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The primary purpose of this study was to identify and explore the current teaching qualifications, teaching positions, classes taught, mandatory requirements, and materials used by piano teachers at performing arts schools. The researcher was then able to identify similarities in the curriculum and methods used by these piano teachers and the improvements sought by piano teachers regarding their current teaching situation. Based on similarities and teacher-suggested improvements, the researcher was able to identify a suggested curriculum to prepare students to enter into college as piano majors.

By using a survey, the researcher was able to identify and understand the content of the traditional piano curriculum for pre-college students. Surveying piano teachers from high-achieving arts magnet schools gave the researcher an in-depth understanding of arts schools and the core piano/keyboard courses being offered across the nation.

The researcher sent out emails to 79 schools that belong to the Arts School Network (ASN) and that met the criteria of a dedicated magnet high school. The
exploratory research used a one shot case-study approach, with a mixed-methods research design. While the research was primarily quantitative in nature, to strengthen the study, open-ended questions, provided a qualitative component, as a means to gather more in-depth information.

Results showed applied keyboard, keyboard technique, music theory, music history, and accompanying are the courses most often required. Subjects teachers would add include piano literature, American music history, jazz coursework, music technology, and ensemble. Limited time, too few keyboards, and insufficient training in technology are obstacles to these changes. An integrated curriculum based in the experiential learning theory is suggested to address current time and scheduling constraints. A comprehensive portfolio of student performances, composition and technological projects, and finally assessment rubrics is suggested to help students prepare for college auditions.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an introduction to and overview of the dissertation proposal. The chapter begins with the background of the problem, followed by the statement of the problem, significance and purpose of the study, research questions, delimitations and limitations, and definition of terms. The chapter concludes with the organization of the remainder of the proposal.

**Background of the Problem**

In 2001, President George W. Bush passed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, requiring states to develop and measure skills through assessment at specified grade levels. The act was designed to offer choices and flexibility for students and parents. Importantly, the act holds individual schools accountable for certain levels of achievement. Because of their success in narrowing the achievement gap, magnet schools appeal to districts with schools that have been targeted for improvement under NCLB (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Overall, magnet schools are “outperforming local districts on state tests, are getting students into college, and preparing them for a productive future” (U.S. Department of Education, 2008b, p. 26).

President Obama believes strong arts education can give the current generation of students creative and problem-solving skills needed for the nation’s future. Under his leadership, in 2011, the President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities (PCAH) issued a report on the current status of arts education in the United States. The committee’s research on access to arts education revealed that arts education was flourishing in some parts of the nation, while inequities were increasing in others. The PCAH (2011) emphasized the importance of “supporting high-quality professional
development in pedagogy and curriculum” (p. vii) and said researchers need to “widen the focus of evidence about arts education” (p. 53) to include music, visual art, dance, and theatrical arts programs in elementary and secondary schools. In particular, PCAH recommended policymakers and stakeholders “support ongoing data gathering about available opportunities, including teacher quality, resources, and facilities at the local and state level” (p. vii). Experts in music education think during this time of decline in economic support for the arts, it is more important than ever for the music profession to have a variety of data on the benefits of arts offerings in schools (Mark, 1996).

The National Assessment of Educational Progress (U.S. Department of Education, 2008c) has already begun widening its focus on arts education. Assessment in the areas of dance, music, theater, and visual arts is to include the areas of performing, creating, responding, content knowledge, and skills application. The arts involve complex skills, and the National Assessment Governing Board (U.S. Department of Education, 2008c, p.1) said that “extending the legitimate use of portfolios and performance measures beyond the theatre, the concert hall, the studio, and the individual classroom” should assist educators and administrators in educational reform to include the arts as part of an essential education. Because arts assessment involves measuring seemingly unquantifiable aspects such as creativity, inspiration, and imagination, assessment can be challenging (U.S. Department of Education, 2008c). Regardless of the challenges, experts think assessment in music education is necessary (Niermann, 2013). Therefore, music educators are challenged to devise ways to assess students on specific arts skills important for all students to know (U.S. Department of Education, 2008c).
There is a documented need to examine the curriculum and resources in existing arts programs. In particular, we should solicit the views of teachers about the curriculum and the assessments and assessment models used to evaluate students.

A good place to begin is at schools that offer a curriculum devoted to the art (i.e., performing arts magnet schools). These institutions are specialized public schools that offer an education in both academics and arts disciplines. Because performing arts magnet high schools offer advanced placement classes and studio coursework, students who graduate from these schools typically have a strong foundation for a career in the performing arts or to enter college to pursue performing arts. Research on these magnet schools shows their students have high academic achievement, further adding to the schools’ desirability for research purposes (Daniel, 2000). The teachers at these schools are instrumental to the students’ success and must develop a rigorous curriculum that combines innovation, cutting-edge practices, continued learning opportunities, and assessments (U.S. Department of Education, 2008b).

These magnet schools enjoy the support of the Arts School Network (ASN), an international non-profit organization that promotes arts education and has an accrediting commission for these schools. Currently, about 500 schools from across the nation belong to the network. Members of the ASN represent arts leaders, schools, and organizations.

**Problem of the Study**

Based on the assessment and accountability mandates of NCLB, magnet schools have become an attractive option for districts seeking to improve school achievement (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Moreover, “expectations for magnet schools have broadened,” and, in response, performing arts magnet schools
have increased their numbers of advanced placement and traditional fine arts courses (U.S. Department of Education, 2004, p. 1). Within a performing arts magnet school, there are different areas of study from which students must choose a focus. These areas most often include music; visual arts; dance; communication, technology, and creative writing; and theatrical programs for which students must successfully audition to gain entry.

Insufficient data exist on curriculum practices or aspects of the standardized arts school curriculum that contribute to these schools’ successes. Gaining teachers’ perspectives should help researchers understand of what should be included in the curriculum (Abeles, Hoffer, & Klotman, 1995). These teacher perspectives should be useful. Hausman and Goldring (2000) said that despite much money invested in all types of magnet schools and their growing popularity in the past 25 years, researchers still know little about outcomes associated with magnet schools and how the outcomes vary among different programs.

Further, within music programs at performing arts schools, various skills need to be learned and assessed (U.S. Department of Education, 2008c). As noted earlier, arts assessment involves measuring seemingly unquantifiable aspects such as creativity, inspiration, and imagination, making assessment challenging (U.S. Department of Education, 2008c). Specifically, music educators agree that assessment and evaluation of such a variety of musical skills is challenging (Kostka, 1997).

Within the music programs, piano teachers encounter a unique teaching circumstance, balancing private and group instruction. Because of electronic keyboards and keyboard labs, piano instruction is no longer a private study; piano teachers are not
exclusively responsible for giving individual students a piece of solo repertoire and guiding them through the learning process. Piano teachers must adjust their teaching style to group classes (Skaggs, 1981), in addition to individual training on solo classical repertoire and other keyboard styles such as jazz and blues. Furthermore, piano teachers are responsible for equipping students with a broad set of musical literacy, or functional piano, skills (Vogt, 2006) within the piano curriculum: including harmonization, transposition, and piano accompaniment. Piano teachers are also responsible for assessing students on these skills (Kostka, 1997).

Vogt (2006) said the ultimate goal for piano teachers is to develop students’ musical literacy in the pre-college years. Musical literacy or functional piano skills involve a range of piano skills that can include music theory, improvisation at the piano, harmonization, composition, transposition, music history as it relates to the keyboard, and piano accompaniment (Vogt, 2006). Moreover, the desired skill set is expanding. Vogt said today’s piano teachers need to “teach a curriculum designed for the general public, including country and western, rock, blues, and easy listening styles of music” (p. 2).

For teachers wishing to strengthen students’ musical literacy skills, the appropriate curriculum and materials are shown to affect the learning process (Minott, 2012). Minott said the appropriate musical literature impacts student learning at the piano, but such materials are difficult to come by. In keeping with Minott, Vogt (2006) said the biggest challenge for “incorporating functional skills such as harmonization into the pre-college curriculum is finding appropriate materials” (p. 3).
Experts in piano teaching who specialize in musical literature, materials, and teaching methods are known as piano pedagogues. Lyke (1987b) suggested a degree in piano pedagogy or a piano performance degree, along with strong pedagogical training, be considered essential for a career in piano teaching. Piano pedagogy, the study of teaching piano playing, has become an increasingly popular degree track at universities and colleges in recent decades (Fu, 2007). Despite the vast amount of pedagogical materials and literature written for the piano, “relatively little attention has been paid to research in piano pedagogy” (Meichang, 2010, p. 4). In addition, research on how to assess keyboard performance is scarce (Kostka, 1997). Researchers in the field say more specific research is needed on assessment and evaluation structures currently used by piano teachers (Meichang, 2010).

Thus, there is a documented need for researching piano teacher perspectives to identify and evaluate current materials, musical literature, and methods of assessment. By surveying piano teachers who train students for performance and for college preparation, the needed curriculum and assessment practices can be identified to determine how students prepare for formal collegiate auditions and for graduation requirements. From this information, a suggested piano curriculum can be developed for pre-college students.

**Significance of the Study**

As noted, there is a need to understand arts magnet high schools, specifically their programs, and other components related to the success of their students. Within the music programs at performing arts schools, there is also a need to identify, understand, and broaden the content of the traditional piano curriculum for pre-collegiate students. This need can be addressed by surveying piano teachers, including
department chairs, from high-achieving arts magnet schools with a piano program. Such research can provide an in-depth understanding of arts schools and of the core piano/keyboard courses being offered across the nation, including why they are offered. Assessment and evaluation of students’ success in achieving the objectives of a music curriculum are requirements for any effective music program (Abeles et al., 1995). My study also determined the assessment and evaluation practices used by piano teachers. My study would also contribute to an understanding of what think is important in preparing students for college auditions.

**Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of the study was to identify and explore current teaching qualifications, teaching positions, classes taught, mandatory requirements, and materials used by piano teachers at performing arts schools. While both private piano teachers and traditional public schools send many students to college each year to pursue piano, my interest in performing arts schools stems from their non-traditional approach to a public school education. A student attending a performing arts high school may not have the means to attend private piano lessons. Therefore, schools such as these could be instrumental in sending a student from a lower socioeconomic demographic to college.

Based on the responses from the teachers, the researcher identified similarities in the curriculum and methods used by these piano teachers, and identified improvements sought by piano teachers regarding their current teaching situation at their magnet school. Based on these similarities and teacher-suggested improvements, the researcher has developed a suggested curriculum to prepare the student to enter college as a piano major which can be located at the end of Chapter 5. .
Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. Are their similar course offerings in piano departments among arts school belonging to the Arts School Network?

2. What are the criteria (in addition to a successful audition) for student selection concentrating in the piano?

3. What are the requirements of piano majors at performing arts schools?

4. What courses do piano/keyboard instructors think should be added, deleted, or changed and the reasons for favoring these changes?

5. Is there a piano requirement for all music majors in the music program at a performing arts school?

6. If so, what is the purpose of such a requirement?

Delimitations and Limitations

This study did not seek information from private piano teachers across the United States. While many students enter college as a performance major who come from both private piano studios and/or traditional public schools, the study focuses on performing arts high schools and their programs. While students at performing arts high schools their extra-curricular lessons are not a focus of the study.

Another limitation to the study was arts schools that are attendance-zone magnets or programs within school magnets. Attendance-zone magnets are schools for which students in the surrounding neighborhood and those outside the attendance zone can attend. In programs within school magnets, only a portion of the students at the school participates in the magnet program. Thus, the research focused only on arts magnet high schools from across the nation that belong to the ASN.

The ASN requires schools to meet certain criteria set forth by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Precollegiate Arts Schools (ACCPAS). Thus,
generalizability of results is limited to performing arts schools belonging to the ASN. Additionally, only music teachers who teach at these schools served as study participants. As such, the results were limited to these specific teacher perspectives, which may be different, for example, from those of administrators or from private piano studio teachers.

**Definition of Terms**

**APPLIED PIANO MUSIC.** Piano instruction is directed toward acquisition of skills in solo performance, specifically technical and musical skills at the piano (Goffe, 1991).

**ARTS MAGNET HIGH SCHOOL.** A magnet school centered on the visual and performing arts that typically includes classes in dance, theatre (including performance and technical stage-work), visual arts, music, and communications (writing, production). There are certain criteria for entrance, and these schools do not allow students from the attendance zone (defined below) to attend.

**ARTS SCHOOL ADMISSIONS CRITERIA.** Criteria established by the district or governing school that include certain benchmarks for students to be considered for acceptance into the fine arts magnet program.

**ARTS SCHOOL NETWORK (ASN).** An international non-profit organization that promotes arts school resources and arts education. Schools that become members must meet certain requirements.

**ASSESSMENT.** An observation of what a student knows and is able to do. Assessment is the process of collecting, describing, and analyzing information about student performance or program effectiveness to make educational decisions.

**ATTENDANCE ZONE MAGNETS.** Schools for which there is an attendance zone. Students in the surrounding neighborhood can attend as can students from outside the attendance zone.

**FUNCTIONAL PIANO SKILLS (also referred to as PIANO PROFICIENCY SKILLS, MUSICAL LITERACY SKILLS, OR KEYBOARD COMPETENCY SKILLS):** Practical piano skills that include but are not limited to piano accompaniment, improvisation, sight reading, chord progressions, technique, critical listening, harmonization, technique, ensemble repertoire, analysis, and transposition at the piano (Bobetsky, 2004; Chin, 2002). The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) requires keyboard competency skills as an essential component for any undergraduate degree in Music, regardless of area of specialization (NASM, 2013).
GROUP PIANO/CLASS PIANO. The approach of teaching the keyboard to a class of three or more students (Skaggs, 1981). This mode of instruction typically focuses on developing functional keyboard skills for non-keyboard majors at the university level (Chin, 2002).

MAGNET SCHOOL. Public elementary and secondary public schools of choice for which programs are planned and developed using local, state, and federal funds, specifically the Magnet Schools Assistance Program.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB) ACT. The NCLB was established in 2001 and requires states to develop and measure skills through assessment at specified grade levels. The act was designed to offer choices and flexibility for students and parents and holds individual schools accountable for certain levels of achievement. One of the objectives of NCLB is to ensure high-quality teachers for all students, regardless of race, ethnicity, or income.

PIANO/KEYBOARD DEPARTMENT. Within a performing arts magnet school, this is the area of specialization that focuses primarily on keyboard and piano skills.

PIANO PEDAGOGY. The study of teaching the piano.

PROGRAMS WITHIN SCHOOL MAGNETS. These are schools in which only a portion of the students participates in the magnet program.

THEME-BASED MAGNET SCHOOL. Magnet schools have a focused theme and align their curriculum to the theme (Thomas, 2012b). Common themes include science, technology and engineering, fine and performing arts, international baccalaureate, and international studies (Thomas, 2012b).

**Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation**

This chapter presented an introduction to the dissertation and included a description of the problem, the purpose of the study, the research questions, and the key terms. Chapter 2 presents a review of the relevant literature that contains a historical overview of magnet schools and the research on learning theory, piano pedagogy, class piano, piano curriculum, teacher roles, and assessment and evaluation in music education. Chapter 3 presents the methodology and includes a presentation of the research design, procedures, instrument, and issues of validity and reliability.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Overview

Magnet schools were founded in the United States during the 1970s in an effort to promote desegregation. In the aftermath of the 1960s’ desegregation rules, public schools in the U.S. were still segregated, perhaps involuntarily, because of residential zoning laws. Outside the wealthy, parents had little choice in where students attended school. In an effort to promote educational equality for all and to help desegregate schools, the federal government provided financial support to districts, to develop new ideas for schooling. District officials introduced the idea of theme-based or magnet schools to attract students from all races and socioeconomic backgrounds. The magnet schools would allow students from outside the designated residential zone to attend.

To attract students from the surrounding community, administrators needed to come up with curricular themes that would keep students interested. The unique makeup of theme-based magnet schools centered on the concept that all students do not learn in the same fashion. With the choice of theme-based instruction, students not interested in the same areas would be drawn or magnetized toward these unique schools, which is how the term magnet school came about (Waldrip, 2003).

Since their inception in the mid-1970s, magnet schools have seen much growth. They remain “the most widespread form of public school choice” (Hausman & Goldring, 2000, p. 105). Large cities such as Minneapolis, Boston, and Dallas were the first to open the specialized magnet schools, which offered theme-based instruction to all students regardless of residential zones (Waldrip, 2003).
As the magnet school idea spread, districts and states needed more money to fund them. Between 1972 and 1981, the federal government set up the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) to encourage school districts to create magnet schools, in an effort to continue desegregation. As an increasing number of districts applied for funding, magnet schools continued to flourish. They became so popular during this time that the federal government could not keep up with funding.

One reason the federal government wanted to continue funding magnet schools was because policymakers had been made aware that students graduating from magnet schools scored higher on standardized tests compared to their traditional high school counterparts. After 1981, the primary goal of the federal government shifted to strengthening existing magnet programs, with less emphasis on desegregation. The 1984 Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) was established by congress to continue federal support for magnet schools that met desegregation plan approval. Even today, to continue to receive financial assistance from MSAP schools must continually address student achievement in academic core subjects, and offer a specialized curriculum (U.S. Department of Education, 2003).

In conclusion, magnet schools are often purposely placed in minority neighborhoods, to encourage racial diversity and equality, to assist their goal of desegregation, so they continue to attract students of all racial backgrounds. Magnet schools offering specialized curriculums are important for attracting students of all racial backgrounds. Common specializations include math-science, pre-medicine, and performing arts programs (Steel & Levine, 1994). More contemporary specializations include culinary arts, International Baccalaureate, social science, and technology-driven
programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The specialized curriculum offered and purposeful school location provides educational equality where it might not otherwise existed.

**Performing Arts and Academic Magnet Schools**

In 2008, an estimated 5,000 magnet schools of some type, with a total enrollment of approximately 2.5 million children, were in operation in the United States (Thomas, 2012). The zone requirements are different for magnet schools. Some magnet schools have an attendance that controls a portion of the school’s enrollment (U.S. Department of Education, 2004) while other have no attendance-zone requirement. If a magnet school has an attendance zone, then students who live within the certain surrounding neighborhood must attend the school (U.S. Department of Education, 2004) but the school is also open to students from across the district who meet specific magnet program criteria. The attendance zone magnet school allows the school district to give preference to distinct neighborhoods, in an effort to provide opportunity to various ethnic or socioeconomic groups, and to enable others outside the school zone to attend (U.S. Department of Education, 2004).

When a magnet school does not have an attendance zone, all students who wish to attend must apply and may come from any neighborhood within the school district. These schools are able to draw students from a wide range of socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds across residential zones, providing a legislative solution to structural inequality across residential school zones (Eaton, 2010).

Of the various types of magnet schools, performing arts schools enjoy a superior reputation, shown by their record of “high student test scores, low dropout rates, high college acceptance rates, continued advancement in postsecondary settings, low staff
turnover, and positive school environment (p.1). Furthermore, their success has been documented in students’ academic achievement in both core subjects and arts courses (Daniel, 2000; Dyas, 2006).

When a performing arts magnet school does not have an attendance zone, the school typically requires specific criteria for admission (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). For the musician, the criterion can consist of a live performance audition. For the artist, this can be a portfolio of work to demonstrate ability. When there are not enough spots to consider all applicants, the district usually relies on a lottery system (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The lottery system is aligned with district demographics, to ensure an equally representative student enrollment (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). The lottery system typically assists the district with “eliminating selection bias” (Blazer, 2012, p.3), by randomizing the assignment of students to the magnet school. In a district that is not diverse, the lottery would give a higher score to an applicant with specific characteristics, such as low socioeconomic status.

Overall, magnet schools in the United States typically enroll larger percentages of Black and Hispanic students than do traditional public schools (Blazer, 2012). They have also attracted more diverse populations, resulting in reduced concentrations of poverty (Blazer, 2012) in many school districts. However, student achievement rates at magnet schools can also be linked to strong parental influence, and therefore their high achievement rates cannot be attributed solely to the quality of the school (Blazer, 2012).

The U.S. Department of Education (2008b) Office of Innovation and Improvement issued a report on magnet school elements and strategies successfully preparing
students for college and career entry. Some of these schools had specific entrance requirements, such as an audition or a portfolio, and others did not. Some schools had a single-theme focus, while others had multiple themes. Their study spent 2 days visiting each school site, where they conducted interviews with staff, administration, parents, and students. First, their study identified the importance of school choice for parents as a factor in increased public school satisfaction, especially regarding these schools. Secondly, they concluded that magnet schools continue to attract low-income and minority students by giving more curricular options than their traditional zoned high school did.

A specific study in Florida strengthened this conclusion regarding performing arts magnet schools. Dawood (2009) found that a greater percentage of African-American students were graduating from arts magnet schools in Florida and entering into the Florida State University System, compared with the percentage of graduating African-Americans from traditional high schools in the state. Dawood further concluded that arts magnet schools in Florida graduate a more diverse student population to the state university system than traditional high schools do. Most notably, Dawood (2009) concluded that more black males, a demographic of concern to educators (Dawood, 2009), were entering the state university system from arts magnet high schools than from traditional high schools in Florida.

Overall, researchers from the U.S. Department of Education identified rigorous graduation requirements, advanced placement courses, and senior projects required at magnet schools as key contributors to students being fully prepared for university admission and career entry (U.S. Department of Education, 2008b).
Students who attend a performing arts magnet school traditionally specialize in music, visual arts, communications, dance, or theatrical arts strands. These students are able to see a tangible outcome of their work and dedication (Wilson, 2001). For an artist, this may be a painting or sculpture; for a musician, a concert; and, for a writer, a finished story (Daniel, 2000). Having such an outcome increases students’ drive and motivation; which, in turn, increases their achievement and success in personal pursuits.

Perhaps the main reason for this student achievement: students want to be at the school and to participate in the arts (Daniel, 2000). Thus, a school with a performing arts theme might appeal to students with an interest in the arts who have struggled with a traditional academic environment. As mentioned earlier, magnet schools’ bringing in such students also results in a diversified student body (Blazer, 2012).

Because performing arts magnet schools have a diverse student population (Dawood, 2009), one challenge principals and administrators face is finding faculty and staff who can relate to the diverse student population (Daniel, 2000). Furthermore, students at arts magnet schools are held to high standards in both arts and academic courses by their teachers (Wilson, 2001). Students are expected to spend long hours, including rigorous practice hours, demanding a good deal of self-discipline (Wilson, 2001).

The class schedule of performing arts schools can be different from a traditional high school so that it can include more time for arts instruction. Many performing arts high-school students are enrolled in specialized arts instruction for up to 50% of their school-day (Daniel, 2000). Performing arts schools including Douglas Anderson School
of the Arts (Douglas Anderson school, 2014), Dreyfoos School of the Arts (Alexander W. Dreyfoos, 2014), and the High School of the Performing and Visual Arts in Houston (Houston School District, 2014) have also adopted the block-scheduling system for students to spend more time in each class before transitioning to the next school period.

Block scheduling is when parts of the daily schedule are structured into larger blocks of instructional time. A typical style of block scheduling could include: “four ninety minute blocks per day with the school year divided into two semesters; or the alternate day block schedule where six or eight courses are spread out over two days” (Irmsher, 1996, p.1). The block-scheduling system allows students to spend more time in each class period, which provides more opportunities for interactive teaching and student learning. In many cases, block scheduling allows a school to offer more courses (Irmsher, 1996).

Irmsher (1996) points out that teachers who are new to the block-scheduling system, which can include new staff at a performing arts school, must have adequate staff development to transition from 35 or 50 minute school period to the longer school blocks. Finally, Wilson (2001) points out that teachers at performing arts schools must be able to work collaboratively, and build interdisciplinary instruction to effectively manage time and to keep students engaged.

**Related Studies on Performing Arts Magnet Schools**

Wilson (2001) examined arts magnet schools to determine a common set of characteristics that contribute to their success. Wilson’s research focused on the three school districts: Miami-Dade, Florida; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Vancouver, Washington. Wilson held focus-group meetings with parents and community leaders, interviewed arts coordinators and other school staff, looked at curriculum and materials,
interviewed teachers and students, and observed instruction (Wilson, 2001) to get a better understanding of each unique school environment. After visiting each school, Wilson observed that while arts magnet schools may have been developed as a result of civil rights legislation, they offer a model for education “on how to transform schools and schooling” (Wilson, 2001, p.370).

The first reason Wilson cites is that “arts magnets are schools organized with a purpose” (Wilson, 2001, p.376). He said the focus on creativity and performing attracts students with diverse interests. These artistic pursuits then spill over into humanities and sciences, through curriculum integration.

A second reason Wilson believes these schools are successful is that “the achievements of arts magnets’ students are accessed by the public” (Wilson, 2001, p.376). In addition to the regular standardized-test achievement scores, the community is able to readily observe “concerts, dance recitals, theatrical productions, films, and exhibitions of paintings” (Wilson, 2001, p.376). Students and teachers put in tremendous effort and teamwork toward these public displays. The goals and rewards associated with presenting a music concert increase student discipline and self-confidence. The rewards also motivate students to attain high goals (Wilson, 2001).

A third reason Wilson cites is that arts schools require students to have “discipline, boundaries, and goals” (Wilson, 2001, p.377). Wilson (2001, p.377) said artistic creation is “a means and an end continually interrelated.” Small steps must be mastered for the whole piece to come together. Students learn to practice, master, and perform their creations, allowing them to connect their means to the end results. This process also strengthens time management skills, as students must effectively rehearse
while they can (Wilson, 2001). This could be a reason why magnet schools are successful in educating typically under-achieving students. While keeping student motivation and discipline high, rehearsal and practice demands keep students from being bored at home (Wilson, 2001).

Finally, a fourth reason Wilson cites for magnet schools success includes active learning (Wilson, 2001, p.379). Students are active in the learning process, which keeps their attention and motivation high. Wilson said each arts magnet school was successful because of “the variety of relationships arts magnets have established with arts communities, their innovative academic programs, the way the arts are related to other school subjects, the professionalism of their teaching staffs, and the professional aspirations of their students” (Wilson, 2001, p.371).

Dawood (2009) surveyed arts magnet schools in Florida, examining high school grade point averages and achievement scores from arts magnet high school students in comparison with achievement scores from traditional high schools in each respective surrounding area. When compared, the arts magnet school scores were equal to or better than the traditional high school grades issued by the state of Florida. The comparison of school types also revealed that arts magnet schools had a higher attendance rate, higher graduation rate, and higher participation rate (Dawood, 2009, p. 158). Dawood said these high rates of attendance and graduation can be partly attributed to the positive innovative learning environment at an arts school.

Dawood’s study also provided a rationale for the increased spending needed to run a performing arts magnet school. Daniel (2000) said one reason performing arts schools must defend their programs to legislators is because of the expenses.
Expenses can include a lower student/teacher ratio, equipment costs, and unique building design (Daniel, 2000).

Dawood (2009, p.159) justified the 20% increased spending of government needed to fund magnet schools. Dawood said compared with surrounding high school counterparts, graduates from arts magnet high schools graduated a higher percentage of students who went on to attend a “competitive-admission” public Florida university. Dawood (2009, p.152) said the enhanced curriculum offered at arts-magnet schools offers a “greater return on investment for policymakers, parents, and students” because of statistical improvement in “better school attendance, graduation rates, and college enrollment in state universities.” She also said magnet schools stimulate and encourage student interest.

Dyaz (2006) examined two exemplary performing-arts high-school jazz programs in an effort to contribute to jazz curricula by comparing and contrasting the two programs. Data from the two schools, the High School for the Performing and Visual Arts in Houston and the Booker T. Washington High school for the Performing and Visual Arts in Dallas, were collected through observations; interviews with students, faculty, administration and parents; and examination of related documents (Dyaz, 2006).

Dyaz said similarities between the programs included the goal of developing jazz instrumentalists, focus on theoretical jazz relationships, and performance combos with a diversified repertoire set. Differences included the specialty courses and ensembles offered at each school, and the director’s teaching style.
Dyaz said students at these two schools take, or have taken, private lessons and play professional engagements; and many plan to pursue jazz studies in college. Students cited their dedication and talent as primary reasons for their school's success, along with the extreme dedication of their jazz directors (Dyaz, 2006).

**Staff at Performing Arts Schools**

Performing arts schools were initially set up at the secondary level, to prepare students with pre-professional training in the arts (Daniel, 2000). One way administrators have achieved success at their schools has been to find the best faculty (Daniel, 2000) to support this goal. Because of nature of the performing arts, staff members of these schools provide continual interactions with their students (Wilson, 2001), to prepare their students for a successful performance.

In some instances, finding the best faculty for performing arts schools includes hiring artist-teachers (Daniel, 2000) who are professionals trained to disseminate their knowledge developed through years working in the performing arts. Daniel (2000) said in many instances, artist-teachers lack proper certifications for teaching; in which case many schools systems make accommodations, so artist-teachers may become certified.

Both high-quality teachers and artist-teachers with imaginative teaching strategies and an integrated curriculum of strategic course offerings have been accredited with successfully preparing students for college and career entry (U.S. Department of Education, 2008b) at performing arts magnet schools. Eaton (2010) said educators who are trained and effective in their teaching strategies will continue to prepare students for post high-school success.

Another consideration for staff and administration at a performing arts school is the program budget (Goffe, 1991). The cost for educating students in performing arts
schools is higher than at a traditional public high school (Gray, 1981, Dawood, 2009). Magnet schools average 20% more in expenses for “specialized faculty, equipment, and instructor expertise” (Dawood, 2009, p.152). While the increased spending can be justified by “higher graduation rates and less absenteeism rates” (Dawood, 2009, p.152), an effective music education program should have a budget plan to help administration determine fiscal needs and organize growth and development of the music program (Walker, 1989).

Goffe (1991) said sufficient funding is needed to implement and continue to operate a music program at a performing arts magnet school. Music educators face the complex task providing adequate funding for a music program (Walker, 1989). However, the music department can generate revenue in the form of admission fees for concerts, rental-fees for school-owned instruments, and fundraising (Walker, 1989). While students at performing arts schools should not be expected to raise funds for necessary equipment, they may participate in fundraisers for related projects such as a musical production or travel-related competition fees (Goffe, 1991). Goffe (1991) said music performances are the best way to fund extra-curricular activities.

A budget plan should help the music educator justify the program (Walker, 1989). Further, Walker (1989) said a music educator should request and establish a budget to include the following 11 items: new equipment, replacement equipment, music library, travel, awards, printing and publicity, repair and maintenance, contest and festival fees, contractual services, concert wear maintenance, and contingency” (Walker, 1989, p.85).

Additional funding is needed to provide access to professionals in the community who offer services such as master-classes, clinics, and workshops (Goffe, 1991) for
students planning to pursue music after high school. Music educators at performing arts schools should also consider networking with community opera programs or symphonies to establish a relationship between the school and the community (Goffe, 1991). These experiences will help students at performing arts school determine career and school options after graduation.

Other ways of securing finances include parent organizations such as booster organizations (Walker, 1989). An arts magnet performing high school in Dallas, the Booker T. Washington High school for the performing and visual arts has a parent-teacher-student association, in which parents work with the teachers to raise money for things like costumes, headshots, and fieldtrips (U.S. Department of Education, 2008b).

**Role of the Piano Teacher**

As mentioned above, this study did not include surveying private piano teachers for their perspective on training pre-college students at the piano. It is important to remember that private instructors have been increasingly more important as music education in the public school system has declined (Crum, 1998). Furthermore, Crum points out that private piano instruction continues to be the most common style of piano teaching.

However, the researcher chose to focus on how magnet schools emphasize college preparation at the piano (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2008b). In a 1991 survey of piano teachers at performing arts schools, piano teachers said their primary goal was pre-professional training at the piano (Goffe, 1991). Teachers said their program's secondary purpose was student enrichment, followed by desegregation. Teachers said the in-depth curriculum of the music program gave an academic advantage to students attending a performing arts school (Goffe, 1991).
Few studies have focused on music programs in performing arts schools (Goffe, 1991) and their methods for preparing students to pursue music in college. Within these music programs, students enroll in rigorous and advanced placement music courses (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2008b). General music courses could include music theory, choral ensembles, orchestra, music history, diction, piano skills, and music appreciation (Goffe, 1991). The curriculum specifically for keyboard majors includes choral or instrumental ensemble, music theory, advanced keyboard skills, and advanced music theory (Goffe, 1991).

When preparing students for college auditions, the types of piano concentrations offered by higher education institutions have expanded over the past 50 years (NASM, 2013). In the 1970s, when a high school student was considering a major in piano, the programs with piano concentrations (Banowitz, 1977, p.385) included Bachelor of Music, Bachelor of Music in Applied Music, Bachelor of Music with an emphasis in piano pedagogy, Bachelor of Music Education, Bachelor of Arts with a music concentration, and Bachelor of Science in Music.

Today, the list of degree titles has expanded according to the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM, 2013). Institutions have begun to offer more specific professional baccalaureate degree titles if the institution has met certain criteria. These contemporary degree titles for pianists include Bachelor of Music in Performance in the areas of “pedagogy, accompanying, or collaborative keyboard” (NASM, 2013, p.102).

Institutions that offer these types of bachelor’s degrees must be adequately staffed and equipped per NASM guidelines. They must also offer specialized coursework in the categories of pedagogy, accompanying, and collaborative keyboard, to occupy at least 25% of the curriculum (NASM, 2013). Other contemporary degree
titles the pianist may consider include the Bachelor of Music in Jazz Studies, Music Technology, Sacred Music, Musical Theatre, and Music Therapy (NASM, 2013).

Researchers therefore say teacher expectations for the pre-college pianist should broaden (Clarfield, 2004). Clarfield (2004) said instead of strongly encouraging piano performance, piano teachers today should prepare the students for a career as a musician. Some potential careers in music include collaborative artists, orchestra members, arts management leaders, and music educators at all levels (Clarfield, 2004). Piano teachers today should also prepare students with non-traditional skills as part of the piano curriculum (Slawsky, 2011; Uszler, 1992), in addition to training in the genres of jazz piano and contemporary music (Fu, 2007).

However, teachers may be reluctant to diversify from a traditional curriculum because of inadequate preparation in certain areas (Wolfersberger, 1986). Wolfersberger surveyed 300 piano teachers to determine selected aspects of the piano teaching profession. Respondents said despite pedagogical training in some areas, they felt inadequately prepared to teach in the areas of “transposition, piano ensemble experience, composition, improvisation, and jazz and rock idioms” (Wolfersberger, 1986, p. 97).

The teachers also indicated inadequacies in training in the areas of “educational psychology and computer technique” (Wolfersberger, 1986, p. 97). Institutions and organizations in the business of educating professional piano teachers should expose these teachers to “innovative and contemporary trends in piano education” (Wolfersberger, 1986, p. 97). Uszler (1992) agreed, and said researchers in the area of
piano pedagogy need to turn their attention toward finding more effective methods for teaching piano.

**Piano Teacher Training**

Traditionally, the master-apprentice model, or tutorial teaching method, has been used to educate undergraduate piano majors on *how* to teach piano (Uszler, 1992). In this system, the master teacher models and demonstrates for students in the lesson (Uszler, 1992). It has been customary for pianists to learn to play and learn to teach through the master-apprentice model (Slawsky, 2011).

With the master-apprentice model, piano teachers teach their students based on how they were taught. In the master-apprentice model, the student transitions from apprentice to teacher after tutelage is complete (Slawsky, 2011). This tutorial teaching, or master-apprentice model is “at the heart of the conservatory tradition” (Uszer, 1992, p.584).

However, the traditional master-apprenticeship model of learning has been criticized for unrealistic career expectations (Slawsky, 2011). The traditional master-apprenticeship model of learning at the piano, while effective for training undergraduates in high levels of music performance, has been criticized for not adequately preparing students for a sustainable career after graduation (Slawsky, 2011). It is also uncertain what specific skills and concepts are being taught across institutions (Slawsky, 2011).

Inadequate preparation is a concern, because piano teachers today must teach in a variety of educational settings, including the private-instructional setting and the group-piano setting; and teaching to the nonmusic major, the music major, and adults (Uszler, 1992). Uszler (1992) said the concert or recital performance is no longer the
exclusive goal of the piano teacher. Keyboard lab, classroom, small group, and other educational settings have changed the goals of the piano teacher (Uszler, 1992). These goals now emphasize teaching “music at the piano” as opposed to “teaching the piano” (Uszler, 1992, p.586).

Piano teachers must also consider different musical genres to connect with today’s musical audience (Husser, 2007). Genres such as jazz, rock piano, and popular music serve the contemporary piano teacher as teaching tools, along with chamber music, accompanying, and musical theatre music, to keep pianists engaged and connected to today’s musical world (Husser, 2007).

A degree in piano pedagogy or a piano performance degree, along with strong pedagogical training, should be considered essential for a career in piano teaching (Lyke, 1987b). With the trend shifting toward group teaching at the piano and functional skills at the piano, there has also been an increase in pedagogical materials and methods books (Uzler, 1992). However, little is known about which methods are effective (Uszler, 1992). It is common for the piano teacher to use material from various methods books (Uszler, 1992). It is typical for the piano teacher to “mix and match books within a series according to personal teaching philosophy or the needs and desires of individual students” (Uszler, 1992, p.587).

**Functional Keyboard Skills**

As noted earlier, the goals of the piano teacher emphasize teaching “music at the piano” (Uszler, 1992, p.586), and preparing students for more college options (Clarfield, 2004). Development of functional piano skills and musicianship training for intermediate age students is important because these skills teach students basic musical knowledge (Lyke, 1987e). While some aspiring musicians may choose to learn functional piano
skills in college, music educators believe in preparation in functional skills before college (Christensen, 2000).

Christensen (2000) surveyed 472 general elementary music teachers along with secondary school band, choral, and orchestra teachers to determine which functional piano skills these teachers use and how often. Respondents said while functional piano skills are important for music education majors, pre-collegiate students who show an interest in teaching should be encouraged to learn functional skills in piano lessons before college (Christensen, 2000). The respondents said, in doing so, the general level of piano proficiency of music education majors would increase.

What is more, a piano student who shows an interest in teaching needs a strong set of functional piano skills, as the student is more likely to teach those skills (Uzler, 1992), compared to other musicians. Uszler said within the music teacher chain of command, the keyboard teacher is typically accountable for teaching functional music skills. An explanation for this trend in piano teaching: the nature of the keyboard makes it an “ideal teaching tool” (Uszler, 1992, p.586) for functional skills, therefore making the piano teacher a likely candidate for teaching functional skill proficiency.

She said piano teachers in general are more likely to focus on teaching functional musical skills in addition to solo repertoire compared with choral or instrumental teachers. She said it is typical for piano teachers to teach their students harmonization, transposition, improvisation, and other functional skills while simultaneously preparing the student for a formal recital (Uszler, 1992).

Experts agree that the acquisition of functional skills and pedagogical instruction is important for today’s aspiring pianist (Clarfield, 2004; Uszler, 1992; Kowalchyk &
Lancaster, 1991). Kowalchyk & Lancaster (1991) said teaching functional skills will help intermediate-level students understand what they are playing. Goodkind (1981) said that the skills of "ear training, harmony, and structural analysis are primary requisites to build an intelligent performance, since the main function of these subjects is to heighten the sense of hearing and musical understanding" (p. 157).

Kowalchyk & Lancaster (1991) define the typical intermediate-level piano student as a piano student at the junior-high or high-school piano student who has had several years of piano study. Functional keyboard skills for the intermediate pianist should include sight-reading, harmonization at the keyboard, transposition, accompaniment, improvisation, and playing chord progressions (Kowalchyk & Lancaster, 1991). Identification of a list of skills to be developed during intermediate years should help piano teachers to plan a curriculum (Uszler, 1991b).

Intermediate piano students (Kowalchyk & Lancaster, 1991, p.288) should learn and acquire the following functional piano skills:

1) the ability to sight-read repertoire and accompaniments beyond the elementary level, (2) transpose repertoire and simple accompaniments to closely related keys, (3) improvise short examples in the style of composers from various historical periods, (4) improvise short examples based on informal idioms (pop, rock, jazz, folk) and twentieth century idioms, (5) improvise melodies from given chord symbols, (6) create musical examples that require the use of sequence, (7) play chord progressions using secondary chords and secondary dominants in major and minor keys, (8) harmonize melodies with secondary chords and secondary dominants using simple accompaniment style, and (9) create second parts to solo piano repertoire based on analysis of theoretical concepts

**Group Piano Class**

Group piano, or class piano, is the approach of teaching the keyboard to a class of three or more students (Skaggs, 1981) and is often used to teach functional piano skills (Uszler, 1992). The electronic keyboard lab broadened educational opportunities
for the piano-lab student (Lyke, 1987c), and also allowed non-piano majors to learn functional keyboard skills in the group-piano setting (Uszler, 1992). The keyboard lab gives students the advantage of listening to each other and being exposed to more literature, and often motivates students through stimulation (Skaggs, 1981). The group piano class has also been viewed as an important tool to assist in theory instruction (Uszler, 1992).

Teachers find the group method of instruction advantageous because they are able to teach the same concept to multiple students, simultaneously, in a fraction of the time it would take to teach just one student in back-to-back private lessons. Students learn through active participation, exploration, and discovery in the group setting, as opposed to the imitation method often used in a private setting (Skaggs, 1981). The teacher in this group setting acts as a guide, as students develop skills that include listening, peer interaction, positive peer encouragement, and self-accountability (Skaggs, 1981).

The piano instructor must decide on the balance between group instruction and solo instruction within the curriculum at a performing arts school. Teachers often use the group-piano setting to focus on functional skills, and use the private, one-on-one, teacher-student setting, to teach applied piano performance (Skaggs, 1981). As noted above, some advantages of group teaching include students being able to learn together, to conduct ear training and rhythmic drills in unison, to play for their peer audience, and to be exposed to a greater portion of piano literature (Skaggs, 1981). Clark (1992) said group-piano lessons allow and should demand emphasize on “musical listening, musical thinking, and musical performance” (Clark, 1992, p. 183).
Kim (2004, p.30)

Group teaching strategies focusing on developing students’ extra-musical skills also helps them listen, concentrate, be responsible, exert self control, handle disappointments and generally care more about learning. Group lessons can, therefore, establish the instructional model that can enhance the emotional literacy of every piano student. (p. 30).

A challenge for the teacher of group piano: the teacher must spend many hours planning appropriate methods and materials for the group-piano curriculum (Skaggs, 1981). The teacher also must be able to effectively manage the classroom. Therefore it is valuable for the teacher to have had coursework in education, psychology, and testing (Skaggs, 1981). Strong organizational skills and coursework in group teaching are also valuable for the group piano teacher (Skaggs, 1981).

**Piano Teacher and Assessment**

Goffe (1991) said a “basic program of requirements for music majors in performing arts high schools should be developed to encourage uniformity in standards among arts schools” (p.108). Experts agree that evaluation and assessment components are key to a successful musical curriculum (Abeles et al., 1995; Hoffer, 2005; Kostka, 1997; Ornstein & Hunkins, 2009). Music educators must assess a variety of skills in music, including performance, music history, composition, composition, and aural skills (Kostka, 1997). However, the area of performance is highly subjective (Ciorba & Smith, 2009), and there is little data on repertoire requirements for entry into performing arts schools (Goffe, 1991) to determine the proficiency level of entering students.

Once a student is admitted to a performing arts magnet school, teachers must consider the unique educational demographic due because of diverse backgrounds (Daniel, 2000). Therefore, it is important not to assess students based on their rank
relative to the rest of the class (Butera, 2013). Instead, the assessment should be based on whether specific criteria have been met.

As piano teachers are becoming increasingly responsible for equipping students with a broader set of functional piano skills (Vogt, 2006, Uszler, 1992) within the piano curriculum along with solo repertoire proficiency, it is important that piano teachers assess students on these skills (Kostka, 1997). Assessment will help teachers determine whether to “accept, change, or eliminate aspects of the curriculum such as textbooks” (Ornstein and Hunkins, 2009, p. 275).

In their recent article, Teaching and Learning: Using Experiential Learning and Reflection for Leadership Education, Guthrie and Bertrand (2012) discuss Dewey (1933) who believed that experiential learning gives educators and students a chance for reflection on the experience, therefore creating a more meaningful learning opportunity. The experiential learning theory suggests that learning occurs through process in which individuals learn and develop, based on the experience (Guthrie and Bertrand, 2012).

Through reflection, part of the process proposed by Kolb (1984), we can determine which criteria are being met (Butera, 2013) and which elements of the curriculum could be eliminated or changed (Ornstein and Hunkins, 2009, p. 275). This will help determine basic program requirements for piano programs at performing arts magnet high schools.

**Summary**

In conclusion, performing arts magnet schools provide parents with educational choice (Hausman & Goldring, 2000) and give students a creative and rigorous education in a nontraditional classroom setting (Daniel, 2000). Students from music
programs at performing arts schools are consistently highly qualified to pursue further study or to pursue a career in the performing arts (U.S. Department of Education, 2008b). This is partly because of dedicated teaching (Dyaz, 2006) and partly because the unique educational environment includes a rigorous curriculum of arts and core academic courses (Daniel, 2000) (U.S. Department of Education, 2008b).

A primary goal of performing arts schools is to provide students with pre-professional training (Goffe, 1991). Many piano students at performing arts schools are dually enrolled in private studio lessons; so the piano teacher must work to engage the student in the keyboard lab setting and in many cases, supplement their private studio instruction. Today, piano teachers are challenged to give 21st century students fundamental and contemporary course options in music (Slawsky, 2011; Meichang, 2010), to engage students and prepare them for success. Therefore, it is suggested that piano teachers have a strong knowledge of educational and psychological learning theories (Uszler, 1991a); and pedagogical, technological, and performance training at the piano (Lyke, 1987a).

It is also suggested that piano teachers at performing arts schools teach a comprehensive musical education, which includes performance skills and functional piano skills (Uszler, 1992). It is also suggested teachers provide extra-curricular activities such as master-classes and field-trips (Goffe, 1991), while using the group piano and solo-piano instructional setting to the school’s best advantage. The piano teacher may have to seek additional funding resources to do this (Walker, 1989).

Experts agree that functional keyboard skills are important for the aspiring intermediate-level pianist (Kowalchyk & Lancaster, 1991; Uszler, 1992). Intermediate
pianist skills should include sight-reading, harmonization at the keyboard, sight-reading, transposition, accompaniment, improvisation, and playing chord progressions (Kowalchyk & Lancaster, 1991). These skills and other musicianship skills should successfully prepare today's pianist for a career in music (Clarfield, 2004).

Finally, piano teachers must find ways to assess functional skills and repertoire requirements. In addition, a “basic program of requirements for music majors in performing arts high schools should be developed to encourage uniformity in standards among arts schools” (Goffe, 1991, p.108). However, quantifiable data on what students know and learn in music education classes at state and national levels is limited because teachers have a difficult time assessing creative and performing arts components (Mark, 1996).

In conclusion, performing arts schools provide a unique environment to research current trends in curriculum at the piano. By taking an in-depth look into the piano programs at performing arts schools, we can find out what courses are being taught; what training and skills teachers find beneficial to teach in these unique environments; and which courses they would like to add, remove, or change in their current school program. Finally, by looking at modes of assessment used by these teachers, we can determine the best ways to set students up for collegiate and professional success.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

This chapter presents the methodology used in the study. The primary purpose of the study was to identify and explore the current teaching qualifications, teaching positions, classes taught, mandatory requirements, and materials used by piano teachers at performing arts schools. Based on this, the researcher identified similarities in the curriculum and methods used by these piano teachers, and identified improvements sought by piano teachers regarding the current teaching situation at their magnet school. Based on these similarities and teacher-suggested improvements, the researcher developed a suggested curriculum to prepare the students to enter college as a piano major. The suggested curriculum is located at the end of Chapter 5 after the discussion of the results and recommendations for further research.

Research Design

The exploratory research used a one-shot case-study approach, with a mixed-methods research design. While the research is primarily quantitative in nature, to strengthen the study, open-ended questions provided a qualitative component in one survey section, as a means to gather more in-depth information. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected simultaneously. The qualitative data were used to provide more depth to and to refine the quantitative data (Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtle, 2006).

Target Population

A target population, sometimes referred to as the sampling frame, is a “group of individuals with some common defining characteristic that the researcher can identify
and study” (Creswell, 2008, p.142). Sampling a target population was used to determine the schools, teacher names, and email addresses of piano teachers, adjunct and part-time, who teach any kind of piano at their respective performing arts high school.

**Procedures**

Before the actual study, the researcher conducted a pilot study, using the researcher-developed survey (discussed below) with piano teachers in Florida from two separate performing arts schools that belong to the Arts School Network (ASN). An online questionnaire created in Qualtrics was distributed to these piano teachers. A total of 10 teachers completed the pilot study. The pilot study contained four sections: student recruitment and achievement, program requirements, student assessment information, and teacher demographic information. Because of the target sample for the pilot study (piano teachers at schools belonging to the Arts School Network), pilot participants were assumed to be representative of the population for the actual study.

Results of the pilot study were reviewed with an external auditor. In an external audit, “a researcher hires or obtains the services of an individual outside the study to review many aspects of the research. This auditor reviews the project and writes or communicates an evaluation of the study” (Creswell, 2008, p.621). The researcher then consulted with colleagues in music education, and changed from nominal-scale questions to open-ended questions, asking participants to type in the exact number of students in their program. This change shortened the survey, and allowed the researcher to collect more accurate answers by allowing teachers to write in specific program size numbers.

After revising the survey (Appendix A), the researcher sent the email through the Qualtrics system inviting these teachers to participate in the study. The email contained
a link to the electronic survey teachers could choose to open and answer. The first schedule of emails was sent on October 29th 2013. A total of 138 surveys were emailed to 79 schools belonging to the Arts School Network that fit the criteria of a performing arts magnet school with a piano program.

**Survey Instrument**

The study used a researcher-developed survey based on similar research on arts schools and high-school music programs (Goffe, 1991; Gordon, 1993; Hinkle, 2011; Lacognata, 2010; Perry, 2012). The revised questionnaire (Appendix A) consisted of four sections: 1) teacher background and qualifications; 2) student recruitment, achievement, and requirements; 3) course offerings and curriculum in keyboard/piano; and 4) assessment and evaluation practices. The survey consisted mainly of closed-ended questions in which the participant was forced to choose from a set of predetermined responses. Section 3 of the survey, (course offerings and curriculum in keyboard/piano), consisted of both closed-ended and open-ended questions, so respondents could explain what they would like to add, change, or delete from their current program curriculum.

Section 1 (teacher background and qualifications), consisted of close-ended questions in the format of nominal scales, ordinal scales, and interval scales to gather quantitative data from respondents. Nominal scales were used to collect data about teacher background and specialties, where open-ended questions were used to gather quantitative data about program size and years of teaching experience. Section 2 (student recruitment, achievement, and requirements) used nominal scales to gather data about student entrance criteria, student graduation rates, and program objectives.
Section 3 of the survey asked respondents to answer both nominal scale questions and open-ended questions. The nominal scale questions asked teachers to check off which courses are currently required within their program. The open-ended questions asked which courses teachers would add, delete, or change in their current curriculum and why.

Finally, Section 4 (assessment and evaluation practices) contained nominal-scale questions about assessment and evaluation practices.

**Data Analysis**

Data from the quantitative portion of the survey were analyzed using descriptive statistics that describe, summarize, and explain the data (Johnson and Christensen, 2008). Data from the qualitative portion of the survey underwent content analysis. Content analysis is a systematic technique that allows a researcher to compress many words of text into content categories based on explicit rules of coding and is used to determine trends and patterns (Stemler, 2001). Content analysis helped “discover and describe the focus” of the responses (Stemler, 2001, p. 1) and helped compare them to the literature. Inductive codes “generated by the researcher by directly examining the data during the coding process” (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 538), were identified from the open-ended responses in Section 3 of the survey.

**Validity and Reliability**

The researcher asked committee members and professional colleagues in the field of music education to evaluate the questions before they were pilot-tested to ensure item validity. Feedback from participants was used to make needed revisions to the survey. Content validity was established through review by an external audit. As mentioned, in an external audit a professional outside the researcher’s committee
reviews the project and writes or communicates an evaluation of the study’s (Creswell, 2008, p.621). The open-ended questions’ content validity was evidenced by themes in the responses; and was checked by experts in the field.

Reliability for the revised survey was based on a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.939. Furthermore, only one version of the survey was distributed, to increase internal consistency.

**Summary**

In conclusion, the pilot study allowed me to identify similarities in the requirements of piano majors and similarities in the entrance criteria for piano majors at performing arts schools. The pilot study also helped identify questions needing to be revised or converted to open-ended questions, to yield more accurate answers and shorten the survey. The researcher was also able to identify which courses were currently required, and which courses teachers would like to see added to their curriculum. The suggested curriculum can be found at the end of Chapter 5, after the discussion of the results and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

An online questionnaire created in Qualtrics was distributed to piano faculty members at performing arts schools across the nation. In total, 138 emails were sent to 79 schools from the Arts School Network that fit the criteria of a performing arts high school. Fifty-seven teachers returned the survey. Ultimately, 48 surveys contributed to the data collection for this study, resulting in a 42% return rate.

The survey was divided into four sections: teacher demographic information, student recruitment and achievement information, program requirements, and student assessment information. Data collected from the questionnaires are presented below. Description and analysis of survey results are presented in conjunction with the questions as designated on the survey (Table 4-1 to 4-19; Figure 4-1 to Figure 4-8).

Research Questions

- **RQ1:** Are there similar course offerings in piano departments among arts schools belonging to the Arts School Network?
- **RQ2:** What are the criteria (in addition to a successful audition) for student selection concentrating in the piano/keyboard department?
- **RQ3:** What are the requirements of piano majors at performing arts schools?
- **RQ4:** What courses do piano/keyboard instructors think should be added, deleted, or changed and what are the reasons for favoring these changes?
- **RQ5:** Is there a piano requirement for all music majors in the music program at a performing arts school?
- **RQ6:** If so, what is the purpose of such a requirement?

Data from Questionnaires

Questionnaires were distributed to piano faculty members across the nation using Qualtrics, a University of Florida survey tool. Descriptive statistics are presented...
below, in order of the four survey sections (teacher demographic information, student recruitment and achievement information, program requirements and course offerings, and student assessment information).

**Response Rate**

On October 29th 2013, 138 surveys were emailed to 79 schools belonging to the Arts School Network that fit the criteria of a performing arts magnet school with a piano program. Twenty teachers wrote back saying they were music teachers from the department, but they were not piano teachers and could not properly answer the survey. This brought the survey down to 118 recipients. From this, a total of 57 surveys were returned to the researcher. Eight were thrown out due to incomplete or unworkable responses, so 48 surveys counted toward the study. This resulted in a 42% return rate.

**Section 1. Teacher Demographic Information**

**Questions 1 and 2: Getting consent and current teaching status.** Most teachers (85%, n=40) who returned the survey are employed at their performing arts school as full-time instructors. Types of “other” teaching statuses reported include music history and composition Instructor, vocal instructor, piano literature instructor, digital music composition instructor, chamber music instructor, teacher of orchestral music, guitar teacher, and part-time instructor (Table 4-1).

**Question 3: Years of teaching experience after college.** Most teachers (42%, n=19) responding to this survey had 5 or fewer years of piano teaching experience: (Table 4-2).

**Question 4: Years teaching in current position.** Most teachers (39.13%, n=18) responding to the survey have been in their position for 5 years or less. (Table 4-3).
Question 5: Level of professional education or training in music. The most popular degree reported by respondents was the Master of Music Degree: 32%, (n=15). (Table 4-4). Seventy-four percent (n=26) of the respondents did not hold a Professional K-12 music teaching certificate.

Question 6: Number of students enrolled in the piano program. The average piano program size reported for a performing arts high school was 45 students. Program sizes had a range of 300 to 5 students (Table 4-5) (Table 4-6).

Question 7: Number of students enrolled in the school music program. Average music program size reported was 322 students. The program size had a range of 1000 to 22 students (Table 4-5) (Table 4-7).

Section 2. Student Recruitment and Achievement

Question 11: Admission criteria. Teachers were asked to indicate the level of importance of three criteria typically used in the admissions process at performing arts schools. If none of the three criteria fit, respondents could say “other.” Teachers were asked to indicate the level of importance of the admission criteria by rating each criterion from 1 to 5: 1 was “unimportant” and 5 was “very important.” Forty teachers answered the question. The criterion with the highest mean (M=4.45) was performance-based audition (n=31) (Table 4-8). About 7 teachers reported “other” types of criteria: “interest, county residents, school lottery, attendance record, sight-reading, and unsure.”

Questions 12 and 13. Seniors who plan to pursue music in college and type of institution where they plan to pursue music. From 43 teacher responses, 332 students from the Spring 2013 graduating class went on to pursue piano or a piano-related degree in college (Table 4-9).
Section 3. Program Requirements and Course Offerings

**Question 8: Piano requirement for non-piano music majors.** In total, 40 teachers responded to this question: 45% (n=18) of the teachers said piano is required for non-piano majors; 55% (n=22) reported that piano is not required.

Eighteen teachers shared that piano was required for non-piano majors at their school. Sixteen of these 18 teachers (88.89%) said the piano requirement is designed for non-piano majors to learn functional skills at the keyboard. Twenty-eight percent (n=5) said the requirement is to assist non-piano majors with learning music theory. Thirty-three percent (n=6) said the requirement is for non-piano majors to learn solo repertoire.

**Question 10: Primary objective of the piano program.** From the 40 responses to this question, 50% (n=20) said the primary objective of their piano program was to prepare the students to enter college or conservatory as a performing arts major or for a career in the performing arts. The remaining 50% (n=20) said the primary objective of their piano program was for students to receive the best education possible for artistically gifted students, regardless of post-high-school plans.

A Chi-square analysis with a p-value of .06 revealed that schools with a piano requirement would have a primary objective of sending their students to college to pursue music. Given a larger population, the .06 number would likely have been closer to .05 or below, indicating an association among schools with a piano requirement and in their primary program objective of preparing students for a conservatory or college to study music (Table 4-10) (Table 4-11).

**Question 14: Methods books.** For this item, teachers were asked whether they used a standard method book to teach piano majors and non-piano majors. Teachers
who did use a method book were asked the title of the book used for both piano majors and non-piano majors. Only 21 teachers said they used a methods book: 42.8 % (n=9) of the 21 teachers said they used a methods book for piano majors. Of those, 3 listed the methods book as *Alfred’s Basic Piano Course*. One teacher listed the *Isidore Phillippe Methods book*, and five did not list a methods book title.

Sixteen teachers said use follow a methods book for non-piano majors: 37.5% (n=6) of these teachers listed *Alfred’s Basic Adult Piano Course*. One teacher listed *Piano for the Developing Musician*, one listed *The Older Beginner Piano Course*, one listed the *Bastien Series*, one listed the *Norton History of Western Music*, one listed the *D’Auberge books*, and one listed *Scales, Etudes, and Chorales*.

**Question 15: Grade-level requirements.** Teachers were asked to list any specific repertoire students were required to learn by grade level. This question yielded only 5 responses. One teacher said yes, students were required to learn specific pieces by grade level; however, the respondent did not list any piece titles. One teacher said students were not required to learn specific repertoire, but students were required to present a 45-minute comprehensive solo recital to include music from all important eras in classical music.

**Question 16: instructional setting for applied skills.** Teachers who use the private instructional setting to teach applied skills: 28.9% (n=11). Teachers who use the group piano class setting to teach applied skills: 60.5% (n=23).

**Question 17: Instructional setting for functional skills.** Teachers who use the private instructional setting to teach functional skills: 15.2% (n=5). Teachers who use a group piano class setting to teach functional skills: 66.6% (n=22).
**Question 18: Course/skill requirements for piano majors.** In total, 126 responses were given for course requirements for piano majors (Figure 4-1). The top required applied skills included keyboard or piano (n=21), music theory (n=21), and keyboard technique (n=19). Courses required the least included jazz/blues piano (n=2) and music composition (n=4).

**Question 19: Functional skill requirements for piano majors and non-piano majors.** Piano majors: 142 responses were given for this question. The top-required skills for piano majors were sight-reading (n=21), basic music reading at the piano (n=21), chord progressions (n=21), and ear-training (n=19). Skills required the least included composition (n=8) and improvisation (n=5) for piano majors (Table 4-12).

Non-piano majors: In total, 98 responses were given for this question. The top-required skills for non-piano majors were basic music reading at the piano (n=19), ear-training (n=18), and sight-reading (n=16). Skills required least for non-piano majors included improvisation (n=3) and accompanying (n=1) (Table 4-13).

**Question 20: Courses deleted from the curriculum.** Presented to the teacher as an open-ended question, teachers were asked if there were any courses or topics they would remove from their current program. Open-ended questions allow participants to respond in their own words (Johnson & Christensen, 2008) and typically are qualitatively analyzed. However, a researcher may quantitatively analyze the data by counting the number of responses. Only 6 responses were given: 5 teachers said “no” and 1 teacher would remove Gospel Choir from the current program curriculum.

**Question 21: Additional courses or topics added to the curriculum if teachers had more time and or resources.** This was presented to the teacher as an
open-ended question. There were 16 responses. Through inductive coding, the researcher divided the responses into seven categories: piano or piano-related coursework, music history courses, jazz coursework, music technology, contemporary music, portfolio preparation and training, music theory and related coursework, and ensemble courses (Table 4-14).

Question 22: Additional resources that would improve the current teaching situation at each school and why. This open-ended question received 18 responses. Through inductive coding, the researcher divided responses into 8 categories: keyboard and keyboard-related materials, funding, technology, space, staff training and professional development, administrative time for teachers, scheduling and time with students, and career counseling (Table 4-15).

Section 4. Assessment Information

Question 23: Piano lesson frequency (Table 4-16). Thirty teachers answered this question: 40% (n=12) said they require a weekly lesson; 26.6% (n=8) said they never require a lesson. Note that some performing arts schools require students to enroll in private piano lessons outside the magnet school program. This factor could contribute to the 26.6% reporting no lesson requirement.

A Chi-square analysis with a p-value of .01 shows that schools requiring weekly piano lessons have a primary objective of preparing students for entrance into a college or conservatory to pursue music (Table 4-18).

Question 24: Performance requirement and frequency (Tables 4-19) (4-20). Juries and recitals are the most frequent assessments reported by teachers. Juries are required twice per school year by 13 teachers. Recitals are required twice per school year by 10 teachers.
Question 25: Teacher competency ranking (Tables 4-20) (4-21). Teachers from performing arts schools were asked to rank on a scale of 1 to 6 various competencies in the order they felt best prepared students for entry into college or conservatory as a music major. The number 1 was the highest ranking. Teachers ranked performance competency as most important ($M=1.64$) to prepare students for entry into college or conservatory.
Table 4-1. Current teaching status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time instructor</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct piano faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class or group piano instructor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist-in-residence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff accompanist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music theory instructor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to indicate their teaching status by marking all positions that applied to them. Therefore, the total percentage does not add up to 100%.

Table 4-2. Years of piano teaching experience after college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-3. Years teaching in current position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4-4. Level of professional education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Music</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Music Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor other (please describe)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Music</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of Music Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master other (please describe)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate in Music</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD in Music Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate other (please describe)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional K-12 Music Teaching Certificate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist in Music Ed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other certifications (Please describe)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of teachers who responded</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of professional education or training by marking all the applied to them. In total, 47 teachers responded to this question. Percentages were taken from 47 responses.
Table 4-5. Piano program and music program size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano program size</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>56.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music program size</td>
<td>12,265</td>
<td>322.76</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>255.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-6. Number of piano students enrolled in the music program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-7. Number of music students enrolled in the music program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151-200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-250</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-300</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451-500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>551-600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-8. Admission criteria rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrance criterion</th>
<th>1-un-important</th>
<th>2-little importance</th>
<th>3-moderate importance</th>
<th>4-important</th>
<th>5-very important</th>
<th>7-total responses</th>
<th>8-mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic measures</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Audition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic requirements</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-9: Teachers who indicated their most recent graduating class would attend college for music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th># of Teacher Responses</th>
<th># of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-state or out-of state public university</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservatory</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-10. Cross-tabulation of schools that have a piano requirement with their primary program objective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary program objective</th>
<th>Piano requirement</th>
<th>No piano requirement</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservatory Prep</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Education Prep</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-11. Cross-tabulation results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$-value</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-12. Functional skill requirements for piano majors in order of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of functional skill</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sight-reading</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear-training</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic music reading or notation at the piano</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord Progressions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble Playing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and/or Arranging</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other functional skill (please describe)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other functional skills required included elementary figured-bass.
Table 4-13. Functional skill requirements for non-piano majors in order of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of functional skills</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic music reading or notation at the piano</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear-training</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight-reading</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight-reading</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord progressions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord progressions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble playing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and/or arranging</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and/or arranging</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-14. Categorization of responses to the open-ended question, what additional courses or topics would you add to the curriculum if you had more time and or resources to do so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inductive categories</th>
<th>Participant responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Piano or piano - related coursework         | piano literature for senior piano majors  
Required piano class.  
Piano seminar; keyboard skills (harmonization, improvisation, transposition, score reading, figured bass)  
Piano Lit (literature survey)  
Class piano |
| Music history                               | Music History  
History of Popular Music in America  
History of American Music |
| Jazz coursework                             | We would restore our year-long jazz history class  
History of Jazz  
jazz studies class  
jazz ensemble |
| Music technology                            | Digital Music Composition: Levels 1, 2and 3 and 4. Each is one semester course, currently.  
Music Technology  
garage band |
| Contemporary music                          | Modern music styles  
Contemporary Music Ensemble |
| Portfolio preparation and training          | Composition Portfolio  
Audition Prep  
We would like to offer training in the building and repair of musical instruments. |
| Music Theory and related ensemble           | ear training  
basic Music Theory Course  
orchestration class  
conducting class  
Early Music Ensemble  
Bach Ensemble (open to vocal and instrumental music majors  
Contemporary Music Ensemble  
Mariachi |
Table 4-15. Categorization of responses to the open-ended question, what additional resources do you think would improve the current teaching situation at your school and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inductive Categories</th>
<th>Participant responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard and keyboard-related</td>
<td>More keyboards. The classroom is overcrowded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials</td>
<td>Keyboard lab is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More grand pianos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have adequate keyboards in our piano lab, but instruments always need maintenance and repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We are hoping to enlarge our keyboard lab from 10 stations to 20, because so many of our piano/composition/electronic music classes are taught there and are limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More materials in general. I have a class of 25 students, 5 in the advanced section and 20 in the beginner section. The class should be capped at 20 students in a beginner section (students to materials ratio 2:1), 10 in an advanced (students to materials ratio 1:1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Funding for private lessons for students. I work with socio-economically disadvantaged kids. While we are an arts school, they come to me as beginners and rarely have the opportunity to practice or play outside of class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our budget has been cut along with that of every other school in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Access to technology!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer lab (music theory) as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>More classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The classroom is overcrowded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>more room and performance spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More practice rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easier access to performance space for large ensembles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We are currently capped at 24 students in class piano (the number of keyboards that are available per class). We currently offer six piano classes on our A/B block schedule. There is no room in our schedule to offer more classes without adding staff and classroom space. We can not offer the above (Music History / History of Pop Music in America) due to a lack staff, teaching units and classroom space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff, training, and</td>
<td>Training for faculty and students in software and tools for electronic music and recording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative time for teachers</td>
<td>More administrative time. Less busy work. More autonomy over program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More TIME to prepare lessons and research new materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time, time, time. . . for everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and time</td>
<td>Better scheduling for music students would improve student learning and support the programs better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for students</td>
<td>More time for practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time, time, time. . . for everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More contact time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counseling</td>
<td>career counseling for students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-16. Piano lesson frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson frequency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times per month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 times per week</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4-17. Cross-tabulation of school program objective with piano lesson frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary program objective</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>2-3 times a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>2-3 times per week</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservatory Prep</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Education Prep</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.18. Results of cross-tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>19.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>07.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$-value</td>
<td>00.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-19. Performance frequency and requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Performance</th>
<th>Required once per year</th>
<th>Required twice per year</th>
<th>Required three times per year</th>
<th>Required four times per year</th>
<th>Total responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jury</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/state festival</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recital</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duet or ensemble performance</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-20. Rank order of teacher rating of competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juries/Adjudication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional piano skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique (posture, hand position, balance, scales, arpeggios)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of literature/repertoire covered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers were asked to rank competencies on a scale of 1 to 6. 1 being the most important and 6 being the least important competency in preparing students for collegiate auditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Juries</th>
<th>Functional skills</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Amount of Literature covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4-1. Course requirements for piano majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Requirements</th>
<th>Students Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keyboard or Piano</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Keyboard Technique</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Keyboard Duet</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Keyboard Ensemble or Chamber Music</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jazz/Blues Piano</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Music Theory</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. AP Music Theory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Music History or Music Appreciation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Music Composition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Accompanying (Vocal or Instrumental)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Electronic Music</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other Course/Skill (please describe)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other Course/Skill (please describe)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Through this study, the researcher set out to understand piano programs at performing arts magnet high schools and to identify the content of the traditional piano curriculum for pre-college students. Results from the survey were used as a basis to develop a suggested curriculum for piano majors at performing arts schools, which can be found at the end of this chapter.

In total, 79 schools that belong to the Arts School Network (ASN) fit the criteria of being a performing arts magnet high school with a piano program. The researcher sent a total of 138 emails with the survey. In total, 48 surveys were returned with usable data, resulting in a 42% return rate. Reasons for the limited response include lack of teacher time, the length of the survey, and unfamiliarity with the researcher request.

Summary of the Results

Exactly half of the teachers reported their primary school mission was to prepare the students to enter college or the conservatory as a performing arts major. Results also show that piano teachers responding to this survey were not driven by demographic requirements. A few teachers responding to the survey said students must dually enroll in private lessons outside the piano program, and remain enrolled in private lessons throughout high school.

The results suggest a certain level of piano proficiency must be met for acceptance into the program. The low rating of demographic requirements suggests that these are not an important component of student selection; however, teachers may have not known their programs have demographic requirements or may have felt uncomfortable sharing information on this subject.
The high performance score suggests teachers from this study can be selective about who they accept as piano majors. If students are accepted into a program with a primary objective of pre-college training, it is likely they will be required to take weekly piano lessons as part of the program as was a result of the cross tabulation from Question 23 (Table 4-16).

Another conclusion from the results is that piano teachers from selective programs recognize the importance of functional skills for non-piano majors in order to prepare them for college auditions. This was indicated by teachers focusing on skills such as notation at the piano, ear-training, sight-reading, and chord progressions.

The focus on the above mentioned skills along with suggestions for additional coursework aligns with research that expectations for the pre-college pianist should broaden (Clarfield, 2004) and that piano teachers today are challenged to give fundamental and contemporary course options in music (Slawksy, 2011; Meichang, 2010). The courses suggested to enhance the curriculum include jazz piano, portfolio preparation, piano literature, digital music, and piano seminar. The highlighting of these skills could serve as a suggestion for teachers to include these skills in piano curricula going forward.

The results from the study also indicate that teachers at performing arts schools use the keyboard lab setting to teach both applied and functional piano skills to piano and non-piano majors. A scheduling and time constraint later confirmed in the study suggests that private instruction may not be a viable option.

Rouston et al. (2005) discovered that music teachers who were transitioning into their first year of teaching reported challenges working with large numbers of students
at once. A suggestion from this research study would be for music education undergraduates or piano performance majors to train in how to teach group instruction at the piano. With more and more students learning to play piano on digital keyboards, training in group-piano lessons could be a potential benefit to piano performance and music education undergraduates.

Conclusions

Teaching status. More teachers at performing arts schools hold performance degrees than music education degrees. Results also show that most participating teachers had 15 or fewer years of piano teaching experience. Perhaps younger teachers are more likely to fill out an electronic survey, such as the one used for this study. Another consideration: performing arts schools employ piano teachers with a strong background in performance, indicated by the degrees reported in Table 4-4. These teachers might not have as many formal years of teaching experience as a music education major who went into teaching directly after college.

One suggestion from the research: universities and conservatories should consider certification programs for their piano performance major. Slawsky (2011) said piano teachers have confidence-related challenges when beginning to teach (p.222). Only 26% (n=12) of study participants had a professional K-12 music teaching certificate; 74% (n=35) of teachers had no professional music teaching certificate. A professional K-12 music teaching certificate might better prepare teachers for unique teaching situations such as performing arts high schools.

Recruitment. In total, 332 students were reported to have pursued music from Spring 2013 graduating class at the time of the survey. One conclusion: high schools of the performing arts are one resource for colleges, universities, and conservatories to
recruit highly qualified piano students. A piano professor and/or related music school recruiter might increase this number (332) by developing and building a relationship between their schools and these performing arts high school teachers.

**Assessment requirements.** In connection with the recruitment ideas above, one suggested curriculum objective would be a performance rubric. The rubric would help piano teachers and students from these programs prepare a portfolio for conservatory or university music auditions.

Assessment in the arts can be challenging (U.S. Department of Education, 2008c). A rubric would provide a written record of the assessment, along with video or audio-recorded digital media, such as a CD or DVD. This way, teachers would have a consistent, non-relative ranking from which to compare their students, and ultimately their programs. In addition, students would have a concrete portfolio for potential colleges or conservatories before a formal audition.

Grounded in experiential learning theory, reflection in the form of a written rubric would provide a recorded assessment of student performance. This rubric should be used to include performing ensembles, duets, and other collaborative performances. A rubric would help students self-assess, to think and reflect on their experiences as they progress through the program. As part of experiential learning theory, a reflection on each new performance or collaborative learning experience would help create meaning to the knowledge acquired (Guthrie and Bertrand-Jones, 2012).

Through use of CD or DVD recordings, students could self-assess the recorded performance with a rubric. One ultimate goal of music teachers is for students to see
their work in relation to a musical standard. With self-assessment rubrics, the student is measuring live performance, or musical composition, to a specific standard.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The following recommendations for future research would improve the field of music education for piano teachers and students.

- Teacher balance between educator and performer.
- Music program and/or school demographic requirements
- Piano Literature Inquiry
- Similar study on one specific program or comparing of two programs

One recommendation for further research on performing arts high schools would be to determine how active the teachers are as performers. Because a high number of these teachers earned performance degrees, it would be interesting to see how active they are in performance and how they balance their time between educator and performer at schools such as these, with high student demands.

A second recommendation would be an in-depth look at demographic requirements at magnet schools in general. As reported, demographic requirements bore little weight in the admission process, for students entering piano programs at performing arts schools. Respondents placed a high emphasis on an audition, so it can be concluded that a certain level of piano proficiency is expected at the audition. If this is the case, further research on the demographic requirements of the entire music department or even the entire school is in order. It could help determine how these schools fulfill their magnet responsibilities.

A third recommendation would be to identify specific literature and editions used by teachers in the field. From all the responses, teachers did not follow any particular methods set for piano performance majors, aligning with prior research indicating that
piano teachers pull from a variety of resources. A qualitative study with live interviews, would help determine what composers and editions teachers typically refer to, when deciding on repertoire for their students.

Another way to find this information would be for teachers at performing arts schools to provide their recital program information. As mentioned in the discussion, recitals are the most frequent form of assessment at performing arts schools. They are usually required twice a year. By obtaining a list of recital pieces per semester, a researcher could determine trends or preferences in repertoire selection. This might also be obtained from a qualitative study.

**Suggested Piano Curriculum for Piano Majors**

As a result of the study, the researcher developed a suggested piano curriculum based on teacher responses, suggestions, and identification of current program requirements. The suggested curriculum maintains a focus on current course requirements, such as applied keyboard and music theory. However, keyboard teachers from this study suggested that jazz piano, American music history, keyboard literature, and electronic music courses would enhance the current curriculum.

Teachers also said more time and access to technology would enhance their current teaching situation. Daniel (2000) describes that specialized arts instruction will account for up to 50% of each school day (p.1) at a performing arts magnet high school. In keeping with teachers who responded that time and scheduling were a current concern, the suggested curriculum does not add any additional courses to the school day.
The curriculum includes coursework where students will work with other student musicians in the department to provide real-life experience that should help meet the curriculum goals within the current schedule.

**Philosophy**

The curriculum for the piano major is based on experiential learning theory. A piano program where students are “outside of the conventional school classroom and placed in responsible roles that engage them in cooperative, goal-directed activities with other youth” (Hamilton, 1980, p.181) promotes student learning while keeping a focus on “learning toward external goals in addition to the education of the participants” (p.181). These external goals include collaborating with other musicians in the school; using digital media to compose and produce a piece of music; or more specifically, learning through the rehearsal process for a concert.

Rehearsal, composition, and collaboration skills are part of curriculum. Student learning is centered on these skills, on self-reflection, and on new knowledge gained from the experience. Through this suggested curriculum, students enrolled in the program will revisit concepts learned in one course, which are then reinforced and expanded upon in other courses throughout the high school program. The integrated, experiential curriculum helps eliminate the time and scheduling constraints teachers identified as obstacles to their current teaching situation.

The knowledge of stylistic elements and composers from the piano literature survey can also assist students in their own playing and performing, in solo-repertoire study, and jazz piano coursework. The idea is that students’ interest levels are kept up, because they are not taking a music class just to perform a recital piece on a stage.
Experiential learning theory, which emphasizes gaining knowledge through a meaningful experience, includes the collaborative ensemble component for the piano student to gain real-life skills. In collaborative piano ensemble, the student works with other keyboard majors, vocalists, instrumentalists, or performing ensembles. Each semester, the student attends rehearsals, sight-reads, practices the part outside school, and develops accompanying skills. The collaborative experience, which simulates real-world experience, gives students the preparation skills necessary for college and the workforce. It also exposes students to various musical literature, again reinforcing concepts from the keyboard literature course.

**Course Descriptions: Applied keyboard with keyboard technique.** Students learn keyboard literature from various stylistic periods. Courses include technical and stylistic development at the keyboard. Students attend weekly-applied lessons, along with end-of-semester performance requirement.

**Music theory.** Students develop fundamental skills in music theory through the keyboard-lab structural environment. The music theory course includes a focus on developing sight-reading, ear-training, chord-progressions, and basic music reading or notation proficiency.

**Piano ensemble.** In a piano ensemble course, students collaborate with other instrumentalists, vocalists, or fellow keyboard players. Each semester, students are paired with a different collaborator. The pianist works as a collaborator-accompanist. As part of the course, piano students should attend lessons with their chosen collaborative partner (if applicable); or attend rehearsals if the partner is an orchestra, chamber group, or choral group. During this course, students develop listening and analytical
skills, sight-reading skills, and performance skills, reinforcing concepts from applied keyboard. Students must work together to complete an end-of-semester collaborative performance (keyboard duet, chamber ensemble piece, or the pianist accompanying a choir piece).

**Jazz piano elective.** A keyboard course that focuses on functional piano skills, through the lens of jazz piano. The course emphasizes skills which include improvisation, instruction on chord progressions, harmonization, and chord voicing.

**Music technology elective.** Students develop skills in electronic music, including work with software and music-writing programs (Finale, Sibelius, etc.), and Garage Band applications. The class combines aspects of music composition, for students to practice writing music and producing a product using software such as Garage Band. Each semester culminates with a project for students to demonstrate proficiency (i.e., a multi-format project, such as a piece composed and notated onto software by the student, and then produced on a Garage-Band application). The project(s) will contribute to each student’s senior portfolio.

**Piano literature survey.** This course familiarizes students with various stylistic periods of musical literature through the lens of keyboard literature. The course begins with the baroque period and moves chronologically (Baroque, Classical, Romantic, Modern) through the 20th century to include jazz piano literature and American music history. Students develop listening skills, identifying pieces from a prescribed repertoire as deemed appropriate by the instructor. This course includes the broader scope of general musical history, and students develop analytical skills to identify stylistic periods associated with individual composers.
**Recital requirement.** Students perform in a recital at the end of each semester (twice per school year). Performance can be solo repertoire and depending on grade level, can be a combination of a solo repertoire with a piece learned in the piano ensemble course such as duet/two pianos, or collaborative piano (accompaniment), as the instructor sees appropriate. The instructor uses the performance rubric and video-records the recital for students to see, to provide feedback. The rubric and recording are collected and saved for the final senior portfolio.
### Table 5-1. Grade 9 curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Suggested</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester I</td>
<td>Semester I</td>
<td>Piano ensemble is replacing music history to familiarize students at the onset with ensemble playing at a basic level. Emphasis includes functional skills such as sight reading and accompanying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard I</td>
<td>Keyboard I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music theory I</td>
<td>Music theory I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music history</td>
<td><em>Piano Ensemble I</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-semester recital</td>
<td>End-of-semester recital</td>
<td>The recital requirement for 9th grade is simply a solo recital performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>The goal is for students to take each of the three suggested electives before graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard I</td>
<td>Keyboard I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music theory I</td>
<td>Music theory I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music history</td>
<td>Elective: jazz piano, piano literature survey, music technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 5-2. Grade 10 curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Suggested</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester I</td>
<td>Semester I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard II</td>
<td>Keyboard II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music theory II</td>
<td>Music theory II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music elective</td>
<td>*Piano ensemble II</td>
<td>Piano ensemble for the 10th grade year is slightly more challenging than the ninth grade ensemble. Repertoire should match ability and culminate (see end of Semester 2 performance) with one formal or informal performance of the final piece with assessment rubric to keep track.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**End-of-semester recital**

*End-of-semester recital*

The sophomore recital should be a solo repertoire performance; or can include the ensemble repertoire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard II</td>
<td>Keyboard II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music theory II</td>
<td>Music theory II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music elective</td>
<td><em>Elective: jazz piano, piano literature survey, music technology.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recital</td>
<td><em>Solo recital and collaborative performance</em></td>
<td>To include a piece of solo repertoire and either live or documented concert ensemble performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-3. Grade 11 curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Suggested</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester I</td>
<td>Semester I</td>
<td>Piano ensemble III should advance to student accompanying an ensemble: this could include a chamber ensemble, choral group, orchestral group or something similar. The purpose of the Piano ensemble III is for students to become gain pre-professional experience attending rehearsals, practicing outside the school day, and preparing for a performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard III</td>
<td>Keyboard III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP music theory</td>
<td>AP music theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music elective</td>
<td>*Piano ensemble III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-of-semester recital</td>
<td>*End-of-semester recital:</td>
<td>To include a piece of solo repertoire and either live or documented concert ensemble performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard III</td>
<td>Keyboard III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP music theory</td>
<td>AP music theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music elective</td>
<td>Elective: jazz piano, piano literature survey, music technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recital</td>
<td>Solo recital and collaborative performance</td>
<td>To include a piece of solo repertoire and either live or documented concert ensemble performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-4. Grade 12 curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Suggested</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester I</td>
<td>Semester I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard IV</td>
<td>Keyboard IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano accompaniment</td>
<td>Piano ensemble IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music elective</td>
<td>Portfolio preparation.</td>
<td>*Portfolio preparation: The portfolio preparation course is designed for the student to gather documents and concrete examples of their previous years of high school to demonstrate their ability to present as part of collegiate audition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End-of-semester solo recital</td>
<td>End-of-semester solo recital with collaborative performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard IV</td>
<td>Keyboard IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano accompaniment</td>
<td>Piano ensemble IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Elective</td>
<td>Portfolio preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recital</td>
<td>*Solo recital with documented collaborative performance.</td>
<td>Performance; To include a piece of solo repertoire and documented or live concert ensemble performance from 12th grade ensemble course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX A
SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. Teacher background and qualifications
   a. What is your formal educational background?
   b. Are you a certified music teacher, or do you teach on a provisional basis?
   c. How many years of teaching experience do you have?
   d. What is your background (e.g., music education, music performance, piano pedagogy)?

2. Student Recruitment, Achievement, and Requirements
   a. What is the level of importance of the criteria in place for admission of students into the piano department of each school of the arts?
   b. In regards to keyboard majors, what is the primary mission of your keyboard program within the performing arts magnet school?
   c. Are there certain solo repertoire selections that keyboard majors need to learn?
   d. Are the certain functional skills requirements that keyboard majors need to learn?
   e. Are the keyboard majors required to give recitals and juries?
   f. Is there a piano requirement for every music major?
   g. If so, what is the purpose of this requirement?
   h. Are there certain functional skills requirements that non-keyboard majors need to learn?

3. Course offerings and curriculum in keyboard/piano
   a. Do you follow a methods book or set of methods books?
   b. What courses do you think should be added, deleted, or changed in the curriculum?
   c. What improvements would you like in your specific teaching situation, e.g., more keyboards, more staff?

4. Performance and assessment requirements
   a. How often are students required to take piano lessons within the program at your school?
   b. What types of performance-related events (e.g., juries, recitals) are students required to do?
   c. What is the frequency of these requirements?
   b. What is the level of importance of different competencies (e.g., performance, juries, functional piano skills, technique) in preparing students for college auditions?
Official Survey Copy

Dear Fellow Music Teacher,

My name is Dominique Edwards. I am a PhD candidate in the School of Music at the University of Florida. I kindly request your participation in a study designed to gather information about piano programs at performing arts magnet high schools. Your responses are valuable because they will provide information about piano classes, functional piano skills, college preparation methods, and similarities among the piano curricula at performing arts schools across the nation. You have been asked to participate in this survey questionnaire because you have been identified as a piano teacher, piano faculty member, music faculty member, or music department chair at a performing arts magnet high school that belongs to the Arts School Network (ASN). Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw your consent to participate and may discontinue your participation in the survey at any time without consequence. There are no anticipated risks, compensation or other direct benefits to you as a participant in this survey questionnaire. If you choose to participate, you do not have to answer any question you do not wish to answer. If you choose to participate, your identity will be kept confidential to the fullest extent provided by law and your identity will not be revealed in the final manuscript. If you agree to participate, please check "Yes I agree" from the response set below. After checking yes and completing the electronic survey, you give me permission to report your responses anonymously in the final manuscript submitted to my faculty supervisor as part of my coursework. The necessary directions to complete the survey are included at the beginning of each survey section for your information. Thank you again for your time. If you have any questions or would like additional information regarding the study, please feel free to contact me by email at dom04@ufl.edu. You may also contact my faculty adviser, Dr. Charles Hoffer, Professor of Music Education at the University of Florida by email at hoffer@ufl.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant you may also contact the University of Florida IRB-02 institutional review board office at: Telephone: (352) 392-0433

☐ Yes I agree to participate in this survey (1)

☐ No, I do not wish to participate in this survey (2)
Q1 This is a short survey about your school, the classes you teach, and your curriculum. Section 1 of 4: Please tell me about yourself and your teaching experience. Please indicate your current teaching status at your school by marking all that apply:

- Full-time instructor (40+ hours a week) (1)
- Adjunct piano faculty (2)
- Class or group piano instructor (3)
- Artist-in-residence (4)
- Staff accompanist (5)
- Music theory instructor (6)
- Department Chair (7)
- Other (please describe) (8) ____________________

Q2 How many years of piano teaching experience (after college) do you have?

Q3 How many years have you been teaching in your current position (including this year)?

Q4 What is your level of professional education or training in music? (Please check all that apply)

- Bachelor of Music (1)
- Bachelor of Music Education (2)
- Bachelor Other (please describe) (3) ____________________
- Master of Music (4)
- Master of Music Education (5)
- Master Other (please describe) (6) ____________________
- Doctorate in Music (7)
- PhD in Music Education (8)
- Doctorate Other (please describe) (9) ____________________
- Professional K-12 Music Teaching Certificate (10)
- Education Specialist in Music Ed (11)
- All Other Certifications (Please describe) (12) ____________________

Q5 Section 2 of 4: Program Information

Please tell me a little bit about your program:

What is the number of total number of students (9th-12th grade) enrolled in your school’s PIANO program?

Q6 What is the total number of students (9th-12th grade) enrolled in your school's whole music program?
Q7 Is there a piano requirement for non-piano music majors (instrument/choral major) in your performing arts school?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Answer If Is there a piano requirement for non-piano music majors (... Yes Is Selected

Q8 What is the nature of the purpose of the requirement? (please check all that apply)

- the piano requirement is designed for non-piano majors to learn functional skills at the keyboard (e.g. sight-reading, chord progressions, harmonization) (1)
- the piano requirement is a tool to assist non-piano majors with learning music theory (2)
- the piano requirement is set up so that non-piano majors learn solo-piano repertoire (3)
- I don't know (4)
- Other (please describe) (5) ____________________

Q9 Please check the statement that most closely represents the primary objective of your piano program:

- Preparation for entry into college/conservatory as a performing arts major or for a career in the performing arts. (1)
- To receive the best education possible for artistically gifted students, regardless of post high school plans (2)
Q10 The following is a list of admission criteria. Please indicate the level of importance each criterion has in admission to your program: academic measures (e.g. standardized tests, grade point averages); performance-based audition; demographic requirements (e.g. must accept a certain number of minorities of lower socioeconomic backgrounds regardless of skill level) or please describe any other entrance criteria in the designated "other" box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-Unimportant (1)</th>
<th>2-Of Little Importance (2)</th>
<th>3-Moderately Important (3)</th>
<th>4-Important (4)</th>
<th>5-Very Important (5)</th>
<th>I don't know (6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Measures (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-based audition (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Requirements (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe) (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 From your most recent graduating class, did any seniors go on to pursue piano or a music related degree in college? If YES, please type in the approximate number of students in the box below. If no, please move to the next question.

Answer If In your current class, do any of your graduating seniors... Text Response Is Not Empty

Q12 With regard to the students pursuing piano or similarly related music major in college, please indicate approximately how many students attended the following types of institutions.

- In-state or out-of-state public university (1) ________________
- Selective Conservatory or school of music (e.g. Juilliard, Indiana, Michigan, Cincinnati, Florida State) (2) ________________
- Other (please describe) (3) ________________

Q13 Do you follow a method book or set of methods books? If yes, please indicate which method book(s) below.

- For piano majors (1) ________________
- For non-piano majors (2) ________________

Q15 Section 3 of 4: Student RequirementsAre there specific solo repertoire pieces that students at your school are required to learn at each grade level? If yes, please list
required pieces. (For example, students in 9th grade may be required to learn "Minuet in G" by J.S. Bach). If no, please move to the next question.

Q16 In which of the following instructional settings do you generally teach applied piano skills (e.g. solo repertoire, technique, keyboard duets)?

- Group piano class or keyboard lab setting (2)
- Private Instructional Setting (3)
- Other (please describe) (4) ____________________

Q17 In which of the following instructional settings do you teach functional piano skills (e.g. ear-training, harmonization)?

- Private Instructional Setting (1)
- Group Piano class or keyboard lab setting (2)
- Other (please describe) (3) ____________________
Q18 Requirements: Below is a list of generic course or subject titles typically offered at performing arts schools. While the title may not be exact, there is a description of the course or subject provided below for clarity. Please indicate if any of the courses or subjects below are required for your piano majors. If you are not sure, please check "I don't know." Please leave an item blank if it is NOT required.

Keyboard or piano: Course focusing on learning keyboard literature and individual performance

Keyboard Technique: Scales, technical skills, sight-reading, etc. Keyboard Duet (one piano/four hands or two piano/four hand music, etc.) Keyboard Ensemble /or Keyboard Chamber music: music written for keyboard and one or more instruments) such as Haydn Trio for piano and strings, Mozart Trio for clarinet, viola, & piano, etc. Jazz/Blues piano: Course for students to learn and develop jazz skills (12 bar blues, etc.) Music Theory: Courses in traditional analysis of music fundamentals or similar. AP Music Theory: College Level course for in-depth study of music theory. Music History or Music Appreciation: Knowledge of stylistic periods, composers, and/or role of music throughout the ages Music Composition: composition or musical arranging Accompanying: Training in vocal or instrumental accompanying skills. Electronic Music: Studio techniques, recording, digital editing, or mixing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>This is required for piano majors (1)</th>
<th>I don't know (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Keyboard or Piano (1)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Keyboard Technique (2)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Keyboard Duet (3)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Keyboard Ensemble or Chamber Music (4)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jazz/Blues Piano (5)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Music Theory (6)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. AP Music Theory (7)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Music History or Music Appreciation (8)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Music Composition (9)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Accompanying (Vocal or Instrumental) (10)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Electronic Music (11)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other Course/Skill (please describe) (12)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other Course/Skill (please describe) (13)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19 Below is a list of functional piano skills. Please indicate if piano majors and non-piano majors are required to learn these skills as part of the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>This is required for piano majors (1)</th>
<th>This is required for non-piano majors (2)</th>
<th>I don't know (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ear-training (1)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sight-reading (2)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic music reading or notation at the piano (3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition and/or Arranging (4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying (Vocal/Instrumental) (5)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvisation (6)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transposition (7)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonization (8)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chord Progressions (9)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble Playing (students learn to play piano as part of an ensemble) (10)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other functional skill (please describe) (11)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other functional skill (please describe) (12)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q20 Please list any additional courses or topics that you have either added to the curriculum due to additional resources or that you WOULD add to your curriculum if you had more time and/or resources to do so. Examples could include history of jazz, contemporary music ensemble, garage band, etc.

Q21 Are there any courses or topics that you CURRENTLY teach that you think should be deleted or removed from the program/curriculum? If so, what are they and why?

Q22 What additional resources (e.g. more staff, keyboards, materials, training, pedagogical materials, time in the school day, career counseling for students, performance opportunities) do you think would improve the current teaching situation at your school and why?

Q25 Section 4 of 4: Performance Requirements: How often are students required to take piano lessons within the program at your school?

- Never (1)
- Occasionally, less than Once a Month (2)
- Once a Month (3)
- 2-3 Times a Month (4)
- Once a Week (5)
- 2-3 Times a Week (6)
- Daily (7)
- Other (8) ____________________
Q26 The following is a list of performance-related events. Please check the events that are required for students in your program. Please check all that apply. If an item is not required, please check "This is not required" in column two.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Not-Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jury (1)</td>
<td>Required once a year (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/state festival (2)</td>
<td>Required twice per year (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recital (3)</td>
<td>Required three times per year (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duet Performance/Ensemble Performance (4)</td>
<td>Required four or more times per year (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe) (5)</td>
<td>This is not required (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe) (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27 The following is a list of competencies. Please rank order the level of importance of the following items in preparing students for collegiate auditions. Please mark 1 for the most important item, 2 for the second most important item, and so on. If an item does not apply, mark zero or leave it blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juries/Adjudication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional piano skills (harmonization, accompanying, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique (technique, posture, hand position, balance, scales, arpeggios)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of literature/repertoire covered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
LIST OF PERFORMING ARTS HIGH SCHOOLS BELONGING TO THE NETWORK OF PERFORMING AND VISUAL ARTS SCHOOLS 2012-2013

1. **Alabama School of Fine Arts** Birmingham, AL [http://www.asfa.k12.al.us/index.cfm?event=home](http://www.asfa.k12.al.us/index.cfm?event=home)
3. **Arizona School for the Arts** Phoenix, AZ [http://www.goasa.org](http://www.goasa.org)
5. **Menlo School** Atherton, CA [https://www.menloschool.org/](https://www.menloschool.org/)
6. **Inspire School of Arts & Sciences** Chico, CA [http://www.inspirecusd.org/](http://www.inspirecusd.org/)
7. **Chula Vista School for the Creative and Performing Arts** Chula Vista, CA [http://www.cvscpa.com/](http://www.cvscpa.com/)
8. **South Orange County School of the Arts Foundation** Dana Point, CA [http://www.socsarts.org/](http://www.socsarts.org/)
9. **Huntington Beach Academy for the Performing Arts** Huntington Beach, CA [http://www.hbapa.org/](http://www.hbapa.org/)
11. **Los Angeles County High School for the Arts** Los Angeles, CA [http://www.lachsa.net/](http://www.lachsa.net/)
15. **School of Arts and Enterprise** Pomona, CA [http://www.thesae.k12.ca.us/](http://www.thesae.k12.ca.us/)
16. **San Diego School of Creative and Performing Arts** San Diego, CA [http://www.scpa.sandi.net/](http://www.scpa.sandi.net/)
18. **Orange County School of the Arts** Santa Ana, CA [http://www.ocsarts.net/](http://www.ocsarts.net/)
19. **Crossroads School for Arts & Sciences** Santa Monica, CA [http://www.xrds.org/](http://www.xrds.org/)
27. **Duke Ellington School of the Arts** Washington, DC  
http://www.ellingtonarts.org/home/index.html

28. **Cab Calloway School of the Arts** Wilmington, DE  
http://www.cabcallowayschool.org/

29. **Douglas Anderson School of the Arts** Jacksonville, FL  
http://www.da-arts.org/

30. **Booker High School VPA** Sarasota, FL  
http://www.sarasota.k12.fl.us/bhs/home.shtml

31. **Pinellas County Center for the Arts** St. Petersburg, FL  
http://www.pccagibbs.com/

32. **Harrison School for the Arts** Lakeland, FL  
http://www.harrisonarts.com/

33. **Howard W. Blake High School of the Arts** Tampa, FL  
http://blake.mysdhc.org/

34. **Alexander Dreyfoos School of the Arts** West Palm Beach, FL  
http://awdsoa.org/

35. **Tri-Cities High School** East Point, GA  
http://school.fultonschools.org/hs/tricities/Pages/default.aspx

36. **Savannah Arts Academy** Savannah, GA  
http://www.savannah.chatham.k12.ga.us/schools/saa/default.aspx

37. **ChiArts - The Chicago High School for the Arts** Chicago, IL  
http://www.chiarts.org/?gclid=CI_u55GFrrlCFQs3nAo0Da0AHQ

38. **Niles Township High School D219** Skokie, IL  
http://www.niles-hs.k12.il.us/

39. **Youth Performing Arts School** Louisville, KY  
http://www.jefferson.k12.ky.us/schools/special/YPAS/index.html

40. **Lusher Charter School** New Orleans, LA  
http://www.lusherschool.org/

41. **NOCCA** New Orleans, LA  
http://www.nocca.com/

42. **Boston Arts Academy** Boston, MA  
http://bostonartsacademy.org/center

43. **Groton School** Groton, MA  

44. **Walnut Hill School of the Arts** Natick, MA  
http://www.walnuthillarts.org/

45. **Anne Arundel County Public Schools** Annapolis, MD  
http://www.aacps.org/

46. **Baltimore School for the Arts** Baltimore, MD  
http://www.bsfa.org/

47. **Barbara Ingram School of the Arts** Hagerstown, MD  
http://www.barbarainingramsschool.com/

48. **George Washington Carver Center for Arts and Technology** Towson, MD  
http://carverhs.bcps.org/

49. **Interlochen Center for the Arts** Interlochen, MI  
http://www.interlochen.org/

50. **Perpich Center for Arts Education** Golden Valley, MN  
http://www.mcae.k12.mn.us/ahs/ahs.html

51. **Creative Arts High School - Saint Paul Public Schools** St. Paul, MN  
http://creativearts.spps.org/

52. **Saint Paul Conservatory for Performing Artists** St. Paul, MN  
http://www.spcpa.org/

53. **Central Visual & Performing Arts High School** St. Louis, MO  
http://www.slpss.org/Page/6777

54. **Mississippi School of the Arts** Brookhaven, MS  
http://www.msa.k12.ms.us/

55. **Durham School of the Arts** Durham, NC  
http://www.dsa.dpsnc.net/
56. Cicely L. Tyson Community School of Performing & Fine Arts  East Orange, NJ
   http://tysonel.eastorange.schoolfusion.us/

57. New Mexico School for the Arts  Santa Fe, NM  http://nmschoolforthearts.org/

58. Las Vegas Academy of the Arts  Las Vegas, NV  http://schools.ccsd.net/lva/


60. Fiorello H. LaGuardia High School of Music & Art and Performing Arts  New York, NY
   http://laguardiahs.org/

61. Harlem School of the Arts  New York, NY  http://hsanyc.org/


63. Long Island High School for the Arts  Syosset, NY  http://www.nassauboces.org/Page/1644

64. School for Creative and Performing Arts  Cincinnati, OH  http://scpa.cps-k12.org/

65. Toledo School for the Arts  Toledo, OH  http://www.ts4arts.org/

66. Classen School of Advanced Studies  Oklahoma City, OK  www.classensas

67. Lehigh Valley Charter HS for the Arts  Bethlehem, PA  http://www.lvpa.org/

68. Pittsburgh CAPA 6-12  Pittsburgh, PA  http://pps.schoolwires.com/capa/site/default.asp

69. Fine Arts Center  Greenville, SC  http://www.fineartscenter.net/

70. South Carolina Governor’s School for the Arts and Humanities  Greenville, SC  http://www.scgsah.org/

71. Chattanooga High School Center for Creative Arts  Chattanooga, TN  http://www.centerforcreativearts.net/


74. McCallum Fine Arts Academy  Austin, TX  http://www.austinschools.org/campus/mccallum/fine_arts/

75. Booker T. Washington High School for the Performing and Visual Arts  Dallas, TX
   http://www.dallasisd.org/btw

76. Houston High School for the Performing and Visual Arts  Houston, TX  http://www.hspva.org/

77. North East School of the Arts  San Antonio, TX  http://www.neisd.net/nesa/

78. Seattle Academy of Arts and Sciences  Seattle, WA  http://www.seattleacademy.org/

79. Green Bay Area Public School District  Green Bay, WI  http://www.greenbay.k12.wi.us/Pages/default.aspx
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