References

- Abeles, H., Hafeli, M., Horowitz, R., & Burton, J.(2002). The evaluation of arts partnerships and learning in and through the arts. In Colwell, R. & Richardson, C. (Eds). *The New Handbook of Research and Learning*. (pp.931-940). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ackroyd, J. (1984). Arts in the community: A study of the fine arts associations and the school of fine arts in Willoughby Ohio. Dissertation: University of Cincinnati.
- Adler, M. (1984). *The Paideia Program: An educational syllabus*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Aldridge, J. & Goldman, R. (2002). *Current issues and trends in education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- American Federations of Teachers (2000). Doing what works. *Education Issues Policy Brief*, 12, 1-12.
- Anderson, L. (1992). A chamber group on every block. In Marks, M. (Ed), *The Music Educator and Community Music* (pp.51-52). Virginia: MENC.
- Aprill, A. (1996). The Chicago arts partnership in education. In J. Remer (Ed.), *Beyond Enrichment: Building Effective Arts Partnership with Schools and Your Community* (pp. 139-147). New York: ACA Books.
- Arts Education Partnership. (2002). Arts Education Partnership Strategic plan (2002-2003). Retrieved December 29, 2002, from <http://www.aep-arts.org/StrategicPlan.html>
- Arts Education Partnership (2000). *Strengthening state-level arts education partnerships*. Washington,DC:Author.

- Arts Education Partnership (1999). *Learning Partnerships: Improving learning in schools with arts partners in the community*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Arts, Education, and America (1980). *People and places: Reaching beyond the schools*. New York: Author.
- Barnes, G. (2002). Opportunities in service learning. *Music Educators Journal*, 88(4), 44-46.
- Bartelt, D. (1995). The macro-ecology of educational outcomes. In Risby, L., Reynolds, M., & Wang, M. (Eds.), *School-Community Connection: Exploring Issues for Research and Practice* (159-191). California: Jossey-Bass.
- Beyerbach, B., Weber, S., Swift, N. and Gooding, T. (1996). A school/business/university partnership for professional development. *The School Community Journal*, 6(1), 101-111.
- Bliss, R. (1992). Take music into the community. In Marks, M. (Ed.), *The Music educator and community music* (pp.67-69). Virginia: MENC.
- Boethel, M. (2000). Adapting to community-based learning. *Benefits²*, 4, 1-7.
- Bowsher, J. (1989). *Educating America: Lessons learned in the nation's corporations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Butler, J. (2000). Democracy, Diversity, and Civic Engagement. *Academe*, 86(4), 33-37.
- Campbell, P. and Kassner, C. (Eds.). (2002). *Music in Childhood*. California: Wadsworth Group.
- Campbell, S. (2001). Shouts in the dark: Community organizations for students in rural schools with "urban" problems. *Education and Urban Society*, 33(4), 445-456.
- Chapman, J. and Aspin, D. (1997). *The school, the community, and lifelong learning*. London: Cassell Wellington House.

- Chapman, L. (2000). A century of distancing Arts from the public. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(3), 27-28.
- Chapman, L. (1982). *Instant art; Instant culture: The unspoken policy for American schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clark, N. (1999). Let there be music. *Principal*, 79(2), 43-45.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (1998). *Ensuring student success through collaboration: What every educator should know*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Colwell, R., & Richardson, C. (Eds.). (2002). *The New Handbook of Research and Learning*. Oxford: University Press.
- Colwell, R. (Ed.). (1992). *Handbook of Research in Music Teaching And Learning*. New York: Schirmer Books
- Cutietta, R., Hamann, D., & Walker, L. (1995). *Spin-Offs: The extra musical advantages of a musical education*. Indiana: United Musical Instruments.
- Davies, D. (1995). Commentary: Collaboration & family empowerment as strategies to achieve comprehensive services. In Risby, L., Reynolds, M., & Wang, M. (Eds.), *School-Community Connection: Exploring issues for research and practice* (pp.267-280). California: Jossey-Bass.
- Davies, D. (2000). How to build partnerships that work. *Principal*, 80(1), 32-34.
- Davis, J. (1994). Beyond school walls: Challenges to collaboration between public schools and community arts centers. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 95, 12-13.
- Deasy, R. (Ed.) (2002a). *Critical Links: Learning in the arts and student achievement and social development*. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.

- Deasy, R. (2002b). Introduction: The growing impact of partnerships. In Colwell, R., & Richardson, C. (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Research and Learning* (pp.905-907). Oxford: University Press.
- Dodd, E. and Lilly, D. (2000). Learning within communities: An investigation of community Service-Learning in Teacher Education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 22(3), 77-85.
- Donaldson, J. and Kozoll, C. (1999). *Collaborative program planning: Principles, practices, and strategies*. Florida: Krieger.
- Dreeszen, C., Aprill, A., & Deasy, R. (1999). *Learning partnerships: Improving learning in schools with arts partners in the community*. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership.
- Drinker, Jr., H. (1992). Amateurs and music. In Marks, M. (Ed.), *The music educator and community music* (pp.35-40). Virginia: MENC.
- Elliot, D. (1995). *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eilert, G. (1940). The music educator and the community. *Music Educators Journal*, 27(2), 17:58-59.
- Eisenberg, M. (1992). Networking: K-12. *Eric Digest*, 1-4.
- Eisner, E. (2000). Arts Education Policy. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(3), 4-5.
- Eisner, E. (1998). *The kind of schools we need: Personal essays*. New Hampshire: Heinemann.
- Ernst, R. (2001). Music for life. *Music Educators Journal*, 88(1), 47-51.
- Fineberg, C. (1994). Policy issues for school districts to consider. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 95, 22-24.

- Fiske, E. (Ed.). (1999). *Champions of change: The impact of The arts on learning*. Washington, DC: Arts Education Partnership and the President's Committee on the Arts And the Humanities.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *The disciplined mind: What all students should know*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gates, J. T. (Ed.). (1988). *Music Education in the United States: Contemporary Issues*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.
- Gee, C. (1994). Artists in the classrooms: The impact and consequences of the national endowment for the Arts' artist residency program on K-12 arts education (II). *Arts Education Policy Review*, 95, 8-31.
- Glenn, J. (2002). Building bridges between school and community: Service learning in business education. *Business Education Forum*, 56(4), 9-12.
- Goodlad, J. (2000). Educational renewal and the arts. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(4), 11-14.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Growing Up Complete*. (1991). A Report of the National Commission on Music Education. Virginia: MENC.
- Gurley, J. (1999). Platonic Paideia. *Philosophy and Literature*, 23(2), 351-377.
- Heath, S. (2001). Three's not a crowd: Plans, roles, and focus in the arts. *Educational Researcher*, 30(7), 10-17.
- Hinckley, J. (2001). A sound education. *Educational Leadership*, 59(2), 65-68.
- Hinckley, J. (1995). Urban music education: Providing for students. *Music Educators Journal*, 32-35.

- Hope, S. (1992). Professional organizations and influences. In Colwell, R. (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Music Teaching And Learning* (pp. 724-734). New York: Schirmer Books.
- Hutchens, J. and Pankratz, D. (2000). Change in arts education: transforming education through arts challenge (TETAC). *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(4), 5-10.
- Jay, G. (2000). The community in the classroom. *Academe*, 86(4), 33-37.
- Jones, E. (1994). A corporate foundation perspective. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 95,18-21.
- Jorgensen, E. (2003). *Transforming Music Education*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Jorgensen, E. (1994). Justifying Music Instruction in American Public Schools: A Historical Perspective. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 120,17-29.
- Kaplan, M. (1992a). The social role of the amateur. In Marks, M. (Ed.) *The music educator and community music* (pp.41-45). Virginia: MENC.
- Kaplan, M. (1992b). Music, community, and social change: Parts I & II. In Marks, M. (Ed.), *The music educator and community Music*. (pp.19-25). Virginia: MENC.
- Kaplan, M. (1988). Society, sociology, and music education. In Gates, T. (Ed.), *Music Education in the United States: Contemporary Issues* (pp.3-32). Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- Kassner, K. (2001). Technology for musicianship: Using the internet for music instruction. *General Music Today*, Winter, 30-32.
- Kennedy Center Alliance for Arts Education Network. (2001). Community audit for arts education: Better schools, better skills, better communities. Washington: Author. Retrieved December 21, 2002, from <http://www.kennedy-center.org/education/kcaaen/specialinitiatives>

- Kennedy Center Alliance for Arts Education Network. (2000). *The Arts beyond the school day: Extending the power*. A report of the after school protocol task force. Washington, DC: Author.
- Kirst, M. and Kelley, C. (1995). Collaboration to improve children's services: Politics and policy making. In Risby, L., Reynolds, M., & Wang, M. (Eds.), *School-Community Connection: Exploring issues for research and practice* (pp.21-43). California: Jossey-Bass.
- Lehman, P. (2000). Unfinished business. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(3), 21-22.
- Lehman, P. (1999). National assessment of arts education: First look. *Music Educators Journal*, 85(4), 34-37.
- Leonhard, C. (1981). Expand your classroom. *Music Educators Journal*, 68(3).
- Leonhard, C. (1980a). Toward a contemporary program of music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 63, 1-10.
- Leonhard, C. (1980b). People's arts program: A new context for music educators. *Music Educators Journal*, 66(8), 36-39.
- Lowe, J. and Reisch, M. (1998). Bringing the community into the classroom: Applying the experiences of social work education to service-learning course in sociology. *Teaching Sociology*, 26, 292-298.
- Mahlmann, J. (1995). Maximizing the power of coalitions. *Association Management*, 47, 32-39.
- Maloney, W. (2000). The community as a classroom. *Academe*, 86(4), 52-55.
- Marks, M. (3rd ed.). (1996). *Contemporary music education*. New York: Schirmer Books.

- Marks, M. (1992b). *The music educator and community music*. Virginia: MENC.
- Maxwell, M. (1999, June 22). School board news: Arts education should be a key part of school Improvement. Retrieved February 26, 2002, from <http://www.nsba.org/sbn/1999/>
- Melaville, A. and Blank, M. (2000). It Takes a Whole a Community. *Principal*, 80(1), 18-20:22.
- Merz, C. and Furman, G (1997). *Community and schools: Promise and paradox*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Milstein, M. and Henry, D. (2000). *Spreading resiliency: Making it happen for schools And communities*. California: Corwin Press Inc.
- Mims, M. (1993). Working together for music education. *Music Educators Journal*, 79(5), 39-41.
- Mitchell, S. (Ed.). (2002). *Effective educational partnerships: Experts, advocates and scouts*. Connecticut: Praeger.
- Murfee, E. (1993). *The value of the arts*. A report by the President's Committee on the arts and community. Washington, DC: Author.
- Murrell, P.C. (2001). *The community teacher: A New Framework For Effective Urban Teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Myers, D. and Brooks, A. (2002). Policy issues in connecting music Education with arts education. In Colwell, R., & Richardson, C. (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Research On Music Teaching and Learning* (pp.909-930). Oxford: University Press.
- Myers, D. and Thomas, C. (1996). *Beyond tradition: Partnerships among orchestras, schools, and communities*. Georgia: Georgia State University.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). The NAEP 1997 Arts Education Assessment: An Overview. *NAEP*, 2(4).

- Okaloosa-Walton Cultural Enrichment Project* (1970). Florida: Author.
- Otterbourg, S. (2000). *How the arts can enhance after-school programs*. Washington, DC: US Dept. Education.
- Palmer, M. (1997). Tapping into community resources. *Teaching Music*, 5(3), 62-63,82.
- Payne, J. (2000). Making culture public: Grassroots community collaboration and ethnic heritage. Unpublished dissertation, New York University, New York.
- Perlstein, S. (1998). Culture builds community. *Generations*, 22(4), 72-73.
- Phelps, R., Ferrara, L., and Goolsby, T. (4th ed.). (1993). A guide to research in music education. New Jersey: Scarecrow Press.
- Potter, L. (1997). Building reform around Adler's Paideia Proposal. *American Secondary Education*, 25, 24-28.
- President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and the Arts Education Partnership (1999). *Gaining the arts advantage: Lessons from school districts that value arts education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Punke, H. (1951). *Community uses of public school facilities*. New York: King's Crown Press.
- Rakow, S. and Robinson, L. (1997). School and university partnerships: Teaching for success. *Contemporary Education*, 68(2), 143-147.
- Rainbow, E. and Froelich, H. (1987). *Research in music education: An introduction to systematic inquiry*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Remer, J. (1996). *Beyond enrichment: Building effective arts partnerships with schools and your community*. New York: ACA Books.

- Remer, J. (1990). *Changing schools through the arts: How to build on the power of an idea*. New York: ACA Books.
- Reimer, B. (1997). Music education in the twenty-first century. *Music Educators Journal*, 84(3), 33-38.
- Reimer, B. (1999). Facing the risks of the Mozart effect. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(2), 21-26.
- Rigsby, L. (1995). Introduction: The need for new strategies. In Risby, L., Reynolds, M., & Wang, M. (Eds.), *School-Community Connection: Exploring issues for research and practice* (pp.1-19). California: Jossey-Bass.
- Roberts, T. (2002). Learn to Care, Care to Learn. *Educational Leadership*, 60 (1), 45-48.
- Roberts, T. (1998). *The power of Paideia schools*. Virginia: Association for supervision and curriculum development.
- Rodgers, B. (1999). Back from the brink: The community Perspective. *Teaching Music*, 6(4), 40-41:62.
- Schmitt, D. and Tracy, J. (1996). *Gaining support for your school: Strategies for community involvement*. California: Corwin Press.
- Soep, E. (2002). Arts in the city. *Kappa Delta Pi*, 39(1), 12-16.
- Speck, M. (1996). The Change process in a school learning community. *The School Community Journal*, 6(1).
- Sparling, E. (1992). Music for the masses. In Marks, M. (Ed.), *The music educator and community music* (pp.40-45). Virginia: MENC.
- Stankiewicz, M.A. (2001). Community/schools partnership for the arts: Collaboration, politics, and policy. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 102(6), 3-10.
- Swanwick, K. (1999). *Teaching Music Musically*. London: Routledge.

- Swick, K. (2001). Service-learning in teacher education: Building learning communities. *The Clearing House*, 74(6), 261-264.
- Taylor, P. (2002). Service-learning as postmodern art and pedagogy. *Studies in Art Education*, 43(2), 124-140.
- Tooley, J. (2000). *Reclaiming education*. London: Cassell Wellington.
- Undercofler, J. (2000). Trends and mega-trends. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 102(2).
- Undercofler, J. (1997). Music in American schools: A plan for action. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 98, 15-19.
- Van Scotter, R., Haas, J., Kraft, R., and Schott, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Social foundations of education*. Massachusetts: Prentice-Hall.
- Vincent, M. and Merrion, M. (1996). Teaching music in the year 2050. *Music Educators Journal*, 82, 38-42.
- Volkman, R. (1999). Art education today: A return to basics. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 66(1), 55-58.
- Voorhees, J. (1986). Music in a new age: The challenge of electronics. *Music Educators Journal*, 13,(2).
- Weitz, J. H. (1996). *Coming up taller: Arts & humanities programs for children and youth at-risk*. Washington, DC: President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities.
- Wendrich, K. (1982). *Essays on music in American education and society*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.
- Wenner, G. (1992). Joining forces with the arts community. In Marks, M. (Ed.), *The music educator and community music* (pp.40-45). Virginia: MENC.
- Werner, R. (2000). Arts education policy in twentieth century. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(3), 15-16.

- Wilson, B. (2001). Arts magnets and the transformation of schools and schooling. *Education and Urban Society*, 33 (4), 366-387.
- Wilson, B. (2000). Achieving reform in local school districts: The systematic arts education project. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(4), 15-19.
- Wingell, R. and Herzog, S. (2001). Introduction to research in Music. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Wolf, D. (2000). Beyond outsourcing: Creating corridors of arts Opportunities. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 101(3), 23-24.
- Yancey, W. and Saporito, S. (1995). Ecological embeddedness of educational process and outcomes. In Risby, L., Reynolds, M., & Wang, M. (Eds.), *School-Community Connection: Exploring issues for research and practice* (pp. 193-227). California: Jossey-Bass.