The Status of Music Education in U.S. Public Schools

Executive Summary and Key Takeaways

The late-2015 reauthorization of federal K-12 legislation, now known as the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (or ESSA), orients K-12 schooling around the notion of a "well-rounded education" comprising eighteen distinct subject areas of which "music" and "the arts" are each specifically enumerated. Given the status of music as a named component of the nation's "well-rounded" education, the Give A Note Foundation, with support from the Country Music Association, sought to understand the present status of music education in the nation's public schools. The Foundation interviewed music educators and supervisors across the United States, and distributed a survey to a sample of schools with music education programs to gain knowledge about music education in public schools. Overall, the survey and the interviews with music educators and supervisors from across the nation largely replicate previous studies on the status of music education in the nation's schools, while also providing more detailed context for the work music educators do every day. Here are some key takeaways:

1. **Most music educators work within subfield specialty areas.** We now can confirm that the majority of American music educators teach in their specialty area (for example, as band or choir educators). Music educators in elementary schools are the most likely to teach across a variety of specialty areas, while middle and high school music educators are more likely to be specialists. This is particularly true for smaller schools, as the number of music educators (and the ability to specialize) is directly correlated to the number of students in a school. Owing largely to National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) requirements that students enrolled in Bachelor's degree programs accredited by NASM select and study a "primary instrument," preservice music educators have long been tracked into curricula that are designed either for future "choral/general" teachers or future "instrumental" teachers. While it is impossible to determine from our data whether the job market for music educators reflects this tracked preparation or collegiate curricula have been influenced by the jobs available, we can say from our results that there is, at present, a "match" between the preservice and in-service situations.

2. **Traditional, ensemble-based music education is by far the most common form of music education in America.** The most common music course offerings are the traditional

ensembles of band, chorus, and orchestra, and their variations (such as marching band or show choir). This is evident across elementary, middle, and high schools, although non-ensemble "General Music" is the single most common offering in elementary schools. Scholars and leaders in the profession have suggested that music education for students would be improved if there were greater flexibility in the types of musical engagement offered in schools. While expansion of the music curriculum beyond traditional ensemble offerings is a worthy goal, the reality in schools today is that the profession is still quite traditional. Expanded, non-traditional offerings most often found in schools include guitar, music appreciation, music theory, and keyboard; however, none of these were offered at more than 25% of the schools nationally.

3. **The 2014 Music Standards have begun to influence music teaching and learning.** Music educators and schools are aligning curriculum to the 2014 Music Standards, referencing these standards more often now than the 1994 Standards. As more states adopt or adapt the 2014 Music Standards (14 to date, an additional 18 states in process), we can expect to see more music educators using the standards in their curriculum planning and design. Given the 2014 Music Standards emphases on Creating music and Responding to music as co-equal learning goals to Performing music, it is possible that music educators teaching traditional ensembles may begin to innovate *within* ensemble structures to make ensemble-based music education more comprehensive, by including elements of music Creation and Response.

4. **Fundraising is an important part of being a music educator, especially in urban districts and in secondary schools.** Music educators in urban settings viewed fundraising as a necessity, central to their offering a quality music education program. Fundraising for these teachers was not seen as supporting enrichment or supplemental elements of their music education program. Overcoming perceived financial constraints seems to be an important part of music teachers' experiences. Our results showed a consistent increase in the amount of money raised as teachers worked with older students: the most money was raised by high school music programs and the least by elementary programs, and this relationship was consistent across urbanicities. This likely reflects increased costs for essential equipment like instruments and ancillary costs like travel that are more prevalent in middle and high school music programs. Clearly, financial management and fundraising are important skills for today's music teachers.

5. **Professional development for music teachers varies considerably.** Professional development (PD) focus, offerings and participation varied by both urbanicity and grade level. Secondary music teachers are more likely to attend professional development *outside* of their local school district, while elementary school colleagues were more likely to attend PD offered within the district. In addition, music educators in urban or suburban districts were more likely to have PD available within the district. By far, the annual state music educators' association conference was the most commonly attended out-of-district PD experience. Those interested in improving the practice of music teachers through professional development would seem to find the largest audience

and most impact for their ideas by presenting at state music educators' association conferences.

Importantly, regardless of grade level or rate of urbanicity, music educators receive fewer opportunities in PD within their district that are germane to their content area – music – than they are presented local opportunities for professional development in areas outside the field. The difference here is impressive: 54% to 84%. Districts unwilling or unable to provide local PD relevant to music teaching and learning should be encouraged to provide financial support for music teachers seeking relevant PD out-of-district. Philanthropic efforts aimed to improve the state of music education in the nation's schools might also develop programs to provide financial support for teachers to attend relevant PD out-of-district.

6. **Music teachers want to invest in musical instruments.** If given an unexpected allocation of additional funds with the explicit goal of improving music learning, 79% of music educators would spend those dollars on instruments for their students. Capital needs – instruments and resources for students – lead the pack in terms of how music educators would spend new dollars. Given the lack of capital funds available in many states and school systems following the Great Recession, this finding resonated with our interviewees as well. There are existing philanthropic efforts to provide instruments to schools that are otherwise unable to purchase them. These efforts should be continued, and perhaps expanded to contexts outside of instrumental ensembles. Elementary teachers could be supported with purchases of Orff instruments, ukuleles, or other classroom instruments; choral teachers could be supported with purchases of quality pianos for rehearsal or performance.

7. **Local leadership is key.** Interviewees emphasized the important roles that building principals and site administrators play in determining music education opportunities for students. Local control and site-based management were often used to describe how and who determined music education offerings. In large, decentralized districts with site-based management, often the difference between a school with an outstanding music program and a neighboring school with a faltering or nonexistent music program is simply the principal's desire to support or withhold support for music teaching and learning. If music education is to be seen as the right of every child in American schools, then advocates and philanthropists must work at the local level to educate school leaders as much as they work in the broader state and national policy environments.

Next Steps

This survey, and the accompanying interviews, provide a more in-depth perspective on several areas of interest to the music education field, and, in particular, to advocates working to create better and more music education opportunities for our nation's children. Taken together with the existing research on the status of music education and music

educators in American schools, some important questions are raised and others remain. Next steps and areas for further exploration include:

1. **Supporting Expansion of the Music Curriculum**. With few exceptions, music education continues to be dominated by the traditional ensembles: band, chorus, and orchestra. Yet, music educators, music education scholars, and others want to expand the ways in which students engage with music in schools. What can we do to support diversification and innovation within ensembles? What can we do to support the expansion of the kinds of music classes offered, to include more world music, more popular music, and more technologically-mediated musical engagement? Where can we find models of places where this is done well and share those with the field? How can the vision of the 2014 Music Standards be met by continuing to promote world-class ensemble music making and to also allow for newer forms of musical engagement within schools?

2. **Financial Support for Music Teaching and Learning.** Music programs continue to be under-resourced, particularly in urban settings, and among many of the non-teaching tasks that music educators must do, music teachers felt the least effective in their abilities to fundraise. What role does the philanthropic community play in meeting these financial needs – specifically music educators' expressed needs for capital investments such as instruments? And what role should we expect our politicians – whether they be in the state legislatures, the U.S. Congress, or elected school board members – to play in creating more equitable and properly funded music education programs? How can we better prepare preservice music educators to judiciously manage the financial aspects of leading a music education program and to be effective fundraisers? How can we improve the ability of in-service music educators to effectively access needed resources via fundraising?

3. **Supporting the Professional Development of Music Teachers.** What role can foundations, the National Association for Music Education, and other interested groups play in encouraging equitable professional development for music educators? How can philanthropic and outside efforts be marshalled to increase the amount of relevant, **music specific** professional development offered to teachers by their districts? Is there a need for advocacy in this area, perhaps tied to implementation of ESSA? Or, instead, is this a resource issue: Do districts find it difficult to locate content or experts providing professional development for music teachers? Do districts simply lack the financial resources to provide content-based professional development to music teachers?

4. **Supporting Advocacy and Policymaker Education at the "Localest" of Levels.** The ability, and success, of the National Association for Music Education and its federated state associations to influence policy at the state and national levels has seen the relative standing of music improve at those levels—most visibly in the inclusion of music within the

federal definition of a "well-rounded curriculum" in the Every Student Succeeds Act. However, this study highlights the importance of support from local superintendents and building-level administrators in the provision of quality music education for the nation's children. What role can foundations, NAfME and other outside groups play in supporting music education decisionmakers – specifically principals and other site-based administrators – in making decisions which will increase access to quality music education programs? What do these decisionmakers need to inform their choices? How can local administrators not predisposed to support music be convinced of the value of music education? How can local administrators who are predisposed to support music be educated on how they can *best* support music education? And how is that information best shared to support music teachers and their students? How is this information (and decision making) coordinated throughout the K-12 "pipeline" within a school district?

5. **Continued monitoring of the field**. The survey instrument created as part of this study is suitable for use in future studies of music teachers and the contexts in which they work. Repeated use of this survey on nationally representative samples of music teachers over time can help illuminate trends and progress in the field with relevance for music teachers, music teacher educators, NAfME, and philanthropic organizations investing in music education.

Introduction

The late-2015 reauthorization of federal K-12 legislation, now known as the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (or ESSA), orients K-12 schooling around the notion of a "well-rounded education" comprising eighteen distinct subject areas of which "music" and "the arts" are each specifically enumerated. Given the status of music as a named component of the nation's "well-rounded" education, the Give A Note Foundation, with support from the Country Music Association, sought to understand the present status of music education in the nation's public schools.

Although the federal government's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) periodically releases limited descriptive statistics on arts education in America, these broad snapshots are undertaken no more frequently than once per decade and, by design, seek to describe the four arts areas in great breadth but in little depth. In the present project, we endeavor to create a more focused profile of music education and music educators in America, both to provide a descriptive statistical profile of the landscape as a whole and to highlight the on-the-ground realities for music education in some of the nation's school districts. We hope the results of this study will inform music and arts educators and policymakers about the current status of music in the nation's schools. Secondarily, we hope the information we gathered will help guide philanthropic organizations toward strategic ways they can invest in the improvement of music education for all American students.

Our profile was carried out in two distinct and separate parts. The first part consisted of site visits, carried out by the Give a Note Foundation, to school districts throughout the United States. In these visits, staff spoke with district- and building-level administrators and spoke with music educators to get a sense of the state of music education for the students in their districts. While these interviews provided interesting insights into influences on daily music education practice across the nation, Give A Note Foundation recognized that these site visits gave only a snapshot of music education in those specific places. Recognizing the highly contextualized nature of the site visits, the Foundation fielded a scientific survey of a nationally representative sample of the nation's music educators. The survey allows us to draw broad conclusions about the state of music education in schools that employ at least one music teacher and the characteristics of the music teachers working in those schools. In this report, we primarily present the school-level and teacher-level findings of the national survey. Interspersed with those results are key takeaways from the site visits.

Overview of Related Research

The present study extends a line of "status study" research that has been helpful to the profession. The most prominent of these studies are the music portions of the arts education reports produced by the National Center for Education Statistics (Carey, Kleiner, Porch, & Farris, 2002; Parsad & Spiegelman, 2012). Both the Carey et al. (2002) and the Parsad and Spiegelman (2012) reports present the results of data gathered through the U.S. Department of Education's *Fast Response Survey System*, or FRSS. The two arts education FRSS studies collected nationally representative information about public school arts education defined broadly as "the study of creative works in music, visual arts, dance, or drama/theatre and the process of producing such creative works" (Parsad & Spiegelman, 2012). FRSS data were gathered at the school-level, by surveying school administrators, and at the teacher-level, by surveying arts educators themselves. In summarizing the collected data, both FRSS reports combine school- and teacher-level data to provide a comprehensive "snapshot" of the status of arts education.

Key takeaways from the more recent 2012 FRSS report shed light on the availability of music instruction and on characteristics of music teacher employment. Parsad and Spiegelman (2012) report that music education had the greatest availability of all four art forms—available in 94% of elementary schools and 91% of secondary schools—but that the availability of music was linked to the socioeconomic statuses of the families served by American public schools. Schools serving more students in poverty were less likely to offer music. Among the schools where music education was available, music instruction was delivered by a music specialist in 91% of elementary schools. In secondary schools where music education was available, 81% of music teachers were full-time music specialists, a further 15% of music instructors were part-time specialists, and only 3% of music instructors in secondary schools were not music specialists. Arts courses were required for graduation in 57% of public secondary schools, with the majority (70%) of those schools requiring one arts course credit for high school graduation.

Beyond the Department of Education reports, researchers in music education have also examined the status of music education in the nation. Abril and Gault surveyed a national sample of principals leading elementary (2006) and secondary (2008) schools to understand

administrators' perspectives on the nature and quality of music programs. Most elementary principals (92.5%) reported that music was a required component of the school curriculum, and 94.9% of elementary principals reported having a music specialist on staff. Elementary principals were generally positive about the status and potential of their music programs to achieve musical and non-musical educational goals for their students. Nearly all secondary principals (98%) reported that at least some music was offered in their school, although music was only required in 34% of the schools represented. (This disparity could be owing to the combination of middle and high schools among the "secondary" school principals—in the United States, music is often a required subject through grade 6 and elective thereafter.) Principals reported band as the most common music offering, following closely by choir, though there were myriad other offerings. Rural schools had the least diversity of music course offerings when compared to urban and suburban schools. The slight difference in diversity of course offerings in suburban and urban schools was statistically indistinguishable. Similar to their peers in the elementary schools, secondary principals reported broad success in their music program's success in achieving musical and non-musical educational goals.

Student uptake of elective high school music instruction has also been studied by music education researchers. Using nationally representative data from the U.S. Department of Education, Elpus and Abril (2011) explored the demographic characteristics of students reporting participation in their high school's music ensembles during their senior year. They found that roughly 21% of students in the Class of 2004 reporting participating in band, choir, or orchestra during their senior year of high school. However, music ensemble students were not a representative subset of all students—female students, those who identified as White, and those from families in the higher socioeconomic statuses were overrepresented among music students while male students, students of Hispanic or Latino origin, and those from families in lower socioeconomic statuses were underrepresented and music students. Later work on national *transcript* (as opposed to self-reported survey) data (Elpus, 2013; 2014; 2015) showed that a greater proportion of students are enrolled in at least one high school music course at some point during their high school career than reported participation in senior year. Roughly 34% of students nationally were enrolled in at least one ensemble or non-ensemble music course during high school. Even when using transcript data to determine who was in music, there are still demonstrable disparities between music students and non-music students in terms of race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status.

Questions Guiding the Present Study & Methodological Overview

Given the research results reported from federal education surveys reviewed above, the Give A Note Foundation's national survey on the status of music education and music educator employment in the United States was guided by the following broad research questions:

1. What types of music curricular and co-curricular music classes are offered in elementary and secondary schools?

2. What are the characteristics of the teachers employed to teach those classes?

3. In what professional development experiences are music teachers participating?

4. How do music teachers perceive the environment for music education where they work?

To answer these research questions, we created a comprehensive questionnaire designed to gather data about schools where music programs are offered and about the music teachers working in those schools. While the earlier data sets reported above help provide information on access to music education in our nation's schools, **the GAN Foundation survey focused on schools where music programs exist,** surveying the educators involved in those music programs directly. We analyzed data provided by a nationally representative sample of 468 teachers working in 392 public elementary, middle, and high schools. To ensure that our data are nationally representative, we computed a set of survey weights to adjust for non-response and to ensure our sample of schools is representative of the 103,000 public schools in the nation and our sample of teachers is representative of the estimated 117,000 public school music teachers. More detail on the survey method and weighting procedure is available in the methodological appendix to this report.

Survey Results

School-level Descriptive Results

We obtained information from 392 unique schools representing the full spectrum of American public schools in terms of urbanicity and school grade levels. Our weighting procedure ensures that the sample of responding schools is nationally representative along the two dimensions of school locale/urbanicity, (e.g., urban, suburban, town/exurban, rural) and the grade levels included in the school, (e.g., elementary, middle, high, or some combination). The results we report here can be considered nationally representative of schools that employ at least one music teacher. Where more than one teacher responded from within a school, we randomly chose one of the complete responses to represent the school-level data in our analysis. In this section, we report our school-level descriptive results.

Music teachers in Schools: Full-time. We estimate that 90.91% of schools with any music teacher employ at least one full-time music teacher, while 9.08% of schools offering music employ only part-time music teachers. Overall, the average number of full-time music teachers per school was 1.67 ± 0.15. In elementary schools, the average number of full-time music teachers was 1.29 ± 0.16; in middle schools, the average number of full-time music teachers was 2.11 ± 0.32, and in high schools the average number of full-time music teachers was 2.22 ± 0.34. In multi-level schools (such as junior-senior high schools or K-8 schools), the average number of full-time music teachers was 1.84 ± 1.04. The number of full-time music teachers employed in schools was not significantly related to school urbanicity. As might be

expected, the number of full-time music teachers employed in schools *was* related to total school enrollment; each additional 1,000 students enrolled at a school was associated with an average of 1.30 more full-time music teachers ($p < .001$). The association between school enrollment and the number of full-time teachers remained statistically significant even when controlling for school urbanicity and school level $F(7, 385) = 8.02$, $p < .001$.

Music teachers in Schools: Part-time. We estimate that 37.89% of schools employed at least one part-time music teacher—in three-quarters of these schools, the part-time music teacher(s) are working alongside one or more full-time music teachers. Among schools that employed part-time music teachers, the average number of part-time music teachers was 1.56 ± 0.20. The average number of part-time teachers in primary schools employing part-time music teachers was 1.54 ± 0.18, in middle schools it was 1.51 ± 0.27, and in high schools it was 1.71 ± 0.70. Among schools where part-time music teachers are employed, 16.12% of schools have assigned their part-time music teachers to teach a subject outside of music for a portion of the school day. Unlike full-time teachers, the number of part-time music teachers employed by a school was not significantly related to school enrollment, school level, or urbanicity.

Music Teacher Certification by School. Nearly all schools with music programs (94.95%) employ music teachers who hold the appropriate state certification to teach music.

Music Teacher Specialization by School. Roughly 42% of schools employ music teachers to teach courses entirely within a specific specialization of music—for example, band, choir, orchestra, or general music. There are, however, statistically significant differences by level, by urbanicity, and by school size; 50% of elementary schools employ music teachers who teach across multiple specializations while only 34% of high schools employ music teachers who teach across multiple specializations. In rural schools at any level, only 31% of schools employ specializing music teachers, significantly lower than the proportion of schools with specializing music teachers in urban (47%), suburban (42%) and exurban (53%) locales. Schools reporting that music teachers were generalists, on average, enroll 230 fewer students than do schools reporting that music teachers specialize.

Music Courses offered at elementary schools. The average number of music courses offered at elementary schools was 2.67 ± 0.28. By far, a course called or similar to a course called "General Music" was the most common music offering at elementary schools—fully 98% of elementary schools offered curricular music that music teachers identified as "General Music." The next most common offerings were concert band (43% of elementary schools), choir or chorus (39%) of elementary schools, and orchestra or string ensemble (25% of elementary schools). Less common offerings included individual instrument lessons (8%), guitar ensemble (7%), guitar as an individual instrument (5%), piano (5%), marching band (6%), percussion ensemble (5%), show choir (2%), jazz choir (2%), music technology (2%), and individual voice lessons (2%).

Music Courses offered at middle schools. Middle schools offered an average of 3.68 distinct music courses (± 0.37). At the middle school level, band (91%) and choir or chorus (83%) were, by far, the most common music courses offered at schools that employed at least one music teacher. General music is available at 56% of middle schools and orchestra or string ensemble is offered at 41% of middle schools. Less common middle school music offerings include jazz band (19%), individual instrument lessons (18%), music appreciation (9%), guitar ensemble (7%), piano (6%), music theory (5%), and show choir (4%).

Music Courses offered at high schools. High schools offered an average of 5.47 music individual music courses (± 0.47). As with middle schools, band (93% of high schools) and choir or chorus (89% of high schools) are the most commonly offered music classes in high schools employing at least one music teacher. Orchestra or string ensemble is offered in 36% of high schools with music programs. As would be expected given the increase in the number of courses, the breadth of music course offerings tends to increase at the high school level. Beyond the traditional large ensembles, smaller ensembles are offered for class credit at high schools: jazz band (42%), marching band (36%), percussion ensemble (15%), a contemporary/popular/rock ensemble (5%), show choir (13%), jazz choir (11%). Additional music courses offered at high schools included music theory (24%), AP Music Theory (21%), music technology (13%), music appreciation (22%), guitar ensemble (16%), guitar as an individual instrument (14%), individual instrumental lessons (25%), individual vocal lessons (16%), IB music (2%), general music (39%), and music history (9%). Mariachi and Steel Pan were each available at less than 1% of high schools.

Financial support for elementary music programs. Elementary music programs received support from districtwide (69%) or building-based (57%) school budgets. Only 7% of elementary schools reported having no allocation from either a building or district budget. These funds were supplemented by student fundraising in 18% of schools, parent fundraising in 16% of schools, family donations in 22% of schools, and outside donations or sponsorships in 25% of schools. Most elementary schools (51%) reported receiving the majority of their financial support from a districtwide budget, while a further 34% of elementary schools reported receiving the majority of their financial support from a building-based budget. In a full 15% of elementary schools, the majority of financial support came from fundraised sources. Reported amounts fundraised for elementary school music varied; slightly over a third (38%) of elementary schools raised comparatively little ($500 or less) per year, 14% reported raising between $501 and $1,000 annually, 10% reported raising $1,001 to $5,000 annually, 1% reported raising $5,001 to $10,000 annually, and under 1% of elementary schools reported raising in excess of $10,000 annually. Caution should be exercised in interpreting fundraising amounts, however, because 37% of elementary school respondents did not know how much money their elementary music programs earned in fundraising. It is possible that elementary teachers are less aware of total fundraising amounts because even among those elementary teachers who did know how much they raised annually, the overall dollar amounts raised by elementary schools for music programs tended to be smaller than the amounts raised by schools serving older students (see *A Closer Look at Fundraising*, later in the report).

Financial support for middle school music programs. The majority of middle school music programs received support from districtwide (70%) or building-based (66%) budget allocations; 10% of middle schools reported receiving no allocation from either a building or district budget. District and building monies were supplemented by student fundraising in 62% of schools, by parent fundraising in 44% of schools, by donations from families in 47% of schools, and by outside donations or sponsorships in 32% of schools. Majority financial support for middle schools came from the districtwide budget (40%) or a building-based budget (26%), while in 34% of schools fundraised sources provided the majority of financial support. As might be expected, middle schools raised more funds than did elementary schools. About 18% of middle schools raised under $500 annually, 16% raised between $501 and $1,000, 35% raised

between $1,001 and $5,000, 13% raised between $5,001 and $10,000, and 8% raised more than $10,000 annually. Fewer middle school teachers (only 10%) compared to elementary school teachers reported that they didn't know how much money their school music program raised annually. Considering only those respondents who knew how much their school fundraised, there was a statistically significant difference in amounts by school level, $F(10, 3279) = 6.38$, $p < .001$.

Financial support for high school music programs. Most high schools received allocations from districtwide (66%) or building-based school budgets (57%); only 8% of high schools reported receiving no allocation from either of these sources. High school budgets were supplemented by student fundraising in 79% of schools, by parent fundraising in 63% of schools, by donations from families in 51% of schools, and by outside donations or sponsorships in 48% of schools. High schools reported majority financial support from districtwide (39%) and building-based (23%) budgets, while 38% of high schools reported receiving the majority of their financial support for music from fundraised sources. High school music programs tended to raise considerably more than other school levels: only 8% of high schools reported raising $500 or less per year, while 7% reported raising $501 to $1,000. The plurality of high schools (41%) raised between $1,001 and $5,000 per year, and just under a quarter (24%) of high schools raised between $5,001 and $10,000 per year. Fully 11% of high schools reported raising in excess of $10,000 per year and only 9% of high school respondents did not know how much money their music program fundraised.

Curriculum for Music. Most elementary schools (52%) followed a written curriculum guide for music courses. Slightly fewer middle schools (48%) and high schools (46%) reported that they followed a written curriculum guide for music. Music teachers reported that most of these curricula (53%) were written at the district level, while 23% were written at the state level and the remaining 24% were written either at the school, classroom, or another level. Among schools that had followed a written curriculum guide, 86% of these were aligned with state standards, 34% were aligned with the 2014 Music Core Arts Standards, 11% were aligned with the 1994 National Standards for Music, and fewer than 1% were not aligned with any of these. About 4% of respondents (more in the high schools and fewer in elementary and middle schools) did not know the standards to which their curricula were aligned. To our knowledge, this is the first national survey of music teachers to investigate music curricula since the release of the 2014 Music Standards. It is noteworthy fewer than three years since the release of those standards, music teachers reported that their curricula were aligned with the newer standards at greater rates than the venerable 1994 standards.

Textbook Purchase Decisions. Most schools reported that textbook purchasing decisions were made at the classroom (38%) or district (40%) levels. About 3% reported that textbook purchases were made at the state level, while 4% reported they were made at some other level and 8% of respondents didn't know. Textbook purchase intervals varied; 9% reported purchasing textbooks more frequently than once per 5 years, 10% reported purchasing textbooks about every 5 years, 8% reported purchasing textbooks in intervals of between 5 and 8 years, 8% reported an 8-year textbook purchase interval, and 34% of schools purchased music textbooks less frequently than once every 8 years. Caution should be exercised in interpreting this result, however, as fully 20% of respondents didn't know and 11% considered the question not applicable to their school.

Music and Arts Integration. Most schools (74%) did not integrate music instruction with another art form or with other academic subjects. Integration was most evident in Elementary schools — where 30% reported integrating music with the other arts and 29% reported integrating music with non-arts subjects. Slightly less integration was reported by middle schools (18% for music with other arts and 20% for music with non-arts subjects) and high schools (22% for integration with other arts and 19% for integration with non-arts subjects). This finding is not unexpected given how scheduling and content is handled in elementary schools versus secondary schools. Secondary schools traditionally have content specialists for all content areas, whereas elementary schools treat teachers more as generalists – with the exception of music, art and PE. This creates a more conducive environment for integration in the lower grade levels.

Teacher-level Descriptive Results

There were a total of 439 complete responses to our teacher survey. Our weighting procedure ensured these respondents were nationally representative of music teachers in the nation's public schools, regardless of whether these teachers belonged to any particular professional organization. In this section, we report our teacher-level descriptive results.

Full-time/part-time status and teaching assignment. Based on data from the National Center for Education Statistics, we estimate that 24.4% of music teachers are employed part-time teaching music, while 75.6% of music teachers are employed full-time teaching music. Of those music teachers employed part-time, we estimate that 45% of them are assigned to teach other school subjects to fill the balance of their school day. The most common alternate subjects taught were theater/drama, math, and English/language arts. It is important to note that even though the overwhelming majority of music teachers report holding state licensure in music, in many states, certified teachers in any subject are permitted to teach "out-of-field" for up to 49% of the workday.

In-house professional development in music. About 54% of music teachers had participated in music-focused professional development that was provided by their school or district in-house. Topics reported by music teachers who had participated in music-focused in-house professional development were:

In-House Music-related Professional Development Topic	Percentage of teachers reporting
Music instructional techniques	31%
Music or course management technology training	24%
Assessment in music class	23%
Repertoire sharing (i.e., reading session)	20%
State/district music standards	20%

In-House Music-related Professional Development Topic	Percentage of teachers reporting
New state/district mandates (in music)	14%
Workshops with teaching artists	14%
Research on music teaching and learning	7%
Improving conducting	5%
Integrating other subjects into music	5%
Didn't know or couldn't remember	< 1%

In-house professional development in other areas. While only just over half of music teachers had received in-house professional development specific to music and music teaching, many more (84%) reported participating in school- or district-provided professional development on topics *outside* of music. These topics were:

In-House Non-Music Related Professional Development Topic	Percentage of teachers reporting
Instructional techniques in an area other than music	32%
Training in technology unrelated to music	28%
Training in state or district mandates	28%
Standardized testing in English and/or math	18%
Assessment strategies not specific to music	24%
Didn't know or couldn't remember	1%

Out-of-district professional development in music. Roughly two-thirds (67%) of music teachers had participated in out-of-district music professional development conferences and activities. These activities were:

Professional development activity	Percentage of teachers reporting
State Music Educators Association Conference	54%
NAfME National or Divisional	10%
State American Choral Directors Association	8%

Professional development activity	Percentage of teachers reporting
Midwest Band & Orchestra Clinic	5%
State Orff/Schulwerk Association	5%
ACDA National or Divisional	4%
State Bandmasters Association	3%
State American String Teachers Association	2%
State Organization of Kodaly Educators	2%
AOSA Divisional or National	2%
ASTA National or Divisional	< 1%
Divisional or National Bandmasters Association	< 1%
OAKE Divisional or National	< 1%

Fundraising. We asked music teachers to characterize the necessity of fundraising to their program. Specifically, we asked them whether they felt that the fundraising helped them provide extra opportunities that enriched—but were not integral—to the music program *or* whether they felt that they could not adequately deliver a music curriculum without the financial support they earned through fundraising. Most music teachers—**58%**—said they felt that fundraising helped enrich their music program, however, a large minority (**42%**) said that their program's fundraising was essential to delivering an adequate music curriculum.

How would music teachers spend an unexpected budgetary windfall? We asked music teachers how they would spend an unexpected extra $10,000 if their school or district was suddenly able to allocate it. To make the responses more focused, we told teachers in this hypothetical situation that the money would come with the restriction that it must be used "to enhance the quality of music teaching and/or learning" in their classroom. We allowed respondents to choose up to three options (unranked) and also allowed for an open-ended response. The most common responses were:

- 76% of music teachers would purchase instruments for student use
- 48% of music teachers would purchase instructional supplies like sheet music or method books

- 38% of music teachers would purchase performance equipment like risers or microphones
- 35% of music teachers would bring in guest clinicians or composers to work with students
- 17% of music teachers would invest in their teaching by attending professional development conferences
- 11% of music teachers would bring their students to work with a guest clinician or composer off-site
- 8% of music teachers would purchase a piano for classroom or performance use
- 4% of music teachers would invest in their teaching by taking graduate courses in pedagogy or conducting
- 2% of music teachers would invest in their teaching by teaching graduate courses in performance
- The most common "other" responses were specific technology purchases, such as iPads or other tablet computers, electronic keyboards, recording equipment, etc.

Music educator self-efficacy. We asked music teachers to rate their confidence in their abilities to perform various tasks—other than teaching—that are integral parts of the work of a music educator. They rated their self-efficacy in these areas on a scale of 0 to 100. Music teachers felt least confident in their abilities to fundraise and manage a professional social media presence, while they felt the most confident in their abilities to use technology and manage their projects and programs.

Area	**Average Self-Efficacy Rating**
Use technology to manage clerical elements of the music program	80.25 (*SD* = 24.76)

Area	Average Self-Efficacy Rating
Project or program management	79.57 (*SD* = 24.47)
Manage finances/bookkeeping for the music program	69.52 (*SD* = 31.14)
Communicate to diverse audiences	77.56 (*SD* = 22.23)
Use technology for education (in general)	75.03 (*SD* = 23.63)
Professional networking (in-person)	72.28 (*SD* = 26.08)
Use technology for music instruction	73.19 (*SD* = 24.82)
Maintain a professional social media presence	65.56 (*SD* = 31.86)
Fundraise	58.15 (*SD* = 32.60)

A Closer Look at Music Teacher Professional Development

Professional development and school urbanicity. School urbanicity was significantly related to music teachers' participation in in-house, music focused professional development, $F(3, 1298) = 13.09$, $p < .001$. In general, teachers working in higher population density geographic locations were more likely to report participating in school- or district-provided content-relevant professional development.

School Urbanicity	Participated in School/District Music Focused PD	Did Not Participate in School/District Music Focused PD
City	84%	16%
Suburb	59%	41%
Town/Exurb	45%	55%
Rural	32%	68%

While participation in school- or district-based music professional development was more prevalent among teachers in urban and suburban districts, there was no statistically

significant difference for out-of-district professional development by urbanicity, $F(3, 1288) = 0.72$, $p = .54$.

School Urbanicity	Participated in Out-of-District Music Focused PD	Did Not Participate in Out-of-District Music Focused PD
City	70%	30%
Suburb	62%	38%
Town/Exurb	72%	28%
Rural	68%	32%

Professional development and school level. Whether a music teacher had participated in school- or district-provided music professional development was related to school level, $F(3, 1308) = 3.04$, $p = .03$. In general, primary and middle school teachers participated in school- or district-provided music professional development at greater rates than their high school colleagues.

School level	Participated in School/District Music Focused PD	Did Not Participate in School/District Music Focused PD
Elementary	61%	39%
Middle	59%	41%
High	42%	58%
Multi-level	40%	60%

Although elementary music teachers participated in school- or district- provided professional development, teachers in middle and high schools were considerably more likely to attend out-of-district music professional development than were elementary teachers. School level was related to out-of-district professional development participation, $F(3, 1284) = 7.36$, $p < .001$.

School level	Participated in Out-of-District Music Focused PD	Did Not Participate in Out-of-District Music Focused PD
Elementary	55%	45%

Middle	79%	21%
High	77%	23%
Multi-level	76%	24%

A Closer Look at Fundraising

Fundraising and urbanicity. The urbanicity of the school in which a teacher taught was associated with whether the teacher felt that fundraising provided enrichment to the music program or that fundraising was a necessity to offer an adequate music program, $F(3, 1308) = 2.9$, $p = .03$. Teachers in city and rural schools said fundraising was a necessity significantly more than did teachers in towns/exurbs or suburban schools.

School Urbanicity	Fundraising Enriches the Music Program	Fundraising is Necessary for Adequate Music Instruction
City	42%	58%
Suburb	60%	40%
Town/Exurb	70%	30%
Rural	63%	37%

Although the majority of teachers in urban schools felt that fundraising was necessary for them to provide adequate instruction, there were no significant differences in teachers' rating of their self-efficacy for fundraising, $F(3, 435) = 1.11$, $p = .35$. Among respondents who knew the amount of money their music program fundraised each year, there was no statistically significant difference among school urbanicities in the amount fundraised, $F(11, 4416) = 1.25$, $p = .24$. We interpret this last result with caution, however, because none of the respondents from city schools reported fundraising amounts in excess of $10,000 per year. Because of this, we could not compute a reasonable estimate for the number of city schools who fundraise at this amount; however, it is possible that the percent of city schools fundraising at this level is quite low or rounds to zero.

Amount raised	City	Suburb	Town	Rural	All locales
$1 - $500	41%	35%	20%	34%	34%

$501 - $1,000	14%	24%	18%	15%	18%
$1,001 - $5,000	27%	24%	37%	32%	29%
$5,001 - $10,00	18%	10%	12%	14%	13%
> $10,000	0%	7%	13%	5%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Fundraising and school level. As discussed above, schools serving older students tend to fundraise greater dollar amounts for music than schools serving younger students. Among schools where the respondent knew the approximate fundraising amount, the amount of money raised for music programs was related to school level, $F(10, 3279) = 6.38$, $p < .001$. Note that no respondents at Multi-level schools (e.g., grades 6-12 "Junior-Senior" High Schools) reported raising in excess of $10,000, so caution must be applied in interpreting this result.

Amount Raised	**Primary**	**Middle**	**High**	**Multi-Level**	**All schools**
$1 - $500	61%	20%	8%	19%	34%
$501 - $1,000	22%	18%	8%	39%	18%
$1,001 - $5,000	15%	39%	45%	18%	29%
$5,001 - $10,00	2%	14%	26%	24%	13%
> $10,000	1%	9%	12%	-	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Perceptions of music teachers about the climate for music teaching and learning. We asked music teachers to rate the adequacy of the support they received from their school, their district, and their community on a variety of factors related to the climate for music teaching and learning. In the table below, adequate or inadequate support is highlighted (bolded) for each issue depending on how the majority of teachers reported adequacy in each area.

In most areas, a majority of music teachers reported that support was somewhat or very adequate. A majority of teachers felt that the availability of music technology hardware, the availability of music technology software, and time for collaborative planning was very or somewhat *inadequate*. By far, most music teachers reported that administrator support for

music was adequate or very adequate—this is perhaps unsurprising as the *presence* of a music program in a school is often heavily influenced by whether a local administrator wants to support music, and only schools with active music programs were included in the survey. In fact, more music teachers rated their administrators' support for music "very adequate" than rated parent support as "very adequate," which potentially reflects the importance (and influence) of local administrator buy-in for the health of a music program.

Issue	Very Inadequate	Somewhat Inadequate	Somewhat Adequate	Very Adequate	Not applicable/ No opinion
School- or district-allocated funding	20%	18%	**35%**	**25%**	2%
Facilities for music instruction	10%	21%	**33%**	**35%**	1%
Facilities for music performance	17%	22%	**35%**	**26%**	-
Availability of classroom instruments	8%	21%	**36%**	**30%**	5%
Condition of classroom instruments	7%	26%	**35%**	**28%**	3%
Availability of music technology hardware	**22%**	**30%**	29%	16%	3%
Condition of music technology hardware	18%	20%	**32%**	**19%**	11%
Availability of music technology software	**26%**	**27%**	31%	13%	4%
Storage space for instruments, equipment, and other materials	18%	25%	**38%**	**17%**	1%
Instructional time allocated for music courses	8%	22%	**36%**	**33%**	1%
Time for individual planning	15%	22%	**36%**	**26%**	2%
Time for collaborative planning	**29%**	**32%**	23%	12%	4%

Student motivation, interest, or demand for music learning	3%	13%	**37%**	**42%**	4%
Parent support for music in the school	6%	14%	**39%**	**36%**	5%
Administrator support for music in the school	4%	12%	**32%**	**50%**	3%
Community support for the music program	2%	11%	**37%**	**45%**	6%

Considerations for the Future

This research study creates some clear areas of next steps for Give A Note Foundation, our philanthropic partners, and NAfME in terms of supporting music educators through curriculum, professional development, resource, and advocacy strategies as outlined above. As this report is focused on the supports ***current*** music educators need, the philanthropic, advocacy and service responses based on these findings will need to be balanced with the need to address equity and access barriers in those schools and students currently without access to music education.

Methodological Appendix

Sampling Procedure

We sought to conduct a nationally representative survey of American public schools with music programs and the music teachers employed at those schools. While many research studies in music education begin with a limited sampling frame, such as members of state music educators' associations, we wanted to ensure our sample included teachers who were and were not members of such organizations. As such, we started our initial sampling at the school level by drawing a random sample of 2,000 schools from the most recent **Common Core of Data** (CCD), a data product of the National Center for Education Statistics which, among other pertinent information, lists contact information for all local education agencies and public schools in the United States. Some of the entries in the CCD are not regular public elementary, middle, or high schools (for example, alternative schools or certain other kinds of local education agencies can be listed in the CCD). In order to reach our target population of regular public schools with music programs, we drew our sample in two stages—first, we randomly chose 2,000 schools from among the complete population of schools listed in the most recent Common Core of Data. We then determined which of the randomly chosen schools employed at least one music teacher by manually searching school websites for music teacher contact information; where website information was inconclusive, we contacted the schools by phone to determine if they employed at least one music teacher. From the random sample, we identified 1,436 schools that were in-scope (meaning the selected school was a regular public elementary, middle, or high school) and employed at least one music teacher. We identified 2,079 individual music teachers employed at those schools.

We sent survey invitations electronically to all 2,079 teachers we located. At the conclusion of the survey period, we had received 528 (25.40%) survey responses from teachers, of which 468 were complete, yielding a 22.51% final teacher response rate. Responding teachers worked in 392 separate schools, yielding a 27.30% final school response rate. We developed survey weights to ensure that our responding teachers and the responding schools were nationally representative. In order to ameliorate the threat off potential non-response bias, we conducted a non-response bias analysis and adjusted our base weights for non-response. All survey quantities reported in the results reflect the application of these weights and are nationally representative. More detail on the survey method and weighting procedure is reported in the final section of the methodological appendix.

Survey Fielding Procedure

The questionnaire for this study was newly developed explicitly for this study, but the instrument is intended to be "evergreen" and reusable in future music education studies. The items on the questionnaire were developed by a music education researcher with experience in survey research and pilot tested by a small group of working music teachers ranging from 2 to 30 years of experience and small group of music program leaders with music administration experience ranging from 10 to 25 years. None of the pilot test participants worked at schools

that had been selected for the random sample of the main data collection. Pilot test participants recommended some slight wording changes for clarity and open-ended feedback suggested that teachers and administrators both felt that questions were appropriate for the level of expertise and school-level knowledge that could be reasonably expected of a working music teacher at elementary, middle, or high school levels. All feedback from the pilot test was incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire, which was then reviewed without further changes by an expert in music education philanthropy.

The survey was administered entirely online using the platform of a common, commercially available online survey tool. The music teachers who worked at the schools selected for the sample were invited to participate in the survey via e-mail. We sent a total of five e-mails to invited teachers. The first was a "heads-up" e-mail informing teachers of the existence and purpose of the survey. The next three e-mails were standard survey invitation e-mails initiated from the online survey administration system. Once a sample member responded, they received no further invitation reminders. For those respondents who received multiple invitations, the e-mails were sent roughly one week apart, with slight variation in the interval between invitations to ensure that each invitation was sent and arrived on a different day of the workweek. The survey remained open for 30 days from initial invitation to closure. All invitees were offered a $15 Amazon e-gift card as a response incentive; e-gift cards were delivered to respondents' e-mail upon completion of the survey. Although we needed to track response and non-response in an identifiable manner, all responses were anonymized in the dataset prior to analysis.

Weighting Procedures

Our survey had two defined target populations for which our results need to be nationally representative. The populations are (1) schools in the United States with music programs, and (2) the music teachers working in those schools. To ensure that our results are representative of these populations, we created a set of survey weights to be used in our main analyses. As we had two distinct populations, we created two separate weights: a school weight and a teacher weight. The weights, formally known as inverse probability weights, represent the inverse of the probability that any one school or teacher would be selected for the sample. The weights, when used with Taylor series linearization for variance estimation, ensure the representativeness of results obtained from our sample.

As we started with a simple random sample of schools from the CCD as our sampling frame, the base weight for each school is the number of schools in the sampling frame (102,799) divided by the number of schools in the sampling frame (1,436). In the unattainable perfect world where all sampled schools had responded to the survey, the sample would be "self-weighting," in that all schools would have this equal base weight. After the survey closed, we determined if a school was considered "responding" or "non-responding." Responding schools were those where at least music teacher fully completed the survey; non-responding schools were those for which no fully completed survey was returned. In cases where more than one music teacher from a school fully responded to the survey, we included all teacher responses in the teacher sample but randomly chose one respondent to serve as the informant

for the school-level questions. We adjusted the base weights for nonresponse by setting the weights of non-responding schools to zero and adjusting the weights such that the total weight for responding schools equaled the total weight for the sample. As we had no reason to believe that nonresponse patterns were completely at random, we further adjusted the weights using raking. Raking the weights ensured that our schools, when weighted, followed the same distribution as the population of schools in the CCD on the dimensions of school urbanicity (referred to by NCES as "locale") and school level (e.g., elementary, middle, high, or multi-level). The weight raked along these dimensions is the final school weight for the sample.

The calculation of teacher weights followed a similar method as the calculation of school level weights. We used estimates of the population of music teachers from the most recent NCES Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS 2011-2012) as our starting point for weights. We adjusted base weights for nonresponse as described above for school weights and then raked the teacher weights so that our respondents, when weighted, matched the marginal distribution of the population of music teachers in SASS along the following dimensions: race/ethnicity, sex, and full-time/part-time status. The weight raked along these dimensions is the final teacher weight for the sample.

Interview Appendix

List of School Districts participating in interviews with Give a Note Foundation during the 2015-2016 school year

- San Diego Unified School District, San Diego, CA
- Boston Public Schools, Boston, MA
- Dallas Independent School District, Dallas, TX
- Philadelphia City Schools, Philadelphia, PA
- Denver Public Schools, Denver, CO
- Deer Valley Unified School District, Phoenix, AZ
- Peoria Unified School District, Peoria, AZ
- Paradise Valley Unified School District, Phoenix, AZ
- Scottsdale Unified School District, Scottsdale, AZ
- Phoenix Union High School District, Phoenix, AZ
- Ocala, FL
- Spanish Fork, UT
- Puyallup, WA
- Dexter, MO
- Stapleton, NE
- Jericho, NY

References

Abril, C. R., & Gault, B. M. (2006). The state of music in the elementary school: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *54*(1), 6–20. http://doi.org/10.1177/002242940605400102

Abril, C. R., & Gault, B. M. (2008). The state of music in secondary schools: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *56*(1), 68–81. http://doi.org/10.1177/0022429408317516

Carey, N., Kleiner, B., Porch, R., & Farris, E. (2002). *Arts education in public elementary and secondary schools: 1999-2000* (No. NCES 2002-131). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Elpus, K. (2013). Is it the music or is it selection bias? A nationwide analysis of music and non-music students' SAT scores. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *61*(2), 175–194. http://doi.org/10.1177/0022429413485601

Elpus, K. (2014). Evaluating the effect of No Child Left Behind on U.S. music course enrollments. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *62*(3), 215–233. http://doi.org/10.1177/0022429414530759

Elpus, K. (2015). National estimates of male and female enrolment in American high school choirs, bands and orchestras. *Music Education Research*, *17*(1), 88–102. http://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2014.972923

Elpus, K., & Abril, C. R. (2011). High school music ensemble students in the United States: A demographic profile. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *59*(2), 128–145. http://doi.org/10.1177/0022429411405207

Parsad, B., & Spiegelman, M. (2012). *Arts education in public elementary and secondary schools: 1999-2000 and 2009-10* (No. NCES 2012-014). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.