

MENC: From Tanglewood to the Present

Michael L. Mark

Michael L. Mark is professor emeritus in the music department at Towson University in Towson, Maryland.

This paper will set the stage for Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education by describing the events that were critical to MENC and to music education from the time leading up to the Tanglewood Symposium in 1967 to the present. The reason for reviewing past events, for studying history, is to understand why things are as they are now and to help approach the future in as educated a manner as possible. The distinguished historian and former Librarian of Congress **Daniel Boorstin** analyzes the relationship between past and future by differentiating the seers and the prophets of ancient ages. He writes that the seer “forecast how events turn out,” while “the prophet prescribed what men should believe, and how they should behave.”¹ This distinction also holds for the Tanglewood Symposium, when MENC emulated the prophet, not the seer.

The last thirty years have seen more change, and faster change, than any other three decades in history. Now, only thirty-two years after that symposium, the United States has become a different society in many ways. American’s think differently, live differently, behave differently, and have different expectations of the future. This raises critically important questions: How have these differences affected music education, and how have they affected MENC? What if the Tanglewood Symposium hadn’t occurred? What course would MENC have taken from then to now? Before we tackle these questions, let us examine some of the facts of the Tanglewood Symposium.

MENC began expanding its functions dramatically in the second half of the twentieth century, and especially since the Tanglewood Symposium, to fulfill its ongoing mission of advancing music education and the professional growth of its

members.² Its role has been critical because with its membership, committees, publications, workshops, conferences, and symposia, MENC alone has the organizational structure and credibility to guide the profession through an era of accelerated, profound change. This paper traced the activities that MENC has undertaken as the umbrella organization for the music education profession. It describes a variety of roles assumed by the organization in intellectual leadership, curriculum, professional development, advocacy, and professional standards.

Trends in music education and in every other discipline generally occur in response to a particular societal need. That need is usually expressed first in some sort of large, clearly defined social movement, and later is often confirmed in the form of legislation or judicial decisions. The Tanglewood Symposium is a good case in point. It did not take place in a vacuum. It was a commanding response to what was happening in, and to, American society at that time. And so before looking at the symposium, let us examine its societal backdrop to see why the Tanglewood Symposium occurred. There were several reasons for the symposium. One of them was plain and simple anger. Our professional leaders were angered by the Yale Seminar on Music Education of 1963. That seminar was supported by a large government grant to analyze school music and to propose improvements. But the analysis and proposing were done by musicologists, composers, and performers who knew little or nothing about music education, and who did this without the participation of music educators. Professional music education leaders were exasperated by the Yale Seminar. In fact, Tanglewood might have been called a seminar too, but its leaders chose to call it a symposium to distance it as far as possible from the Yale Seminar.³ The Tanglewood Symposium allowed professionals to analyze their own venue.

Now, let's look at the larger societal reason for the Tanglewood Symposium. There were three momentous catalysts of the 1960s that changed the way that Americans viewed their society – school reform, civil rights, and technology. Together, these three characteristics of the 1960s profoundly influenced the United States, and in doing so, they also influenced MENC.

The first catalyst: school reform. School reform began with the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) in 1953. The Bureau of Education of HEW was the first attempt of the federal government to influence the school curriculum, which until that time had been considered the province only of state and local governments. Earlier, the few education issues of interest to the federal government were handled by the Federal Security Agency. We might measure the progress of school reform by the problem areas identified by the United States Bureau of Education in 1954: illiteracy, the relationship between school dropouts and juvenile delinquency, special instruction for exceptional children, the education of children of migratory workers, and the education of teachers. These issues are still with us, and our continual efforts toward reform since the 1950s have not produced satisfactory results. Reform efforts intensified when the Soviet Union advanced beyond us in the space race by launching Sputnik in 1957. This was a rude awakening for Americans because we had thought that we were the most technologically advanced country in the world. We suddenly realized that technologically, the Soviet military was capable of threatening our security. Then, the American public learned that our schools were failing to prepare students well enough to meet the military technological needs of the Cold War. The federal government responded by gradually extending its powers to areas that had previously been the domain of state and local governments. When the federal government took an active role in school curriculum for the first time, we entered what would be a continuous, ongoing, and never-ending era of school reform. This was in the early 1960s, before MENC had firmly established itself in the government relations arena. That function was to evolve in response to a particularly misguided education objective that has colored virtually every reform effort to the present. Many reformers lost sight of the fact that the basic skills - reading, writing, and mathematics - are simply the tools that open the gate to education but are not an education in themselves. These skills have been spotlighted extensively now for four decades. They have been a major focus of education policy development, assessment, and funding. The emphasis on skills, rather than education, has posed a threat both to music education and to society in general, and since the late 1960s, MENC has dedicated much time, energy,

and money to persuading the public, policymakers, and its own practitioners that music has a legitimate place in the education of all children.

School reform continues to this day, but “reform” is no longer the correct term. The work implies that after something is reformed we go about our business in a new, enlightened manner. It would be better just to call it “change” because it echoes the ongoing change in society. Whatever the correct formula might be to fix our schools, we have not found it yet. Nor do we always take a carefully reasoned approach to reform. Allen Britton wrote in 1958:

American music educators have demonstrated what may be considered an easy readiness to climb aboard any intellectual bandwagon which happened to be near by, and to trust it to arrive at destinations appropriate for music educators, or worse, to adopt its destinations as their own without careful enough scrutiny of the intellectual properties involved.⁴

Now, forty years later, change has become the way of life for educators and for all Americans. In 1967, music educators had to look to a future that was radically different from their realities of the 1960s, especially in the relationship between their profession and the public. Somebody had to lead the way, and that, of course, was the Music Educators National Conference.

The second catalyst: Civil rights. Civil rights defined the era in which American belatedly decided to honor the constitutional principle of equality of all Americans. The civil rights movement of the 1960s was fueled both by idealism and the demand for fairness on the part of many Americans. Congress had passed civil rights legislation much earlier than the 1960s. In fact, the first civil rights law was passed in 1866, and the second in 1875. Those laws were generally ignored, and they were pushed aside in the 1880s and 1890s by other statutes that we call Jim Crow laws, which led to the doctrine of “separate but equal.” The principle of separate but equal legally segregated white and black Americans from each other in most areas of daily living. But the doctrine did not provide equality to black Americans in any aspect of life. In 1954, the *Brown v.*

Topeka Supreme Court decision desegregated the schools, and we saw the first truly significant step toward equal civil rights. The decision did not integrate the schools; it just made segregation illegal. New housing patterns, permissive welfare laws, ineffective drug enforcement laws, and policies that concentrated the poorest citizens in urban ghettos worked together to prevent widespread desegregation. Finally Congress passed a strong Civil Rights Law in 1966, this one with teeth, and in 1968, the Supreme Courts affirmed the 1866 Civil Rights Bill, 102 years after its original passage.

Civil rights, along with the war in Vietnam, was the backdrop of societal change, and it set the stage for the introduction of multicultural studies in schools. There were other large social issues during the 1960s as well, especially the war in Vietnam. The decade of the 1960s was turbulent. Demonstrations and marches were common throughout the country, in the streets and schools and on campuses, and they were often violent. This was how many Americans demonstrated to their leaders that they wanted change, and the leaders responded positively with judicial decisions and powerful legislation to empower not only black Americans, but also women, young people, and others.

The third catalyst: Technology. Americans were very familiar with technology by 1967, but had not yet learned to use it to their greatest advantage. Its applications for individuals were years in the future, but most people were aware that their lives would be more and more affected by technology. They just did not know in what ways.

The Tanglewood Symposium

MENC began to prepare the music education profession for the future during a time of change, progress, and turmoil. It was against the backdrop of the change, progress, and turmoil of the 1960s that the leadership of MENC began to prepare the music education profession for the future. The leadership recognized that a shallow attempt to cure symptoms would not serve the organization for the long term. The first step had to be nothing less than visionary, and it was. It was the Tanglewood Symposium, held during two weeks in the summer of 1967 at Tanglewood, Massachusetts, the summer home of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. MENC

cosponsored the symposium with the Berkshire Music Center, the Theodore Presser Foundation, and the School of Fine and Applied Arts of Boston University. Its purpose was to plan MENC's future directions by defining the role of music education in an evolving American society that was dealing with the new realities of rapid social, economic, and cultural change. The symposium brought together music educators and representatives of business, industry, and government, and it produced the Tanglewood Declaration, clearly the profession's most important vision statement of recent times. The declaration made clear the imperative for the music education profession to address itself to the musical needs of every constituency in a nation that had only recently reached a fair degree of consensus on civil rights, that was beginning to realize that it would be more and more affected by rapidly developing technology, and that had become painfully aware of the inadequacy of its schools (see appendix A, p.19).

The Goals and Objectives Project. After the Tanglewood Symposium presented its vision for the future, MENC had to find a way to realize the vision. It did that with the Goals and Objectives (GO) Project in 1969. The GO Project, led by Paul Lehman, identified two critical responsibilities pertaining to future professional needs: Those of MENC, and those of the profession in general. The broad goal of MENC was to conduct programs and activities to build a vital musical culture and an enlightened musical public. The goals of the profession were to carry out comprehensive music programs in all schools, to involve persons of all ages in learning music, to support the quality preparation of teachers, and to use the most effective music education techniques and resources.

The GO Project identified thirty-five objectives (see appendix B, p. 20), from which the MENC National Executive Board selected eight to receive priority treatment. These eight goals were to:

1. lead in efforts to develop programs of music instruction challenging to all students, whatever their socio-cultural condition, and directed toward the needs of citizens in a

- pluralistic society;
2. lead in the development of programs of study that correlate performing, creating, and listening to music and encompass a diversity of musical behavior;⁵
 3. assist teachers in the identification of musical behaviors relevant to the needs of their students;
 4. advance the teaching of music of all periods, styles, forms, and cultures through grade 6 and for a minimum for two years beyond that level;
 5. develop standards to ensure that all music instruction is provided by teachers well prepared in music;
 6. expand its programs to secure greater involvement and commitment of student members;
 7. assume leadership in the application of significant new developments in curriculum, teaching-learning patterns, evaluation, and related topics, to every area and level of music teaching; and
 8. lead in efforts to ensure that every school system allocates sufficient staff, time, and funds to support a comprehensive and excellent music program.⁶

The eight priority goals, along with other of the thirty-five, were addressed by means of publications, conference sessions, new committees and commissions, and administrative actions, and by expanding MENC's sphere of influence to make it the umbrella organization for American music education. MENC has seriously undertaken each of them. Some, however, are not attainable because many factors are beyond the control of MENC. When a solution to a problem looks promising, some condition

changes and the solution no longer fits the problem. This is one of the difficulties of a dynamic organization as it plans for the future.⁷ Nevertheless, the ability of MENC to move forward dynamically and aggressively at that particular time is remarkable. Mary Hoffman pointed out in the *Music Educators Journal* in 1980, during her MENC presidency, the particular difficulties the organization had to deal with: several changes in MENC's administrative leadership; an ambitious, successful building fund drive; the move to a new building in Reston, Virginia; and of particular significance, the depressed world economy of the early 1970s that resulted from the international oil crisis. The economy had a profound effect on school music programs throughout the country. Many were reduced and others completely discontinued. The MENC leadership, undeterred by these roadblocks, forged ahead with its ambitious and visionary plans.⁸

After the GO Project, MENC appointed two commissions to begin implementing the recommendations. It created the National Commission on Organizational Development to recommend changes in the organization, structure, and function of MENC, including all of its federated and affiliated units. The second commission, the National Commission on Instruction, was to plan, manage, and coordinate a wide variety of activities. It published *The School Music Program: Description and Standards*,⁹ whose roots were in the earlier MENC source books of 1947 and 1955.¹⁰ The other objectives of the GO Project were to be the responsibility of the Music Education Research Council, the Publications Planning Committee, the public relations program, and the *Music Educators Journal*.¹¹ In fact, entire issues of *MEJ* were devoted to single topics that originated in the Tanglewood Symposium and the GO Project. They included youth music, electronic music, world musics, music in urban education, and music in special education. National, regional, and state conferences have offered numerous sessions to suggest ideas and methods for practical approaches to fulfilling the Tanglewood recommendations. The publications program expanded significantly and offered many books and pamphlets in support of the goals.

Intellectual Leadership

Research. MENC has been deeply involved in research for some time by 1967 through its publications and a variety of research projects and events. The Music Education Research Council (MERC) established the Society for Research in Music Education (SRME) in 1960 to encourage and advance research in music education. MERC eventually oversaw the *Journal of Research in Music Education*, which had been founded in 1953, and later it assumed responsibility for *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*. MERC found a way to involve many more music educators in its research program with the creation of the Special Research Interest Groups (SRIGs) at the 1978 MENC national convention. Now there are thirteen SRIG's.¹² Each publishes a newsletter and meets at MENC national conventions.

MENC and Schirmer Books cosponsored the publication of the *Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning*,¹³ edited by Richard Colwell, in 1992. The *Handbook* is a definitive guide, a *vade mecum*, to the music education research resources, methodologies, issues, and controversies, and is one of the most significant events in the history of music education research. It contains original essays by fifty-five American, Australian, British, and Canadian scholars.

Research findings have also been disseminated at a variety of MENC-related symposia since the late 1970s. MENC cosponsored the three-part Ann Arbor Symposium from 1978 to 1980 to explore the relationship between research in behavioral psychology and in music education psychology. That symposium appears to have been a model for numerous future symposia sponsored by MENC and its SRIGs, and by universities. Their subjects have included the relationship between music education and social anthropology, philosophy of music education, general research, general music, early childhood education, conducting, history, social psychology, and others.

Philosophy. One of the most critical needs of the music education profession at mid-century was for a central unifying philosophy. MENC had played a key role in 1954 when it began the process of professional philosophical introspection by appointing its Commission on Basic Concepts, which represented music education, psychology, sociology, and philosophy. The commission's report was published as the

1958 yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, entitled *Basic Concepts in Music Education*.¹⁴ This landmark work, along with another book, *Foundations and Principles of Music Education* (1959) by Charles Leonhard and Robert House,¹⁵ provided the framework for the development of an aesthetic philosophy of music education. The two books and other writings of the 1950s and 1960s encouraged music educators to teach music for its own value, rather than for its extramusical, or ancillary, benefits. The movement leading to the philosophy of aesthetic education reached maturity with the publication of Bennett Reimer's book, *A Philosophy of Music Education*.¹⁶ This book immediately became the primary work of the music education philosophical literature. The first of the eight points of the Tanglewood Declaration was consonant with this philosophical position. It stated: "Music serves best when its integrity as an art is maintained." MENC expanded its involvement in music education philosophy when it approved a new SRIG in Philosophy in 1992. Since then, philosophy has received a good deal of attention at MENC professional meetings.

Psychology. The profession has also seen major developments in psychology since the Tanglewood Symposium. Since the 1970s, many psychologists and music education researchers have focused their efforts on musical perception, cognition, and other specialized interests. More recently, researchers have concentrated on the theories of multiple intelligence's of such psychologists as Howard Gardner, Philip Phoenix, Elliot Eisner, and Paul Hirst. Howard Gardner points out the "one evident factor in the rethinking of intelligence is the perspective introduced by scholars who are not psychologists."¹⁷ That statement is clearly true in music education, where scholars have complemented the work of psychologists by examining the relationship between theories of intelligence and music education. MENC has supported these interests in its publications and through several of its SRIGs, including those that focus on affective response to music, creativity, learning and development, philosophy, measurement and evaluation, and perception.

Curricular Developments

New trends in general music. During the 1950's and 1960's, two European music curricula spread rapidly throughout the United States. The Orff and Kodály methods were welcomed in American schools partly because they incorporated techniques that were consonant with conceptual learning principles, which was a central part of school reform at that time. MENC had helped disseminate conceptual education in music with its 1967 publication of *The Study of Music in the Elementary School: A Conceptual Approach*, edited by Charles Gary. Both the Kodály and Orff approaches developed in the United States independently of MENC, but MENC was partly responsible for their success because their practitioners presented them frequently at its conferences and in its publications. Later, both the Orff and Kodály organizations became MENC allied organizations.

The most ambitious MENC program to address curricular issues during the 1960s was the Contemporary Music Project (CMP), which was funded by the Ford Foundation and MENC. CMP's innovative curriculum developments were presented in many seminars, workshops, and published materials. A critically important aspect of the program's success was that it demonstrated MENC's ability to organize, implement, and complete a nationwide high-budget curriculum development program. This might well have given the organization the experience and confidence to undertake new large-scale programs in the future.

Advocacy

Advocacy has become one of MENC's most critical functions. MENC positioned itself for advocacy at the national level when it relocated its headquarters from Chicago to Washington in 1956, but its advocacy activities began in earnest in 1966 with the appointment of Joan Gaines as director of its new public relations program. As MENC began planning for the Tanglewood Symposium, it also prepared the way to make the public more aware of the role of music education in American society. One of the early actions occurred in 1968, when the Ford Foundation extended its funding of the Contemporary Music Project for an additional five years. One of the CMP programs, the

Young Composers Project, shifted its focus, and was renamed the Composers-in-Residence to Communities Program. For five years, communities, and not just schools, benefited from the presence of professional composers. Could there be a more effective public relations plan? The need for public relations increased in the early 1970s when the declining global economy directly threatened school music programs with severe budget restrictions. MENC recognized that it would need to commit more resources to promoting music education to policymakers. It refocused its efforts from public relations to government relations, although it has continuously maintained a strong public relations program as well. MENC began its government relations efforts by working with federal legislators and presenting workshops for state and divisional MENC units. These workshops became a routine feature of national, regional, and state conferences and have been ever since. As MENC became more deeply involved in this activity, it replaced the designation “government relations” with the term “advocacy,” which described its activities more accurately. Since then, MENC has participated proactively in federal legislative agendas by providing expert witness in many diverse federal issues,¹⁸ and MENC presidents and executives have testified on Capitol Hill on behalf of music education. By the 1980s, MENC had acquired considerable expertise in advocacy.

Coalitions. MENC has been a leader in building coalitions of arts education organizations. Coalitions are necessary because they represent greater numbers of people and wider interests than are possible in any one organization, and they multiply political influence. For years before the Tanglewood Symposium, MENC had worked closely with such organizations as the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the American Association of School Administrators, and others.

Within the arts education fields, MENC recognized that public policies that affect any area of arts education usually affect all of the arts education disciplines. Samuel Hope wrote in 1989: “Unity has been the rallying cry of the American arts advocacy

movement for nearly thirty years. A fundamental principle of arts advocacy remains that unity is essential for effectiveness.”¹⁹ MENC had cooperated with the professional associations in dance, art, and theatre since the 1960s in an organization known as DAMT (dance, art, music, theatre). DAMT was recognized officially by the United States Office of Education and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in joint projects that set the stage for later cooperative efforts.

In 1986, MENC and the American Council for the Arts (ACA) called together thirty-one leaders of arts and arts education organizations at the Pew Memorial Trust in Philadelphia, where they formed the Ad Hoc National Arts Education Working Group. The meeting produced “The Philadelphia Resolution,” which stated the basic principles agreed upon by all the organizations in regard to the value of arts education and the need to strengthen it in American education.²⁰ The resolution was a strong advocacy tool for dealing with policy-making bodies.

That coalition became the National Coalition for Education in the Arts (NCEA) in 1988. Its mission was to develop and monitor policy affecting education in the arts.²¹ This alliance was the one that successfully advocated the inclusion of arts education in the *Goal 2000: Educate America Act* (Public Law 103-227) of 1994, which was probably MENC’s most significant advocacy triumph. Also in 1994, the National Coalition for Music Education sponsored a summit meeting in Washington, D.C. The meeting brought together forty-nine organizations dedicated to many specialized facets and interests in the music education profession. They met to discuss the most effective ways in which their organizations could cooperate in a wide range of music education issues.²² In 1998, MENC sponsored the third Music Education Summit, this one attended by representatives of more than eighty-five organizations, and again resulting in a strong instrument of advocacy.

The Development of Professional Standards

In 1974, the National Commission on Instruction published *The School Music Program: Description and Standards*,²³ which came from the Tanglewood Symposium recommendation that MENC provide leadership in developing high-quality music programs in all schools. This book presented standards in curriculum, staffing, facilities, equipment, and levels of other kinds of support, and it described the ideal school music program as a benchmark against which lay people and educators could compare the programs in their own schools. Paul Lehman wrote in the second edition in 1986 that the book “has been used extensively by superintendents and principals, state departments of education and state supervisors of music, music educators, and laymen. It has been referred to and quoted by various groups concerned with accreditation or certification, and it has been cited in innumerable curriculum guides. It has been the most popular publication in the history of MENC.”²⁴

The two editions of *The School Music Program* were written in response to the national demand for higher education quality and accountability. By setting standards and achievement levels, MENC demonstrated to the public and to policymakers that the music education profession considered its work to be substantive and consequential, and that it continually sought to improve itself.

National Standards for Arts Education. The standards published in the two editions of *The School Music Program* were valuable in their own right, but they were actually a prelude to a new set of standards written in response to the *Goals 2000 Act* of 1994. The earlier standards were established for a profession that was still trying very hard to convince the American people that music should be a curricular subject. Now, with the passage of the *Goals 2000 Act*, national goals were written to satisfy a congressional mandate. This mandate assured wide recognition for the new standards, and since then, many state departments of education have adopted identical or similar arts education standards for their own reform efforts.

By advocating, creating, and then promoting the National Standards, MENC extended a framework for curriculum development to the entire profession.

Summary

What if the Tanglewood Symposium had not taken place? If the Tanglewood Symposium had not taken place, it is likely that MENC would nevertheless have addressed itself to many of the issues that it has undertaken in the last thirty years. It is unlikely, however, that it would have been able to do so in such a disciplined and sequential manner that used the organization's strengths to the greatest advantage. It is difficult to imagine how different the music education profession would be today if no entity existed to encourage, nourish, and sustain it as MENC has. MENC has given structure and direction to the profession, helping focus it on critical issues and taking leadership in working through them. In doing so, MENC has enabled the music education profession to maintain its ability to help fulfill the musical needs of individuals, communities, and the nation. It has empowered the profession to remain a diverse and dynamic component of American education. Judging from all it has done for the music education profession, it appears justified in having changed its name in 1998 from the Music Educators National Conference to MENC – The National Association for Music Education. It clearly has established itself as the leadership organization for the entire profession.

It would be irresponsible to draw the simplistic conclusion that all of the progress that MENC has made since 1967 is the direct result of the Tanglewood Symposium and the GO Project. No strategic plan can guide an organization for over thirty years without constant renewal. There have been some strategic plans for MENC, but none of the magnitude and scope of the symposium and the GO Project. Mary Hoffman articulated a fundamental truth of long-range planning when she wrote in 1980: "In an organization such as MENC, long-range planning is, in essence, long-range hoping. Too many deviations can arise on what would seem a straight path toward any single goal or objective...Perhaps it is time to undertake a reevaluation of the GO Project as it applies to a new decade."²⁵ She was referring to the decade of the 1980s. This leaves us with the question of who plans for MENC and how. There is no way to

know when the goals and objectives of the GO Project no longer resided in the memory of MENC officers and administrators. MENC President June Hinckley concludes that the influence of the Tanglewood Symposium has become “a way of thinking” for the MENC leadership.²⁶ This way of thinking has continued to guide the organization along the zigzag path of general school reform.

Conclusion

Now, in 1999, almost two decades after Hoffman’s suggestion, MENC and The Florida State University cosponsor the Housewright Symposium to help guide MENC through the next twenty years. One might ask whether another symposium is necessary when the basic principles derived from Tanglewood are still relevant. Symbolically, the new millennium would seem an appropriate time for professional introspection and planning, but it, in itself, does not sufficiently justify a second major event of this type. The new societal order, however, does. The civil rights revolution of the 1960s is no longer revolutionary. Its music education derivative, the study of multicultural music, has become a curricular norm. The school reform movement that swept the country in the 1960s still continues. Reform is ubiquitous now, and June Hinckley refers to it as “reform du jour.” It’s a familiar part of the life of every educator. Technology refuses to stand still, but even so, music educators feel secure with it. Almost everything that music educators do has a new face since the 1960s. We have come to accept that what is effective and appropriate now probably will be outdated in a very short time. The need for MENC to undertake the Housewright Symposium is exactly the same as the need for the Tanglewood Symposium. But the times are different. Again, MENC must play the role of prophet, rather than seer.

Notes

¹ Daniel Boorstin, *The Seekers* (New York: Random House, 1998), 6.

² *Member Handbook, 1996-97* (Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference), back cover.

³ Charles Gary, telephone interview with author, 18 December 1998. Gary was the executive secretary of MENC at the time of the Tanglewood Symposium.

-
- ⁴ Allen Britton, "Music in Early American Public Education: A Historical Critique," in *Basic Concepts in Music Education* (Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1958), 207.
- ⁵ This germinated in the Contemporary Music Project, the large MENC curriculum project of the 1960s.
- ⁶ From "Goals and Objectives for Music Education," *Music Educators Journal* 57, no. 4 (December 1970): 24-25.
- ⁷ Michael L. Mark, "The GO Project: Retrospective of a Decade," *Music Educators Journal* 67, no. 4 (December 1980): 42-47.
- ⁸ Mary E. Hoffman, "Goals and Objectives for the Eighties," *Music Educators Journal* 67, no. 4 (December 1980): 48-49, 66.
- ⁹ National Commission on Instruction, *The School Music Program: Description and Standards* (Vienna, VA: Music Educators National Conference, 1974).
- ¹⁰ Hazel Nohavec Morgan, ed., *Music Education Source Book* (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1947); and Morgan, ed., *Music in American Education: Music Education Source Book Number Two* (Chicago: Music Educators National Conference, 1955).
- ¹¹ "MENC Forms Two Commissions," *Music Educators Journal* 57, no. 8 (April 1971): 47-48.
- ¹² Affective Response, Community and Adult Music, Creativity, Early Childhood, Gender Research, General Research, History, Instructional Strategies, Learning and Development, Measurement and Evaluation, Perception, Philosophy, Social Science.
- ¹³ Richard Colwell, ed., *Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1992), dust jacket.
- ¹⁴ Nelson B. Henry, ed., *Basic Concepts in Music Education*, Fifty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958). This was the second NSSE yearbook that involved MENC. The first was the Thirty-fifth Yearbook, part II, entitled *Music Education*, published in 1936.
- ¹⁵ Charles Leonhard and Robert House, *Foundations and Principles of Music Education*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).
- ¹⁶ Bennett Reimer, *A Philosophy of Music Education* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970), 2.
- ¹⁷ Howard Gardner, "Who Owns Intelligence," *The Atlantic Monthly*, February 1999: 70.
- ¹⁸ For example, the Copyright Law, reductions in funding for music programs, the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; the establishment of the Cabinet-level Department of Education; the 1979 White House Conference on the Arts; the Career Education Act of 1978; legislated authority to conduct a baseline survey of the status of arts education in the schools, which resulted in the publication of the book *Toward Civilization*; and the need for a White House Conference on Education in 1980. MENC also provided expert witnesses to testify at several congressional hearings. One, "The Arts Are Fundamental to Learning" (1977) was a joint hearing before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, and the Special Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities of the Committee on Human Resources, U.S. Senate. Another was entitled, "To Permit the Use of Title IV-B ESEA Funds for the Purchase of Band Instruments," after which Congress agreed to permit the purchase of band instruments with Title I funds.
- ¹⁹ Samuel Hope, "The Need for Policy Studies in Arts Education," in David Pankratz and Kevin Mulcahy, *The Challenge to Reform Arts Education: What Role Can Research Play?* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1989), 74.
- ²⁰ John T. McLaughlin, ed., *Toward A New Era in Arts Education* (New York: American Council for the Arts, 1988), 7.
- ²¹ Pankratz and Mulcahy, xi - xiii.
- ²² "National Music Education Summit Participating Organizations," *Teaching Music* 2, no. 3 (December 1994): 48.
- ²³ National Commission on Instruction, ix.
- ²⁴ Paul R. Lehman, *The School Music Program: Description and Standards*, 2d ed. (Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference, 1986), 7.
- ²⁵ Hoffman, 48.
- ²⁶ June Hinckley, correspondence, 21 March 1999.

Appendix A: The Tanglewood Declaration

By Allen Britton, Arnold Broido, and Charles Gary

The intensive evaluation of the role of music in American society and education provided by the Tanglewood Symposium of philosophers, educators, scientists, labor leaders, philanthropists, social scientists, theologians, industrialists, representatives of government and foundations, music educators and other musicians led to this declaration:

We believe that education must have as major goals the art of living, the building of personal identity, and nurturing creativity. Since the study of music can contribute much to these ends, *we now call for music to be placed in the core of the school curriculum.*

The arts afford a continuity with the aesthetic tradition in man's history. Music and other fine arts, largely non-verbal in nature, reach close to the social, psychological, and physiological roots of man in his search for identity and self-realization.

Educators must accept the responsibility for developing opportunities which meet man's individual needs and the needs of a society plagued by the consequences of changing values, alienation, hostility between generations, racial and international tensions, and the challenges of a new leisure.

Music educators at Tanglewood agreed on the following:

- 1) Music serves best when its integrity as an art is maintained.
- 2) Music of all periods, styles, forms, and cultures belongs in the curriculum. The musical repertory should be expanded to involve music of our time in its rich variety, including currently popular teenage music and avant-garde music, American folk music, and the music of other cultures.
- 3) Schools and colleges should provide adequate time for music in programs ranging from preschool through adult or continuing education.
- 4) Instruction in the arts should be a general and important part of education in the senior high school.
- 5) Developments in educational technology, educational television, programmed instruction, and computer-assisted instruction should be applied to music study and research.
- 6) Greater emphasis should be placed on helping the individual student to fulfill his needs, goals and potentials.
- 7) The music education profession must contribute its skills, proficiencies, and insights toward assisting in the solution of urgent social problems as in the "inner city" or other areas with culturally deprived individuals.
- 8) Programs of teacher education must be expanded and improved to provide music teachers who are specially equipped to teach high school courses in the history and literature of music, courses in the humanities and related arts, as well as teachers equipped to work with the very young, with adults, with the disadvantaged, and with the emotionally disturbed.

----- From *Documentary Report of the Tanglewood Symposium*, (Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference, 1968), p. 139.

Appendix B: The Goals and Objective Project

The purpose of the Goals and Objectives Project was to identify the responsibilities of MENC as they pertained to future needs. The project, directed by Paul Lehman, began in 1969 with a steering

committee and the following eighteen subcommittees, each of which related in some way to the Tanglewood Declaration.

1. Preparation for Music Educators
2. Musical Behaviors –Identification and Evaluation
3. Comprehensive Musicianship – Music Study in the Senior High School
4. Music for All Youth
5. Music Education in the Inner City
6. Research in Music Education
7. Logistics of Music Education
8. Fact Finding
9. Aesthetic Education
10. Information Science
11. Music for Early Childhood
12. Impact of Technology
13. Music in Higher Education
14. Learning Processes
15. Musical Enrichment of National Life
16. MENC Professional Activities
17. Professional Organization Relationships
18. Music of Non-Western Cultures

After the committee reports were condensed, Paul Lehman drafted the proposed MENC goals and objectives. This statement was submitted to the federated and associated organizations, and by the chairpersons of the national committees. In October 1970, the MENC Executive Board adopted the following two goals for MENC, four for the profession in general, and thirty-five objectives.

The goals of MENC shall be to conduct programs and activities to build:

- A vital music culture
- An enlightened musical public
- The goals of the profession are:
- Comprehensive music programs in all schools
- Involvement of people of all ages in learning music
- Quality preparation of teachers
- Use of the most effective techniques and resources in music instruction.

The objectives:

- *1. Lead in efforts to develop programs of music instruction challenging to all students, whatever their sociocultural condition, and directed toward the needs of citizens in a pluralist society
- *2. Lead in the development of programs of study that correlate performing, creating, and listening to music and encompass a diversity of musical behaviors
- *3. Assist teachers in the identification of musical behaviors relevant to the needs of their students
- *4. Advance the teaching of music of all periods, styles, forms and cultures
5. Promote the development of instructional programs in aesthetic education
6. Advocate the expansion of music education to include preschool children
7. Lead in efforts to ensure that every school system requires music from kindergarten through grade six and for a minimum of two years beyond that level
8. Lead in efforts to ensure that every secondary school offers an array of music courses to meet of all youth
9. Promote challenging courses in music for the general college student

-
10. Advocate the expansion of music education for adults both in and out of school
 - *11. Develop standards to ensure that all music instruction is provided by teachers well prepared in music
 12. Encourage the improvement and continuous updating of preservice and inservice education program for all persons who teach music programs and in the certification of music teachers
 - *13. Expand its programs to secure greater involvement and commitment of student members
 14. Assist graduate schools in developing curricula especially designed for the preparation of teachers
 15. Develop and recommend accreditation criteria for the use of recognized agencies in the approval of school and college music
 16. Support the expansion of teach education programs to include specializations designed to meet current needs
 - *17. Assume leadership in the application of significant new developments in curriculum, teaching-learning techniques and technology, instructional and staffing patters, evaluation, and related topics to every area and level of music teaching
 18. Assume leadership in the development of resources for music teaching and learning
 19. Cooperate in the development of exemplary models of desirable programs and practices in the teaching of music
 20. Encourage maximum use of community music resources to enhance educational programs
 - *21. Lead in efforts to ensure that every school system allocates sufficient staff, time, and funds to support a comprehensive and excellent music program
 22. Provide advisory assistance where music programs are threatened by legislative, administrative, or other action
 23. Conduct public relations programs to build community support for music education
 24. Promote the conduct of research and research-related activities in music education
 25. Disseminate news of research in order that research findings may be applied promptly and effectively
 26. Determine the most urgent needs for information in music education
 27. Gather and disseminate information about music and education
 28. Encourage other organization, agencies, and communications media to gather and disseminate information about music and education
 29. Initiate efforts to establish information retrieval systems in music and education, and to develop data bases for subsequent incorporation into such systems
 30. Pursue effective working relationships with organizations and groups having mutual interests
 31. Strengthen the relationships between the conference and its federated, associated, and auxiliary organizations
 32. Establish procedures for its organizational program planning and policy
 33. Seek to expand its membership to include all persons who, in any capacity, teach music
 34. Periodically evaluate the effectiveness of its policies and programs
 35. Ensure systematic interaction with its membership concerning the goals and objectives of the conference

*Priority objectives