

Reading material for Higher Education and the Real World of Practice:  
Creating a New Alignment

**Section 1 The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP):  
New National Project to Examine Impact of Arts Training**

**Section 2 The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project Project Description**

**Section 3 Aspen Music Festival and School - Symposium 2005  
BRINGING TOGETHER THE WORLDS OF MUSIC  
TRAINING AND PERFORMANCE**

## **STRATEGIC NATIONAL ARTS ALUMNI PROJECT (SNAAP)**

Tracking the Lives and Careers of Arts Graduates in America

### **New National Project to Examine Impact of Arts Training**

**The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP)** was launched May 1, 2008 to examine the impact of arts training. It will provide a first-ever in-depth look at the factors that help or hinder the careers of graduates of arts high schools, arts colleges and conservatories, and arts schools and departments within universities, whether the alumni work as artists or pursue other paths.

Arts alumni who graduated 5, 10, 15 and 20 years earlier will provide information about their formal arts training. They will report the nature of their current arts involvement, reflect on the relevance of arts training to their work and further education, and describe turning points, obstacles, and key relationships and opportunities that influenced their lives and careers.

The results of the annual online survey and data analysis system will help schools strengthen their programs of study by tracking what young artists need to advance in their fields. In addition, the information will allow institutions to compare their performance against other schools in order to identify areas where improvements are needed. "SNAAP will allow arts education institutions to assess their effectiveness and help them better prepare their students for the careers they enter - in the arts or not," says Mary Schmidt Campbell, Dean, Tisch School of the Arts, New York University.

The Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research will administer the annual survey in cooperation with the Curb Center for Art, Enterprise and Public Policy at Vanderbilt University. Steven J. Tepper, Curb Center associate director, says "SNAAP is a milestone for cultural policy research, because it will go beyond profiles of individual artists and provide a comprehensive look at the creative workforce in America and the critical role of training institutions in preparing artists and creative workers." The project will be guided by a National Advisory Board comprised of leaders from all types and levels of arts training institutions, visual and performing artists, and arts and community development leaders from the nonprofit and commercial sectors.

Arts-training institutions and civic policy makers need good data to respond and plan effectively. Artists often don't end up working in the exact fields in which they trained. Instead, they may work at the boundaries between disciplines. They frequently move between the nonprofit and commercial sectors and hold multiple jobs. Moreover, there is a growing demand for arts training, both from students and the rising number of employers in the creative economy. "More than any arts education project in the past few decades, SNAAP has the potential to guide needed change in the curriculum," says James Undercofler, president and CEO of the Philadelphia Orchestra.

Over time, SNAAP findings will allow institutions to learn more about the impact of their educational programs to better understand, for example, how students in different majors use their arts training in their careers and other aspects of their lives. Policy makers and community leaders will be able to use SNAAP findings to understand local, regional and national arts workforce issues and market patterns. The results will also indicate how students who have trained intensively in the arts contribute to their communities and different areas of the economy.

According to George Kuh, Indiana University professor and SNAAP project director, the arts alumni survey will be extensively field-tested in 2008 and 2009 with as many as 100 institutions before its first national administration in 2010. "We'll learn a lot about what matters in arts training from these early results and also be able to fine-tune the survey for future use," stated Kuh. The Vanderbilt University Curb Center will host a national conference in 2010 to explore the educational and cultural policy implications of SNAAP findings.

After several years of studying the need for and feasibility of the project, the Surdna Foundation recently awarded a five-year \$2,500,000 leadership grant to help launch the project. Phillip Henderson, Surdna Foundation President, believes that SNAAP will be "one of the signature accomplishments of our foundation in this decade, and its value to arts training institutions will only increase over time."

"For the first time, SNAAP results will allow us to see how high-quality, deep training in the arts guides professional careers of creative American citizens," says Sarah Bainter Cunningham, Arts Education Director at the National Endowment for the Arts.

In addition to Surdna and the National Endowment for the Arts, support from other funders is anticipated to support the testing phases of the project and insure widespread participation. SNAAP is expected to become self-sustaining through institutional participation fees by 2012.

###

The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP) is based at the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, School of Education, 1900 East Tenth Street, Suite 419, Bloomington IN 47406-7512.

For more information, contact Sally Gaskill, SNAAP Associate Director, at [gaskill@indiana.edu](mailto:gaskill@indiana.edu) or 812-856-0735. The SNAAP website is [www.snaap.iub.edu](http://www.snaap.iub.edu).

# The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project

## What is the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP)?

SNAAP is an online survey system to collect, track, and disseminate national data about the artistic lives and careers of alumni who trained as visual, performing, or literary artists at both the high school and college levels. As an ongoing research system, it will allow education institutions, researchers and arts leaders to look at the systemic factors that help or hinder the career paths of alumni, whether they chose to work as artists or pursued other paths. SNAAP will be administered as an annual survey of alumni at specified junctures at 5, 10, 15 and 20 years following their institutionally-based arts training. Once fully operational, SNAAP findings will allow for national and other comparisons and can be disaggregated in various other ways so that institutions can better understand, for example, how students in different majors use their arts training in their careers and other aspects of their lives.

## Who in general will benefit from SNAAP?

Information gathered through SNAAP will benefit arts training institutions, policy makers, and arts leaders, as well as parents and students considering intensive arts training. The information will provide the first national profile of how artists prepare in this country and allow for deepened understanding of what constitutes artistic success and contribution. In addition, data gathered through SNAAP will assist government entities, funding organizations, and arts leaders in making investment decisions in education, training and resource allocation.

## Why is SNAAP important now?

Arts training institutions have articulated an urgent need for objective data. The information that SNAAP will provide is especially timely given the changing environment in which arts training institutions operate: career opportunities are shifting, competition for both students and resources is on the rise, and a generational shift in leadership is underway. Institutions require data to respond and plan effectively. Accreditation requirements also include data regarding alumni paths.

## How will key groups benefit from SNAAP?

**For arts high schools, arts colleges and conservatories, SNAAP will provide information to:**

- improve institutional hires, address alumni needs and enhance development efforts
- strengthen curriculum by tracking what striving young artists need to advance in rapidly changing arts fields
- clarify what students learned and how it has been used in both arts and non-arts contexts
- compare their work to that of similar institutions to identify strengths and gaps
- learn more about the institutions from which their students came to create more productive learning links and better match students to institutions

**For policy makers, community development professionals, and funders, SNAAP will provide systemic information about:**

- what led artists to pursue careers in the arts and other fields, including financing and other resource factors
- local and regional arts workforce issues and market patterns for community developers and planners
- how students who have trained intensively in the arts contribute to the creative economy nationally and by specific locale
- gaps in the arts training ecology, across disciplines, at different training junctures and across various geographic locales
- support mechanisms and resources needed to encourage and sustain artists in their most vulnerable five years after school and beyond

**For parents and students considering intensive arts training, SNAAP will provide information about:**

- arts career paths
- educational resources
- the roles of professional relationships, and
- obstacles to achieving arts training and professional goals

### **Who will be surveyed?**

SNAAP's primary clients are all arts high schools, arts and design colleges and conservatories, and arts schools and departments within comprehensive colleges and universities. We will survey alumni who graduated 5, 10, 15, and 20 years earlier from the arts training programs that participate in SNAAP.

### **What kinds of questions will the SNAAP survey ask?**

- early interests and training as well as current involvement in the arts
- types of art practiced and how often
- current and past careers and education
- relevance of arts training to work and further education
- turning points, obstacles, critical relationships and opportunities
- support and resource needs post graduation
- experiences as teachers
- current family situations
- unions and other professional affiliations
- income and support, student debt, other fiscal issues
- career impact and influence of faculty and staff, other artists, classmates, family, friends, co-workers, and other arts professionals

### **How will SNAAP data be collected?**

SNAAP is a web-based survey that collects data from alumni through questions that make use of drop-down menus and check boxes. A unique feature of the survey instrument is that it creates a "Life Map" for each respondent upon survey completion, which provides a visual representation of the impact of various professional, educational and personal experiences on career development. The survey has been specifically developed to reflect the non-linear nature of arts training and careers and to be user-friendly. Without influencing responses, respondents can obtain real-time comparisons between their answers to specific questions and those of other survey respondents.

### **SNAAP funders**

To launch SNAAP, the Surdna Foundation provided a five-year \$2,500,000 leadership grant to Indiana University in partnership with the Curb Center for Art, Enterprise and Public Policy at Vanderbilt University. The National Endowment for the Arts has committed \$60,000 for 2007-2008 with an invitation to submit proposals for additional future funding. Support from other organizations is anticipated to support the various phases of the project and insure widespread participation. SNAAP is expected to become self-sustaining by 2012 by institutional participation fees.

-----

The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP) is based at the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research, School of Education, 1900 East Tenth Street, Eigenmann Hall, Suite 419, Bloomington IN 47406-7512. For more information contact Sally Gaskill at 812.856.0735 or [snaap@indiana.edu](mailto:snaap@indiana.edu) or visit the SNAAP website: [www.snaap.iub.edu](http://www.snaap.iub.edu).



**Aspen Music Festival and School – Symposium 2005**  
**BRINGING TOGETHER THE WORLDS OF MUSIC**  
**TRAINING AND PERFORMANCE**  
**July 15–July 17, 2005**  
**Aspen Institute**

*Facilitated by EmcArts Inc.*



## **EmcArts Inc.**

EmcArts Inc. is a tax-exempt consulting firm (formerly Emc.Arts, LLC). In response to the needs of the arts and culture sector, we have built a service organization of experienced consultants to support our primary mission: to strengthen the capacities and effectiveness of arts organizations.

EmcArts services fall into three broad organization development areas: Innovation and Capacity Building; Evaluation and Research; and Strategic Planning. With our clients, EmcArts creates solutions that stimulate real, long-term change. Our programs generate knowledge, develop networks, increase the effectiveness of local cultural systems, and build high-performance organizations.

### **Team for Aspen Symposium 2005**

Richard Evans, President and Project Director  
Melissa Dibble, Director of Client Partnerships  
Christopher Gentile, Project Manager  
Helen Graves, Writer/Editor



## Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	1
<b>Symposium Participants</b>	3
<b>Summary of Keynote Address</b>	5
<b>Proceedings</b>	6
Opening the Symposium	
Breakout discussions on key topics	
Synthesis of emerging issues	
Communication in the future	
<b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A	Symposium Agenda
Appendix B	Participant Biographies
Appendix C	Keynote Address – Full Text
Appendix D	Summary of Planning Group Proceedings
Appendix E	Digest of eSymposium

*(Copies of the Appendices are available upon request from  
MDibble@EmcArts.org)*



## INTRODUCTION

Serious concerns about the future of classical music, classical music training, symphony orchestras, and other presenters of classical music in North America are being raised with ever-greater urgency by those inside and outside the field (even in newspapers and magazines that no longer publish reviews of performances or recordings).

One matter on which there is consensus is the inevitability of change. But how to achieve change, what it will consist of, whether or not it can be positive – these are all fiercely debated topics.

A gap too frequently exists between the worlds of professional musician training and music performance, because their institutions rarely interact. Yet the larger field requires dialogue in order to bring about growth and vitality.

EmcArts believes that, in order to address effectively the major challenges that classical music faces in the 21st century, it is essential to stimulate dialogue and, ultimately, establish permanent channels of communication between these two sets of major players.

Such dialogue was the aim of *Bringing Together the Worlds of Musician Training and Music Performance*, a Symposium held in July 2005, sponsored by the Aspen Music Festival and School (AMFS) and developed in partnership with EmcArts Inc. in New York City. AMFS was the ideal sponsor for an event that brought together leaders in both sectors to share concerns, ideas, challenges, and criticisms, and to articulate ways to continue and enrich the conversation. The organization “lives” in both fields, bringing together classical music’s great educators and performers annually for its 9-week festival and school season.

### **Phase 1 – Initial planning, May 2004**

In the Symposium’s first phase, funded by the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, a Planning Group was composed of 12 leaders from relevant fields – including symphony orchestras, conservatories, colleges, community music schools, arts education programs, presenting, composing, and performance. The group met for two days in New York City, raising questions and topics that were challenging and provocative. Their dialogue was candid, mixing realism and idealism and ultimately producing a set of key topics for consideration in the full Symposium (these topics are summarized in an earlier report which appears in *Appendix D*).

### **Phase 2 – The Symposium – July 2005**

From July 15–17, 2005, a group of 21 leaders gathered at the Aspen Institute, under the auspices of AMFS, for two days of presentations, full-group discussions, and breakout sessions. The purpose of the Symposium was articulated as follows:

*To identify ways for individuals and organizations committed to music training and performance to communicate better, share a stronger sense of common purpose, and foster effective change across the field.*



A summary of their work appears below; the agenda appears in *Appendix A*. In addition, during the four days preceding the Symposium, participants were invited to take part in an online discussion aimed at exploring in advance the issues and questions posed by the Symposium. A digest of the discussion appears in *Appendix E*).



## SYMPOSIUM PARTICIPANTS

### Keynote Speaker

---

James DePreist      Laureate Music Director of the Oregon Symphony, Portland, OR; Principal Artistic Advisor of the Phoenix Symphony, Phoenix, AZ; Director of Conducting and Orchestral Studies at the Juilliard School, New York, NY; Permanent Conductor of the Tokyo Metropolitan Symphony Orchestra, Tokyo, Japan

### Symposium Participants

---

Eric Booth            Author, Consultant, Speaker, Everyday Arts, Inc., High Falls, NY

Robert Capanna     Executive Director, Settlement Music School, Philadelphia, PA

Robert Cole          Director, Cal Performances, University of California at Berkeley; General Director of the Berkeley Festival & Exhibition, Berkeley, CA

Robert Cutietta     Dean, Thornton School of Music, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

Jon Deak             Associate Principal Bassist and Creative Education Associate, New York Philharmonic, New York, NY

Henry Fogel         President & CEO, American Symphony Orchestra League, New York, NY

James Gandre        Dean and Professor of Voice, Chicago College of Performing Arts of Roosevelt University, Chicago, IL

David Geber          Cellist; Associate Dean of Performance and Chairman of Strings, Manhattan School of Music; Faculty member, Aspen Music Festival and School, Aspen, CO

Joan Gordon          Dean, Aspen Music Festival and School, Aspen, CO

John Graham         Professor of Viola, Eastman School of Music; Faculty member, Aspen Music Festival and School, Aspen, CO

David Halen          Concertmaster, Saint Louis Symphony Orchestra, St. Louis, MO; Faculty member, Aspen Music Festival and School, Aspen, CO

Libby Larsen         Composer, Minneapolis, MN

Raymond Mase        Trumpet and Chamber Music faculty member, Juilliard School, New York, NY; Faculty member, Aspen Music Festival and School, Aspen, CO

Tania McGee         Director of Education & Community Affairs, Sphinx Organization, Detroit, MI

Derek Mithaug       Director, Office of Career Development, Juilliard School, New York, NY

Patricia Nott          Vice President & Dean of Musicians, New World Symphony, Miami Beach, FL



Don Roth	Former President, Aspen Music Festival and School, Aspen, CO
Greg Sandow	Member of Graduate Studies Faculty, Juilliard School, New York, NY
Joan Tower	Composer, Annandale-on-Hudson, NY
Allison Vulgamore	President & Managing Director, Atlanta Symphony Orchestra, Atlanta, GA

### **Observing Guests**

---

Cheryl Ikemiya	Program Officer for the Arts, Doris Duke Foundation
Diane Ragsdale	Program Associate in the Performing Arts, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, NY
Melinda Whiting	Editor in Chief, <i>Symphony</i> , and Director of Publications, American Symphony Orchestra League, New York, NY

### **Facilitators**

---

Richard Evans	President, EmcArts Inc.
Melissa Dibble	Director of Client Partnerships, EmcArts Inc.
Christopher Gentile	Client Partnerships Associate, EmcArts Inc.
Helen Graves	Writer/Editor, EmcArts Inc.



*A brief biography of each participant appears in Appendix B.*



## SUMMARY OF KEYNOTE ADDRESS

As the Symposium began, James DePreist delivered a keynote address that emphasized the importance, for both presenting and training institutions, of genuine engagement with audiences and with other community members. As the field moves forward with such efforts, and with its endeavor to undertake deeper engagement and to establish better communication and understanding between presenting and training institutions, *“We have to be far more inventive in what we do, and in which people we bring to the table.”* The unions, in particular, must be part of discussions about changes that can be made in the protocols for training and auditioning, and for encouraging musicians to approach their careers with a sense of purpose and innovation.

One key to forward progress, DePreist remarked, will be the development of a new business model – one in which music and musicians are constantly present in the community, in many different venues, so that residents feel a sense of ownership in the presenting institution that is making this possible. *“You can’t assume that people are going to come to your ivory tower.”*

*“How,”* asked DePreist, *“do we change a culture in which everything that is prized is fast?”* The majority of people, he noted *“haven’t got the foggiest idea of what we’re doing or why it’s important to support it.”*

One answer to the constant question of how to achieve change is this: A genuine and lively relationship with audience members helps institutions, even the most traditional ones, diversify – in terms of both the music they offer and the populations they reach. In order to make this relationship with the audience work, however, it cannot be only the artistic and administrative staff members who are involved. The Board of Directors has to be supportive and the Education and Marketing departments must adopt new practices as well. DePreist cautioned that changes in marketing practices must be well-conceived and aimed at the long term. *“Gimmicks may work, but I guarantee you they will be short-lived.”*

DePriest went on to speak about the importance of instilling a passion for music in students, which they will carry forward into adult life. He recalled his own youth, when the Director of Music at Philadelphia’s Board of Education was *“ruthless”* in ensuring that high-quality music education was available throughout the city’s schools. *“When I went back many years later to conduct the Philadelphia Orchestra, 35 of the players in that orchestra had been in their Philadelphia high school orchestras.”*

Ultimately, DePreist argued, *“Dollars are merely a symptom of support. What you have to do when you go into a community is raise not money but consciousness.”* When people are aware of their orchestra and invested in its success, barriers begin to fall away.



*The full text of the Keynote Address appears in Appendix C.*



# PROCEEDINGS

## Opening the Symposium

### Framing the discussion

---

*“What do we hope to achieve?”*

In order to fulfill the Symposium’s purpose, for those working in both music training and performance, the facilitators proposed that the participants should work toward four outcomes:

1. A shared vision of what a vital engagement with music could mean for the future
2. A set of strategies for the field as a whole to consider for pursuing effective change
3. Some new definitions of success
4. Personal commitments to new leadership activities back home

The work of the participants, stated Richard Evans of EmcArts, would begin with their initial sense of priorities for the future. The work would then move through strategies for change, to reach consensus on key leverage points and ideas for personal follow-up.

### Priorities

---

Participants articulated a variety of priorities. The one that was stated most emphatically was the need for an examination and greater understanding of the relationships between the people who make music, those who manage and support them, and those who educate musicians. *“These groups,”* one participant maintained, *“are fairly far out of alignment.”*

It was noted that there are entrenched and innovative views on both sides, in schools and music producing organizations. While wonderful innovations are taking place (as described in a recent article in *Symphony* magazine), it will be important to consider whether particular innovations are real or whether they are *“a reconfiguration of old ways of doing things.”*

One point emphasized was that – although most of the representatives of performing organizations who were at the table in Aspen came from symphony orchestras – orchestras should not and indeed could not be the only entities considered in discussions about the production and presentation of art music. *“The kinds of music performance under consideration have to include ballet, opera, chamber music, and other music,”* stated a participant. Others agreed. One added, *“There are a multiplicity of roles for musicians, and we would be making a big mistake if we limited our discussion to just one set of roles.”* Another underlined this by pointing out that there is *“a tendency to conflate the problems and challenges of symphony orchestras with the problems and challenges of the field as a whole”* – and that this group should be alert to that danger. A participant whose activities include teaching pointed out that many music students are not considering careers in orchestras: *“What I get from my students is an increasing reluctance to follow a traditional career path. They are looking at more entrepreneurial pursuits.”*



There were a number of suggestions about ways to achieve real, lasting improvements. Several participants had specific ideas, proposing, for example, that one way to make music relevant in the 21st century is to increase the involvement of living composers in the field. They argued that if musicians, administrators, and audience members do not have a “way in” to new music, classical music will become increasingly marginalized, rather than a central component of America’s burgeoning and diverse cultural scene. Others referred to James DePreist’s statement that a new business model will be necessary if performing organizations are to survive; one suggested that “*new delivery systems*,” such as satellite radio, may be a valuable way to “*get new music to niche audiences*.” Even as niche audiences were discussed, however, there was general agreement that it is urgent to “*share the joy of our art with the next generation*.”

Typical discussions about musician training were characterized as too narrow. It is important, participants affirmed, to be aware of the whole arc of a musician’s training – “*Not just the conservatory ‘chunk’ but the whole continuum*.” And: “*It is always important to bear in mind that we are training students who play orchestral instruments, not necessarily those who play in orchestras*.” One participant asked, “*How do you train a student to enter a field that is in crisis?*” – but there was not consensus that the field is in fact in crisis. Rather, there was agreement that each of the individuals and institutions that make up the field must move forward, and do so in as positive and transparent a manner as possible, if crisis is to be avoided.

Ultimately, one orchestra administrator remarked, “*I would like to know what new success looks like and what new failures look like*” in a field that has benefited from new business models, and where training and performing institutions are in full communication.



## Breakout discussions on key topics

Following their opening discussion, the participants formed six breakout groups to discuss topics related to the Symposium's theme. Each group was asked to consider several questions:

- ◆ Why is change needed in this area?
- ◆ What innovations are working?
- ◆ What do we need for these and other innovations to spread system-wide?

### 1 – Roles of musicians in performing institutions

The participants in this breakout session cited a number of reasons for pursuing change in this area. First, performing organizations need to overcome the prevailing lack of internal alignment among musicians, board members, and staff. If they do so, they will operate more efficiently and effectively. And they will be better positioned to address the concerns of community members, who *“demand not only artistic excellence, but also learning and engagement.”* One participant suggested that, in symphony orchestras at least, there is too much “product” of a single type; there needs to be more diversity in what is on offer. This would benefit not only audiences but the musicians, who are more fulfilled professionally when there is variety in their work. Also, in order to achieve greater artistic diversity, *“performing organizations should become more hospitable to composers, to ensure both creativity in the ensemble and high-quality performances of new music.”*

What innovations are working (and, when relevant, where)? Responses included the following:

- ◆ The “resident musician” concept (pioneered by the Saint Louis Symphony Orchestra), with its different mix of rehearsal, performance, solo work, education, community activities, public speaking, etc. – all of which empower the musician to define his/her own role within an orchestra
- ◆ Musicians playing an expanded role in orchestra governance and in strategy development (as they do at the New York Philharmonic)
- ◆ Internal processes within orchestras that bring stakeholders together productively (some of these are beginning to involve community representatives as well)
- ◆ The development of a performing institution's ability to discuss changes in musician roles over time, rather than only dealing with this at crisis moments

In order to stimulate the widespread adoption of these and other innovations, the participants agreed that a system should be in place to define, track, and demonstrate the success of new roles for musicians in strengthening orchestras (and other performing institutions) and their service to communities. This system will develop through stronger communication between performing institutions, and among performing and training institutions and service organizations – communication that is specifically designed to share innovations and success. Regional planning meetings will be forums to cross-fertilize and implement ideas. The effort would benefit, as well, from the



establishment of a network of mentors to strengthen the role of composers in orchestras, to encourage diversity, and to act as change agents.

Challenges that have to be overcome include resistance to change – on the part of many constituents, including audiences – and the difficulties attendant on redesigning programming to embrace new and different kinds of music.

## 2 – Educating the whole musician

---

Change is necessary in this area, the breakout participants maintained, because too often musicians are not trained to be creative. Orchestra environments, in particular, can be unhappy, with very few people “*resonating with the benefits of a life spent making music.*” Meanwhile, orchestras and other performing institutions increasingly expect their members to have a wide range of skills – yet none have changed their admission requirements. There needs to be far stronger alignment in this area.

Conservatory faculty are not yet convinced that building entrepreneurial skills will not compromise their students’ instrumental skills. But it is absolutely essential for students to acquire those entrepreneurial skills in order to flourish as musicians in the 21st century. A large percentage of conservatory graduates do not end up playing in symphony orchestras (or only in symphony orchestras). They work in other groups and venues, with many becoming teachers as well as performers. These graduates must have a broad range of skills in order to succeed, both financially and artistically.

Participants identified some innovations that are working, including the following:

- ◆ Programs that develop entrepreneurial skills, such as Eastman and the Cal Arts REDCAT program
- ◆ Ensuring relevancy of the repertoire:
  - At Settlement Music School, advanced studies include new music ensembles
  - At Eastman, student-led ensembles focus on new or baroque music
- ◆ The sound of ensembles is changing – for example, Pink Martini’s combination of the electronic and acoustic sound palette
- ◆ Master teacher / student relationships that convey “*multiple expertise*” – for example, Rice University faculty member James Dunham is an example of the “whole musician”
- ◆ Players of relatively “*marginal*” instruments – harp, double bass, viola, et al. – are more open to multiple possibilities for performance
- ◆ Achieving sustainability is difficult but possible – the New York Philharmonic has had excellent results in networking with key gatekeepers, and in fundraising, and may establish an endowment for its educational programming

It is vital to propagate innovations that will encourage the development of more young musicians who take a holistic, entrepreneurial approach in thinking about their art and their careers. The breakout participants suggested a series of changes in practice.

In the area of early childhood music education, the participants called for more professional development for teachers, so that, for example, those teachers can convey



the impact of arts learning to their colleagues. It would also be valuable to undertake research on the progress of children who have participated in Head Start's music programming – and to disseminate the findings throughout the early childhood community.

In community music schools, the needs that were identified included “*highly motivated and charismatic instructors*” and additional “*musician resources*” in the community. These schools must strive, the group stated, to become an integral part of the fabric of their communities.

The most significant adjustments that were proposed had to do with changing the attitudes of gatekeepers – particularly to bring about changes in the admissions requirements to a broad range of programs and institutions. “*We need to establish entrance requirements for colleges, competitions, and summer programs that reflect the skills that are truly desired in a mature musician,*” declared one participant. A colleague added that more communication is needed during the application process to conservatories and colleges about skill requirements (such as music theory and communications ability). It would also be valuable if more colleges and conservatories offered preparatory training to high school students.

All agreed that, ultimately, the turning point will come when performing institutions adopt new criteria for hiring. They also stressed that conservatory leaders will have to undertake intensive work with their faculty members to ensure a more widespread understanding of the need for building entrepreneurial skills as well as artistry.

### **3 – Professional development for musicians**

---

According to participants, the primary reason for musicians and the institutions they represent to acquire stronger communication skills is to achieve more meaningful, lasting engagement with audiences and the general public. Presenters are creating a demand for artists to undertake meaningful education and community-based activities, yet many musicians are unprepared:

*Arts presenters will ask groups if they're willing to do outreach. Then, on the way to the school or nursing home, a musician will ask, "What should we play?"*

And too often, the sharing of information is ancillary to other activities, rather than being regular and systematic. One reason for this may be widespread resistance to professional development, by faculty at training institutions, and by professional musicians. Both students and mature artists tend to believe that they do not need training. But “*few have experienced community engagement done right,*” and participants argued that change in this area would result in more satisfying careers for musicians.

Some participants pointed out that professional development is not needed just in the area of communication. Many musicians would benefit from training in conflict resolution and team building.

There have been various innovations and shifts in thinking that have furthered the professional development of musicians in recent years:



- ◆ Employment interviews that address an individual musician's interests  
*In Phoenix, Michael Christie has held a meeting with each musician, to ask, "What do you desire personally as a musician, and as a member of this ensemble?"*
- ◆ Musicians serving as valued members of Board committees (as at the New York Philharmonic and elsewhere)
- ◆ A growing perception of teaching – in multiple settings, including Aspen – as a form of professional development for individual musicians
- ◆ Individual musicians speaking in support of fundraising, from the stage and in other venues (examples include the Pittsburgh Symphony and St. Paul Chamber Orchestra)

*Musicians with the St. Paul Chamber Orchestra get up and deliver fundraising pitches to audiences. They are trained by coaches. I am sure that orchestras would be thrilled if that kind of engagement with audiences was taught in schools.*

- ◆ Programming at training institutions that brings faculty members together  
*A recent cross-disciplinary mentoring program for faculty at Juilliard provided a venue for productive exchange – so that, while the program's purpose was not professional development for faculty, that was an outcome.*

If these and similar developments are to take hold throughout the field, participants stressed that the field must directly address the needs and aspirations of young musicians. In order to persuade them to embrace professional development, it is vitally important that we always remember to celebrate the growing and evolving professional artist.

Every musician has an individual path to follow throughout his/her life and career; there is no one model. Rather than framing career development as something with a negative connotation – “You’ll need this if you fail” – we must make it clear that such training allows musicians to make choices now and in the future, and to take charge of their own careers.

What needs to be done? Make sure that everyone disseminates and receives “*information, information, information!*” at gatherings such as conferences of professional affinity groups. The breakout participants emphasized that we must share what we know and what is happening in the field, and that we have to find or establish centralized places to do this. It may be useful, one proposed, to cluster similar programs and examine them, in order to discern the most meaningful trends – those that may become productive norms.

#### **4 – Educating creative artists from an early age**

---

*When we nurture and value the artistic abilities of a child, the results will generally return to us a thousand-fold when the child matures. If we do not do this work with children, we will be totally lost.*

This breakout discussion addressed two areas of music education:



- ◆ Programs and approaches that might benefit every child
- ◆ Programs for children who have reached a higher level of skill and need more sophisticated training

The participants cited the well-known dearth of music instruction in public schools as a primary reason to ensure wider access to high-quality early training.

Efforts that are being made to address the need for better and more widespread music education include programs that are based on Howard Gardner's model of multiple intelligences, encouraging each child to take on four roles: creator, performer, audience member, and/or critic. Some school districts have adopted this framework in the creation of standards in music education.

In addition, there has been notable growth across the country in the number and size of community schools of music, which provide a wide range of children with access to music training.

*These programs are not talent-based. The thinking behind the community school movement is that we should not exclude anyone from music based on perceptions of their talent, because the majority who do not pursue careers in music will continue to be involved with music in different ways (including as audience members).*

Specific examples of programs that are reaching children in innovative ways include the following:

- ◆ The Vermont MIDI project, which has involved several hundred teachers in teaching composition, using minicomputers that offer kids basic composition programs
- ◆ The New York Philharmonic's school partnerships program, which encompasses live music and one-on-one instruction – *"All of the children read music and compose. One-on-one contact validates a sense of personal creativity."*
- ◆ The Head Start program sponsored by Wolf Trap which trains teachers in artistic play as a key part of early instruction and functioning
- ◆ Inner-city schoolchildren receiving music instruction from conservatory students (Eastman and Juilliard have such programs)

In order to promote effective work in this area, participants called for ongoing tracking of successful programs – so that public interest and good will for this kind of instruction will grow. This should be accompanied by advocacy for more public investment: *"'Every child' means many people and a lot of money, which will have to be public money."* Steps that were proposed included wider "adoption" of schools by orchestras and other performing arts organizations, and more professional development for teachers and early childhood instructors.

## 5 – Institutional entry requirements

---

Why are adjustments needed for the process of bringing musicians into performing institutions? Participants agreed that these organizations want to be relevant to their audiences and their communities – *"to be needed!"* This will require musicians who have a broad range of skill sets and interests – not only the performance of music in a



traditional setting, but the necessary interest and capacity to be involved in and with the community, and to undertake other activities that are important to a given orchestra.

They also stated that the field should be encouraging a broader, more diverse range of talent to audition. Members of the group argued that some highly skilled musicians do not feel welcome at auditions – particularly orchestra auditions – because of ethnicity, age, or other perceived barriers. Musicians of color, in particular, encounter situations where they would be in a small minority (often alone, in fact); the “message” they take away from this is that they are not wanted. In addition, it can be costly to travel to auditions, which creates another, socioeconomic barrier.

*Talented young musicians of color frequently do not audition because they don't feel they have a good chance, that someone is already slotted for the job. Also, they don't see themselves represented, and they don't want to be the only black person and the only young person in an orchestra.*

How can these issues be addressed? Some current practices were cited:

- ◆ Conductor auditions already include an assessment of multiple offstage skills as well as onstage performance, and other auditions could adopt this model
- ◆ The Saint Paul Chamber Orchestra has achieved innovations in the areas of bargaining and contracts with musicians, allowing for more flexibility and a stronger sense of collaboration
- ◆ In Europe, some institutions have a “farm system” that nurtures local talent “from earliest involvement in music” (the Vienna Philharmonic was cited)
- ◆ In regional European orchestras, the audition repertoire is not only orchestral but includes chamber music, et al.

Participants suggested other changes that might be considered. First, reimbursement for travel to auditions should be considered. Some hope to see “more interactions with candidates in the final round,” so that the finalists might, for example, play chamber music and/or sit in with the orchestra for a period of time. After all, “we are looking for colleagues” – so meaningful exchange with orchestra members should take place. In the interest of identifying those colleagues, some members of the group suggested probation periods during which feedback would be given regularly (not just when there is a problem) and the musician’s value could be carefully assessed: “Players should be positioned so that they can be heard by the music director and principals.”

Participants who proposed these shifts went on to state emphatically that they were not proposing that quality, in terms of musical performance, should be compromised. But they believe that the future success of performing organizations will depend on their capacity to respond substantively to community needs.

There is no question, they stressed, that auditions must continue to honor the process that initially assesses the quality of performance. However, that assessment could be followed by a finals process that would encompass determinations about wider skill sets needed – such as flexibility of performance practices and styles, as well as interests and ability in the areas of community engagement, education, et al. These skills sets would



very among organizations, depending on their needs – so each organization should individually determine what is expected, explained, and tested at its auditions.

Moving this forward would require “*clearly articulated audition requirements, defined by the needs of each specific orchestra and community.*” It would also require respectful negotiation with musicians’ representatives to bring about the broad agreement that would be necessary to enact such changes.

## **6 – Building the music of our time into all aspects of the profession**

---

Contemporary composers and contemporary music exist in the margins of the classical music field – even though contemporary work is key to the vitality of serious composed music. Performing institutions are often reluctant to program new music. Musicians are often unable to perform new pieces optimally, because rehearsal time tends to be limited when it should, in fact, be extended. And existing audiences at performing institutions (with the exception of dance audiences) are not embracing the idea of new music – though they often like specific new works.

As one of the group’s members pointed out, there are not “*three easy answers*” that will ensure that contemporary art music and composers will become more fully integrated into the infrastructure of American performing institutions. There have, however, been many innovative efforts to do so.

Most notably, of course, Meet the Composer sponsored the Orchestra Residencies program from 1982–92, partnering 21 major American orchestras with composers – most of whom were in residence for three years. During the course of the program, there were 33 residencies. It was followed by the New Residencies program, which paired composers and community partners (always including an arts organization). Symposium participants Jon Deak, Libby Larsen, and Joan Tower were among the composers who participated in MTC’s programs.

Existing innovations that were cited included the following:

- ◆ Composers curating programs that are not primarily of their own music – thus highlighting the living composer as a musical expert with wide sympathies (institutions that have invited composers to do this include the London Sinfonietta and South Bank Centre)
- ◆ Composers working closely with youth orchestras

*There are hundreds of youth orchestras in this country, and they provide formative ground training for young musicians. Minneapolis Youth Orchestra performs a work by a local composer on each concert program.*
- ◆ Composers acting as amateurs, working with young people on the composition of both their own and the children’s music (as happened during some Meet the Composer residencies)

Participants described many other potential routes toward greater acceptance of the music of our time. Some of these focused on audience engagement – for example, building a sense of “ownership” in new music by engaging audiences in giving feedback



and then acting on that feedback. Audience members might also find new music more accessible if they could take part in two-way discussions after concerts, or hear more effective talks by composers or conductors (*“as Leonard Bernstein was doing 50 years ago”*). One participant suggested creating local audience “task forces” on new music.

In venues such as schools and youth orchestras, composers can act as amateurs, working with young people on the composition of both their own and the children’s music. One participant suggested that composers, musicians and leaders of music organizations convene with public school music teachers, to help determine how to meet the composition requirements in State Arts Standards for public schools. At the conservatory level, the participants believe that leading faculty could be encouraged to integrate contemporary composers and new music into their studio teaching. Some would like to see a composition requirement built into all undergraduate training curricula for performers, with students being required to perform a composition of their own in their final recitals.

Ideally, the concept of having a composer in residence at performing institutions and in communities should be revitalized (meanwhile, the participants expressed the hope that orchestras can be encouraged to treat composers with the same respect and service as they do guest conductors and soloists). An artistic *“research and development approach”* was proposed. Such a system for orchestras to integrate new work into their repertoire would include more rehearsal time for new works and musician feedback to composers. New works could be introduced most effectively if multiple organizations partnered to commission and “workshop” pieces.

Participants suggested that representative bodies and service organizations could work together to disseminate effective innovations and successes (among these might be the American Federation of Musicians, Meet the Composer, the American Composers Forum, American Music Center, and the American Symphony Orchestra League).

### **Discussion following the breakouts**

---

The facilitators noted that the Symposium was taking place because we want to have a stronger sense of common purpose. Along with the many specific suggestions that came from the breakouts, they asked, what common themes had emerged?

Most important, the Symposium participants said, is the need for performing and training institutions to be in ongoing, high-level communication. Performing institutions have suggested that there are certain kinds of skills that they want their musicians to have. *“If they start selecting for those skills, training institutions will start educating for them!”* Currently, a representative of a training institution said, there is an assumption that education is the way to achieve change – but until orchestras and other presenting organizations accept change, *“we are putting the cart before the horse.”*

One participant stated:

*We have to be consistent in the skills we say we want musicians to have, how we prepare them for their careers, and the way we select them for professional engagements. Of course it’s easy to say “yes” to the idea of being consistent, but we can’t just nod our*



*heads! The field has to embrace a specific set of steps and priorities that will make it possible for this to happen. This doesn't mean that I'm calling for a "straitjacket" system, though. There also has to be room for diversity.*

How should the field go about making organizations flexible and collaborative?

Prioritization was seen as key. The breakout groups presented "*big ideas*" that – if they are really carried out – will bring about major change. Some will necessarily precede others. Establishing a better relationship between performing institutions and the unions will be essential to ensuring that further steps can be taken. Indeed, "*so much of what we hope to see happen is going to require dialogue and changes in union contracts.*" For example, orchestra management cannot currently institute changes in the audition process without agreement from the unions.

Several of the participants expressed the belief that the impetus for change will come from union members. "*It needn't be a matter of negotiating in a 'take your medicine' sense! We need to work toward consensus among our constituencies.*"

An important leverage point will be making young musicians aware of the alternatives that exist to a career spent only playing in an orchestra. This, it was pointed out, is the space where the training sector can make an immediate difference, by imparting more knowledge. After all, one participant remarked, most people who go into orchestras do so part-time, and the vast majority of professional musicians in this country are not making their entire living by playing in orchestras.



## Synthesis of emerging issues

### “A Framework for Effecting System Change”

---

The beginning of the second day of the Symposium began with the remark, *“We have all come up with a lot of things that we think should change. Now we should come to an agreement about vibrant ways in which this process could move forward.”* The participants wanted to offer something to their colleagues throughout the field – that is, steps that can be taken that will formalize the ways in which performing and training institutions can undertake communication in the future.

The facilitators offered “A Framework for Effecting System Change,” based on dialogue that had taken place the previous day. It included the following elements:

1. **Bring new information into, and across, the system** – strengthen communication and develop new networks
2. **Make or break systemic links** – foster new partnerships and/or restructure existing influence patterns
3. **Influence gatekeepers of the system** – change the roles, attitudes, and choices of those who guard the values and culture of the field, and who approve or disapprove innovations
4. **Establish new norms** – change the rules and regulations governing the system
5. **Provide incentives for system change** – alter what is formally rewarded to be in line with desired changes

To many present, the elements in this Framework highlighted the need for ongoing communication and further convening. *“We don’t fully know what change looks like,”* said one participant. Another pointed out that the field is a highly complex system, which includes not only performing and training institutions, but also composers and individual performers, and a group whose desires had been addressed only glancingly: audiences.

There was general agreement that the Framework was valuable and, indeed, necessary. However, it was noted that, even within this group, there was a multiplicity of points of view about how to bring about change. Several participants described bottlenecks that will not allow changes to be made – unless specific issues around gate-keeping are addressed, within both performing and training institutions.

For example, one participant pointed out that ethnic diversity in the classical music field had not really been discussed during the course of the Symposium. *“It’s a big problem, because ethnically diverse communities are growing by leaps and bounds. There is much more that needs to be discussed in this area.”* Others agreed. One remarked that when the issue of ethnic diversity was first visited, in the 1980s, the question tended to be: What’s wrong with “them”? *“We have finally moved to a position where we are looking at ourselves, which is the only way to change.”*

It is important, participants stated, to continue to bear in mind that the orchestral world is *not* the world of music. *“Not all of us are training young people to be orchestra players. We*



are training them to be musicians.” While many symphonies are experiencing a decline in audiences, other kinds of music performance are not. Schools are not experiencing a decline in enrollment. And other kinds of music performance are flourishing:

*When we talk exclusively about symphony orchestras, I feel like a member of the board of General Motors sitting around and planning to produce more of the same product that we have been making – and which people don’t want. I’m devoted to 1,000 years of music, not just 200.*

However, participants agreed that it will always be the case that the training students receive is determined by norms in the field:

*We train to results. One result that may be desired is pursuing a career in a major symphony. Therefore, we need orchestras to clearly articulate their criteria for hiring new players. Students need that, because there is a surplus of highly qualified players.*

A key leverage point, therefore, will be enhancing “the ability of musicians to be aware of all the alternatives available to them.”

Members of the group pointed out that training and performing institutions are seeking to change without knowing exactly how to do so. The breakout discussions revealed “lots of little experiments going on around the edges,” but actual solutions will be harder-won:

*I keep thinking about how much dialogue this is going to take. How can we change our way of doing business without losing our hearts? These two days have given us poignantly little time to accomplish a profoundly important conversation.*

Participants expressed the desire for some real changes in communication strategies they could make upon returning to their institutions, and that they can share with colleagues at other organizations during gatherings and panels.

One remarked:

*The real accomplishment here is the beginning of a necessary dialogue. If this sort of thing repeats itself over and over again, there will be gradual but real progress in the relationship between training and performing institutions.*



## **“Leverage Points and Communication Channels”**

---

The facilitators presented a second document, “Leverage Points and Communication Channels,” which distilled a selection of proposals on these topics from the breakout sessions. The six “headlines” were as follows:

- 1. Auditions/entry process for orchestra musicians**
- 2. Structure of musician contracts in orchestras**
- 3. Scope of studio faculty teaching**
- 4. Curriculum requirements within musician training**
- 5. Systemic roles of the composer**
- 6. Local or regional community task forces**

Where, the facilitators asked, are the opportunities for communication and dialogue in each of these areas? Who are the key players who should be involved?

### **1. Auditions/entry process for orchestra musicians**

#### Possible initiatives

- ◆ Honor the process that initially assesses the quality of playing. Then add in a finals process that understands and can make determinations about wider skill sets needed, such as flexibility of performance practices/styles, and interest and abilities in the areas of community engagement, education, etc.
- ◆ Work toward a national agreement on a particular area of wider skills to be included in the criteria for entry to orchestras. Alternatively, performing institutions in a region might come together around a more local agreement, beginning a field-wide trend that would then have broad impact.

#### Discussion

Several participants suggested that meetings organized by the American Symphony Orchestra League, the communications forum for orchestra managers and elected musician representatives, were potentially a means of accomplishing change in this area. Because the League is working to forge a stronger relationship with the union and the player conferences, such meetings could be especially valuable.

It was noted that educators, too, should be involved in such discussions. One participant remarked: *“I’ve been an administrator at a conservatory for many years, and this is the first time I have ever been in a setting where we talked to the orchestral community. We do have things to offer to the dialogue.”*

#### Key channels for communication

- ◆ American Symphony Orchestra League
- ◆ The seven major independent music conservatories
- ◆ The Orchestra Forum of The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation



## 2. Structure of musician contracts in orchestras

### Possible initiatives

- ◆ Define, track, and demonstrate the success of new musician roles in strengthening orchestras and their service to communities.
- ◆ Design a different system for orchestras to ingest new work, including musician feedback to the composer.

### Discussion

Participants pointed out that musician contracts are essentially local. It creates problems when orchestras try to work with a “template,” as opposed to responding to a very specific community. On the other hand, it can help when musicians are willing to deal directly with their own, local management. One orchestra leader said, however, that although the necessary good will is there, it has been difficult to find “channels for daily or even weekly communication.”

### Key channels for communication

- ◆ American Federation of Musicians
- ◆ ICSOM
- ◆ ROPA
- ◆ American Symphony Orchestra League
- ◆ National Association of Negro Musicians
- ◆ The Sphinx Organization
- ◆ NASM (National Association of Schools of Music)
- ◆ The Musicians Forum at the Eastman School of Music

## 3. Scope of studio faculty teaching

### Possible initiatives

- ◆ Encourage relationships between master teachers and students that convey “multiple expertnesses.”
- ◆ Cluster similar programs to learn what might be the most meaningful trends and therefore might become norms.

### Discussion

Persuading studio teachers to embrace new points of view – or even engage in dialogue with conservatory leaders – may be, according to several Symposium participants, a difficult proposition. Many studio teachers, they said, have very specific ideas about how they want to teach. “You can talk to them all you want, but the curriculum is what happens when the door shuts. And the superstar faculty at my school have never attended a faculty meeting.”



A teacher's highly personal approach to instruction is often very valuable to his or her students, but it can also limit how much the students learn about the full range of career possibilities in music. In spite of the realities of most musicians' lives, there is an "entrenched" attitude that if students do not go on to become soloists or members of major orchestras, they have failed. Moreover, "under the present structure, the highest-level institutions don't participate in the umbrella group discussions," as "some of our best schools do not belong to NASM."

Some participants related stories about how such barriers can be overcome, by changing some entry, curriculum, and graduation requirements, and by engaging faculty in productive dialogue:

*Every school has specific performance requirements, required courses, and so on. The faculty and management have to agree about these things. A degree-granting institution has to meet certain standards. A conversation can happen as long as you're not asking for radical change, but a viewpoint expansion. I really don't think that among the majority of studio teachers out there, there will be huge resistance.*

Some noted that there has been change at a number of institutions. One reported, "The middle-aged faculty at my institution is different from the older faculty. We don't hear them talk about training only soloists." Another noted that when Eastman launched the Arts Leadership Program, there was resistance from some faculty members, because it was not about technical mastery of an instrument. But "the students in those programs haven't lost an ounce of artistic muscle." Attitudes have changed as the environment has shifted. "If an idea is good enough, it will work." Moreover, participants expressed the belief that if performing institutions change, studio faculty will adapt rapidly.

#### Key channels for communication

- ◆ MTNA (Music Teachers National Association)
- ◆ ASTA (American String Teachers Association)
- ◆ NATS (National Association of Teachers of Singing)
- ◆ Seven Springs
- ◆ Double Reed Society, Harp Society, et al.
- ◆ Manhattan School of Music
- ◆ Eastman / Arts Leadership Program
- ◆ New England Conservatory of Music

#### **4. Curriculum requirements within musician training**

##### Possible initiatives

- ◆ Design entrance and curriculum requirements for colleges, competitions, and summer programs to reflect the skills that are truly desirable in a mature musician. There should be more advance communication from college-level schools about skill requirements.



- ◆ Ensure relevancy of the repertoire. Examples of innovative practices include student-led ensembles that play new or baroque music, and advanced studies including new music ensembles.

### Discussion

One participant noted that almost all training institutions that are located in large cities hire teachers of most instruments (with the exception of strings) from local symphonies. Therefore, if the roles of musicians at those institutions change, *“teaching institutions will change in a nanosecond!”*

Many of those present expressed the belief that today’s classical music students are notably entrepreneurial and adventurous. One conservatory representative stated:

*We are dealing with a very different set of 18-year-old students. They are street-smart. They don’t like to be told what to do. They don’t like institutions of any kind. They’re interested in working around institutions. They leave us wondering what in the hell to do, because most of us didn’t approach it that way.*

*They want to do things quickly, and they love the idea of finding out where they are going. They don’t see that as compromising their playing.*

*These students are going to go out and reassemble the world.*

A colleague added that students communicate rapidly now, via email and websites, and that this has accustomed them to working in a changeable environment.

Moreover, a participant suggested, schools can innovate more easily than performing institutions, because *“we can take chances – we don’t have to worry about subscriptions.”*

### Key channels for communication

- ◆ NAMESU (National Association of Music Executives of State Universities)
- ◆ College Music Society – *“which has been convening on the 21st-century curriculum for the past two years”*
- ◆ The directors of entrepreneurship from the Thornton School of Music, University of Arizona, Eastman, and the University of Colorado, who *“get together annually”*
- ◆ CLEA (Consortium for the Liberal Education of Artists) – its mission is *“to strengthen the liberal arts education of college students enrolled in institutions dedicated to the training of performance artists”*
- ◆ Society of University Composers

## **5. Systemic roles of the composer**

### Possible initiatives

- ◆ Build a network of mentors to strengthen the role of composers in performing institutions.



- ◆ Develop a system to introduce new works effectively, through partnerships of multiple organizations that commission and “workshop” pieces.
- ◆ Work with trade representative bodies to disseminate effective innovations and successes in integrating composers into the field.
- ◆ Bring composers and service organizations together to produce recommendations on composer integration into the field.

### Discussion

Moves that were suggested in this area including the development of a system of multi-organization partnerships to commission and then “workshop” new music, and to introduce new pieces effectively over time. In addition, a network of mentors could help to strengthen the role of composers in performing institutions.

In training institutions, Symposium participants said, it is institutional attitudes that change studio work. At one school, a considerable amount of contemporary music is taught, because “*the teachers know that the students who play it are more likely to make it into the annual performance.*”

Speaking about composers working in communities, a composer attending the Symposium stated:

*The whole idea of placing a composer within a community is to foster an increased intimacy of the members of that community with the performing organization. The composer must consider himself/herself an integral asset, not a liability. The composer must foster creativity within the community, not act like God or Santa Claus. You get down on the floor with community members, whatever age they are.*

One barrier that contemporary composers frequently encounter is a lack of understanding of their work. There are, the composers who were present pointed out, many different kinds of new music. “*It might be useful to the whole field, globally, if we had a congress on new music. We could help the field define what new music is.*”

### Key channels for communication

- ◆ Meet the Composer
- ◆ American Music Center
- ◆ American Composers Forum
- ◆ American Symphony Orchestra League
- ◆ ICSOM
- ◆ Chamber Music America
- ◆ Flute Convention
- ◆ Congress on New Music



## 6. Local or regional community task forces

### Possible initiatives

- ◆ Hold regional planning forums to cross-fertilize and implement ideas on roles musicians can play in the community.
- ◆ Focus public interest on the need for early instruction. Advocate for more investment of public money in this area.
- ◆ Encourage the creation of local task forces on new music, to include composers, other creative and performing artists, organizational leaders and audience members

### Discussion

At the state level, a participant suggested, economic development bureaus are beginning to see the importance of the arts; their attitude will affect local institutions. Several participants talked about the benefits that could potentially derive from working with Rotary Clubs, Chambers of Commerce, and CVB's. One remarked that, if trusted artistic leaders interface with such institutions, that will lend credibility to the argument that the arts help to drive economic development. A colleague noted that, in most states, there are arts advocacy organizations in place (cross-disciplinary and cross-arts). *"They are great conveners and central points for all organizations."* Americans for the Arts serves as their national nexus.

National bodies that work to promote ethnic diversity, such as the Urban League and NAACP, *"don't work on the arts at all."* However, there are some city-based organizations, such as Chicago United, that have cultural partners. A participant suggested that, particularly in the area of early instruction in music, *"an alliance of jazz and classical organizations could be powerful."*

### Key channels for communication

- ◆ Americans for the Arts – *"a built-in channel for access to local arts agencies and conveners"*
- ◆ Rotary Clubs
- ◆ Chambers of Commerce
- ◆ CVB's
- ◆ NASAA and individual state arts agencies
- ◆ IAJE (International Association for Jazz Education)
- ◆ NAJE (National Association of Jazz Educators)
- ◆ Center for Black Music Research



## Communication in the future

A number of Symposium participants proposed that the American Symphony Orchestra League, as the communications forum for orchestra managers and elected musician representatives, could potentially be a means of accomplishing change, through convenings and other forums. The influential work of the Mellon Foundation's Orchestra Forum was also cited in this context.

However, all agreed that the Symposium was well-named – educators *must* also take part in the discussion. A symphony representative remarked, *"Every time I talk to someone from a training institution, I learn something I didn't know,"* and a conservatory representative replied, *"I've been an administrator at a conservatory for many years, and this is the first time I have ever been in a setting where we talked to the orchestral community. We do have things to offer to the dialogue."*

At the end of the Symposium, participants considered who would take responsibility for moving the conversation forward. The League can play a leadership role, particularly in the orchestra world, but cannot act alone. Ultimately, the hope was that the Symposium participants – with the aid of the Symposium proceedings – would work individually and collectively to bring about further meetings and other kinds of communication, such as online dialogue. It was suggested that a web presence for this conversation would attract the voices of students as well as players – *"an opportunity to tap into new wellsprings."*

One orchestra leader said: *"I'm re-energized, and I want to take back to my orchestra the question of what is the broader set of skills musicians need to have, and what kinds of changes are needed in the audition process."* Another participant, a senior faculty member at a conservatory, echoed this sense of urgency: *"Of all modes of communication, there is no substitute for getting people together in a room. I would like to at least bring the three New York City conservatory leaders together, and then move on out from there."*

The participants agreed that the message coming out of the Symposium should be a positive one. Yes, many of the negatives of working in the field (especially in orchestras) had been discussed. But the proposals that emerged from the breakouts were forward-looking. *"Redefining the role of a professional musician is a big positive."* And if that can be brought about, so that musicians and music play a central role in American communities, funders will be less likely to see classical music as *"a dying art form."*

The Symposium was not intended to be an isolated event, benefiting only its attendees. *"We must make it clear,"* said one participant, *"that the work we have done here is for all, not just ourselves."* A colleague added:

*We have to act as "mentors" to the people we work with. Those of us who have taken part in this Symposium are going to get others involved. A group of people will have to take this on as a mission – to increase communication and bring about change throughout the classical music field.*