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Popular music programs continue to expand into higher education in the United States. By examining the who, what, when, where, how, and why of existing higher education popular music programs, information for future development and assessment can be provided. This qualitative multiple case study explored the creation, implementation and operation of two popular music performance programs in higher education in the United States: The Musicianship, Artistry Development and Entrepreneurship (MADE) Music Program at The University of Miami, Frost School of Music, and the Bachelor of Popular Music Program at The University of Southern California, Thornton School of Music. This study examined the curriculum, interactions, leadership, pedagogies, resources, perceived value and successes of these programs. Adding to the larger discussion of popular music in higher education, this study provides insights, ideas and resources for those institutions and individuals already operating or contemplating the development and implementation of popular music programs within higher education settings.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

_Composers are influenced by all the important music in their lives – and I suppose since radio started playing popular music, that’s as likely to be the Beatles or Aphex Twin as it is to be Verdi or Ravel – Jonny Greenwood_

This quote by Jonny Greenwood, lead guitarist for the band Radiohead, comes from an interview for _The Quietus_, an online, London-based Arts Magazine, where he discusses the importance of popular music in today’s composer’s lives (Woolfrey, 2014). Arguably, popular music is important not only in composer’s lives, but also in people’s everyday lives.

But what is popular music? For many, the idea of popular music brings up images of Taylor Swift, Justin Bieber, Kesha or Jay-Z. Yet it is more than that. It is part of the collective consciousness that runs through societies at any given time. Popular music spans many genres and generations and is intricately tied to location and culture. What is regarded as popular to a given generation remains a part of that generation throughout their lives, even though subsequent other music will become popular to younger generations (Powell, 2011), continuing the ever-changing cycle of what popular music describes.

Popular music, like all music, can also be a vehicle for life-long learning and engagement with music and this personal participation in music can provide joy and a sense of purpose to a person’s life. In turn, this engagement may encourage people to seek out others with whom to make music, thus forming bonds of community (Higgins,
But where do we cultivate these communities within and through popular music, and where does the creation and study of popular music belong?

Many questions quickly spring to mind about the place of popular music in education, and in regards to this study, higher education. Is higher education a place for teaching popular music? If placed in higher education, how do we avoid having the performance and creation of popular music become solely a monument and canon to be reproduced and memorialized? How do you teach popular music? How do we invite culture to not only influence, but also be influenced by these programs? How do we support a culture that has the potential to lose its vibrancy and innovation due to rules, regulations and standards; as well as the focus placed on the acquisition of skills and eventually, a job, as is so often seen in higher education?

Perhaps no one will, or should, develop definitive answers to these questions, for that would mean we might stop seeking out possibilities. However, by (a) exploring the history of higher education popular music performance programs, (b) examining effective curricular design, (c) exploring pedagogical strategies, (d) examining curricular frameworks, (e) bringing awareness to the challenges and strengths found within these programs, and (f) exploring the potential of popular music to affect social change, it is possible to provide relevant ideas and points of discussion regarding these questions both for myself and for the larger popular music educational community.

**Defining Popular Music**

There is no universal understanding or definition of popular music, and for everyone, this definition will be different (Frith, 1998; Green, 2006; Rodriguez 2004; Théberge, 2000). Popular music is always changing and encompasses a broad spectrum
of musical styles and tastes. A useful analysis of popular music (Bowman, 2004) notes these attributes: (a) a breadth of intended appeal; (b) mass mediation and commodity character; (c) amateur engagement; (d) continuity with everyday concerns; (e) informality; (f) here and now pragmatic use and utility; (g) appeal to embodied experience; and (h) emphasis upon process’ (p. 36-37). Each of these characteristics touches on different aspects of what leads a music to be popular. Another examination of what constitutes popular music laid out by Frith (2004) provides these criteria for popular music: (a) music made commercially in an economic system; (b) music made using ever-changing technology; (c) music which is experienced as mediated; (d) music which is made primarily for pleasure; and (e) music which is formally hybrid – bringing together musical elements which cross cultural, geographical and social boundaries (p. 3–4).

Popular music is popular to those who engage with it—as consumers and creators—with an intention of mass appeal and engagement (Frith, 1998; Gridley, 1987; Hooper, 2017; Powell, 201; Smith & Parkinson, 2015). Parkinson (2014) described popular music as, “enmeshed with social life, accompanying and in many cases defining the lifestyle practices of individuals and communities” (p.15). What is popular becomes the thing that is created by those who wish to create it. Defining popular music means relying on “a subjective interpretation of what is popular” (Powell, 2011, p.4), or, as Hooper (2017) stated, “popular music is largely defined by the context from which it springs and through which it is received—that which makes it popular” (p.153).

Using Hooper’s (2017) definition as a guide, for this study, popular music was defined as the music that is used, taught and performed within the two programs in this study. Other higher education popular music programs may want to
define popular music differently based on their own philosophies and context. This
definition was restricted to music seemingly viewed as popular by the people who began
and currently teach and learn within these programs. For this study, popular music
included a wide variety of musical genres including, but not limited to: alternative, blues,
bluegrass, country, disco, electronic dance music (EDM), folk, heavy metal, hip-hop,
gospel, indie, Latin-pop, rap, rock, rhythm and blues (R&B), soul, and singer-songwriter.

**Popular Music Programs**

Popular music programs are sometimes referred to as contemporary or
commercial music programs. This study employs the term popular music instead of
contemporary or commercial music for three reasons: (a) the majority of research in
music education refers to these kinds of programs and the music within them as popular
music; (b) the term differentiates popular music programs from contemporary music
programs that include jazz and/or musical theatre; and (c) the term avoids the implication
of pursuing a degree solely for monetary gain.

**Higher Popular Music Education**

Popular music in music education research is referred to as Higher Popular Music
Education, or HPME, an umbrella term that includes education in popular music
business, musicology, pedagogy, performance, production, technology, theory research,
and songwriting.

In this study, I explored two performance-focused HPME programs whose main
purpose is to educate performers, artists, and entrepreneurs to engage with the world as
musicians. Together with instruction in performance and musicianship, these programs
contain aspects of music business, musicology, sociology and pedagogy so as to provide
students with the skills, knowledge and awareness to continue a life in music after university. The students within these programs largely self-identify as performing or creating popular musicians. These two HPME programs are not engaged in teaching music educators how to teach popular music, although music education majors may be included in their student populations.

**Historical Context**

Higher Popular Music Education (HPME) programs are a relatively new addition to the higher education landscape in the United States. At the time of this study, there was no cumulative or summative published research on the history of popular music programs in higher education (Krikun, 2017a). Those sources that have attempted to discuss the popular music education timeline have often focused on the broader stroke of popular music education within elementary and secondary schools, or on advocacy for adding popular music to school curriculums. Additionally, while popular music programs have been part of the European and Australian higher educational terrain for several decades, four-year HPME performance degrees have only recently begun to be offered in the United States, and there is little research on these programs and their histories.

According to Krikun (2017a), popular music education first gained traction in the form of published music in Tin Pan Alley, where, for the first time, commercial success could be measured by sheet music sales. Sheet music sales, along with the advancement of technology and a desire to participate in dance bands, led people to push for popular music in formal education. Access to printed music allowed anyone with the ability to read music access to play their favorite songs alone and with others. Both the advent of
the radio and recorded music fueled this phenomenon (Kotarba, Merrill, Williams & Vannini, 2013).

In the 1920s and 1930s, popular music education was introduced into formal education institutions with the aim of equipping music students with adequate vocational training for specific careers in music (Krikun, 2014). Some of the first higher education institutions to offer popular music instruction, which today would be considered jazz, were the junior colleges (now two-year community colleges) in California. According to Powell, Krikun, and Pignato (2015), these initial jazz programs can be described as popular music programs due to their practical training and the central role of the dance band, the popular music medium of that time.

Beginning in 1924, several of these public junior colleges offered studies and courses in this kind of vocational training in popular music—mostly to service the burgeoning film, recording and radio stations in Hollywood. Pasadena Junior College was the first American higher education institution to offer a course in popular music, and Long Beach Junior College was the first to offer a popular music degree—a two-year Associate’s Degree in Modern Music—in 1937. Los Angeles Junior College followed and began offering courses, and later a degree in commercial music in 1946 (Krikun, 2014, 2017a, 2017b).

Following WWII, jazz, the prevailing popular music of the day, continued to appear within higher education settings. Most scholars connect this continuation of jazz into higher education to the signing of the GI bill (Murphy, 1994). Yet despite this connection, the advance of jazz was slow, as many institutions did not want to add jazz instruction to their musical offerings because of the societal rhetoric that jazz was an
inferior music and did not deserve formal study (Murphy, 1994). Those institutions that did offer jazz instruction often relegated it to extracurricular activities, most generally big bands, with an emphasis on note reading and traditional ensemble playing as opposed to improvisation (Prouty, 2005; Ake, 2002).

Frustrated by the lack of formal schools to learn jazz, Lawrence Berk, a pianist, composer, arranger, wanted to establish a place where musicians could find organized sources of information to help them learn jazz and thus make a living by playing and teaching music as a trade. In 1945, Berk established the Schillinger House (renamed Berklee in 1966), a school for contemporary music that catered to this growing demand for training in jazz (Wilf, 2014). Also in 1945, Alvin L Learned founded Westlake College of Music in Los Angeles with the goal of preparing students for careers in the Hollywood studios (Powell et al., 2015). Following soon after and rising to initial prominence in the fields of jazz were Indiana University, The University of North Texas and The University of Miami (Murphy, 1994; Prouty, 2005). In the 1950’s, the popularity of jazz dimmed for the general public as the spotlight began to be more on rock-centered music, moving jazz further into the realm of art music (Murphy, 1994).

Similar to the initial jazz programs, popular music programs (not connected to jazz) found acceptance in higher education through community college music programs (Krikun, 2014). These initial programs started in the 1970s. Many of these programs were established in the southern United States and specialized in country and bluegrass. These schools included the Hank Thompson School of Country Music at Claremore Junior College in Oklahoma and the Commercial Music program at South Plains College in Levelland, Texas. In 1975, The Country and Bluegrass Music Program at South Plains
College offered a two-year degree in commercial music and by 1997 the program grew to include 25 faculty and over 700 students (Krikun, 2014). Community colleges in California also began developing more vocational programs in recording, technology, music business, songwriting, and music performance and at present, there are approximately 17 community colleges in California that offer commercial music performance degrees and certificates (California Community Colleges, 2015).

During the mid-1970s, for-profit music colleges emerged at the forefront of those institutions providing training in popular music. The Guitar Institute of Technology (now known as Musicians Institute) in Los Angeles, and McNally Smith College in St. Paul, Minnesota were some of the first to offer instruction at the higher education level. From the 1970s up until their closure in December 2017 (Minnesota Music School, 2017), McNally Smith offered both undergraduate and graduate degrees in popular music performance and composition (Krikun, 2017a).

Although popular music offerings continued to be a staple of community college music programs and for-profit institutions, popular music programs in four-year non-profit accredited institutions did not arrive until the early 2000’s (Krikun, 2017a). Musicology and ethnomusicology programs were the first to bring popular music into elite American research universities. During the last two decades of the twentieth century, these programs emerged as popular music studies that consisted of interdisciplinary research and the emerging field of new musicology (Powell et al., 2015).

Following these new musicology fields and excluding for-profit and specialized music conservatories and schools such as Berklee, beginning in the early 21st century, four-year colleges and universities began to incorporate popular music performance
programs into their core offerings. Belmont University in Nashville, TN, was one of the first to offer studies in commercial music performance in the mid-1990s and currently offers both bachelors and masters degrees in commercial music performance and studies. In 2007, The University of Miami launched its songwriting minor, The Bruce Hornsby Creative American Music (CAM) Minor. The CAM minor offers undergraduate music students the opportunity to pursue popular music and specifically songwriting, through a project-based curriculum as a minor connected with any other music degree (Powell et al., 2015). Due to the growing number of contemporary principals and CAM minors, this minor recently expanded in the fall of 2016 to a full bachelors degree performance focused program entitled Musicianship, Artistry Development and Entrepreneurship (MADE). In 2009, the University of Southern California (USC), Thornton School of Music launched a bachelors degree in Popular Music, one of the first bachelors degrees in the United States specifically related and focused solely on performance in popular music (USC Thornton, 2009).

Many other four-year programs have since been established with popular music degrees (musicology, performance, recording, technology), courses, curriculum and ensembles as featured aspects of their music programs including, but not limited to: New York University Clive Davis Institute; The University of Colorado, Denver; The Detroit Institute of Music Education; Columbia College, Chicago, IL; Ithaca College, New York, Five Towns College, New York; The State University of New York, Oneonta; Saint Rose College in Albany, New York; Middle Tennessee State University and Eastern Tennessee State University (Baldwin, Reinhert & Edwards, 2017).
Along with the growth of programs for popular music, many organizations have been developed to promote and advance popular music education at all levels. The International Association for the Study of Popular Music (IASPM) was established in the United Kingdom in 1981 to promote international inquiry, scholarship and analysis in areas of popular music (Cloonan, 2005). In June 2010, The Association for Popular Music Education (APME) was formed in the United States to “promote and advance popular music at all levels of education both in the classroom and beyond” (“Mission APME”, 2017). In 2014, the College Music Society (CMS) convened a task force to examine a more inclusive educative experience for students in music, which included the addition of popular music styles (Campbell, Myers & Sarath et al., 2014). At the International Society for Music Education (ISME) conference in July of 2016, a popular music Special Interest Group (SIG) was formed to “embrace, through popular music, a diverse range of inclusive approaches to music education that welcome the new, the contemporary and all musics and music making that have meaning for those who experience them” (“ISME: SIG”, 2017).

Acceptance and Validity in Higher Education

The Tanglewood Declaration of 1967 is cited as a turning point for popular music’s inclusion in music education (Choate, 1968). The second item of this declaration states:

Music of all periods, styles, forms, and cultures belong in the curriculum. The musical repertory should be expanded to involve music of our time in its rich variety, including currently popular teen-age music and avant-garde music, American folk music, and the music of other cultures. (Choate, 1968 p. 139)
Following this declaration, there was much discourse about including popular music in music education. Opponents viewed it as aesthetically inferior, dangerous, and encouraging of rebellious behavior (Krikun, 2009).

Despite these views, popular music continued to be marginally included in music education. Examples of this can be seen in (a) the MacCluskey (1979) examination of how the Tanglewood declarations were being implemented in the late 1970’s classrooms; (b) the *Music Educator’s Journal* devoting a portion of their December 1979 issue to addressing popular music practices; (c) music symposiums focusing their attention on the inclusion of multicultural perspectives; and (d) the National Standards for Music Education stating a need for diverse styles and genres to be represented in the curriculum (MENC, 1994).

Current research continues to show that popular music has value and deserves to be taught within educational institutions and this is well documented within the literature (Allsup, 2008, 2011; Bennett, 2012; Elliott & Silverman, 2015; Frith, 1998; Green, 2002, 2006, 2008; Hebert, 2011; Humphreys 2004; Jones, 2010; Jorgensen, 2011; Kratus, 2007; Lebler 2007; Lebler 2008; Powell, 2011; Parkinson, 2014; Powell et al., 2015; Regelski, 2009; Rodriguez, 2004; Smith, 2013; Théberge, 2000; Tobias, 2013; Väkevä, 2006; Westerlund, 2006). With continued and growing global HPME, more than 31 higher education institutions in the United States already including popular music in their curriculums (Baldwin et al., 2017), and national and international organizations advocating for the inclusion of popular music at all levels of education, the discussion as to the validity of including popular music within and alongside existing music programs is intentionally brief.
This study aims to move beyond debating validity and instead seeks to add to the growing body of research on exploring and developing best practices in popular music teaching and learning.

**Challenges**

Including popular music in higher education comes with many challenges. These challenges include finding qualified instructors, space and equipment needs, and financial resources. There is also the challenge of creating effective curriculum design, finding, using and creating pedagogies for popular music, and addressing the various interactions that will inevitably arise with and within the addition of an HPME program. This section will begin with discussion on the more concrete challenges and move to the more abstract and subjective aspects of including and creating HPME programs.

**Resource Challenges**

Resource challenges are those challenges that are more concrete and measurable. These include finding instructors, equipment, and spaces as well as addressing the financial needs these additions will incur.

As HPME programs are still relatively new additions to higher education, finding qualified instructors with the required higher education credentials presents a challenge. To meet many higher education requirements, musicians interested in working within these programs usually need to either have a long list of professional credentials, a terminal degree within a complimentary field, or a combination of the above. As of the date of this study, there are very few doctoral level programs in popular music education or performance. Therefore, institutions wishing to add HPME programs may need to
consider alternative modes of assessing and hiring qualified instructors whose experience may be in a related field or through experience in the industry.

In addition to qualified faculty, popular music programs require different equipment than many traditional music programs. This equipment is often expensive to purchase, maintain, and repair, thus placing a possible financial burden on the institution to provide the equipment. This equipment is often referred to as ‘backline,’ and includes amplifiers, cables, computers, drum sets, microphones, microphone stands, mixers, monitors, and PA systems.

Classrooms and rehearsal spaces need to be equipped with this equipment and enough space to accommodate the loud sounds this music has the potential produce. This often entails having sound baffling, dampened and ‘dead’ spaces, and having backline consistently set up so as not to waste rehearsal time with equipment management. Performance spaces that are able to create an atmosphere that would be found in a popular music context—such as moveable chairs, lighting rigs, media possibilities, and live sound manipulation are an important aspect of providing relevant experiences to students within these programs.

As much of culture of popular music involves capturing music in a recorded medium, in addition to equipment and spaces for live music making and creation, there also need to be spaces to record and work within digital mediums. Providing recording studios and classrooms for students to learn recording, mixing and mastering techniques are necessary components for student learning and opportunity. Much of popular music today is created and consumed through digital media—Soundcloud, Spotify, YouTube, etc.—and the ability for students to have skills within recording contexts is essential to
their ability to work and have musical discourse with their peers and the larger popular
music community outside of an institution.

Lastly, it is important to acknowledge that any new program may require an
adjustment to the financial resources of a music department. However, this is especially
true within HPME programs because of its need for new kinds of equipment and spaces
specific to its performance and creation. Each institution will need to address these
financial challenges—some may seek out outside donors or endowments, some may
increase tuition, and many may need to restructure their budget.

**Philosophical Challenges**

Inclusive of the challenge of faculty, space, equipment and financial resources,
there are philosophical challenges involved in the creation and implementation of an
HPME program. Considering that much of popular music has developed outside
academia, placing this music and its ethos within the walls of higher education can be
argued to be in direct opposition to popular music’s ideology as well as an affront to the
art, tradition, and ‘class’ of the traditional music program (Parkinson & Smith, 2015).
Controversy over the assumed need to maintain perceptions of excellence in Western
classical performance continues to echo of elitism and is well documented in music

Popular music does not degrade classical or jazz music or traditions. Instead, each
kind of music appeals to different modes of creativity and expression. Popular music
offers an alternative for those students wishing to study and grow through music, yet with
a passion for The Beatles, ACDC, Kendrick Lamar and Beyoncé instead of Bach,
Debussy, Ellington or Coltrane. Popular music programs can provide a space to create, to
learn, and to explore what it is to be a musician in a context that appeals to a different kind of student. They offer community engagement with peers and learning skills that are useful in all aspects of life—communication, cooperation, joy, autonomy, self-efficacy, self-awareness, and a space to grow and discover their own humanity.

For many of these students, their careers will be multi-faceted, and having a university degree has the potential to provide students with opportunities for future growth and development, as well as multifarious options along their career paths.

**Program Design Challenges**

As will be discussed later in this introduction, as well as in the review of literature, how the program is designed can present distinct challenges. Traditionally, higher education music programs, specifically performance programs, often focus on the learning of a canon of repertoire, with specific goals for technique, knowledge and performance based on pre-existing recordings and printed music (Bennett, 2007; Smith & Parkinson, 2015). While learning and understanding repertoire is an important aspect of any music degree, if this were to be the entire focus of and HPME program, the aspects of innovation, creativity and composition indigenous and inherent to popular music might be lost (Moir, 2017; Parkinson & Smith, 2015). The same can be true of an HPME program that is solely focused on the creation of original music with no awareness of history or repertoire. Therefore, developing programs that respect, honor, and educate about the past, but also respect, honor, and educate about the future is important. Popular music programs need to embrace creativity, innovation, diversity and originality (Moir, 2017).
**Success Challenges**

Finally, there is the challenge of what defines success—both for the student and for the program. Success within these programs can be viewed from many perspectives, and how a program and its leaders view measurable success can affect student outcomes.

As evidenced by many educational scholars (e.g. Dewey, 1938; Freire, 2000; Partti, 2012; Wright, 2010), educational success can lead to “agency, understanding, respect, compassion and self empowerment…alternatively, it may lead to compliance; factual, tacit or embodied knowledge; and transferrable and domain-specific skill sets” (Herbert, Abramo, & Smith, 2017, p. 452). The balance of technical-musical, critical-theoretical and entrepreneurial business skills are increasingly included in the goals of HPME programs around the world (Bennett, 2013; Burnard, 2012; Hallam & Gaunt, 2012; Herbert et al., 2017; Lebler & Hodges, 2017; McLaughlin, 2017; Morrow, Gilfillan, Barkat & Sakinofsky, 2017; Sylvester & O’Reilly, 2017; Wong, 2017).

HPME programs have the responsibility to address these issues and ask the students how they foresee making a life out of making music (Smith, 2013). In today’s current climate where many people state being depressed or feeling inadequate, addressing goals and measures of success that move beyond financial, knowledge, and skill can help to alleviate and mitigate issues related to states of being and worthiness (Brown, 2017).

**Interactions**

Popular music sociologist Simon Frith (1998) states, “Pop tastes do not just derive from our socially constructed identities; they also help to shape them” (p. 276). Interaction refers to the way in which we connect—with each other, with people in the
past, people in the future, and ourselves. According to Sandström, Martin, and Fine (2006), “Through interaction, we become human, respond pragmatically to social situations, negotiate social meanings, shape our behavior, experience and manage emotions, and shape and refine culture” (Kotarba et al., 2013, p. 21).

When intentionally included within the mission of a program, aspects of interaction such as social justice and artistic citizenship (Elliott, Silverman & Bowman, 2016) add social and community value to these programs. Artistic citizenship, as outlined by Elliot et al. (2016), is a concept that refers to the authors’ belief that “artistry involves civic-social-humanistic-emancipatory responsibilities, obligations to engage in art making that advance social ‘goods’” (p. 7). Additionally, they posit that artistic citizens are “committed to engaging in artistic actions in ways that can bring people together, enhance communal well-being and contribute substantially to human thriving” (p.7). This concept will be further examined in the review of literature.

Understanding interactions can help students understand the social context in which music is made, thus helping them to understand the meaning and relevance (Jorgensen, 2011). Popular music has the ability to help reframe the nature of music and cultural history through its diverse forms of human expression where authenticity and commercialism are interdependent (Théberge, 2000).

**What Curriculum Provides**

As will be further examined in the review of literature, curriculum is not just the road map for a course of study. Curriculum includes not only the courses that are taken, but also the pedagogies that are involved in teaching them, the philosophies and motivations behind their design, and the various interactions that the curriculum will have
with the administrators, teachers, and students, the larger university community, and the world outside of the institution in which it is housed.

Bennett (2007) stated that there is a global debate regarding how effective music performance education is in relation to the needs of its students, funding, and continually shifting global dynamic. If change does not occur, these programs will fail due to being obsolete (Bennett, 2007). Additionally, as changing standards, expectations, and audience consumption drives so much of the job market, it is necessary to meet the needs of these students in new and innovative ways (Lewis, 2014).

Popular music presents an ever-evolving terrain of new ideas and sounds. Effective and thoughtful curriculum creation can provide the space to address issues of pedagogy, resources, success, community, interactions, skill, and knowledge and is a powerful context within which to work. HPME programs offer the opportunity for the creation of an evolving and reflexive curriculum that has the ability to remain current and relevant to its population and students.

**Curricular Frameworks and Authenticity**

Current HPME programs can be viewed as developing curriculums through the connection with other disciplines (classical and jazz, formal methodologies), the demands of society for certain knowledge (desire for skills within the popular music aesthetic), and the desire to conform to societal norms (what people expect to gain from a music degree) (Parkinson & Smith, 2015). Each of these are important aspects in the development of HPME programs and each holds a separate framework and idea regarding curriculum creation. I will discuss three possible frameworks for curriculum creation—employability, cultural value, and hybridized.
Employability Framework

The first framework aligns the goal of the program with measurable employment. If the goal of the given program is to provide students with a program that holds employability at its center, the curriculum may look more like a music business degree or repertoire based system of learning. Students are taught skills that will enable them to prove their ability to work once outside of school. The practices within these programs would be to solely provide those skills that offer opportunities for measurable employment (Parkinson & Smith, 2015). This work and employability is then measurable by outside sources.

Within this framework, the competencies required to attain a job are often the benchmark for what skills are deemed important for acquisition within a higher education music performance program, however this does not consider the need for students to often know how to use those skills in different contexts (Bennett, 2007; Barnett & Coate, 2005). Employment related skills encompass both skills related to subject area and those skills transferrable across disciplines.

Measurable employment opportunities for these graduates might be that of an entertainment lawyer, a publishing mogul, a marketing expert for a music company, or a musician in a corporate/club date/wedding band, or even an educator. Regardless, each of these jobs illustrate that the student can become employed by moving through the program and earning a degree. These policies are considered to be neo-liberal in nature, in other words, entrusting societal progression to market forces (Parkinson & Smith, 2015).
**Cultural Value Framework**

The second framework has within the goal of a program to educate students towards cultural value – both for themselves and for the music that they create. This model places the student at the center of the learning process and assumes that they come to learning with their own understanding and awareness of the world (Dewey, 2009). Parkinson and Smith (2015) suggest that, “it is important to explore how and the extent to which higher music education can work as a site for developing musicians as citizens with an awareness of their place and power in the world” (p.65). Successive studies (Green, 2006; Bennett 2008; Higgins, 2012; McLaughlin, 2017; Negus, 1996; Smith 2013) illustrate that people pursue music because they are deeply invested as human beings in what they do.

Yet higher education still needs to meet measureable goals and assessments, as required by such accrediting organizations as National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), Western Association of Colleges and School (WACS) and other accrediting organizations. However, measurable goals do not necessarily have to align with market forces of employability. John Kratus (2017), retired educator and scholar, offers the following six assessable goals. These goals align more to a cultural value framework than those of only skill acquisition and employability. Kratus’ (2017) original statements have been italicized, followed by some elaboration. They are:

1. **Sustainable**—how many people after graduation are continuing to pursue music *in their lives?* Measureable by assessing how many people are pursuing music and at what level—vocational or avocational.
2. **Responsible and Inclusive**—is the pedagogy of the program socially responsible and inclusive. Measureable, albeit subjectively, by examining the curriculum and pedagogical construction of the program to see how socially responsible and inclusive practices are embedded and manifested in its design.

3. **Awareness**—does the program and its students take advantage of local and global resources? Measurable by how the program interacts with the local and global communities with which it is involved.

4. **Individually expressive**—does the program value individuality and creative expression? Measureable with the kinds of repertoire that is being created by the individuals and educators within the program. Is there new repertoire being created? Are there new materials being created by the faculty to educate the students and respond to the quickly changing popular music domain?

5. **Collaborative**—does the program have community and collaboration within its core values? Measureable by examining the community and assessing how it interacts with not only itself, but also with other programs within the larger university community—different disciplines, socially, across majors…etc.

6. **Life-Affirming**—does the program bring meaning and joy into its participant’s lives? Measureable by exploring what the faculty and students derive from their interactions and experiences while working or studying with in the program. This includes providing opportunities for joy that, while experienced through music, have more far-reaching effects on people’s lives.

These holistic educational goals can potentially serve not only the students and faculty within these programs, but also the communities in which they interact. Ideally,
that which gets learned in the classroom should be something with which learners can make more meaning out of their understanding (Barrett, 2005; Khan & Law, 2015; Pitts, 2003).

This curricular framework places emphasis on the students’ intrinsic knowledge and awareness. It also allows for the students to have input into the knowledge they wish to acquire, develops students with individual agency and awareness of how to manage their own skill and development, and has measurable goals that align with cultural values (Barnett & Coate, 2005).

**Hybridized Framework**

A hybridized framework uses aspects of both employability and cultural value to create a curriculum. Students within HPME programs want to be successful, creative, and create lives for themselves while simultaneously monetizing the skills that they possess (Barrett, 2009; Bennett, 2007; Herbert et al., 2017; Hughes, Keith, Morrow, Evans, & Crowdy, 2013a, 2013b; Parkinson & Smith, 2015; Smith, 2000).

A hybridized curricular framework would combine aspects of employability—marketing, skills, repertoire, entrepreneur, etc.—with cultural value—sustainability, responsible, expressive, creative, collaborative, joy, etc.—into a structure that draws upon all these skills to engage students in practices that speak to their individual goals. Planning for this kind of curriculum requires an adaptive framework that allows for change and new avenues of exploration based on student interests. Students are guided toward new awareness and understanding through their current lens, allowing for curiosity and exploration that often leads to serendipitous and concomitant outcomes to those originally chosen by the faculty (Barrett, 2009, Smith, 2000).
In some ways, this is already the norm for many HPME programs. In many HPME programs, in addition to musicianship courses, there are required courses within entrepreneurship and the music business as well as courses in musicology, sociology, and well-being. The combination of these courses enables these developing musicians to share their artistry with the world, to provide for themselves, and to be able to continue to potentially be involved with music their whole lives.

**Pedagogical Strategies**

Although there are long established pedagogies within higher education, HPME teachers and scholars continue to examine these practices and challenge pre-conceived ideas about educating future expert musicians (Carey & Lebler, 2012; Folkestad, 2006; Green, 2006, 2008; Herbert et al., 2017; Hughes et al., 2013a, 2013b; Lebler, 2007, 2008; Lebler & Weston, 2015; Parkinson & Smith, 2015; Powell, 2011; Rodriguez, 2014; Smith, 2013, 2015; Smith & Shafighian, 2013; Väkevä, 2006; Westerlund, 2003, 2006).

According to Lebler (2007):

> If the modern conservatorium (higher education) is to prosper in a rapidly changing cultural and economic landscape, it will need to provide a learning experience that produces multi-skilled and adaptable graduates who are self-monitoring and self-directing. By implication, teaching practices…will need to be rethought…to produce graduates with the abilities and attributes necessary to adapt readily to a changing environment (p. 205).

Exploring both established and burgeoning pedagogies can aide in determining best practices as well as developing new and innovative ways of engaging students and teachers in HPME programs.
Formal Pedagogies

Most traditional music programs in higher education educate through a formal practice of pedagogy. These formal practices are often considered standard modes of teaching and learning music that have been an aspect of music conservatory and music department rhetoric since their inclusion in higher education institutions. These practices are often activities that have been sequenced beforehand and put into an order of learning by the instructor (Folkestad, 2006). Aspects of formal pedagogical practice include: (a) placing focus on reading notation; (b) learning pre-existing repertoire with a bent towards mastery and replication of a specific canon; (c) skill acquisition often bereft of context or application; and (d) a focus on the product as opposed to the process.

Teacher-Centered Learning

Teacher-centered learning is often part of the formal learning mode. Teachers choose what knowledge is to be learned, how it is to be learned, and in what order it should be learned, instead of allowing the student to discover what they are interested in and then fill in the gaps when they come to an impasse. When learning a canon, and often in theory or history, where it is sometimes easier to understand more complicated concepts after more simple concepts are mastered, this can be a useful pedagogical strategy. However, this is a pedagogical concept that continually needs to be reexamined and used judiciously within an HPME context (Lebler, 2007).

Informal Learning

Informal practices tend to be those utilized more prevalently within popular music communities. Although a new addition to the higher education milieu, Green (2008) found that most learning in popular music occurs within an informal learning context and
to learn popular music in a way authentic to its heritage and history, a similar approach is warranted. These activities are often not sequenced beforehand and instead, the activity itself creates the way of working/playing/composing through the interactions of the participants (Folkestad, 2006). Aspects of informal practices include: (a) placing focus on learning by doing; (b) aural, oral and rote learning; (b) creating new material; (c) improvising; (d) skill acquisition that occurs within the context and content of musical practice and performance; (e) and a focus on process. When placed in institutions, to create these kinds of environments, the teacher acts more as a facilitator of learning than a director of knowledge.

**Non-formal Learning**

Non-formal practices take place in or outside of an institution and often have a tailored or very loose curriculum that is designed to suit student needs (Rogers, 2004). They are often used alongside and with formal and informal practices and are on a continuum (Folkestad, 2006). Aspects of non-formal practices include the use of aural and oral teaching and learning, as well as somewhat directed learning, but with more room for self and group discovery.

**Student-Centered Learning**

Student-centered learning is an aspect of informal and non-formal learning practice. In this context, students direct their own learning. Students self-monitor, self-assess and self-motivate themselves to become more adept at the task, skill or knowledge in which they are interested and curious (Lebler, 2007). In these environments, students’ abilities are developed through interactions within their community and assessments are
standards and criteria referenced so that assessment does not negatively affect any one individual based on helping someone else to succeed (Boud, Cohen, & Sampson, 2001).

**Peer-to-Peer Learning**

Peer-to-peer learning and collaborative learning environments are hallmarks of popular music practices. Evidenced by garage rock bands (Westerlund, 2006) and popular music ensembles (Green, 2008), popular musicians often learn music and musical skills through experienced-based learning. Key features include: (a) enabling peers to learn from and with each other; (b) learning from other’s experiences; (c) learning through listening to opinions and expressed values and beliefs; and (d) learning through receiving and giving feedback (Boud, Cohen & Sampson, 2001).

**Summary**

Like all music genres, popular music is a complicated and multi-faceted field, filled with contradictions and challenges. For this study, popular music was defined as the music that is used, taught and performed within these two programs. For this study, popular music included a wide variety of musical styles including: alternative, blues, bluegrass, country, disco, EDM, folk, gospel, heavy metal, hip-hop, indie, Latin-pop, pop, rap, rock, R&B, soul, and singer-songwriter.

Higher Popular Music Education (HPME) is a term that includes education in popular music business, musicology, pedagogy, performance, production, technology, theory research, and songwriting. Within the two HPME programs investigated in this study, the students largely self-identify as performing or creating popular musicians.

Challenges to creating and implementing HPME programs include finding qualified instructors, space and equipment needs, and financial resources. Finding, using
and creating pedagogies for popular music, addressing the various interactions that will inevitably arise, and discourse on concepts of success and philosophies and choice of curricular framework design—employability, cultural value and hybridized—are additional challenges that may arise in creating these programs.

Pedagogies included in HPME programs include formal, teacher-centered, informal, student-centered, non-formal and peer-to-peer. Each of these pedagogies has an affect on the curriculum and its implementation. Effective and thoughtful curriculum creation can provide the space to address issues of pedagogy, resources, success, community, interactions, skill, and knowledge and is a powerful context within which to work.

**Purpose of the Study**

This qualitative multiple case study explored the creation and implementation of the popular music programs at The University of Southern California, Thornton School of Music and The University of Miami, Frost School of Music. This study provides insight into the development of these programs, looking at both the internal and external motivating factors and the challenges of both the implementation and maintenance of these programs. It sought to discover what kind of curricular framework is prevalent within the fulfillment of the design and looked for how these programs are developing authentic pedagogical practices relating to popular music through their philosophies of design. This study examined interactions and aspects of social agency within these programs. Lastly, this study explored perceived ideas about success and value of these programs from the perspective of the administration and faculty.
Need for Study

Higher Popular Music Education (HPME) programs are continuing to be added into existing higher education music landscapes around the world. It is therefore timely to explore why and how they are being created, what is driving their creation, and how to create effective and malleable programs and curriculums that truly serve the needs of the students.

Bowman (2004) states, “Popular music status is ever unsettled and contested, and indeed, these may be its most salient characteristics” (p. 37). Exploring the who, what, when, where how, and why of popular music programs currently existing in higher education institutions is of particular significance to the evaluation, implementation, and creation of future HPME programs.

Although there is research on HPME relating to programs outside the United States, most research on popular music programs and curriculum in the United States focuses on those programs at the elementary and secondary educational levels. There is little research on the design and implementation of HPME programs in the United States, especially those located within four-year institutions, which suggests a need for study (Walker, 2007).

HPME programs offer opportunities for students to pursue music in higher education who do not look like traditional band, choir, orchestra or jazz students. There is a need to understand how to best serve this new population of students. Although there has been significant research on how popular musicians learn (Carey & Lebler, 2012; Folkestad, 2006; Green, 2006, 2008; Herbert et al., 2017; Lebler, 2007, 2008; Lebler & Weston, 2015; Parkinson & Smith, 2015; Powell, 2011; Väkevä, 2006; Westerlund,
2003, 2006;), there is still very little research on these kinds of learning environments and their impact on higher education in the United States.

Findings from this study can be used to engage current and future programs in evaluating, implementing and creating HPME programs in higher education. This research endeavors to help HPME programs grow and flourish to be individualized, creative spaces that create communities where popular musicians can learn and grow to be global citizens and exemplars in their field.

**Conceptual Framework**

HPME program curriculums can be designed in many ways and with many different viewpoints, paradigms, philosophies, and motivations. The programs contained within this study were created by individuals with their own personal vision of what an effective HPME programs looks like. Through this study, I wanted to understand these visions was and examine the challenges they faced with the creation and implementation of their program. I wanted to discover what the leaders and faculty within these programs believe in regards to the above aspects of program design and curriculum.

Based on the literature reviewed for this study, I designed the following curricular framework to lay out a path through which I could explore the curricular design of these programs. This framework is based on the various aspects of curricular design that I believe are part of the process of designing an effective HPME program. This drawing helps the reader organize how I went about discovering how these programs were designed, developed, and implemented (Figure 1).
Starting at the left, as discussed in the introduction, different motivations and challenges shape how the curriculum is designed. These include motivations surrounding the who, what, when, where, how and why, as well as facility, financial, personnel, philosophical challenges. Once these concepts are discussed and arrived upon, the curriculum becomes the focus of construction.

The inner wheel of the conceptual framework lays out the interconnected aspects of curricular design as a wheel, where all parts lead to the center, and the center leads to all parts, indicating a continual and evolving relationship between the parts and the whole. The spokes I designed are as follows:
1. **Leadership** – This category includes the mission statement of the school and the program, the structure of the environment in which the program is nestled, the position of the upper administration in relation to the program and faculty, and the viewpoints and paradigms of the faculty in relation to the mission, environment, and administration.

2. **Framework** – This category relates to the organization of the curriculum. In this study, I am examining whether these programs are employability or culture centered in their design; or whether they encourage and encompass all of these ideas into a holistic, or hybridized curriculum.

3. **Pedagogies** – This relates to how the students are taught. While all methods have merit within a learning environment, in relation to popular music, there tends to be emphasis placed on informal, peer-learning, and student-centered methodologies. This category also relates to how the program and faculty defines what is authentic practice in relation to their vision for the program.

4. **Interactions** – This category relates to aspects of how the program views and implements ideas of social awareness, autonomy, social change, social capital, community building, art with a purpose and artistic citizenship.

5. **Resources** – What are the available resources for the program? This includes space, technology, equipment, finances, and faculty to student ratio and can be affected by both external (demand of market, outside view of program, etc.) and internal (faculty time, financial constraints, etc.) factors.
Moving out of the wheel, yet also affecting its design, are philosophies about success and value. These include aspects of authenticity, program goals, and beliefs about what constitutes success.

Through this conceptual framework lens, I designed my research questions, interview questions and faculty questionnaire, and data analysis as they related to the explorations of these two HPME programs.

**Central Phenomenon and Research Questions**

The central phenomenon of this study was to explore the creation and implementation of HPME programs by exploring two current programs and their recent addition into the higher education musical ecosystem.

Through this exploration, I sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How was each popular music program started, and what challenges occurred during this process?
2. How do these programs conceptualize their curriculum and its implementation?
3. Are interactions being addressed within these programs?
4. What and how are pedagogies for popular music being addressed through the implementation of the curriculum?
5. What are the perceived ideas about success and value within the HPME program from the perspective of the administration and faculty?

**Research question 1: How was each popular music program started, and what challenges occurred during this process?** This question serves two purposes. First, it looks at the motivations behind the creation of the program. It answers the questions of
both internal and external motivations such as who, what, when, where, how and why. Second, it examines the challenges in implementing these programs such as those from current faculty and administration, facilities, philosophical and traditional assumptions about higher education, and technology constraints.

**Research question 2: How do these programs conceptualize their curriculum and its implementation?** This question sought to discover what the overall goal and vision of the curriculum and program, as well as discover what curricular framework was most represented in this vision and implementation.

**Research question 3: Are interactions being addressed through these curriculums?** This question explored whether aspects of social agency, social justice, social awareness, personhood, and artistic citizenship are being taught either indirectly or directly through the curriculum. This question sought to discover if this is something that should be included within these programs, and if so, why?

**Research question 4: What and how are pedagogies for popular music being addressed through the implementation of the curriculum?** This question focused on the pedagogical philosophies infused into the curriculum of the HPME program. These included practices related to the implementation of the curriculum, student learning outcomes, use of technology, and the experience of the faculty. It also explored the nature of authentic practices for popular music and how they manifest in their pedagogies and to what those authenticities most closely align.

**Research question 5: What is the perceived value of the HPME program from the perspective of the leaders and faculty?** This question investigated what the faculty
and leaders (Deans, Program Directors) viewed as the value of having an HPME program, as well as to what their views on success most closely related.

**Delimitations**

**Curriculum**

While curriculums for elementary and secondary music programs contain popular music integration, it is challenging to make connections between these curriculums and those involving higher education popular music performance programs.

Most elementary and secondary curriculums involving popular music discuss either (a) the validity of adding popular music studies—not performance—to the curriculum, or (b) how to address adding popular music into a pre-existing traditional educational format. Elementary and secondary curriculums often engage popular music as a form of including more students in music, another aspect that while relevant to the overall addition of these programs into the higher education, is irrelevant within an established popular music performance focused major.

Students within an HPME program enter knowing they want to study popular music and most will continue to be musicians beyond their time at the university. This is not to say that advocacy for life-long music making is not an aspect of these programs. This is simply is an assumed paradigm.

**Engagement**

Because HPME programs already have more students auditioning than they can accept, this study does not explore recruiting students from the traditional band, orchestra or choir programs. For example, for one music school in this study, 250 of the approximately 400 students auditioning were seeking acceptance in the popular music
program; approximately 20 students were admitted (R. Sanchez, personal communication, January, 2015). In another, there were approximately 500 students auditioning, and 25 were admitted (C. Sampson, personal communication, April, 2017). This information suggests that these programs are a compelling addition to the academic environment, providing opportunities for growth and musicianship that had previously been unavailable to students within higher education.

**Jazz**

As stated in earlier, jazz, due to its current state in higher education, as well as it being considered ‘art music’ (Murphy, 1994) is outside the scope of this study. While there are certainly parallels to jazz program’s entering higher education, for many reasons, these parallels are largely outside the scope of this study. This is a vast topic that is certainly worth exploring. However, it is one that inherently necessitates its own study due to the breadth and depth that would need to be explored. Additionally, jazz programs adopted a traditional conservatory model (Ake, 2002; Murphy, 1994; Prouty, 2005; Wilf, 2007) to create their curriculum. This study is exploring the creation of innovative and new curriculum strategies, pedagogies and constructs with which to effectively teach and design programs in popular music. Although parallels and comparisons will be unavoidable, they will be kept to a minimum.

**Teaching Methods**

In higher education programs, unlike secondary programs, there is also not a need to validate informal or non-formal teaching or learning methodologies. They already exist within the trappings of the genre. Popular musicians learn informally, and many professors within these programs are not trained as educators, they are trained as
performers and they often teach based on both the way they learned and the manner in which they were taught. Many of these professors have no formal training in how to teach or the aspects of teaching that music education majors and researchers learn about in their studies. Their learning is praxial (Elliott & Silverman, 2015) and is based on their experiences.

**Definitions**

**Authenticity**

Philosophers have developed ideas related to authenticity in terms of autonomy and freedom from external pressures and resistance to institutions and high culture (Parkinson & Smith, 2015). Because this study deals with the institutionalization of popular music into academia, this focus most certainly seems to be at odds with the ability to form a definition. However, according to Dyndahl and Nielson (2014) authenticity relates to a belief in “a resilient core of something good and genuine” (p. 107). If that which is good and genuine is reflected through and resides in the creation and implementation of the curriculum, and the definition of what is good and genuine thus align with the motivations and philosophies of the institution within which the program resides, then, for the purpose of this study, authenticity refers to that which is thought to be true or right according to the administration and faculty in relation to the design of the curriculum and all aspects of its implementation.

**Bespoke Education**

Bespoke is defined as custom-made (Bespoke, 2018) and is a term most commonly found within the fashion industry. However, the term has applications to HPME programs. Many traditional music programs have a set and unchangeable course
of study. Popular music is ever changing in its demands, technology, and sounds. Therefore, a different approach to a course of study is warranted—one that has many core elements but that is able to be flexible to the needs of the students and the strengths of the faculty.

In regards to this study, bespoke education is defined as the kind of education that is tailored to the people within the program. It is further defined as an education that is student-centered, flexible, and changeable and one that is able to continually adjust to the needs and demands of the student population and resources of the program.

**Curriculum**

Numerous authors demonstrate the difficulty in defining a curriculum and these various definitions and orientations will be explored further in chapter two of this study. Based on this exploration, for the purpose of this study, a curriculum is a course of study affected by both internal and external factors that is defined, created, and implemented by those wishing to guide the process through which learners make sense of and experience the subject matter being taught.

**Portfolio Career**

Rather than a traditional, or linear career model, a musician within a portfolio career maintains and engages in a multiplicity of roles in order to sustain musical careers (Bennett, 2012). These kinds of non-linear careers involve a continually unfolding and self-managed web of concurrent and overlapping employment arrangements (Bennett & Bridgstock, 2015, p. 263). Portfolio careers are defined as the kind of career where a musician practices within the profession of music, yet does so within one or more specialized fields, often concurrently with one another.
Success

Success is an individual construct, and rarely is a definition of success agreed upon. However, as a general usage, most people have some aspect of holding meaning and happiness within what is considered success. In addition to this more philosophical aspect of success, for many musicians and artists, success is often measured by the ability to maintain a career and support oneself financially (Bridgstock, 2012). Bennett (2013) builds on this, stating that, “building a successful career depends on entrepreneurial activities and carving out a niche market” (p. 235). Bennett goes on to state this kind of entrepreneurial learning within higher education music programs “requires a future-oriented epistemology developed within a safe study environment that rewards leading as well as learning, such that the ‘future self’ is self-defined as one who combines knowledge and action in the creation of the new” (p. 238).

Success within these programs can be viewed from many perspectives. How each program and its leaders view measurable success can affect student outcomes. Additionally, what the students want to learn can affect what is and should be taught within the program, thus affecting the program’s goals and outcomes. Within this study, concepts about success were linked to a particular curricular framework—employability, cultural, or hybridized. Each of these frameworks has within it an embedded idea of success that affects curricular design, as well as program and student outcomes. Connected to this are the specific goals of the program, which can also be considered measures of success.
For this study, success is defined by the stated goals of the two institutions’ programs, the framework embedded in the design of their respective curriculums, and the manner in which the respective stated goals are implemented.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Creating a popular music program in higher education involves the creation and design of curriculum. This includes the design and implementation of pedagogies endemic to popular music, decisions about interactions and authentic practices, and discussions about value and success. To further explore the relationship between these aspects of creating a popular music program in higher education, it is important to situate this study within the context of literature in and around music education, specifically popular music education. In my conceptual framework (Figure 1), I depicted the various aspects that can affect curriculum in Higher Popular Music Education (HPME) programs as a wheel, with curriculum design at the center. This conceptualization of curriculum is not uni-directional, but rather bi-directional, with the spokes of the wheel affecting the center, the center affecting the spokes. When you change one aspect of curriculum, you invariably change another. This coincides with many curricular theorists viewpoints about how to create more effective and interactive curricula, and is the lens through which this review of literature is organized.

Literature reviewed for this study included books, dissertations, and scholarly peer-reviewed journal articles that pertained to curriculum, pedagogies, interactions and success in relation to music education, music, education, and HPME. While there is some research into HPME program curriculums in The United Kingdom, Europe and Australia, at the time of this writing, there is very little research on these curriculums in the United States. There is however information about curriculum both as a general term
relating to education, and in relation to higher education programs outside of music and it is from these areas that this section draws upon and makes connections to the current study.

Developing ideas around curriculum, pedagogies, authenticity, interactions, value and success helped to provide context for the interviews, observations and data analysis that took place in this study. For this review, studies were grouped into the following categories: Curriculum (generally and in HPME); Authenticity (General, Pedagogies, and Curriculum); Interactions; and Success.

Curriculum

General Terms

Curriculum is at the heart of educational programs at all levels, yet rarely is curriculum in the larger sense—not as it relates to a course of study—but to the way it is implemented both pedagogically and philosophically—discussed in relation to all the forces that affect its design. Curricular theorists such as Tyler (1949), Taba (1962), and Pinar (1995) have had immense influence on the construction and reconceptualization of curriculum, yet little attention has been given to the evolution of curriculum and its transformation and transformative possibilities within higher education (Hyun, 2009; Barnett & Coate, 2005). According to Barnett and Coate (2005), curriculum should be one of the major terms in higher education: “Through curricula, values, beliefs and principles in relation to learning, understanding, knowledge, disciplines, individuality and society are realized. Yet these profoundly important matters are hardly ever raised” (p.
Defining what curriculum is and how its many aspects affect all parts of teaching and learning is important to understanding these relationships.

Pinar (1995), a curricular theorist, described curriculum as a kind of conversation. Pinar stated that, “definitions [of curriculum] can be both beginnings and endings dependent upon the discourse and its functions” (p. 28). Pinar (1995) concluded that curriculum should teach students how to use knowledge from both academia and culture to create and understand their own selves. Similarly, Hanley and Montgomery (2002), in their study on contemporary curriculum practices and theories, noted that it is important to acknowledge the complex notion of defining curriculum, because curriculum can be thought of as both a course of study and as the pedagogies that are embedded within the course of study.

Correspondingly, in a study on music business curriculum, Bruenger (2015, described curriculum as a complex system of unique components that interact with each other, yet lack any central control, producing results that are adaptable and go beyond their individual components. Curriculum exists as a space in which students can discover themselves, their interests, and their abilities in a manner consistent with how they interact with the world—it needs to be like modern buildings, filled with light, space, different shapes and relationships, and the possibility for chance encounters (Barnett & Coate, 2005). The curricular imagination of teachers and their ability to translate this imagination into programs, courses, and meaningful experiences within the educational system is tantamount (Barrett, 2009).

These viewpoints on curriculum share the idea that curricula needs to be interactive, have context, and possess the ability to provide students with knowledge and
skills not only in their area of study, but also with the ability to use those skills to further develop and share their ideas with a broader audience. Dewey (1938) is often linked to a concept of life-long learning and agency where, through the curriculum, students learn to use their pre-existing knowledge and to acquire new knowledge that is meaningful (Cleveland-Immes & Emes, 2005; Darwish, 2009). The context through which material is learned and digested includes not only skill building, but also the ability to use those skills for the greater good of self and others (Cleveland-Immes & Emes, 2005; Khan & Law, 2015; Mednick, 2006; Null, 2011; Dewey, 1938; Smith, 2000).

**Music Education**

Moving from these more general views on curriculum into music education-centered curriculum concepts, Elliott and Silverman, in their book, *Music Matters* (2015), discussed a praxial philosophy of music education and curricular design—a curriculum that focuses on the doing and making of music that will in turn form individuals and their understanding of the world with which they interact. They proposed that the what of education cannot be decided upon without the why and who, and similar to Barnett and Coate (2005), espoused that who is being taught and how they learn matters just as much as the content that is delivered within the curriculum. In a previous iteration of this music education philosophy, Elliott (1995), wrote that curriculum making involves reflecting back and forth—making the curriculum interactive, context-dependent, and flexible. In considering the when, where and how, decisions often circle back to the teacher’s and administrator’s decisions about the why, who and what, creating an elaborate phenomenon that, as Pinar (1995) noted, is not easily defined. Often this
interaction is not discussed, but rather implied and implemented due to the philosophies and biases of the people creating the curriculum.

In his philosophy of music education, Reimer (2003) discussed music learning in relationship to musical sounds, creating musical meaning, that music has inherent meaning embedded in its sounds, and that learning these special meanings requires experience with musical sounds. Reimer (2003) posed that a curriculum is a comprehensive, sequential, and balanced course of study. He offered a model of a total curriculum, which includes seven phases:

1. Values (the philosophical basis of education)
2. Conceptualized (philosophy actuated as shared goal aspirations)
3. Systematized (sequenced learning)
4. Interpreted (how professionals understand and implement phases)
5. Operational (interface between professionals and students)
6. Experienced (what students undergo what they bring to the process)

Hanley and Montgomery (2002) further explored these phases in a summarization of Reimer by Stokes (1996):

Curricular theorists must base educational choices on a sound philosophy, relevant psychological research and educational practice and research, effective short- and long-term sequencing of learning, professional teacher interpretation of materials, experienced teacher/student operations in the classroom, what students
undergo and bring to the learning situation, and what educators and society expect from the educational process. (p. 96)

They discussed Reimer’s belief that practice must be grounded in philosophy, and that psychological theory alone does not provide sufficient foundations for curriculum development because it does not address value. Although Reimer and Elliott are often discussed as having disparate viewpoints on music education philosophy, at the core of what they discuss regarding curriculum are similar concepts of teaching and learning whereby the parts affect the whole. Elliott and Reimer acknowledge that that learning must be relevant for the people learning and teaching, and that these factors depend on the context in which the education occurs.

Another music philosopher, Jorgensen (2011), discussed curriculum as the process through which learners make sense of the subject matter. In her book, “Pictures of Music Education” (2011), Jorgensen explored fourteen metaphors and models to describe the various philosophies and motivations that may influence these processes within music. These include *Village and Community, Artist and Apprenticeship, Therapist and Healing, Home and Informality, and Web and Connectivity.* Jorgensen discussed the challenges and strengths of each mode of thinking and how each metaphor and model can affect curriculum design. Within each of these metaphors, she uncovered and explored the many aspects of curriculum and how different approaches to its creation affect—both negatively and positively—the environment, the learners and the teachers. Jorgensen (2011), similar to Elliott (1995), Elliott and Silverman (2015), and Reimer (2003), found value in the parts that affect the whole and vice-versa, as well as the context and relationships between the learners and the teachers. These values support
what the general curricular research (Barrett, 2009; Barnett & Coate, 2005; Bruenger, 2015; Dewey, 1938; Hanley & Montgomery, 2002; Pinar, 2003) posit about the nature of curriculum and its need to be adaptable and malleable and filled with an abundance of opportunities and experiences.

Each of these curricular philosophies offers an idea for curricular planning and creation. These ideas include considering curriculum as an ongoing conversation, a course of study, a set of spaces designed for discovery, activities that lead to constructing context and identity, engaging the what with the who, describing a process, or a balanced course of study. Each curricular philosophy also takes into account both the person being educated, as well as the content and context of the material being presented within its design.

**Curriculum in Higher Popular Music Education**

Within the context and content of Higher Popular Music Education (HPME), similar considerations for the person, content, and context for curriculum design are taken. Depending on the institution, according to Carfoot et al. (2017), there are many factors that affect curriculum design including:

1. The overall vision of the program and institution
2. The context and history of the department
3. Whether popular music is integrated throughout the music school or segregated into its own department
4. The environment in which the institution exists
5. The attitude of the faculty;
6. The resources at their disposal (p. 139)
Although utilizing different nomenclature to describe each facet of curricular design, these factors are similar to what Reimer (2003) proposed as phases of curricular development (see p. 44, this chapter).

According to Bennett (2007), a researcher and professor in Australia, whose research focuses on identity development, employability, graduate transition and creative labor markets, the maintenance and success of a career as a musician in today’s world requires graduates of music performance programs to have knowledge about skills previously untouched in performance programs. Bennett (2007), added that there is a global debate regarding how effective music performance education is situated in relation to the needs of its students, available funding, and continually shifting global dynamic. Institutions educating musicians for careers, specifically in relation to HPME, must respond to the myriad of skills required by today’s musician (Perkins, 2015).

Still, many institutions continue to focus on specialization as opposed to broad and varied skill sets (Perkins, 2015). As the music industry continues to evolve at a staggeringly fast pace, without an understanding of how to navigate this evolving and fast paced market, many musicians will find themselves in challenging career positions. The performance curriculums of these institutions must offer appropriate courses to support these necessary skills (Bennett, 2007; Cleveland-Immes & Emes, 2005; Hanley & Montgomery, 2002; Short, 2002). There is therefore a need to develop curriculum that engages and shapes graduates that are reflective, self-critical, imaginative and confident, with skills and knowledge able to become practitioners in the broadest sense (Moir, 2017).
Bennett (2007) surmised that if change does not occur within the curricular structures of higher education, programs will fail due to being obsolete. Additionally, because so much of the job market is driven by changing standards, expectations, and audience consumption, it is necessary to meet the needs of these students in new and innovative ways (Lewis, 2014). In a book on developing creativity in higher education, Jackson (2006) stated that: “We are trying to prepare students for jobs that don’t yet exist, using technologies that have not yet been invented, in order to solve problems that we don’t know are problems yet” (p. xi). Jackson added that as we move into changing and reconceptualizing educational philosophy within higher education, as well as HPME, we must ask how these ideas will change how we perceive and construct curriculum.

Rodriguez (2017) discussed the worth and potential of an institution in regards to these expectations in a book on popular music in higher education:

The educational worth and potential of an institution is thus in the quality of its students, not its faculty. We should be mindful of our collective responsibility to meet the needs for musical understanding in our communities as they constantly change, even if it means leaving some of our expertise behind, because it presents educators with the same challenge facing students—becoming something you have yet to achieve—and demonstrates the value that what you know is not nearly as useful of knowing how to learn (p. 287).

Or, as Yoda said to Luke Skywalker in the final Star Wars trilogy, “Luke, we are what they grow beyond. That is the burden of all masters” (Bergman, 2017).

Additionally, according to Carey and Lebler (2008), importance in 21st century society is placed on “creativity, adaptability reflexivity and innovative problem solving
skills…the protean musician will need to assemble a portfolio of income-generating activities to ensure the sustainability of a career” (p. 312). Bennett (2012) and Bennett and Bridgstock (2014) concur with this, and wrote about the introduction of HPME in response to portfolio careers—careers with multiple facets of income and expertise—as an:

often justified as a response to the diverse portfolio careers common among professional musicians in the 21st century. This area has been the topic of extensive research indicating how music graduates are presented with a prevalence of portfolio careers incorporating both creative and non-creative roles rather than narrowly defined performance based employment (Carfoot, 2017, p. 148)

Teaching popular music in higher education is multidimensional, yet there is debate on whether curricular content and delivery also comprehensively caters to students wanting to pursue careers as popular musicians or performers (Lebler, 2007, 2008; Feichas, 2010; Burnard, 2012, 2014; Gaunt & Westerlund, 2016; Hughes, Evans, Morrow, & Keith (2016); Smith, 2013; Smith & Shafighian, 2014; Parkinson & Smith, 2015; Smith & Gillet, 2015). Contemporary music programs will therefore need to reflect this convergence between the artist and business models/operations and find elegant solutions that integrate and support both models (Hughes et al., 2016). Sharing these views, Cloonan and Hulstedt’s (2013) research on United Kingdom undergraduate programs in Popular Music Studies found that, “best practices features interaction between a research-focused critical approach and a practically orientated musical, vocational or technological approach—that these areas should be synthesized and integrated” (p. 76-77).
When discussing the creative industries and higher education, Bridgstock (2012) noted: “While the majority of creative, performing and literary artists are self-employed, relatively few tertiary arts schools attempt to develop capabilities for venture creation and management (and entrepreneurship more broadly) and still fewer do so effectively” (p. 122). Higher education entrepreneurship should have a focus not only on the application and sharing of the art, but also on the creation and making of it (Bridgstock, 2012). Similarly, Herbert et al. (2017) surmised that HPME, “could have myriad objectives…imperatives, agendas, traditions and authenticities, identifying HPME as a rich and complex area for negotiating values, experiences and outcomes” (p. 452).

Moir (2017) offered, similar to Bennett (2007), Barnett and Coate (2005) and Hanley and Montgomery (2002) that a focus on the qualities, attributes and skills that musicians need to function in a multitude of creative environments is a more valuable asset for HPME graduates to achieve and to which curriculums should align themselves. This includes a focus on the process of creativity, in lieu of more traditional curricular models of learning a canon and repertoire replication, note reading and specialized performance skills (Hughes et al., 2016). Similarly, in an article on creative traditions found in HPME, Smith and Shafighian (2013) discussed the necessity of creative practices in HPME yet also problematized the nature of and necessity of learning repertoire to understand the music one is creating. They stated, “Contemporary music ought instinctively to refuse and to defy canonization, but responsible education in popular music performance cannot perhaps altogether ignore its complex roots” (p. 3). This complex relationship between canon replication and creativity is often what HPME
programs must contend with as they design their programs and implement effective curriculum.

Contemporary artistry involves more than instrumental performance and proficiency, it also demands the use of technology and innovative music production (Hughes, 2010, 2011). Till (2017) expands on this notion and discussed that although scores and canon are useful, that they are no more, and may be less, important than elements of popular culture such as social media prowess, recording techniques or web-design. Till (2017) contends that, “there is, “no single pedagogical approach that is appropriate to all cultural and educational contexts (p. 25). In all cases, according to McLaughlin (2017), in a chapter based on studies regarding the impact of Scottish folk music on society, as well as the teaching and assessment of post-compulsory popular music education in Scotland, states that, “institutions delivering programs in popular music articulate an ideology, or set of ideologies, that construct popular music/s” (p. 123).

In summary, each of these studies in HPME curriculum supports the concept that popular music programs are a new kind of curriculum in higher education. They need to be adaptable and changeable and able to address the many skills students will need upon entering the professional musical world where a portfolio careers are significant. When designing curriculum, aspects of musical entrepreneurship need to be accounted for. These curriculum need to be holistically designed with multiple aspects of learning and creativity at the forefront of their conceptualization, with multiple spaces for personal exploration and discovery built into their design. These concepts of curriculum lead to ideas about how to authentically represent and teach popular music in HPME.
Authenticity

Concepts of authenticity weave themselves into the questions this study sought to answer, especially in relation to curriculum, pedagogies, and interactions. Authenticity can be a controversial topic, but to not discuss authenticity would be a disservice to this research, as well as to popular music and HPME. This section will discuss those explanations and definitions most closely related to how this term aligns with music and popular music; the performance and pedagogies relating to HPME; and the creation and implementation of HPME curriculums within higher education.

Musical Authenticity

Dyndahl and Neilson (2014), in a study on shifting authenticities in Scandinavian music education, described authenticity as something resilient and genuine with an understanding of what is right: “what is perceived as natural or essential properties – such as a resilient core of something rooted and genuine – of material objects as well as social and cultural practices and phenomena” (p.107). Similarly, in a previous synthesis of constructing authenticity, Moore (2002), described authenticity as a loaded term that qualifies and prizes one manner of thinking about something as authentic to practice such as ‘real,’ ‘honest,’ ‘genuine,’ ‘actual,’ or ‘essential.’ “Authenticity is a matter of interpretation which is made and fought for from within a cultural and, thus, historicized position. It is ascribed, not inscribed” (p. 210). Authenticity therefore, can be described as the way in which one views the world, or, as Small (1998), in a study on socially constructed meanings stated, “All of us carry around our own way of making sense of the world and its relationships” (p. 130).
These relationships seem to be the key to understanding concepts surrounding authenticity. Within musical cultures, authenticity is often measured according to those practices that ascribe to pre-established and understood norms of behavior or social capital (Söderman, 2013). In a book examining the significance of music in the construction of identities and ethnicities, Stokes (1994) connected music to the process of identification, and therefore, authenticity of it. And Walser (1993), in his examination of heavy metal music, linked authenticity to an artist proving their autonomy as an artist by eschewing the corporate world of music whose very existence makes their artistic statements both meaningful and possible (p.100).

Simon Frith (1998), a popular music sociologist, posits that authenticity in relationship to high culture relates to the intrinsic value of the work, while low culture relates the value to what that work can offer to the individual or society. Frith explored the idea that if it is “through the consumption that contemporary culture is lived, then it is in the process of consumption that contemporary cultural value must be located” (p. 13). Frith continued by problematizing this concept using sales figures and market values in relation to success, and inherently authenticity, in popular music.

Yet, according to Parkinson and Smith (2015), in an article on authenticity in HPME, Adorno (1973), rejected understandings of authenticity that rely on the idea of individual control, arguing that authority over authenticity is shared across subject and object. These juxtapositions and relationship between what one thinks of as true and false is a futile act, as both values form an understanding of authenticity (Bendix, 1997). Identifying these values help to situate authenticity within the nebulous space of reality.
Within all these ideas of authenticity lies the common thread that authenticity is constructed by both internal and external forces, that authenticity requires belief even when it differs with others, and what one person considers authentic may be in direct opposition to another’s viewpoint.

**Authentic Pedagogies and Practices**

Questions surrounding authenticity have also raised considerable issues in relation to formal educative practices in music, particularly in relation to personal identity creation and community (Kallio, Westerlund, & Partti, 2014). Educational philosopher John Dewey (1938) suggested over eight decades ago that music within schools should reflect the wider society. Jorgensen (2003), while not specifically speaking to popular music, asserted that as new developments, ideas and problems emerge, educators must decide what to continue to include and what to discard. With popular music gaining popularity within higher education music programs, there exists the question of how to authentically represent and teach this music (Parkinson & Smith, 2015).

This, as sociologist Brené Brown (2010) posed, may mean letting go of time-honored traditions (what higher education thinks it is supposed to be) to allow for the emergence and embracing of new ideas, pedagogies, curriculum design and expressions of creativity (embracing what popular music is) within academia. Inherently, this is challenging, for popular music itself tends to be anti-establishment in nature, and the currency of many popular genres often lies within their ability to counter institutionalized culture (Parkinson & Smith, 2015).

Although decades before the enculturation of popular music into education, music philosopher Christopher Small (1998) discussed authenticity in relation to needing to
have a performance be informed by history, and as such, provide some certainty in an uncertain world. The challenge in placing popular music within a more formal setting includes engendering respect for the past while encouraging creativity in pedagogical practices (Lebler, 2008).

Music schools have very often adopted a system where there is a master/apprentice relationship and a canon to be learned and mastered (Herbert, 2011, Lebler, 2007, 2008). In a study on the institutionalization of popular music pedagogy in the United States, Herbert (2011) described a similar construct for the need to learn from the past while simultaneously finding ways that knowledge can resonate in the living present. Herbert explored the challenges of placing originality within traditional structures of institutions, “Originality may be especially difficult to teach and evaluate, yet it seems an essential feature of many forms of artistry, and is often perceived to be a prominent characteristic of musicians considered pioneers in newly-emerging genres” (p.17). Herbert continues, stating:

Institutionalization, on the other hand, enables a tradition of evaluative structures and pedagogical practices to emerge in response to a particular genre, yet ironically, these very structures and practices may naturally appear to stand in opposition to the distinctive musical originality that serves as their raison d’etre (p. 17).

These institutional factors can, over time, become transmitted and sustained to the point that they become resistant to change (Oliver, 1991), and this is particularly problematic for popular programs if they are to remain relevant to the global musical ecosystem of popular music outside academia.
Smith (2014) surmised that although popular music has a canon, as well as elite figures, it is somewhat different, and according to Till (2017) it has a “history of appreciating divergence from accepted behavior” (p. 16). Thus, a system of participatory and democratic approach to learning – as evidenced by Lebler and Weston (2015) and Allsup (2008, 2011, 2015) is well suited for popular cultural musical form. According to Till (2017), “this approach emerges from a number of sources as a suggested good practice” (p. 15).

Cutietta (1991) in an earlier article discussing popular music in education, established that popular music has its own set of rules and practices and stated:

We can either capitalize on the inherent qualities of pop music or keep trying to fit it into our existing models of instruction…if we give pop music an authentic place in our programs, we can begin to capture the inherent musical qualities, and the excitement of this music. In so doing, we can look at pop music not through the eye of other forms…but instead through its own eyes (p. 28).

Green (2002), in a seminal book on how popular musicians learn, described authenticity corresponding to those practices which are naturally occurring as opposed to those gained through formal education. Green (2002) found that popular musicians learned and processed music in a different manner than that found within formal education structures. She found heightened usage of educational elements such as aural and oral skills, discussion, peer-to-peer learning, and informal learning than found in traditional music instruction models. Yet, she also found that popular musicians were no more or less informed or knowledgeable about their musical genre or instruments than their more traditional counterparts, they just had come by the information in a manner that is not
necessarily tiered or leveled. This kind of informal learning structure is what Green (2002) described as an authentic learning process within popular music, and it typically involves many modes of understanding simultaneously, featuring integrated learning on a more holistic level.

Parkinson and Smith (2015) surmised that as popular music has been slow to arrive into higher education, music makers of popular music have had time to develop immersive and lifestyle-based approaches to practices authentic to their genre in relation to learning. Many students therefore bring skills and capacities developed in informal settings to the formal settings of academia (Lebler, 2008). As such, research within the area of informal learning suggests that formal learning is often present within informal learning spaces and vice-versa, operating on two poles of a continuum (Folkestad, 2006).

In a 2015 article for the May Day group entitled, “Towards an Epistemology of Authenticity in Higher Popular Music Education,” Parkinson and Smith questioned whether, when authority over what is considered authentic practice is left solely to the student, then is the institution doing the student a disservice by not offering them an awareness of the broader construct in which the music they make lies? They proposed that popular music programs can become spaces where multiple authenticities related to practice can and should exist simultaneously, with continual merging, sharing and negotiating constructs that create a hybrid authenticity. They stated that:

institutions and individuals working in higher popular music education have a responsibility to place the issue of authenticity at the center of pedagogy, curriculum design, institutional strategy and disciplinary knowledge share, in order for the field to develop in ways that are beneficial to all involved (p. 93).
These practices of authenticity highlight those praxes reflecting the necessity for the incorporation of student practices that reflect society (Elliott, 2014; Green, 2008; Regelski, 2009) as well as providing a potentially productive way to meld both the informal and formal into constructive pedagogies authentic to popular music in higher education (Parkinson & Smith, 2015).

Another aspect of authenticity commonly found in informal learning environments and many forms of music is creativity. Similar to Moir (2017), Bennett (2007), and Hughes et al. (2016), Hickey and Webster (2001) framed creativity, a skill they consider endemic to authentic practices in popular music, as having four dimensions:

1. person (who is teaching, learning, assessing and what is their encultured identity),
2. process (how does empowerment of students occur),
3. product (what is the measurement of success) and
4. place (what is the space).

Correspondingly, Karlsen (2010), in a study on a two-year higher education school in Sweden, examined authenticity in relation to the environment and pedagogical practices. They found that developing spaces and environments that cultivate individual identity, creativity and authenticity are tantamount to a student’s experiencing a program as authentic. Lebler (2007) asserted that pedagogies that encourage this development of student autonomy, with a shift from expert mentor services to co-produced learning between the student and the faculty, are important aspects of popular music pedagogy.
As society becomes more complex, people need to constantly adapt and develop new strategies in education for dealing with the challenges this brings (Lebler, 2008). Students therefore also need to learn in ways that develop the skills for them to succeed in these environments. In a study on an Australian bachelor of popular music program, Lebler (2007) surmised that these programs will need to provide a musically inclusive learning space that is able to adapt to the rapidly changing cultural and economic landscape. In these environments, students assessed themselves through both self-assessment and peer feedback, as well as with comparison to those that inspire them to create. Learning in these settings was found to be usually autonomous, intrinsically motivated, and self-directed (Green 2002; Lebler, 2008; Westerlund, 2006), similar to how popular musicians have traditionally learned and practiced their craft. These kinds of pedagogies and spaces can then produce graduates who enculturate the skills and abilities that will allow them to adapt to rapidly changing environments outside academia (Lebler, 2008).

Peer learning is another strategy often employed within informal music settings and has been discussed as closely aligned with authentic practices of popular musicians (Green, 2002; Lebler, 2008). These strategies have long been used within education, especially within the elementary and secondary settings, however they are only recently becoming more common within higher education. Boud et al. (2001) described ways in which peer learning can be best implemented within higher education. These strategies include an emphasis on cooperation and collaboration, building and recognizing differences, and matching the learning strategies and assessments to both the overall goals of the course and the individual goals of the students.
Lebler (2008) found that that peer-learning environments that engage students will self and peer assessment practices produced graduates that were better prepared for life beyond academia. The faculty role within this program is that of facilitator and guide, able to provide feedback and encourage the achievement of student-initiated goals. The development of self-directed learning strategies within the students contributed to student success both in and outside of school (Boud et al., 2001; Lebler, 2008).

In summary, authentic popular music practices tend to emphasize the idea that the music within the popular music genres already has value and that creating original music is an empowering activity that should be made available to everyone, (Herbert, 2011). Or, as Thwaites (2013), per an article exploring the connection between creativity and being, wrote, “authenticities of music, institution, history, teacher etc. do not simply exist alongside each other; they are also unified when they meet in the intimacy of their mutuality” (126). Authentic popular music pedagogical practices tend to be informal, and student-centered, with autonomous and self-directed learning, and peer and self-assessment at their center (Green, 2006; Lebler, 2007, 2008; Folkestad, 2006; Herbert, 2011; Parkinson & Smith, 2015; Regelski, 2009; Westerlund, 2006).

**Authentic Curriculum**

As discussed in the introduction, this study explored three curricular frameworks: (a) employability (curriculum designed solely for employment); (b) cultural value (curriculum designed to engage students in the value of their music); and (c) hybridized (curriculum that employs aspects of both employability and cultural value to form a hybrid framework). Each of these frameworks has a certain type of authentic
representation to popular music and what authenticity a program ascribes to in their philosophy affects their curricular design.

In relation to the employability framework, in a study on what constitutes popular music studies, Cloonan (2005) detailed that the arts and social sciences in the United Kingdom traditionally make pragmatic choices on curriculum content. These choices are dependent on student and employer demands, institutional limitations, professional requirements, and faculty interests. Asking questions related to what should students in HPME programs be expected and able to know and do after completing a course of study, he described three parts within his response to these questions—musical, vocational, and theoretical—with each component meriting consideration in its own right. He described his discussion as follows:

These responses can be seen as attempts to deal not only with uncertainty about whether the subject should be taught at all, but also with how it should be taught, what should be taught, and how the competing pressures of institutional politics, student demand, developments in the body of academic knowledge and the demands of the popular music industries should be dealt with. (Cloonan, 2005: 83)

Cloonan (2005) also discussed the potential downsides of working within an area of study that is particularly attractive to those who see students as a source of revenue, rather than as a source for a better future, leading to a perception that success within these programs is inexorably linked to commercial viability. He argued that these programs cannot simply be about vocationalism and advocated for programs to rise above this notion and challenge existing industry practices. Dunderstadt (2000), in an analysis of
the challenges and opportunities facing higher education, disagreed, reporting that the United States neo-liberalist ideologies posit that the universities should be expected to sustain the prosperity of the society, rather than, “places where human potential is transformed and shaped, the wisdom of our cultures is passed down from one generation to the next, and the new knowledge that creates our future is produced” (p. 33).

In a discourse about HPME programs in the United Kingdom, McLaughlin (2017) described these programs as focusing on “selling the possibilities of employment to prospective students of popular music” (p.123). And Parkinson and Smith (2015) described the need for program teams to subscribe to the idea of tracing educational value to neo-liberalist policy where “citizenship is narrowed to the demands of consumerism” and that to decline this notion would mean to decline the ability to fund programs (Giroux, 2007, p. 25).

Carey (2008) acceded this viewpoint, making it clear that from the literature on higher education, that the needs of the students in terms of employment outcomes are becoming a main concern as music schools struggle to deliver content that not only prepares the student for the workforce, but also produce a skilled performer (Carey & Lebler, 2012). Moir (2017) concurred with these ideas and discussed this view of HPME graduates as implying that “their activities, behavior, and motivations are profit-driven and competitive”(p.39) Similarly, in their paper on authenticity in popular music programs, Parkinson and Smith (2015) discussed success in HPME programs related to gaining access to “a professional world of sustained employment and income” (p.106) instead of that related to cultural edification. Analogously, Warner (2017), in a qualitative study on the perceptions of popular music studies in higher education, found that popular
music tended to emphasize professional knowledge, content, and skill acquisition over teaching students to think for themselves.

Yet, according to Carey and Lebler (2012), rarely do musicians have a clear-cut and pre-determined path into their professional life after college. Often, they will need a collection of skills and abilities that will allow them to work and adapt to changing circumstances, and will commonly engage in portfolio careers that lack the traditional models of progression and promotion. There is a need to show that popular music is not just about getting jobs, but rather something larger that embraces not only the practical, but the theoretical and personal as well (Warner, 2017). Allsup (2015) likewise stated that “music education encompasses more than training…recognizing a theory of self-formation that is more ancient” (p. 258).

Programs conceived in opposition to commercialism are at odds with those designed with policy agendas. These kinds of programs can be considered to use a framework of cultural value. Popular music has traditionally been a non-academic cultural form and has developed largely outside of formal settings for learning, with music that is decidedly, “anti-academic” (Parkinson & Smith, 2015, p. 98).

However, traditional music conservatory values can be viewed as part of the opposing viewpoints to commercialism, for long has their distinction been to create ‘great art’ and to preserve the traditions of the classical, and now jazz, canon. These canons are inherently against multiplicity and relativism (Parkinson, 2014). Yet according to Parkinson and Smith (2015) this philosophy poses another problem. Should popular music programs ascribe to this notion of authenticity—that of preserving the canon—they would be most in line with traditional authentic conservatory practices, but much perhaps
out of line with authentic popular music practices – that of originality and creativity.

Moir (2017) stated, “the type of approaches to popular music education…that prioritize performance and replication are in danger of replicating Western classical approaches to performance, to the detriment of other important skills and attributes” (p. 40).

Moir (2017) described how this kind of design can be detrimental to the music itself, for if authentic practices are lost or undervalued, then the music itself within academia may bear little resemblance to the music that exists in the world (p. 40). Instead, Moir argued that in order to develop relevant HPME curricula, the practices of popular music must be understood and respected. Additionally, the curriculum should be designed to enable students to develop skills to be practitioners in the broadest sense and that to do this, it is important to move away from a model of curricular authenticity that aligns with employability (Moir, 2017, p. 41).

Combining the need to work, high motivation to succeed, and a strong sense of personal achievement through the production of tangible outputs allows for occupational independence not tied to either tradition or originality, but rather somewhere in the middle therein lies a hybridized framework. This, according to Hickey and Webster (2001), is an ideal practice that can encourage students to apply their knowledge in creative ways. Moir (2017) posits that popular music curriculum should be designed in ways that focus energies on the “qualities, attributes, and skills…to function and participate in a multitude of different creative environments” (p. 39). As Menger (1999) found, in programs that ascribe to authentic practices related to a more entrepreneurial career, there lies value in both these ideologies. Curriculum, “should aim to instill in
students the skills for, and a sense of, collaborative entrepreneurialism” (Smith, 2013, p. 193).

Moir (2017) stated that learning must go deeper and encourage the learner to link new knowledge with existing knowledge “using collaborative communities and engaging in questioning and problem solving techniques” (Webster, 2011, p. 37). These careers look more like portfolio careers – those that incorporate both creative and non-creative roles (Bennett, 2012; Bennett & Bridgstock, 2014). Similarly, in a study on popular music curriculum, Théberge (2000) posed that a truly comprehensive popular music program would have embedded in its design multidisciplinary aspects drawn from many areas of the university, and from the strengths and multiple perspectives of various sources within the university. Curricula for HPME can be divided into musical, vocational, and theoretical parts, with the demarcations between these often blurry and undefined, but each equally important to the education of the student (Cloonan, 2015).

In summary, authenticity and its relationship to music, teaching, and learning, as well as developing curriculum are complicated, challenging, and have many facets. Authentic practices and pedagogies in popular music include those which are more student-centered, facilitated, self-directed, informal, autonomous, and peer-mediated and assessed. Authentic curricular design in popular music relates to those practices that align with a certain philosophical underpinning related to outcomes, goals, and perceived value of the education. These authenticities can be described as aligning with frameworks of employability, cultural value, or hybridized curricular design.
Interactions

Interactions are those mechanisms that engage students in generating and sharing meaning within music (Kotarba et al., 2013). This section will discuss how trends in social and community areas related to the arts, and specifically popular music, play a role in creating programs that contain communities and social spaces for the exchange and proliferation of ideas and viewpoints.

Highlighting the role of sociology in music education, Wright (2010, p. 12) commented that Pierre Bourdieu and Basil Bernstein have been particularly useful when thinking about the complex relationships between culture, education, society and music: “central to Bourdieu’s sociology was an ongoing investigation of the relationship between power and culture” (Söderman et al., 2015). Perkins (2015) discussed that Bourdieu’s notion of habitus in relation to HPME can help to shape the way students approach their learning and careers (p. 101). Perkins goes on to discuss economic, cultural and social capital in relation to HPME in regards to relationships between people that determine positions and decisions about careers. Green (2008) shared this idea regarding the sociology of music and observed that it “must construct its objects in full recognition of the complexities of individual and social mediation” (p. 10). McLaughlin (2017) discussed this idea of Green’s as “central to many approaches of the cultural and sociological study of popular music and from which the development of popular music pedagogical methodologies can draw” (p. 155).

According to Kotarba et al. (2013), young people, and music students even more so, rely on music culture to define themselves. They identify that it is important to consider young people’s subcultural identities and their social-psychological functions (p.
They go on to define popular music as “all types of music that are processed through, and share the logic, of mass media” (p. 13) and:

when music is produced, distributed, and consumed to satisfy goals other than appreciation of its aesthetic qualities, its instrumental functions work as commercial technologies marketed and sold to change definitions of social situations in order to reproduce, imitate, or alter individual feelings and collective emotional dispositions (Kotarba et al., 2013, p. 168).

Sociologist and popular music expert Frith (1998) found that within music and the education of music, lies the ability to inform, represent, and enact social relations and situations in a way where emotional understanding and ethical rules can be taught and learned. These crucial social networks can be found within the inherent social nature of music, which can then lead to people being successful in building intercultural understanding and civic engagement (Jones, 2010). Dairianthin and Francis (2015) suggested that:

PME [popular music education] is particularly powerful when it addresses the whole person, as well as values that reach beyond mere instrumentality. They focus on allowing learners to engage bodily with music, engaging either whole selves as a means both of forming and informing the individual, and of self-actualization and self-transcendence. (Till, 2017, p. 21).

Additional literature suggested that commerce and culture have entered an awkward alliance in regards to education and artistry (Carey, 2005; Hughes et al., 2016; McGuigan, 2009a, 2009b, 2010). Hooper (2017) described the need to help students to
understand the industry by showing them how their music fits into everyday lives and stated:

Cultural, critical and therein, sociological theory are important and necessary components of any popular music programme, making the case that this is, perhaps, the true distinction of our field: a charged and current space for discovery, discussing and dissemination of inextricable links between contemporaneous culture and context, for contextualizing, therefore, both the art and the artist (p. 154).

Hooper (2017) continues and related the expectation that pop music and musicians participate in culture as “simultaneous creators and commentators” (p. 159) and students need to be aware of not only what they are playing, but how it will be received. Finally, Hooper (2017) concluded that, “it is the exciting privilege and important responsibility of current popular music departments, colleges and programmes to offer studies that focus on music, but refuse to isolate it” (p. 163). If educators within popular music acknowledge these influences, new pedagogies will appear. These in turn may help to provide opportunities for ways for students to transform their musical understanding as it relates to the formation of their identity (Abramo, 2011, p. 476).

Woodward (2017), in a chapter on social justice and popular music education, found that “music is more than a mirror of society – it is also a force for change” (p. 395). Woodward (2017) stated:

The historical legacy of popular music being a widely accessible vehicle for exposing realities, voicing ideas, prophesying futures and being an agent of
change lends the discipline of popular music education the ability to exist naturally as a home for the promotion of social justice (p. 396).

Educators owe it to students to honor how they make music outside of the classroom and to nurture the student voice by paying attention to it (Woodward, 2017). Ginwright and Cammarota (2002) recommend a process to develop critical consciousness and social action that involves first seeing it in oneself, seeing how to change it and how change can heal, and then seeing it in others.

In, “Artistic Citizenship,” Elliott et al. (2016) argued that the notion of art (including music) having intrinsic value nested within its aesthetic properties relegates some of its powerful values and contributions to society to residual status. Further, “social and ethical responsibility lie at the heart of artistic practice” (Elliott et al., 2016, p.3) In relation to citizenship, Liu and Hanauer (2011) described citizenship as showing up for each other. Combining Elliott et al. and Liu and Hanauer, instructions for artists also involve and serve students with an effort towards identifying problems in the world and asking them what they can do to help with the art they create. Bowman, (Elliott et al., 2016) further elaborated on citizenship as the balance between individual freedom and the needs of the greater societal collective. Basic human rights can only be exercised in a community that values and is committed to honoring and sustaining them, including those artistic practices that are integral to human life (Bowman, 2016).

Elliott et al. (2016) discussed three principles related to artistic citizenship: (a) Arts are made by and for people and are grounded in social endeavors, as well as being important to the creation of individual identity, (b) There is a need to integrate art into personal and community life, as the value of art is a function of what it is good for, and
If arts are socially grounded practices, “they should be viewed, studied, and practiced as forms of ethically guided citizenship (p. 6). “Artistic citizenry – socially aware, socially responsible, and committed to changing the world for better – is an extraordinarily valuable asset” (Elliott et al., 2016, p. 77).

Bowman (2002), espoused that, “experiencing and making art changes who we are and what we expect from life” (p. 63), and Christopher Small (1998) surmised that how we music is who we are (p. 220). If who we are is directly related to the music we put into the world, and if art shapes human nature, then it also has the power to effect social good as well as to subvert it (Elliott et al., 2016). In an earlier book on artistic citizenship, Campbell and Martin (2006) reported what is entailed within this construct. They state that “the keys to artistic citizenship lie in understanding how art and artists are brought into the world” (p. 1). Like Elliott et al., they discussed how art for public good is in opposition of the idea of art for its own sake. However, they examined public art, or in relation to this study, public music – that which is readily and freely available to the public due to technology – is a way of seeing and knowing, as well as way of gathering and bringing forth ideas about humanity. When put into the world, they pointed out that art can be aligned with very different ideas of what public good is and can be either for or against the state in which it exists. They offered that artistic citizenship is a paradox and one that all artists would be well served to embrace.

Rights without responsibilities figure prominently into practices that promote strife and violence. Turino (2016) wrote that art can also serve malicious purpose, for music can unite people and prepare them for both heroism or villainy, as in We Shall Overcome or Work, Bread (heroism), and Death to the Jew (villainy) (p. 297),
respectively. Additionally, Vujanovic (2016) found that art can be used to incite something called “bad public good” (p. 104) —where speaking out against those who would not protect the public good of society would be deemed ‘bad’ by those in power. Often, Vujanovic surmises, this kind of rhetoric can be the last line of defense for communal interest.

A socially just curriculum teaches students to use academic knowledge and popular culture to understand their own self-formation within society and the world (Pinar, 1995). Alongside this, Baszille (2009) surmised that schools have the opportunity to be the place where young people come to understand their political agency as critical and active citizens. Bennett (2007) in a study investigating musicians’ careers by exploring the reality of professional practice, surmised that conservatories need to be an integral part of the communities in which they operate and discussed how engagement and involvement in the community can help students shape and broaden the scope of their performance and non-performance goals in music.

In a study on popular music in university, Björnberg (2003) found that instructional models based on intensive small group work over long periods of time served to provide students with the experience needed to work and thrive within communities and developed skills related to artistic citizenship such as self-reflection and self-efficacy. Similarly, in a study on arts entrepreneurship programs, Bridgstock (2012) revealed that programs that focused on less tangible capabilities such as opportunity recognition and resilience allowed students to identify or create ways they could share their artistic endeavors to add value of some kind to the world. Additionally, Bridgstock found these programs fostered connection and communication with others, as well as the
growth and development of their art for the purpose of contributing to society. New and Ghafar (2012) also examined self-awareness in students as they attempted to adapt themselves to their environment, with significant social factors emerging as important to their development including culture, religion, family, language. These factors were found to reinforce autonomy and self-awareness within students, something Lebler (2007), in a study on the curriculum within a bachelor of popular music program in Australia, found to be equally effective in creating self-motivated and autonomous musicians able to sustain careers in their chosen field.

Cloonan and Street (1998), discussed that the informed citizen must be aware of the power of music, for as the major recording industries are part of extremely powerful media groups, which in turn are often connected the political economy. Additionally, they found that through the increasingly close links between politicians and musicians, policies are being designed through these interactions (Cloonan & Street, 1998; Street, 1997). Jorgensen (2011), in an article on other perspectives about creating music, posits that music can help to create more psychologically well-rounded individuals, as musical effects and affects derive from how social beings interact with musical sound and situation. Music’s force is found in the way an individual approaches that music what they bring to it from their own personal understanding, and the context in which it is set (DeNora, 2000).

In summary, aspects of interaction, when embedded in the design of an HPME program, can have an effect of creating and reinforcing pedagogical and curricular philosophies that can shape students’ understanding, not only of themselves, but of others, of the power of music, and of the world in which they will interact. HPME
programs have the potential to be places for developing social agency and discussions, possibly impacting the larger popular music ecosystem (Cloonan & Street, 1998).

**Success**

Success for those students majoring in music performance is often defined as having a performance career (Bennett, 2012). Yet Bennett (2007) found that arts graduates who were not employed in performance is around 48%, and therefore not considered employed, as per current measures of success in relation to education. Bennett (2012) found that skills in business, organization, communication, and the ability to think creatively more closely aligned with those measures of success outside of performance careers. Bennett found that musicians typically work in more than one specialized field and they build a sustainable career by responding and adapting the needs of many diverse communities in which they work. Bennett (2012) also found that developing positive attitudes within students towards non-performance study is important to the attitudes related to successful careers within music. Developing these skills requires students to think of their individual talents and interests as capacities rather than abilities, which enables possible futures “not based on hierarchies of success, but on strengths, interests, personalities and lifestyle choices” (p.6).

Schmidt, Zdzinski, and Ballard (2006), in an article on the motivations of undergraduate music majors, found that students measure their success not only through mastery, but also through intrinsic motivations of achieving personal goals and successfully working with others within their field. These learned intrinsic motivations can then lead to the ability and desire of the students to continue learning even after their
formal education is complete. In an article discussing changes in higher education music curriculum, Cleveland-Immes and Emes (2005) similarly found that by allowing the students agency over their learning, an environment is created that allows faculty to maintain their focus on the most current and relevant content in which they are working. Barnett and Coate (2005) espouse similar ideas in their book “Engaging the Curriculum in Higher Education.”

In a study on arts entrepreneurship, Bridgstock (2012) examined why so few arts programs employed aspects of entrepreneurship in their curriculums, especially with so many artists working on a freelance basis. In the study, Bridgstock examined the relationship of entrepreneurship to employability, often a hallmark of success. Bridgstock (2012) found a link between the ability of an artist to self-manage a career and “positive subjective and objective dimensions of career success” (p. 127). These successes were often linked to the nature and process of the work, the motivations of the artist, and the value ascribed to the work being produced. Bennett (2013) agreed, as “building a successful career depends on entrepreneurial activities and carving out a niche market” (p.235)

As many higher educational programs success rates of students are tied to their ability to gain funding for their programs in the United Kingdom, Parkinson and Smith (2015) found that these values of financial success over personal and cultural success are embedded in many aspects of higher education programs. Although both faculty members within a HPME program in the United Kingdom, they found that there was often a disconnect between the amount of money spent on an education in popular music and the amount of financial independence that is gained after graduation. Their study
questioned the validity and necessity of such degrees while simultaneously defending them as important. They stressed the need for faculty within HPME programs to be honest with students regarding the purpose of their programs, indicating a need to be clear about academic intentions and curricula. This kind of openness, they espouse, can create places where multiple authenticities can exist (p. 107).

Smith (2013) considered “constructions and presentations of success, what it means to be a popular musician in the 21st century, and how these issues are dealt with in the higher popular music performance education institution” where he works. He advocates for the inclusion of the acceptance of portfolio careers as a viable measure of success within graduates of HPME programs. Additionally, he stated that the “under- and mis-representation of popular music’s canon and practices, and ideas of success thus threaten to under-value the majority of popular music and popular musicians” (p. 26) are problems that should be addressed within HPME programs and across music education as a whole.

Smith (2013) further observed that institutions need to “recognize diverse manifestations of success for musicians, and to reflect these back, through curriculum and pedagogy, to our students so that they are all the better prepared for navigating the future” (p. 29). He asserted that “the musicians of the future are coming from a substantially changed cultural understanding of what it means to be a musician” (p. 30) and questions if we have come to equate musician success with fame alone. Smith contends that it is the responsibility of music educators in all sectors to “embrace a pluralistic (perhaps infinities) view of multiple potential ‘musicalities’” and to ask both
faculty and students how they can help each other to develop and realize their individual musicality (p. 30).

Lastly, Smith exposed the current music industry model of selling as much as possible of as little as possible as incompatible with a more flexible, portfolio career model. He affirms that the portfolio model encompasses the myriad of successful musicians that are multifaceted entrepreneurs who operate in multi-genre and multi-disciplinary networks and fields around the world, and it is to this model that he offers success be measured. Smith challenges those working within music programs to incorporate an understanding and awareness of what portfolio careers require and to alter discourses and curriculums accordingly. He concluded with this thought regarding popular music education:

Some people say, “you’re the future of music education.” We’re not the future—we’re just now, but, because of our relentless critical interrogation of our culture, our practices and the needs of our students, the present actually looks like the future. (Smith, 2013; p. 34)

In summary, success in HPME programs, as well as in most higher education music programs, is often defined as having a successful performance career. However, as discussed, this is not often tenable as a means of financial stability in today’s ever changing society. According to the literature, today’s musician must have the ability to sustain a multi-faceted and multi-disciplinary entrepreneur, or portfolio careers. HPME program success can therefore be measured by the students’ capacity to gain the skills, knowledge and interactions to sustain portfolio careers.
Summary of Literature Review

Curriculum encompasses that which is taught and learned through a course of study. It can be considered a living, evolving entity that requires multiple understandings of how teaching and learning interact with each other on multiple levels of knowing and being.

The creation of curriculum in HPME takes into consideration many factors including the overall vision of the program, historical context, the environment and resources and the attitude of the faculty and administration. Effective curriculum in HPME offers multiple ways of learning and knowing, as well as the learning of a variety of skills and abilities to afford students a broad and deep understanding of popular music and entrepreneurship.

Authenticity has many contradictory meanings, all of which help to position what authentic is to a particular situation or person. Authentic practices in popular music relate to the pedagogies involved in teaching popular music, the ideas surrounding repertoire and canon, and perceptions towards what is authentic in relationship to the goals and objectives of the curriculum. The authenticity of each programs’ goals and objectives are inherently related to perceptions of success.

Interactions relate to the education of students with an awareness of the potential their music has to create positive changes in society. Through curricular practices connected to philosophies of artistic citizenship, social change and awareness, students can be encouraged to use and create music that has immense potential for change.

Success is the end game. Curriculum, authenticity and interaction practices are funneled into what each individual student views as success for themselves. Popular
music programs have the ability to shape these ideas and concepts of success and to help students find rewarding career paths that engage them in life-long music making and music careers that are wide and varied in their opportunities.

The concepts in each of these sections led to how this study was created and implemented. The participants, questions and observations centered around answering the research questions connected to these broad categories of curriculum design that include pedagogies, authenticity, interactions and success.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Design

The focus of this study was to explore two higher education Popular Music Performance (HPME) programs within the United States and to present an in-depth understanding of how these programs were initiated and implemented (Yin, 2014). This study was designed as a multiple-case study, the study of the particulars and complexities of a case or cases, to understand a phenomenon (Stake, 1995). Creswell (2013) describes a case study as a kind of qualitative methodology and approach where the researcher explores a bounded system (case), or as in this study, multiple bounded systems (cases), over time through detailed data collection that involves multiple sources of information such as interviews, observations, questionnaires, documents, and reports.

As case study research involves the study of cases within a contemporary context or setting (Yin, 2014), these cases were selected to show the possibility of two different approaches and perspectives to the design and implementation of a curriculum for a current HPME program. There are two cases in this study—the HPME programs at The University of Miami Frost School of Music (UM) and The University of Southern California Thornton School of Music (USC). This study included an exploration of the creation and implementation these two programs and their curriculums, including resources, curricular philosophies in regards to pedagogies and interactions, and concepts of success, with a focus on describing what each program provides to their students.
While multiple-case studies have inherent comparisons embedded within their methodology, it was not the goal of this study to compare the two programs to portray one as superior. Instead, it was the goal of this study to provide detailed historical and documented information about two approaches to creating and implementing a HPME program within an existing higher education musical context. By providing two examples of existing curriculums, as well as the challenges and philosophies surrounding their creation and implementation, this study’s aim was to provide information to those institutions and individuals who are seeking to create their own HPME program within existing higher education territories. Additionally, the outcomes of this study will serve the two HPME programs being explored, providing an additional lens for the growth and evaluation and assessment of their program and its curriculum.

An iterative process of data collection and analysis was used to develop a theoretical explanation of the design and implementation of these two HPME program curriculums. This chapter describes procedures for selecting the two cases, for collecting data and for analyzing the data. Data collection procedures are organized into three parts—interviews, questionnaires, and observations. Data analysis was done both concurrently and subsequently throughout the course of the investigation.

Sampling

Purposeful and criterion sampling methods were used to select the cases and participants. Purposeful sampling refers to picking cases and participants that meet some pre-specified criterion that can inform an understanding of the problem and central phenomenon of the study. Criterion sampling refers to picking cases in which the participants in the study have experienced the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013). In this
study, purposeful sampling was used to select the two schools being studied as well as the participants within those schools. Criterion sampling was used to further narrow potential participants into those that have experienced the creation and/or the implementation of the selected HPME programs.

**Cases**

This study was focused on examining a particular kind of program within the larger context of higher education, specifically, a popular music performance program located within a music school nested within a larger higher education institution.

At the time of this study, there were 31 schools identified in the United States offering a bachelors degree that includes some form of commercial music performance (Baldwin, 2017). Nine in the west (California, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah); eight in the mid-west (Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Oklahoma); six in the south (Florida, Tennessee, Texas); and six in the east (Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia).

As an exploration of 31 schools was outside the scope of this project, I narrowed the number of schools based on the following exclusion criteria:

1. The school is a founding member of The Association for Popular Music Education (APME). APME is a growing non-profit organization advocating for the advancement of popular music at all levels of education. Being a founding member of this organization speaks to the commitment of an institution to popular music and education.

2. The HPME program within the school is a degree-granting program. Some schools offered classes and minors in popular music, as this was a study of
HPME curriculum, those schools that did not offer full programs at the time of this study were excluded.

3. The program is performance centric. Some programs offer popular music degrees that are research and musicology based. Research and musicology can offer valuable insight, and add societal awareness to the scope of HPME programs, however this study was concerned with popular music performance curriculums.

4. There is a significant songwriting or composition component within the program. Many programs offer degrees in popular music with an emphasis on learning a canon of repertoire. As this study was interested in exploring ways in which new ideas and creativity can be taught and celebrated in academia, this was an important criteria in which schools are selected.

5. The program has been in existence for a minimum of five years. I wanted to explore programs that have been around long enough to work out some of the initial issues that inevitably occur with the enculturation of a new program, but new enough that they are still changing and growing. This time span allows me to find programs that have similar trajectories, and can offer relevant and meaningful insight into the issues they faced when starting, as well as ongoing challenges and successes of which they are aware.

6. The HPME program offered is a four-year degree. There are many community colleges offering training in popular music, however, as I was
interested in how a four-year program operates, and as an average of four years is the general norm for the completion of college programs, programs that are two years are excluded from this study.

Using these exclusion criteria, the following schools emerged: Belmont University, TN; Berklee College of Music, MA; The University of Colorado at Denver, CO (CU Denver); Greenville College, IL; McNally Smith College, MN\(^1\); New York University Tisch School of the Arts, NY; The University of Miami, FL, (UM); and The University of Southern California, CA (USC).

Because the desired scope of this study was two schools, the following exclusion criteria were used to further narrow the field:

1. The program is nested within a larger university setting. As this study was exploring how HPME programs are created within larger institutional settings, looking at schools such as Berklee, an individual music centered institution, was outside the scope of this study.

2. The program was started within the past ten years. Programs in existence for longer than ten years can offer valuable insight into maintaining a program, however many of the initial issues of starting the program may long have sense been forgotten, and the people that started the program may be no longer affiliated with the program.

3. There is a live performance emphasis within the program. Many HPME programs offer instruction with emphasis on software, DAWs (digital audio workstations), and beats creation as well as recorded music and environments.

To narrow the field, I chose to look at those programs with a strong emphasis

\(^1\) McNally Smith was still operating at the time of this study. They officially closed in December of 2017.
on live performance – programs that had performance ensembles as an integral part of their curriculum.

4. There is no religious philosophy within the school. To enable this study to have the broadest range of applicability possible, those schools with a specific religious philosophy attached to their mission statement were excluded from this study.

This further narrowed the possible cases to McNally Smith, CU Denver, UM, and USC. From these four schools I chose UM and USC as my two cases. Exclusion criteria for McNally Smith and CU Denver are:

1. I did not have any access to a gatekeeper at either CU Denver or McNally Smith.

2. McNally Smith is a for-profit institution and therefore excluded because of the difference in operational ability.

3. McNally Smith’s commercial music program was founded in the 1970’s, well beyond my desire for a program founded within the past 10 years.

4. CU Denver’s popular music is a music business degree with a popular music performance emphasis, not a popular music performance degree.

Inclusion criteria for UM and USC are:

1. I attended UM as a PhD student in the Music Education program and acted as a teaching assistant within the popular music program. Additionally, I attended UM at the inception of the program as a Masters student in 2007. At that time, the program was single songwriting class. This access and
awareness gives me both an etic and emic perspective on the program and I could offer valuable insight into its growth, change, and implementation.

2. I know both directors of UM and USC’s programs through my professional and educational networks which allows for some ease of access within the programs. Having a ‘gate-keeper’ at an institution allows for ease of research that can ultimately lead to a more well-rounded study (Creswell, 2013).

3. Both of these HPME programs had origins at approximately the same time - UM started their minor in 2007² and USC began their program in 2009. This similarity in inception creates some interesting comparison possibilities for how and why they started, as well as the differences in their growth.

4. The people that started these two programs are still involved in their day-to-day operations. This allows for a more clear chain of events for the creation and implementation of the curriculum to be understood as there was a consistent leadership presence

5. Both programs have experienced significant steady growth of their programs, indicating some form of successful curriculum.

6. There was an assumed difference in approach to curriculum and design at each institution. Although I have not attended or worked within the program at USC, I know many of the students and faculty and in discussions with them, there was an observed difference between the two programs.

7. There was a perceived difference in what constitutes success at each university, something I was interested in observing for its possible effect on curriculum creation. In informal discussions with students and faculty at both

---

² It would grow into a major which would launch in Fall 2017.
institutions, the idea of what was a successful graduate differed between each institution.

Participants

Criterion sampling (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) was used to ensure that the participants have experienced the phenomenon to provide rich description. Especially relevant are those subjects who have had experience in either the design of the curriculum or experience teaching within the popular music program in which they work.

University of Southern California

At the University of Southern California (USC), there were two deans included in this study. The Dean of the USC Thornton School of Music, Rob Cutietta; and The Vice Dean of Contemporary Music, Chris Sampson3. The director of the Bachelor of Popular Music program, Patrice Rushen was included in this study. Each of these participants engaged in one-on-one interviews.

Faculty included were those within the contemporary program as listed on the USC Thornton School of Music website (2017), faculty members from other departments providing auxiliary support to the popular music program student population, and teaching assistants that provide support for these faculty. The selected faculty were chosen from the above by obtaining an official list from the Dean of Contemporary Studies in regards to which faculty members are most closely connected to the creation and implementation of this program.

3 When this study began, Chris Sampson was the Vice Dean of Contemporary Music. He stepped down as Vice Dean in January 2018, however his connection with this program has not ceased and he is currently Associate Professor and Founding Director of the Popular Music program.
University of Miami

At the University of Miami (UM) three deans were included in this study: the Dean of the Frost School of Music, Shelly Berg; the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Steven Moore; and the Associate Dean of Strategic Development and Initiatives, Rey Sanchez, who also serves as the director of the Bruce Hornsby Creative American Music Program (CAM), a minor that was the precursor to the current HPME program at UM. The Director of the Musicianship, Artistic Development and Entrepreneurship (MADE), the HPME degree program at UM, Carlos Rivera, was included in this study.

Faculty that were included are those within the contemporary/CAM/MADE program as listed on the UM Frost School of Music website (2017), faculty members from other departments who provide auxiliary support to the popular music program student population, and teaching assistants that provide support for these faculty. The selected faculty were chosen from the above department through website data and by obtaining an official list from the director of the MADE program in regards to which faculty members are most closely connected to the creation and implementation of this program.

At both institutions, it was possible that faculty who were integral in creating and implementing these programs have since relocated to other institutions. If so, and when possible, these individuals were included among the study participants.

Data Collection

In qualitative case study research, the investigator often uses open-ended methods of data collection. This ensures a rich understanding of each case and allows for the description of expected and unexpected relationships.
Data collection for this study took place during the spring of 2017. Additional data required to assure reliability, or to provide a more thorough explanation of the phenomenon, was collected during the fall 2017 semester.

Data collection for this study included in person interviews, faculty short answer questionnaires, class and school observations, written curriculum, website information, school and educational reports, and program documents.

A site visit to USC Thornton was secured and data was collected over a one-week period where approximately eight to ten classes were observed each day of the site visit. Field notes were taken for later coding. Signed consent forms for observation and questionnaires were secured from faculty with whom I interacted. In person interviews were conducted with two Deans and the Director of the BPM.

As I was attending UM Frost as a graduate student, class observations at UM were conducted over a two-week period, but the observations themselves were equal to a week’s worth of classes. Field notes were taken for later coding. Signed consent forms for observation and questionnaires were secured from faculty with whom I interacted. In person interviews were conducted with three Deans and the Director of MADE.

**Recruitment**

Recruitment strategies for Dean and faculty participant participation included email, phone calls, and in-person connection with individuals either on campus, or at music conferences and meetings. At UM, recruitment was done in-person on campus. Signed consent forms were obtained. At USC, recruitment was initially done through the Vice Dean of Contemporary Music, with follow-up emails and phone calls to secure participants.
Interviews

In a multiple case study, common questions facilitate across-case analysis. Using standardized interview guides helps to promote consistency (Dallas, Noor, Dancy, Kavanaugh, & Cassata, 2005).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted. Interviews serve to offer an in-depth and rich description on a particular phenomenon through the lens of the participant (Creswell, 2013). Interviews also offer explanation and personal insight, perception, and attitude towards the phenomenon being studied and are an essential source of case study evidence (Yin, 2014). Interviews also give access to the observations of others, learn about perceptions and interpretations of experiences, and allow for learning about places and phenomenon’s that we have not lived (Weiss, 1994).

Data was collected through face-to-face interviews in person. These interviews were guided by the research questions, but unstructured enough to allow the discovery of new themes and ideas. Modifications and refinements to the initial interview design were anticipated as themes emerged from the research and further information was necessary to further explore and reflect the new categories and concepts. This was in accordance with Creswell’s (2013) concept of multiple perspectives from participants rather than a single reality. The first interview guide is attached at the end of this proposal (see Appendix A).

Interviews were conducted with Deans at both universities. Deans are responsible for ensuring the mission of the school be embedded within the individual curriculums, ensuring the well-being of the students, and overseeing the changes that occur over time.
These interviews offered important insight into the development and implementation of the programs.

These Deans oversaw the creation and implementation of the curriculum, thus these interviews provided valuable context for certain aspects of this study. Each dean offered valuable insight into these programs at different levels of creation and implementation – from the administration to the student course of study to the individual program. Additionally, they offered insight into the challenges and success of these programs, and provided information on what they view the role of HPME programs within their institution.

Interviews with the Deans of Programs provided meaningful data on how the programs were created. Each of these participants were guiding forces behind the implementation of these programs. These interviews provided a particularly unique viewpoint of the motivations, challenges, and pedagogical philosophies driving the creation of these programs. Additionally, as they have overseen the growth of these programs since their inception, these interviews provided in-depth understanding and context for understanding the phenomenon being studied.

For this study, data was obtained via interview using the Dean Interview Guide. For accuracy, trustworthiness and use in cross-case analysis, each dean was given the same interview guide. (See Appendix A). Each dean was able to provide individual relationships to the questions, with some topics being expanded on in relationship to the role the dean plays to that particular topic.

The interview guides for this study were developed from previous literature on curriculum development and previous interview guides regarding curriculum in higher

Interviews were conducted using the process outlined in Weiss, 1994. A letter was given to the participants at the site introducing them to the study. Once permission was received to conduct the case study at the school site, a letter of participation was sent to the deans to solicit participation in the study. Once informed consent letters were received, interviews were set up using the protocol established in Weiss, (1994). This protocol included:

1. Inviting the individuals to participate
2. Preparing for the interview
3. Conducting a pre-interview visit
4. Recording the interview
5. Preparing a verbatim transcript of the interview
6. Submitting a transcript to the interviewee for additions and corrections
7. Preparing a final copy of the interview of analysis.

Questionnaires

Additional data was obtained using the Faculty Questionnaire. A short answer questionnaire was administered to all pre-designated faculty within each program, totaling no less than five, but no more than twenty, at each site. When possible, matched rank and discipline from each site were used to ensure internal and external validity within across-case analysis.

Questionnaires were conducted using the process outlined in Yin, 2014. A letter was sent to the participants at the site introducing them to the study. Once permission
was received to conduct the case study at the school site, a letter of participation was sent to the deans to solicit participation in the study. Once informed consent letters were received, questionnaires were sent to the participants using protocol as outlined by Yin, 2014. This protocol includes:

1. Inviting the individuals to participate
2. Preparing for the questionnaire
3. Conducting a pre-questionnaire visit
4. Obtaining the completed questionnaires
5. Entering the questionnaire answers into AtlasTi for further analysis.

Data was collected using an online survey questionnaire software Qualtrics. Data collection from questionnaires was obtained electronically through a secure server. This questionnaire was designed to be collected either all in one session, or multiple sessions, as are needed by the questionnaire taker. However, the questionnaire took no more than one hour to complete. See short answer questionnaire guide (Appendix B).

**Observations**

Further data was collected through non-participant field observation at each of the universities participating in the study. This observation was necessary to observe the manner in which the curriculum was being implemented within an actual setting to obtain relevant data on the kind of curriculum being taught.

Specific classes were observed to collect rich data on the implementation of the curriculum. There are four main types of classes located within each of these programs – ensembles (content focused and creation focused), skills (theory, ear-training, songwriting...etc.), content (history, musicology), and private instruction (voice, guitar,
bass, piano, strings…etc.). To obtain broad, in-depth understanding of the programs, selection of observed courses will include both a lower-level and a higher-level from each category: ensembles, skills, content and private instruction. In most cases lower-level were located within the freshman/sophomore track and higher-level were located within the junior/senior track. However, when this was not possible, observations were made at both the beginning and advanced course level regardless of class track. For example, if a course of theory occurs as Level 1 and Level 2 and was subsequently taken in the Freshman and Sophomore year of study, each of these levels were observed regardless of track.

With written consent of the faculty member teaching the class, observation of classes, ensembles and private lessons were observed. All reporting of any individual activity relevant to the research is anonymous and does not refer to any student in any way that would lead to identification.

Data collected from observations was recorded through field notes and written up using the guidelines outlined in Miles & Huberman (1994) and Yin (2014). These guidelines included notating the time of the observation, a detailed and factual description of the activity observed, and notes about the activity observed. Data collection from field observations was collected in the form of typed field notes on a computer and was not audio or video recorded. (See Appendix D for a table of observations).

These observations occurred within a one-week period at each institution. At USC, observations all took place within the same week, however at UM, observations took place throughout the semester due to time limitations of the researcher. However,
they totaled one week’s worth of classes. Detailed field notes were recorded during each observation to later be used within data analysis. Travel to USC was necessary, and funding was obtained from personal finances, however travel to UM was not necessary, as I was in attendance at this institution.

At UM, as a TA, I was a member of the staff, and now, as full-time faculty, I am a participant-observer. As a participant observer, I am aware that this position may allow me access to information that I would not otherwise have as well as bias (Yin, 2014) and these bias are taken into consideration. At USC, as I was not a member of their staff, I was an observer, however I am familiar with many of the faculty as per my work within the field and consider them to be colleagues.

Other Sources

Included in data collection for this study are reports and documents. Inclusion criteria are reports and documents relevant to this phenomenon including, but not limited to, archival records, statistical reports, curriculum documents, recruitment documents, news and media reports, accreditation data and reports from such agencies as SACS, NASM and WACS, and website data from each institution.

Data Analysis

All interviews were recorded with the permission of the participants. Interviews were transcribed verbatim. Questionnaires were filled out electronically. Follow up protocols for clarification of interview and questionnaire answers were observed. All interviews, questionnaires and field notes taken during observations were analyzed using strategies developed by Miles and Huberman (1994). Notes and reflexive passages
within field notes were taken and I drafted a summary of my field notes on a separate page once they were completed.

All interview transcriptions, questionnaire data and questions, and field notes and reflexive passages were entered in the qualitative data analysis program AtlasTi for in-depth, cross-case analysis. Tables, graphs and matrices were employed when necessary to explain or bound the data to further understand the relationships between cases (Miles & Huberman, 1994)

Coding

Coding is a process of aggregating the text or data into small categories of information. Coding can help to make meaning out of the data, especially as all collected data was not necessarily relevant to the objectives of the study. A process of open coding was used to organize the data and arrange it into broad categories, or themes, to allow for the comparison of data within and between the interviews, questionnaires, document/content analysis, and field observations. This process involved reading through the data and creating tentative labels for sections of data that seem to be related to each other and what is observed (Creswell, 2013).

Initial categories that emerged from this process of open coding included those related to the research questions: Motivations Surrounding the Creation of Programs, Curriculum Organization and Goals, Resources, Pedagogies, Interactions, Success, and Program Value. Other large and sub-categories emerged throughout the research process, which is another part of open coding.

Once open coding reached saturation, further coding was applied. Saturation in this study occurred when there appeared to be no more categories within which to
classify the data during open coding. As there were only two institutions involved in this study, more data could not be mined so as to discover alternative codes, thus saturation of the procured data was reached. When saturation was reached regarding these categories, the use of ‘axial coding’ was employed to reexamine the collected data in order to determine other relationships between the separated categories (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Axial coding involves identifying relationships and connections between the codes established within the open coding. See Appendix S for a visual representation of how this study used axial coding and Appendix T for a code manual listing all the codes, their relationships and definitions. These codes and relationships further helped to reduce the information to a manageable set of themes from which to discuss the narrative of this study (Creswell 2013).

**Interpreting and Representing the Data**

Interpreting the data involves making sense of the data, moving beyond the codes and categories to extract a larger meaning from the data. Some of this involved individual interpretation of the data in relationship to the larger research literature. Generalizations of what was learned throughout this process were explained and explored throughout the interpretation of the data and were represented through various means. Representation of the data takes the form of a narratives, tables, graphs, or diagrams that can further help to illuminate and understand the differences between the two cases (Creswell, 2013).

**Trustworthiness of the Final Report**

Trustworthiness in regards to qualitative research consists of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Creswell, 2013). Each of these aspects
plays an important role in establishing trustworthiness of the final report and will be discussed below in relation to this study.

To establish creditibility, dependabililty and confirmability of the final report, multiple observations, questionnaires, and interviews were conducted. Background research was carried out to develop a rich and thorough understanding of the programs and individuals involved in the study (Creswell, 2013). Background research for this study involved procuring reports, courses of study and website data of each program and its faculty, reading literature related to HPME, and speaking to leaders in the field of popular music education so as to create a backdrop of knowledge for examining these programs.

The use of multiple sources of data, in this case observations, questionnaires, interviews, and background research allowed for multiple modes of triangulation of the data, furthering trustworthiness of the final report. Triangulation involves the examination of the data so as to discover corroborating evidence between the multiple data sets—observations, questionnaires, interviews, and background research. An additional advantage to triangulation and synergy of the data is that it can bring about new themes and explorations for further research and topics within the study, thus leading to new codes and themes (Creswell, 2013).

Interpretation of the settings, interviews, questionnaires, and events in the study can be threatened by my own perspectives and beliefs (Merriam, 1988). To minimize this possibility, I was mindful not to infer cause-and-effect relationships or to limit my focus of the research, continually being open to different perceived realities from the
participants, as well as utilizing multiple perspectives from the participants (Creswell, 2013). This process also ensures credibility and confirmability.

As data was collected, participants were asked to verify the accuracy of the data. Transcripts of the interviews were sent to the participants to ensure accuracy. Additionally, I engaged in informal conversations with the participants to further clarify my understanding of the participant’s thoughts and opinions. At UM, where I was a teaching assistant for the duration of my study there, and now am a full-time faculty member, my observations over the past three plus years were included in this evaluation for accuracy and understanding as a participant observer of the UM HPME program.

In addition to these informal conversations, I utilized peer review from colleagues and advisors at UM and within the larger academic community of which I am a part to crosscheck the accuracy of the findings and to discuss my data analysis process and findings. This also aides in the confirmability of the final report so as to ensure objective data analysis.

In regards to transferability, purposive sampling was used to establish clear choices for whom and what to examine in this study. Additionally, although heretofore there are no similar studies on HPME programs within the United States, based on the rich description of data, the conceptual framework and the other aspects of trustworthiness, readers of this study could use this information to create their own study, evaluate an existing HPME program or to implement a new HPME program.

**Internal Review Board**

Internal Review Board approval was sought and obtained prior to beginning this study and all protocols related to this were followed during this study.
**Reflexivity and Qualifications of the Researcher**

As this was a multiple case study and I am a within case subject, I understand and acknowledge that I am part of this research process.

I am a singer, a songwriter, an educator and a writer. I have a bachelors degree from the Manhattan School of Music in Jazz/Commercial Voice Performance (1999), and a Masters degree in Jazz Pedagogy/Performance from The University of Miami (2007).

Coupled with recording and releasing three independent albums and performing and touring nationally, during my time in NYC, I had the opportunity to educate students in Kindergarten – College, as well as adult learners of various levels. Through these experiences, I found that the demographic I most enjoyed was college-aged, pre-professional singers and musicians. Working within a university setting has always appealed to me, as I enjoyed the community and structure of these environments during my tenure as a student within them.

As I had experience performing and touring as a jazz singer-songwriter, and I had become increasingly interested and immersed in functional voice training, I started thinking about what I might want to do as a course of study for a dissertation were I to go back to school. In my search, I discovered that there are currently no degrees in the United States offered in contemporary voice performance or pedagogy that do not also require knowledge and experience about classical and/or musical theatre. As my specialty lies in jazz and contemporary styles outside of musical theatre, and I have little to no experience singing in these styles, a D.M.A. in voice was not available to me. Additionally, as my musical journey had lead me away from traditional jazz and
improvisation and more toward original music and songwriting, a D.M.A in jazz voice was outside of what I wanted to pursue.

However, The University of Miami (UM) offered a compelling possibility and compromise. They offered me the opportunity to receive a Ph.D. in music education and have the majority of my teaching assistantship work be allocated to the Bruce Hornsby Creative American Music Program – the HPME program at UM - while simultaneously involved in courses on pedagogy, research, assessment, program evaluation, performance, community music, sociology, and philosophy. I applied and was accepted into the Ph.D. in Music Education program at the University of Miami. I found moving through this program both interesting and often challenging, as I have no degrees in music education, but had instead spent the last 20 years learning, forming opinions about, and mastering the art of teaching through self-initiated learning, doing and often failing and simply figuring out how to do things while in the process of doing them.

Looking back on the past four years, I am humbled by this journey. Not only have I had the experience of working within a HPME program, I have had access to scholars of music education theory, popular music and popular music education, practice, and curriculum, and have availed myself of the multiple resources available at UM such as songwriting, vocal pedagogy, musicology, and independent studies. I have grown as a musician, artist, songwriter, educator, entrepreneur, writer, and, as fate would have it, found I actually enjoyed research. In some ways, I find research to resemble other creative tasks—much like working on a new song or learning all there was to know about a kind of music so as to emulate or write in that style—or even cooking—research involves
finding the and understanding all the parts and then being able to assemble them together in a compelling and engaging manner.

I currently hold the title of Lecturer, Director of Contemporary Voice, within the Music Media and Industry, Musicianship, Artistry Development and Entrepreneurship (MADE) and Bruce Hornsby Creative American Music (CAM) Programs, at the University of Miami. I applied for this position in the last semester of my coursework for my Ph.D. and I am extremely honored to hold this position. Lately people ask me if I like what I’m doing and my response is: “If I was asked to create the “job” I wanted at this point in my life, this would be it.” It’s strange to go from being more of a portfolio career musician to having one thing that I spend the majority of my time doing, but for now at least, it just seems to be part of my journey.

My interest in popular music dates back to my childhood. Hearing the songs on the radio, going to concerts, and playing the piano–I always wanted to play more fun things than the music in my basic Alfred primer. I recall singing songs I heard on the radio, making up songs and lyrics in my diary, and improvising on the piano. However, no course of study or lessons during my childhood adolescence ever addressed these creative endeavors and I remember even at a young age believing that they were not valuable experiences and that they should be hidden. I was taught that music lived on a page and that in order to learn it, you needed to be able to read and play it off printed music. I have since learned this particular skill was of very little significance in my, as well as my students, overall understanding of music, and while important for expedited communication with other musicians, it is only part of what being a musician entails.
When I entered Manhattan School of Music as a student in the mid-nineties, the only option for a course of study for singers who were not interested in classical music or musical theatre was jazz. I believe many singers of my generation chose jazz as a course of study for similar reasons, but then used that knowledge to create new and innovative music that crosses boundaries and genres, as can be evidenced in the music of Becca Stevens, Gretchen Parlato, and Jo Lawry. Today, I find the advent of HPME programs into academia especially exciting for those singers who are seeking an alternative to more traditional offerings.

I want to be part of the fabric that educates these singers and their instrumental counterparts. Stemming from my work with contemporary singers, I have a desire to help singers learn techniques and tools that will keep them healthy and optimally using their voices. However, I found that in order to best serve them, contemporary vocalists would most likely need to be housed under the umbrella of HPME programs. Thus, I found that exploring only voice programs or contemporary voice curriculum seemed to be only part of the solution for helping these singers achieve their goals. The larger umbrella of HPME program curriculums offers a unique perspective on situating these singers and their needs within these programs.

It seems as if popular music programs are moving into higher education at a pace similar to jazz programs in the 1970’s. With this study, I am seeking to understand possibilities for new and innovative ways to engage higher education in the creation of HPME programs that will foster individuality and creativity without moving these programs into the canonization that has occurred within the fields of jazz and classical music as they became indoctrinated into higher education. By exploring two relatively
new HPME programs, it was my hope that future programs can learn from these seemingly innovative ideas of curriculum and program design.

Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, as popular music by its very nature is communal and has potential to reach a broad and diverse demographic, I am continually aware of my growing desire to include social awareness, interactions, and principles of artistic citizenship within these programs. As the tradition of many higher education institutions is to educate with holistic intent of developing the whole person, I am an advocate of curriculums that have these philosophies embedded in their design. This can lead to educating students with a strong sense of self, an awareness of the broader global community to which they are a part, and how they can play a part in positive social change.

**Specific Goals**

Through this study, I explored how these two programs started and how their day-to-day operations work. I examined their curriculum, faculty, resources, pedagogies, interactions, and motivations. Understanding this information will allow me to provide information on how curriculums function in higher education musical performance program settings to others within the field of HPME and have a better understanding of how to address student needs as dictated by the changing musical and global ecosystem.

As creativity and the celebration of individuality are important aspects of popular musicians, I endeavored to discover ways to create spaces for these characteristics to flourish. I want to understand how to help up-and-coming contemporary vocalists best navigate the diversity of popular music styles and musicianship. I want to engage
students in having agency and autonomy over their learning experiences and inspire them to become musical leaders and educators in their field.

Lastly, most importantly, and perhaps somewhat cliché, I wanted to find a way to help the world be a better place through music. HPME programs have possibly unlimited potential for creating positive interactions and force within the world, but to best understand how this might be achieved within the world of academia, we need to know and understand how and why they work.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE PROGRAMS

One of the first goals of this study was to discover how each program began. Therefore, it is important to describe how each program started, their basic course of study structure, the spaces in which they operate and the faculty within each institution. Additionally, this section will help to answer the first research question, “How was each popular music program started, and what challenges occurred during this process?” In reference to the conceptual framework (Figure 2), this chapter will address both the left hand side of the framework, where discussion about motivations and challenges are addressed, as well as some of the inner circle of the framework connected with resources and leadership.

Figure 2: Conceptual Framework 1.2
This information will provide a background for understanding and discussing the differences between these two programs—curricularly, pedagogically and conceptually—and aide in answering the remaining research questions. The information contained in the following section is taken from data collected from interviews, observations, and documents from each university. For organizational and consistency purposes, information about the HPME program at USC is always placed before information from the HPME program at UM in the narrative, as USC was the first of the two institutions to offer a degree in popular music.

Seven individuals, three from the USC Thornton School of Music and four from UM Frost School of Music, were interviewed:

1. Rob Cutietta, Dean, USC Thornton
2. Chris Sampson, Vice Dean of Contemporary Music, USC Thornton
3. Patrice Rushen, Director of the Bachelor of Popular Music program, USC Thornton
4. Shelly Berg, Dean, UM Frost
5. J. Steven Moore, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, UM Frost
6. Rey Sanchez, Associate Dean of Strategic Development and Initiatives, and director of the Bruce Hornsby Creative American Music Program (CAM)
7. Carlos Rivera, Director of the Musicianship, Artistic Development and Entrepreneurship (MADE)

Comments from individuals will be signified by using their last names.
Program Beginnings

USC Beginnings

The popular music program at USC Thornton School of Music (hereafter referred to as Thornton) grew out of a single songwriting class. In 2003, although this songwriting class was being offered at Thornton, Dean Rob Cutietta, recalls that there was no professor for the class:

We’re in LA and we couldn’t find a professor–that’s ‘cause no one cared about it…I was going to cancel it and Chris Sampson…said–well, can I try teaching it? I said, sure. He [Sampson] wasn’t even a–he was a staff member at that point–he started teaching it and it became very successful–and that was really the seed that allowed us to grow into this whole thing. But from then on–it was totally new curriculum–conceptual–everything about it.

Chris Sampson, an accomplished classical guitarist, acoustic guitarist and songwriter with some notable credits, who at that time was Director and Dean of Admissions for Thornton, took over the elective songwriting class. At that time he recalls there being about thirteen students, all of whom where non-music majors. From 2003 – 2005, Sampson saw the class grow rapidly into multiple sections and levels. They began producing small grassroots songwriter showcases in various Los Angeles venues, and a few students within the classes started to have professional success as touring and recording artists.

Previously and concomitantly, from 1992 – 2002, in his role as Director and Dean of Admissions at USC, Sampson oversaw auditions for the entire music school, which at
the time included only jazz and classical. He observed that if a student had an interest in
popular music during the audition process, one of the following would happen:

1. They would be denied admission outright regardless of their talent.
2. They would be admitted into a somewhat related music degree that didn’t
   exactly meet their interests (Classical vocal arts, music business, jazz, etc.) –
   this often led to disillusionment and inhibited degree completion.
3. They would simply choose another field (English Literature, etc.).
4. They would not go to college at all.

Sampson determined that there was a significant demand from “serious, professionally minded musicians” who did not fall into the jazz or classical categories. He further concluded that this demand was unseen because the vast majority of students would never file an application because they knew that most/all university music programs would not meet their needs. As Sampson said, “They would self-select out.”

In 2005, drawing on his admissions experience, the growth of the songwriting class, and knowing there was an untapped applicant pool, Sampson proposed a Bachelor of Popular Music degree that would include vocalists, instrumentalists and songwriters. Based on the USC Thornton mission statement, which states that the music school will “reflect the artistic landscape of Los Angeles,” Sampson argued that without a program to address popular music styles, they were not fulfilling their mission.

Cutietta approved the concept of the program and gave Sampson the go-ahead to continue creating the popular music program. Cutietta describes himself as a supporter: “I was the supporter. It’s always been my thing so I was very enthusiastic about it.” Cutietta’s support for the program came partly from his personal experience as an electric
bass player in the 1970’s attempting to go to school for music as well as being an ongoing advocate for change in music education. Regarding his experience with academia and the electric bass:

Well, what was crazy was—I was a professional musician when I was in high school—and I had no intention of going to college at all—I was doing fine—I was doing studio work—electric bass—completely—and then when I decided to go to college which was kind of part time because I was working nights and stuff like that—I couldn’t even apply to go to music—even though I was working professionally. I was union musician doing recordings and everything—but no one acknowledged that the electric bass was an instrument—this was in 1971 or ’72—eventually I took enough credits and they said, ‘well why don’t you become a music major’ and I said, ‘well, because you don’t accept my instrument’ and they said—why don’t you learn how to play classical guitar—so I literally learned how to play classical guitar in about eight months—good enough to get in…but they at least acknowledged that it was a real instrument.

Regarding Cutietta’s ongoing advocacy for change in music education:

I started writing about this [need for change] in 1980. And well, got hate mail and all kinds of things—literally— got hate mail from some of the early things I did—so, then I came here and you come to a school to be Dean to make an impact.

With Cutietta and Sampson having similar observations regarding the othering of different kinds of music students, they were keen to see a change. However, not everyone was excited about this change. Cutietta, reflecting on the reaction of the faculty:
The biggest challenge we had early on was the faculty was very concerned we were going to ruin our reputation…And so we actually, very systematically, we worked with a firm…they said the best way to do that is to make your classical credentials untouchable…So that was the first challenge–was convincing the faculty that we really weren’t going to ruin the place.

From 2005 – 2009, Sampson continued to research and write a new curriculum. Drawing on not only he and Cutietta’s experience, but also bringing in outside consultants such as Patrice Rushen, an alumni of USC, and a well-known and respected pianist, songwriter and music director in Los Angeles. Rushen said of one of her initial meeting with Sampson:

Chris [Sampson] called me in to do it, because I had been doing music direction a lot for television shows…And so I came in to do it…We got along really well. He said, "Can I take you to lunch and show you something?" I said, "Sure." He whipped out of his pocket a piece of paper about that size [indicates cocktail napkin size]. He said, "This is what I'm working on. And I said, "Really?" And he said, "Yeah." He says, "I'm going to need some consultants and some people to talk to and I'm going to have some questions for you." I was like, "Dude. If this is what it is about, sign me up now." I knew immediately, after having gone through the program [Rushen is a USC alumnus], after having gone through putting together the program that they needed and working with him, I knew his attitude, his demeanor and his thoughtfulness, I already liked that. Then I see that he's about to write the program I wished I had, I'm like, "Whoa. Really?"
Sampson and his colleagues continued to shape the burgeoning program and propose how and when it would go into effect. One of the challenges they faced was what to call the program. After deliberation, they decided to call it popular music.

According to Cutietta:

When we launched it, we didn’t hide it. We really…In fact, even the name – a lot of people said, oh, you can’t use popular–not popular–contemporary–improvisatory– I mean, everything except what it was and we played around with that for a long time and then it was–no. We’re going to call it popular music and we’re not going to be ashamed of what we do. So that was the big kind of thing.

Both Cutietta and Sampson also wanted to ensure that there was a high standard of musical excellence maintained within the program. Sampson reflected:

First and foremost, we always monitored quality. So…we are in… I do say the luxurious position to be selective. We don’t have to drive numbers by getting a lot of students so that allows us to keep the quality at a certain level that continued to enhance, so if the quality was anything less, then I think that the skepticism would have increased.

Cutietta expressed being especially proud of maintaining a level of excellence:

The musicianship is no laugh…in fact that’s one of the things I’m really proud of…right from the start we put the gauntlet down and said these are absolutely fabulous musicians– they just like and play a different style of music and like different instruments–so that’s really worked…”

In 2008, the program received formal approval from the University and Thornton committees and began accepting students into the inaugural class for the fall of 2009.
The program was implemented as a full Bachelor of Music Popular Music Performance degree. When it was announced, the story was covered on the front page of the LA Times, and Sampson recalls it quickly going viral, enforcing his belief that there was a pent-up demand for such a program. Referring to USC being the first university in the United States to offer a Bachelor of Music in Popular Music Performance, Cutietta recounts, “We didn’t hide it. We didn’t have to broadcast it. It was such big news. The first school ever to do this\(^4\). First university to ever do this.”

Sampson recalled that the program attracted such a significant applicant pool that it was “immediately the most selective program at USC Thornton.” However, even the admitted students were excellent musicians, there was still an attitude of ‘lesser’ that they received from their peers and faculty. Sampson recalled:

That first class had to endure a lot of snarky-ness, of skepticism to say the least, and maybe outright disagreeing with what we did, there was lots of incidences that definitely gave us the idea that this class–that first class–didn’t belong in a higher education–from students and faculty alike. It wasn’t reserved to faculty purists, this was also within, among the student ranks.

Sampson continued to build the program and became Vice Dean of Contemporary Music in 2009, where he oversaw both jazz and contemporary studies.

USC enrolled their first class of 25 students into the BM in Popular Music (BPM) in the fall of 2009. Also in 2009, the BM in Popular Music received formal program approval/accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).\(^5\)

---

\(^4\) Although other schools in the U.S.A. offered study in popular musics, Cutietta is referring to being the first four-year music school embedded within a larger university system to offer a bachelors degree in popular music performance.

\(^5\) USC Thornton has since discontinued its association with NASM
Patrice Rushen, mentioned previously as one of Sampson’s initial consultants, formally joined the faculty in 2010, and in 2013, became Director of the Popular Music Program at USC Thornton. Rushen reflected on the challenge of the beginnings:

One of the biggest problems with it is what people's perception is of it based upon the name of it. Somehow popular is associated with less than. Popular is associated with small band with a radio friendly young demographic music forgetting its breath and history, which has been informed by all kinds of music…Our first duty was to make sure that just the core faculty that was dealing with it were all coming from the same place. That took a little bit of time. Again, because you're starting something with no roadmap, nothing new. It's brand new that you have nothing to point to, to say, "Well, this is the way they've done it." Nobody has done it. So, we're starting from blank slate, just a sketch and an idea, and the overview philosophically that Chris [Sampson] has.

Sampson reflected on his original curriculum from where it began to where it is today:

I have to say I am astounded when I actually reflect that the original curriculum that I put on paper basically still exists–so it's really held up. Now, it’s been fine tuned and it’s constantly being adjusted, but there was no–I am happy to say– and if I’m gonna be honest–surprised to say that there was no significant overhaul of when it was conceived to what it is now in terms of its curriculum.

The ability to continuously look at the curriculum and make changes according to the needs of the students and not get entrenched in tradition was important to Sampson. There was also an awareness that this is a different kind of curriculum and a different
kind of student and is something that is a hallmark of the Thornton BPM. Sampson stated:

A popular music curriculum is a different approach, mindset, structure—even outcomes—that is specific to what we do. And the recognition that it has its own specific vocabulary musically and otherwise, and that with that, it’s kind of a brave new world in a sense because, we, I don’t feel that there’s really a lot of precedence for pedagogy. That actually is super exciting because we don’t have to fall into the hundreds year sort of pattern that a conservatory would be. But, with, without, sort of certain things to draw – we do need to realize that it’s…something different. We can’t superimpose a jazz curriculum over top of a popular music curriculum…Because as people continue to develop popular music programs I want them to recognize that this is a different animal. It’s a different kind of student. It’s a different type of learning environment.

As well as a flexible curriculum, there was the issue of student body size. Thornton is restricted by the university to have a combined total of 100 freshmen throughout the whole school of music. In order to find space to include popular music majors in this number, changes needed to be made. First, they discontinued the Studio Guitar major. They also shrunk the Music Industry major and eliminated the undergraduate Music Education and Electro-Acoustic majors.

Throughout his career, as a musician, scholar and administrator, Cutietta has advocated for change. The addition of the popular music program at Thornton allowed for another opportunity for change. According to Cutietta:
So, all my writing didn’t do anything and so—let’s just show how it can be done. So that is really how it started. I mean it was just like—it’s time—and I didn’t want to do it subtly. I didn’t want to morph. I wanted to just start over. And that’s what we did.

Today, the BM in Popular Music accepts 25 students a year, with a combined total of 100 students total across the entire four-year degree program. Reflecting on this restriction of growth in size, Sampson commented:

Well, when we talk about growth, I’m very fortunate that we’re not talking about numbers. I have no intention of actually growing the numbers. And again, I know that’s a luxury because a lot of institutions need…the extra tuition revenue and the extra economic model and everything and I recognize how fortunate and honestly how unusual that is. So that’s wonderful that I get to put a cap on that.

Although no growth in size is occurring, the growth in stature has been significant. Sampson reflects on the change from the initial class that endured cynicism and ‘snarky-ness’:

For it to actually switch to where now our students are actually seen as leaders— are seen as people who incite really great discussions and who are not only shoulder to shoulder, but actually kind of leading the way, and pulling people along and through their energy and everything. So we’ve now gone from this sort of skepticism to being a bit the 800-pound gorilla in terms of their energy and influence— their influence into the teaching environment has become significant...
Additionally, in relationship to the popular music students’ effect on the classroom environment and this energy, Sampson indicated there was a difference in the philosophies of the popular students as creators of music, rather than interpreters:

Our popular music students see theory as ‘that’s tools for them to write’ so they’re hungry, hungry, hungry for that. Music history is information they use for writing, for creating. So, what they’ve done is that they’ve completely changed the dynamic of this class—where they, they will the questions is—they don’t just accept the information at face value—they say things like ‘what about this’ and ‘what about this’ and ‘how can I use this’ and ‘how can I use this’ and that was initially shocking for their classmates who weren’t used to that kind of extroverted supercharged…and we’ve now gotten to a place where all of our traditional instructors say that it’s a really asset to have the popular music students in there because they just tend to be more dynamic and hungry because it’s feeding what they have and what they have to create different perspective but it raises the level of dialogue in the class—that’s been very satisfying.

This growth and change in philosophy and attitude to the popular music program is aided by the way the program is speaking for itself through its graduates and stature. The first BPM class graduated in 2013 and its members have toured nationally/internationally, are signed to significant publishing/recording contracts, have started their own businesses, and have significant TV/Film placements. Rushen, reflecting on the effect of the success of the program:

The kids are coming into the program so strong because of the work that the other kids have done and are doing out there, and who are examples of what the
program is. So, they're coming ready, meaning we have to keep tweaking the experience because the kids are coming in in a different place and the expectation is the same in terms of what we're going to deliver…

Each year has shown an increase in the number of applicants, with approximately 500 students auditioning for 25 spots within the USC Thornton BM in Popular Music program last year. Cutietta, Sampson and Rushen have all been integral to the formation and success of the program. Cutietta remains Dean of the Thornton School of Music, and Rushen continues to be the Director. Sampson, however, stepped down from his position as Dean of Contemporary Studies in January of 2018, but continues to have an active role in the program as Associate Professor and Founding Director of the Popular Music program.

Summary

USC’s Thornton’s Bachelor of Popular Music (BPM) grew out of a single songwriting class. The program grew out of a need and desire to provide a place to grow and learn for students who did not have experience in more traditional music genres, as well as a desire to change music education as a whole. In 2008, the program received formal approval and they began accepting students into the inaugural class for the fall of 2009. Rob Cutietta, Chris Sampson (Founding Director of BPM) and Patrice Rushen (Director of Popular Music Program) were integral to the implementation and continue to play important roles in the maintenance of the program. There are a total of 100 students in the BPM at any one time, with each class having a total of 25 students, as dictated by the Thornton School of Music.
Although the majority of the original curriculum is still in place, the program structure allows for change and revisions as popular music itself changes. There is a high level and quality of applicants and there is a pressure for admitted students to have high levels of musicality and knowledge. Additionally, according to Sampson, these students have had an effect on the perception of what it means to be a popular musician at Thornton. There continues to be high levels of interest in this program, and although it is unable to grow in size, it has grown in stature.

**UM Beginnings**

The popular music program at UM Frost School of Music (Frost) grew out of a songwriting class that had been running for about five years prior. In 2006, Bruce Hornsby\(^6\), an alumnus of Frost, approached Associate Dean Rey Sanchez with the desire to start a songwriting scholarship at Frost. The issue, as Sanchez put it was, “We didn't have songwriting students officially in the school and no program to speak of.” Subsequently, they formed a committee, including Hornsby, and in 2007, after gaining approval, launched a songwriting minor: The Bruce Hornsby Creative American Music Program (CAM) minor.

Sanchez said of the process in forming the minor on committee:

That was a very interesting journey, because…I was able for the first time in this institution to really understand how things work and to understand the deficiencies, the holes if you will, that exist in a traditional music school regarding contemporary music, popular music.

In committee, they first decided what Sanchez referred to as guiding principles that assisted them in the process of creating. One of the guiding principles of was that it

---

\(^6\) Bruce Hornsby is a Grammy Award winning singer, pianist and songwriter.
was to be a performing songwriting minor. This was built on three ideas: (a) an existing philosophy within Frost as a school of performers; (b) the pathways many of the faculty had taken from performing (and continuing to perform) into education; and (c) that it would be performing songwriters, as was its endower, Bruce Hornsby.

Another guiding principle was that they did not want a silo or a stand-alone songwriting program. “We realized that songwriters could be found anywhere. They cut across all disciplines,” said Sanchez about their discussions. They wanted to make learning the craft of songwriting accessible to everyone in Frost. The only way they could do this, make it robust, and have it be accessible to the entire music school was to make it a songwriting minor. As Sanchez put it, “The only way, at the end of the day, within an academic structure that you can do that is to create some kind of area of emphasis or something. In our school what made the most sense was the minor.”

Within Frost, students choose a major, a principal instrument, and a minor. Creating a songwriting minor allowed all majors and principle instruments access to this opportunity, and beginning with its inception in 2007, all majors within Frost were able to audition for the Creative American Music (CAM) minor. The CAM minor is an auditioned minor with a set of courses totaling 17 credits. The credits within the minor include musicology courses, songwriting ensembles, a lyric writing course, and a senior project. Unique in its cross-discipline application, this minor continues to be a vibrant part of the Frost community, engaging students from all majors in the art and craft of songwriting.
As Sanchez recollected, once they created the minor, they could have left everything alone and remained fundamentally the same as a school. However, he recalls saying to the committee during deliberations:

This is all great, except we're never going to get the [additional] great songwriters that we want if we can't accept into the school a student who is neither a classical musician nor a jazz musician. Where does the acoustic guitar playing singer songwriter fit in here? They're not going to take them in jazz guitar, certainly not classical guitar [for principle instruction].

Sanchez recalled committee discussions about this particular topic and commented:

…in those committee deliberations, especially when we were going through school committees, people were like, "Wait, we don't teach that here? We don't teach guitar?" I said, "No, it's jazz guitar." "Isn't that jazz music?" "No, jazz guitar is very, very specific." "Don't the classical ..." "No, they don't use steel strings. They don't ..." They didn't understand that part…

Undergraduate Dean Steven Moore was at first reticent to accept contemporary principals, but he ultimately changed his mind:

What flipped me was when I saw that a CAM student would come in and they could sing, accompany themselves, and already had a portfolio. So basically, they were composing at 17. All right. And they could hear harmonies pretty well, a lot of them. They couldn't read music like I wanted. They didn't understand rhythms like I wanted….But to me, they're musicians, just a different kind, and music is a very broad category in my mind…This was a different kind of a kid…This is a different level of musicianship. They can already compose…The lyric writing
was there, and so to me, this was an impressive set of skills… The other thing that was starting to happen here is they're beating the doors down! I mean, you know, we've got to open the doors because they're going to knock them down if we don't! And it just didn't seem right.

Moore reflected that at many schools, students who were not trained in a traditional mode (classical or jazz) did not have the opportunity to attend music school and he felt that with this program at Frost, there was the possibility to change that paradigm. Recollecting a previous experience where he witnessed a student not being accepted into a classical voice program due to the kind of music with which they auditioned:

Something just hit me. It's like, this is not right! This is a musician! Why are we not ready for this kid? You know? It's not that the kids not ready–it's the schools not ready. And it also had a certain tinge of racism in it, or culturalism…That we weren't able to take kids from an oral tradition, and that was bugging me, but I couldn't change it where I was…So I've already been thinking this way, you know? How do we do this? So I felt very good about having a broader toolkit with which to bring in these students who are clearly ready.

With the committee aware that songwriters are often a different kind of musician, concomitant with its inception, in 2007, UM began accepting contemporary principals into Frost who were also CAM minors. This initially limited the contemporary principal size. Sanchez states:

We would have never been able to be successful with the CAM program had we not had contemporary performance [principals]. Concurrently with approving the
Hornsby program, we approved the contemporary performance principal, originally limited to students also accepted into the CAM minor in very specific majors.

As Sanchez stated, combined with acceptance into the CAM minor, only certain majors were allowed to be contemporary principals. These included Music Business, Music Therapy, Music Engineering, Music Writing and Production and Bachelor of Arts. Following this, according to Sanchez, Music Education began accepting contemporary principals in 2009. Initially, these contemporary instruments consisted of voice, keyboards, guitar, drums, and bass. Contemporary media performance (laptop) became an option in about 2011, and in 2014, contemporary strings was added.

Moore said:

[at Frost] your instrument that you play impacts so many different things. It impacts your lessons, it impacts your ensembles, it impacts the theory that you take, and sometimes other courses too…So what people didn't realize is that we had all these different degree programs times all these different instruments. It really created like 40 to 50 to maybe 300 different tracks you could be on. But opening this up to then the contemporary instruments changes the world. Actually, now they've got a seat at the table, so now you've had classical…In the 1960s, jazz took a seat at the table….and now it's happening here. Sometimes you've got to kind of make some room! And so we did that. That was a big move.

Through word of mouth, Frost had 22 people audition for the CAM minor for the fall of 2007, although they only admitted four students.
Another shift occurred in the fall of 2014, when Frost opened the contemporary principal to all majors outside of jazz and classical performance majors and principals, regardless of being in the CAM minor. The programs affected by this shift included Music Business and Entertainment Industries (MBEI), Music Engineering Technology (MUE), Media Writing and Production (MWP), Music Education (MED), Music Theory/Composition (MTC), Music Therapy (MTY), the BM in Professional Studies, and the BA in Music. This shift meant that students in non-performance music majors who were not in the CAM minor could now take lessons in contemporary instruments. Contemporary performance principal instruments currently (2018) include Guitar (Electric and/or Acoustic), Voice, Electric Bass, Keyboards, Contemporary Media (Alternate Controllers/Laptop), Strings (Fiddle, Electric Violin, etc.) and Drumset.

This increase in contemporary principals began to change the makeup of students at Frost. The increase in applicants also brought up the issue of quality. Berg\textsuperscript{7} described the issue of quality for contemporary principals as wanting “a small highly talented cohort.” And Sanchez stated:

The question became how do we do this at the same level that we do everything else [at Frost] at a really high level? It's very easy, it'd be very, very easy to open the door to a lot of people that would not meet our performance standards or our musicianship standards. That would be disastrous in a place like this. If there's any word, any action that kind of explains or just kind of like our overriding attitude in these first ten years is keeping the lid on, trying hard to make sure that

\textsuperscript{7} Shelly Berg had previously been the Chair of Jazz Studies at USC Thornton. He began his tenure as Dean of the Frost School of Music in fall 2007, just as the CAM minor and contemporary principals were started.
anybody who comes here is a good fit, and trying not to overwhelm our system with too many people.

This template of multiple degrees with contemporary principal and CAM minors operated with skills, theory and ensembles tied to their contemporary principal lessons, but without a specific contemporary major. However, change was on the horizon.

In 2011, Frost split the music business degree into two tracks—Music Business and Entertainment Industries (MBEI), a traditional music business track; and Music Business and Entertainment Careers (MBEC), a degree that took the heart of the music business curriculum, added in the CAM minor, and substituted out a few financial and heavy business courses for more creative pursuits such as ensembles and lyric writing.

Soon after this split of the music business degree into MBEI and MBEC, from 2014-2015, the contemporary faculty met and began work on what would become the contemporary (popular) music major at Frost—The Bachelor of Music in Musicianship, Artistry Development and Entrepreneurship (MADE) major. Included in this discussion were existing contemporary faculty members Dean Rey Sanchez, Carlos Rivera (now Program Director of MADE, Daniel Strange, Brian Russell, Ana Flavia Zuim, and Raina Murnak. This major began as a brainstorm on a large sheet of paper where these existing contemporary faculty sat in a room on a faculty retreat in the Spring of 2015 and, as Sanchez recalls asking:

What's the degree program that we all wish we had? Let's start with a blank sheet of paper, and let's create, take what we used to call MBEC (Music Business and Entertainment Careers), and let's turn this into a real degree program for people that want to go into the creative side of the music business, particularly those that
want to focus on performance and their own thing, your own DIY program… Leave enough room for the CAM minor, but let's build in a music business minor. Let's take all those finance courses and different things that happen in the music business program, behavioral management and stuff, and let's take that out and replace it with creative courses, and build in the core of music business into this thing, which is all the music business courses. We have our music core. We have our academic core. Then what's left, what do we want that to be? That's what the MADE program ended up. We realized that we needed an emphasis on entrepreneurship, an emphasis on artistry development, and a strong emphasis on musicianship as well.

Berg expressed feeling the same way about having a strong over-arching curriculum, not just about the contemporary program, but also about curriculum creation in general:

Let's not start with classes and credit hours. Let's start with ideals. What are our ideals for our students? What kind of people or musicians do we want them to be? Then underneath those ideals, what are the skill sets that they need, so that they can achieve those ideals? Now let's forget there's a curriculum. If we were going to build a curriculum to do that, what would it look like?

According to an unpublished 2018 NASM self-study on MADE executed by the current Director of the MADE program, Carlos Rivera and existing faculty within the MADE program, there were three guiding principals to the creation of the MADE program:
1. The program would emphasize the highest level of musicianship and creative performance, both live and recorded;

2. The program would have a strong, built-in entrepreneurial/music business component; and

3. The program would have enough built-in flexibility to accommodate CAM (or most other minors) within the required 120 credits.

Rivera stated that during the retreat, “Everybody had something that they brought to the table as to what's an ideal curriculum for someone who is, today, going to try to make a living in music, in popular music.” Everyone added something.

They struggled with what to call the program. Sanchez expressed his view of the word popular in relation to contemporary and commercial:

I prefer the term contemporary. Contemporary literally means what's happening now, as opposed to popular music, which I see as pop, which is a genre…We all know what we mean when we say popular music, but when I say contemporary music, I mean anything that could possibly be happening right now is really under this umbrella on some level…pop is an official genre. Pop isn't really the same as popular, but most people think it is.

Based on these discussions, choosing to call it a contemporary performance degree was the first choice, but they wanted something more inspiring and explanatory than just contemporary. After many discussions, brainstorms and ideas, as Rivera recollected, Brian Russell, Director of Contemporary Guitar, came up with the name that encompassed their guiding principles–MADE: Musicianship, Artistry Development and Entrepreneurship.
Not wanting the degree to have 140 credits and overload the students, Moore worked alongside the contemporary faculty to ensure the program had 120 credits. All the contemporary faculty wanted to be certain there was a high degree of flexibility and electives within the degree. Rivera stated:

I feel like, for me, it was looking at curriculum, and I started looking holistically…

I started looking at, what is common in all of our programs at UM. Not Berklee, and not USC, I never even. But what is common in our program, so what do the students have to do? So there are sort of three tiers, right? There's the tier of what the university expects, that's requirements math, english, STEM, or the cognates. Then there is what the School of Music requires, and those have to be addressed too. Whether it's experiential, but they have to go through a core, that everybody, for the most part, I think for the most part, have to take a certain kind of class. Those are the core of the school. Then, how many credits are left to play with?

With the contemporary faculty working closely with Moore, all University and Frost committees approved the program proposal by spring 2016. Moore was pleased with what the contemporary faculty had come up with and said of the MADE major, “…it's basically a performance degree, but it's got a lot of business in it, so it's a hybrid...I call it a performance degree with a dose of reality.” As the program gained approval, Carlos Rivera secured the position of the Director of MADE, which he continues to hold.

Although there was some reticence from other faculty within Frost, because the program had operated as a minor for almost ten years, many of the faculty had become accustomed to what the contemporary students brought to the overall milieu of the
school. Many of the faculty viewed the contemporary program as an asset, as well as an enticing option for jazz and classical students entering Frost to be able to study or be involved with the songwriting and contemporary ensembles. Berg commented on how having a popular music program at UM brought value to other departments, especially in regards to the multi-disciplinary and less-siloed approach found within UM. He cited having the popular music program as another way to encourage students in traditional instruments to come and study at Frost:

What I think is cool is when our [traditional music] professor says, ‘I was able to get that [traditional] undergrad, because that undergrad also wanted to write songs and wanted to plug into the pop music program.’ Another [other traditional] professor said the same thing. So I think that because of the rate of change in the world, professors are actually seeing that they can recruit that student…because that student wants to have involvement in the popular music program [being offered at Frost].

Berg continued, “I think the world is evolving too fast for there to be big pushback.”

Unlike many traditionally structured higher education programs, students who attend Frost as a MADE major do not major in a contemporary instrument. They major in MADE, with a contemporary principal instrument of study (voice, guitar, keyboard…etc.) and an optional application/acceptance into the CAM minor.

Although MADE places a high level of priority on creating, composing, and arranging in all aspects of contemporary music, CAM minors are viewed specifically as songwriters in the broadest sense of the word, with need to have skill on both voice and their principal instrument. CAM minors who are also contemporary principals take a
split lesson their freshman year with study on both voice and a secondary instrument, giving them alternating weekly instruction. This is allowed and encouraged for CAM/contemporary principals in subsequent years, but is at the bequest of the student as to what they wish to focus on. Many students stay on the same instrument throughout their tenure at Frost, however, all contemporary principal students are allowed to switch instrument focus at semester points during their tenure at school, as per approval and the availability of the studio teacher.

The MADE program was implemented in the fall of 2016, with incoming freshman and existing students with enough credit allowance in their schedules allowed to immediately transfer into the program. This allowed seven, then juniors, to transfer into the program. The first MADE senior with a CAM minor finished coursework early and was graduated in the fall of 2017. The remaining six senior MADE majors, five of which are also in the CAM minor, will graduate in spring 2018. The current junior class has nine MADE majors, the sophomore class has eight, and the freshman class, the first class to be able to audition for Frost as a MADE major, has 21. As of fall 2017, there were 45 MADE majors.

Including students within the MADE major, as of fall 2017, there were a total of 115 contemporary principal students within Frost: 38 freshman, 26 sophomores, 23 juniors, and 25 seniors. The total of CAM minors attached to these contemporary principals total 59, however there are some CAM minors not accounted for who are jazz or classical principals. In conjunction with the increase in MADE majors, both the students assigned contemporary principals (who are non-MADE) and CAM minors has increased each year.
Summary

Frost School of Music’s Musicianship, Artistry Development and Entrepreneurship (MADE) program grew out of a single songwriting class. The program grew out of a need to provide a place to grow and learn for students whose musical experience was not in classical or jazz. In 2007, with an endowment from Bruce Hornsby, The Bruce Hornsby Creative American Music (CAM) songwriting minor, was implemented. This auditioned minor continues to be open to entire Frost community, regardless of major. Rey Sanchez and Steven Moore (Deans), Carlos Rivera (Director of MADE) and the entire contemporary faculty at UM were integral to the implementation and continue to play important roles in the maintenance of the program.

Students cannot major on a contemporary instrument. Instead, they choose a major and then take principal lessons (classical, jazz or contemporary) based on their interests and skill sets. Students taking contemporary principal lessons (which are tied to theory and skills classes) can be found within the degrees of MADE, Music Business, Music Education, Music Engineering, Music Therapy, Music Writing and Production, and the BA in Arts. This provides an educationally diverse student body within contemporary principal lessons, theory and skills classes. At the time of this study, the total number of contemporary principals was 115, with 45 of the contemporary principal students being within the MADE program.

As the MADE program is relatively new, there are still changes being made, and the program structure allows for change and revisions as popular music itself changes. There is a high level and quality of applicants and there is pressure for prospective and admitted students to have high levels of musicality and knowledge. There continues to be
high levels of interest in this program, both from applicants wanting to attend, as well as from internal students wanting to transfer into the MADE program and contemporary principals from other majors and principals.

**Courses of Study**

Each program’s course of study, obtained from university on-line academic bulletins appear in appendices: USC’s Bachelor in Popular Music (Appendix E), UM’s MADE Bachelor of Music (Appendix F).

As an overview, USC uses the term units and UM uses the term credits to describe the same relationship of time and load in their course of study on their bulletins. At both USC and UM, a 1 unit/credit class–outside of ensembles–has approximately one hour a week of contact time with faculty, a 2 unit/credit class has approximately 2 hours a week, etc. Ensembles at both institutions are 1 unit/credit classes, but meet for 2 – 3 hours a week. As adequate preparation and practice is included in factoring unit/credit loads, hourly private instruction at both institutions are loaded at 2 units/credits, but are only one hour of contact time with faculty per week.

USC requires 132 total units and UM requires a total 120 credits for students to complete the degree. USC requires 32 units, and UM requires 27 credits of general education. USC has 78 units of music requirements, UM has 75 credits. Outside of the required courses, USC has 22 units of electives, UM has 18 credits of electives (See Figure 3 for comparison).
Within the music requirements, both schools require theory, aural skills, keyboard proficiency, music business, music history, musicology, music tech (MIDI, DAW, etc.), performance, and private instruction. USC requires all students to take a songwriting course, keyboard proficiency and a drumming proficiency course during their tenure at school. UM requires keyboard proficiency, however they do not require songwriting, although they do have both a lyric writing and songwriting course available.
to students. There is no drum proficiency requirement at UM. This is perhaps because USC has a Roland™ drum lab within their resources, while UM has not yet acquired this technology.

**Summary**

As a whole, both institutions offer similar course offerings—general education, core music classes, lessons, ensembles, electives and a senior project. Yet based on these courses of study, there is a difference between the number of credits a student must complete to graduate. The added number of credits at USC is largely observed in the number of general education credits (32 USC, 21 UM), the number of lesson credits (8 USC, 16 UM), and the forum credits (4 USC, 0 UM), although students must attend forum at UM to graduate, there is no credit given for this class. However, the ensembles are relatively even, as the performance class at USC is similar to the ensemble requirements at UM.

**Space and Facilities**

As previously discussed, popular music programs require specific spaces and equipment to operate effectively. With this in mind, each HPME program in this study has created their own unique spaces for their programs based on their ability to convert and manage existing spaces and/or build new spaces. Most schools will have to wrestle with these ideas when implementing any new program, and what follows is how USC and UM have approached the issue of space when placing a popular music program into an already existing traditional music environment and its spaces.
**USC Spaces and Facilities**

When USC started their program in fall 2009, the program had one staff member, two rooms, and mostly loaned equipment from Sampson’s personal storage facility. However, in 2006, George Lucas had donated $175 million dollars to the film school at USC to build a cinema complex on the campus (Silverstein, 2006). After the cinema complex was completed, the film school subsequently moved out of their existing spaces and into the newly built complex. This affected the BPM program at USC because the spaces which the film school had previously occupied were now vacant. This gave the BPM program access to two professional sized sound stages, multiple classrooms, offices, a theatre, and three fully equipped recording studios with sound booths. Cutietta recalled:

So, we took over all the old film school. If you’ve seen Carson [one of the professional sound stages]–That’s why it’s called the Johnny Carson stage. Because it was a television studio. So, all those buildings were the film school. So, we had soundproof rooms, we had everything. They weren’t right for us–we had to adapt them. But that really worked out. In hindsight, I don’t know what we would have done without that kind of jump of fate.

With these spaces at their disposal, the vision was to design the spaces to align with the way popular music is often created – starting with the song, moving into production, then marketing and pitching, and finally the performance. With the newly acquired cinema spaces at their disposal, over the next ten years, the BPM program was able to develop each of these ideas into specific spaces for each of these steps in the
creative process. Sampson described these spaces as: (a) starting with the song; (b) production and recording; (c) marketing and innovation; and (d) performance.

Starting with the song, The Songwriter’s Theatre (Appendix G), is a 981-square foot, 55-seat venue for songwriting instruction and performance. It is lit and decorated to evoke the feeling of a nightclub in Los Angeles, with moveable seats near the front of the stage, red velvet curtains, stage lighting, full backline (piano, keyboard, guitar amps, bass amp, drum set, microphones, DIs), and sound system set and ready to go with the click of a button. The room is also equipped with a retractable screen for projecting from a computer during classes or shows. This room is used for songwriting classes, arranging and composition classes, small performances, and workshops.

Moving into production, and down the hall from The Songwriter’s Theatre, there are three recording studios (Appendix H) available to students to work on the production and recording. Home to the Music Production program, these studios are user-friendly so as to encourage and engage students in as much independent work as possible. These studios are used daily by students to practice and rehearse, as well as for classes in production, engineering, and performance.

From the creating to the production and recording students then move into The Music Innovation Industry Lab (Appendix I), a space designed with modular tables, white boards, and smart boards along every surface, which was built to encourage creativity and innovative thinking along the business and marketing side of the creative process. This room is used for meetings, classes, and as stated above, brainstorms for creative projects.
Finally, after creating, recording, and marketing, the music moves into performance. USC converted one of the sound stages into a space for acoustic music, and the other for amplified music. Called The Carson Soundstage, or “Carson” for short, the amplified space renovation continued to be updated, with its most recent update occurring in 2017 (Appendix J). Along with state of the art sound baffling which makes the room acoustically “flat” (allowing for tight, balanced sound to come from the PA), it includes a raised platform stage, professional lighting and amplification, sound board, backstage area with ramp for equipment, full backline (drum set, multiple guitar amps, bass amp, keyboard amp, microphones, stands, baby grand piano), and a professional sized multi-media screencast was added in 2017. Carson is used for the weekly performance classes, ensembles, guest artists, and performances by students throughout the semester as well as for culminating class performances. However, the annual senior showcase takes place off campus at the historic El Rey theatre.

In addition to these four flagship spaces, there are also traditional classroom spaces. These spaces are simple, clean and efficient. All are Wi-Fi enabled. They are equipped with white boards, projectors, and desks. These spaces include lecture halls, private studios for lessons, a Roland™ Drum Lab, a keyboard lab, a computer/midi lab, practice rooms, instrument lockers and drum cages. Furthermore, there are private and shared offices for most of the faculty, the Dean, the program director, and the executive assistants.

---

8 Initially, the senior showcase took place at the legendary Troubadour club, however, due to popularity of the event, has recently moved to the El Rey Theatre.
**UM Spaces and Facilities**

When UM started their program in 2007, no additional spaces were built, and students rehearsed in pre-existing classrooms equipped with basic backline shared with the jazz department—drums, a few amps and a PA. Lessons took place in faculty offices and performances occurred either off campus or in Clarke Recital Hall, a space designed mostly for acoustic chamber music concerts.

In 2015, UM completed work on a major addition to the Frost School of Music. Through a donation from longtime supporters, The Frosts, the Patricia Louise Frost Music Buildings were completed. Housing state of the art sound reinforcement within offices that are designed to double as small classrooms and rehearsal spaces, as well as a 25-seat multi-purpose room, and attached recording studio, these buildings were designed to be the flagship for a new way of interacting with space.

When the MADE program was launched in the fall of 2017, the addition of these new buildings helped meet some of the growing popular music program’s needs. As Sanchez stated:

A very simple thing is that a contemporary ensemble needs back-line and sound, most of them, for everything that they do. It’s not a matter of setting up chairs and stands. They actually have to set up a bunch of gear, and there has to be a PA system. There has to be somebody to run it. You can’t have students dragging amplifiers all around the school, so your rehearsal space has to be equipped, ready to go. We finally got that space two years ago with the new building, PLF building. Then that room gets used, not just by us…[yet] even if it was just our room 100%, nobody else's, it would still be a challenge based on the number of
students and ensembles that we have…. That's the part that makes this area more difficult to scale, because the more you do, the more those resources you need.

Most of the ensemble classes within the MADE major and CAM minor take place in PLF N 330 (Appendix K). This space is designed as multi-purpose room for both acoustic and amplified music. However, there is basic backline (piano, keyboard, drum-set, guitar amps, bass amp) set up at all times, and the seating and set-up are modular according to what the class dictates. Microphones and stands are kept locked in a cabinet and must be set up separately for each class by the students and/or instructors. There is a Pre-Sonus™ sound system installed in the room that can be operated off any computer with the application connected to the internet, or via the computer located within the room. In the fall of 2017, work was completed on the adjoining recording booth, directly connected to PLF N 330, and is available for use by licensed engineer student or faculty music engineers to record any project that a student may engage an engineer for.

Ensembles also rehearse in larger ensemble rooms located in the Foster building and the Rehearsal center (Appendix L) as well as the offices of the faculty assigned to the ensemble. These rooms are not specifically designed for amplified music, but they have high ceilings and are adequately equipped with backline and large enough to accommodate ensembles varying in size from a duo to an 18–20 piece big band. For each rehearsal, microphones and stands must be set up and connected, and in these rooms, there is no access to the Pre Sonus™ system.

In 2016, UM also completed a renovation of the Weeks Recording Studio (Appendix M), a state-of-the-art recording studio for use by students in the Music Engineering (MUE) degree. Although open to all students for use in recording and
production, recording must be supervised and run by a student in the music engineering degree. Two smaller additional recording studios mainly used by the Media Writing and Production students, (Appendix N) are available to students with adequate training and licensing. One is designed to record small projects, the other is designed specifically for mixing and mastering of products.

Classes for music business, entrepreneurship and marketing take place in traditional classrooms. There is an on-campus record label, CaneRecords, as well as on-campus publishing entity, Cat5, which is operated through the music business program, and in which many contemporary performance majors are involved.

For live performance, the official MADE venue is Clarke Recital Hall (Appendix O), a 147-seat venue that is used for all official concerts and showcases for the MADE program and CAM minor. Clarke was designed for small chamber music concerts and jazz, not for the amplified sounds often necessitated by popular music. When official performances happen, there is a stage build that takes a crew about a half day to place drums on risers, amplifiers, microphones, keyboards and other equipment as dictated by an input list given to the live sound team. On Fridays, when the hall is used for a studio performance class, a simplified system is used that can be set up from a bare stage to drums, amps and microphones in about 20 minutes by the students and faculty. The PreSonus™ system works in Clarke similar to PLF N 330.

There are also traditional classroom spaces. These spaces are simple, clean and efficient. All are Wi-Fi enabled. Faculty offices (Appendix P) in the new building are able to double as classrooms or rehearsal spaces for up to 12 people, and most are equipped with drums, amps, pianos and microphones. All offices are equipped with
white boards, television monitors, and chairs. Other spaces used by MADE include traditional classrooms, lecture halls, private studios for lessons, two keyboard labs, a computer/midi lab, practice rooms, instrument lockers and drum cages. Additionally, there are offices for all of the full-time faculty, the Dean, the program director, and the executive assistants.

**Summary**

Both institutions have added to and made changes to existing spaces to accommodate the requirements necessitated by popular music programs. These include spaces for crafting songs, recording, rehearsing and performing.

USC had the benefit of having a large amount of spaces vacated by the film school into which they were able to move. Thus, they have been able to renovate and update those spaces over the past ten years to their specific needs.

UM had the benefit of new buildings and spaces being erected that allowed for adequate spaces for their needs. Many of spaces are utilized by multiple programs and are not specifically designated for the MADE program.

**Faculty**

**USC Faculty**

According to the USC Thornton website, there are 66 faculty under the umbrella of contemporary music, which includes Jazz Studies, Music Industry, Music Technology, Popular Music, and Screen Scoring. Within contemporary music, sixteen are dedicated faculty in the popular music program, with faculty in these contemporary areas, as well as music history, theory and musicology serving the students in the BPM.
Based on questionnaire responses, faculty teach a combination of courses, with all faculty respondents teaching in at least two different areas and some teaching in as many as six. For example, one faculty member reported teaching ensembles, composition, production, recording, skills andsongwriting while another reported teaching ear-training, private lessons, technology related classes and theory.

Faculty have garnered many accolades and awards, some of them with top-tier artists, along with credits on national and international touring acts, significant achievements in arranging, producing, publishing music directing, music business, and entrepreneurship, Thornton popular music faculty hold a wealth of knowledge about the music industry. However, they are not the superstars of their profession such as Taylor Swift or John Mayer. Compared to more traditional music performance programs that hire famous faculty to draw students in, this is a different paradigm for a higher education music performance program.

Based on data collected in the questionnaires to the popular music faculty, all the respondents have over eleven years of teaching experience, with over 60% having been at USC for over eleven years. Half the faculty respondents were Associate Professors, with the remainder being Assistant Professors, Full Professors or Lecturers. Based on website data, of the 16 faculty specifically designated as connected to popular music, there are 5 adjuncts, 1 Lecturer, 7 Assistant Professors, 1 Associate Professor, 1 Full Professor and 1 Artist-in-Residence. However, as stated previously, this is not the full picture, as many other areas of the Thornton school serve the popular music population. These other faculty are from the fields of jazz studies, music industry, music technology, musicology, and screen scoring. So, while they are connected to, and work with the student population
within the BPM, and are under the contemporary umbrella, they are not directly within the popular music program.

Outside of Sampson, there are no tenured faculty within the popular music program. This is different than most universities, as Assistant, Associate and Full Professors are generally part of a tenure track process. Part of having no tenure is a desire to keep the learning fresh and innovative and to not get “stuck” in codified systems of thinking. Cutietta stated:

    Popular music is changing every single year—so part of keeping it fresh and not letting it become that is by the name. Because if we didn’t change things—we could get away with that for a few years. Let’s say, in ten years – that’s an extreme – but imagine if this program today—if somebody is today seven years old came into today’s program—they’d chew us up a lot. It would not be popular music—that’s some kind of old fagies music—that was ten years ago—and so that was one way to really keep that…Part of it is we have no tenure of faculty in that area. In fact we’ve pretty much eliminated tenure in the whole school of music, um, and not that we would—people have job security for sure—but we can make changes…So, that’s the reason—we’re not doing tenure at all. The only areas left in the school we’re hiring tenure are the academic areas because they follow the mold of doing research.

    Sampson and Cutietta wanted to find faculty that were not only expert practitioners in their field, but also competent and passionate educators, “We have this incredible…high energy talented but dare I say, skeletal staff because we just really didn’t know what to expect. We didn’t know how much support it was going to
require…hiring in an academic world doesn’t come very quickly,” said Sampson. As stated in the section on the program beginnings, one of the first hires they made was Patrice Rushen, an accomplished music director, pianist, singer and bandleader who came on first as a consultant during the planning stages, then as an artist in residence in 2009, and eventually became, and continues to be, the Chair of the BPM. Rushen reflected regarding the first beginnings with Sampson:

Our first duty was to make sure that just the core faculty that was dealing with it were all coming from the same place. That took a little bit of time. Again, because you're starting something with no roadmap…It's brand new that you have nothing to point to, to say, "Well, this is the way they've done it." Nobody has done it.

Rushen continued: “So, we're starting from a blank slate, just a sketch and an idea, and the overview philosophically that Chris [Sampson] has. First thing was to get all of our faculty in sync.” Additionally, Rushen added her thoughts on what she and Sampson were looking for in their faculty:

The only people to teach it are the people that have been through it. Because that's what we have learned. That's been a big lesson about the success of this program. We lucked out, because all of the teachers are practitioners of this…when you have people that have played with Miles Davis, Santana and Michael Jackson. Or when you have people that have written symphonic music, have played with Sonny Rollins and had hit records and won Grammys. That's a special family. Really special. Who also went to school and understand the confines and rigors of an institution and having to institutionalize [music], but who are not afraid to be able
to communicate in a certain way that allows for us to keep opening up the doors for the kinds of education we'd wish we had.

This attitude is reflected in the faculty themselves. As one faculty member put it: “You have to have a faculty that is obsessed with providing the young artists with the critical information they've gathered through their experiences over decades in the professional music world.” Rushen also reflected on the philosophical changes that happened regarding how the program was conceptualized, implemented and taught by the faculty.

It was difficult at first, to get everybody on that same page, because most of us had gone through the tradition of what it's like to take music lessons, what it's like to be in somebody's studio, to learn specific kinds of things that they want you to learn, but no clue how you're going to use it.

As Sampson stated, they have faculty “buy–in”. Meaning, the faculty support the ideals of helping students not only learn the material, but also learn how to learn and learn how to use the material. One faculty member put it this way: “Teaching the students skills that they can apply in current practices, that engage knowledge of their instrument, as well as improvisation, interpretation and feel. It is a wonderful, rewarding challenge to connect all of these dots.” Additional comments from the faculty from the questionnaire responses were similar regarding their experience teaching and included enjoying mentoring and “being in a position to respond positively to student's enthusiasm and effort.” One participant stated:

I love reprocessing musical skills and ideas for myself and being a teacher gives me the ultimate reason to spend a lot of time doing this. I love increasing the number of
musicians in the world and increasing the amount of music in the world. I love sharing my enthusiasm and seeing it multiply and become more powerful in the hands of young and brilliant artists.

In the questionnaire, faculty self-reported that they felt valued and that their teaching practices added to the overall implementation of the program. They cited many reasons for this feeling including: (a) having a wide ranging understanding of musicianship and technology to help students support their careers in popular music genres; (b) helping students assess their strengths and weaknesses and making connections between what they create and how to market their product; and (c) fostering and creating a safe and nurturing environment that allows students to stretch outside their comfort zone, encouraging experimentation and personal growth.

Together with the regular faculty, the BPM makes use of their close proximity to the wealth of Los Angeles professional musicians, there are continuous high-profile artists giving master-classes each month. Sampson views this as vital to the authentic experience and connection to the larger global music economy, as well as wanting to maintain a connection to those that are currently part of the popular music industry.

**UM Faculty**

According to the UM website, there are eight faculty members dedicated to the MADE major, with those same eight faculty members, in addition to musicology faculty also dedicated to the CAM minor. However, it is of note that faculty in Music Business, Music Engineering, Music Composition, Music Theory and Composition, Studio Music and Jazz, Media Writing and Production, Arts Presenting, and Digital Art and Sound Design also serve portions of the student body to complete their course of study. In
addition, as students at Frost, regardless of major, are encouraged and allowed to take courses outside of their major, many faculty from all areas of Frost serve the MADE/CAM/contemporary principal population of students.

Based on questionnaire responses, faculty teach a combination of courses, with all faculty respondents teaching in at least two different areas and some teaching in as many as six. For example, one faculty member reported teaching ear-training, ensembles, music history, musicology, private lessons and theory while another reported teaching music business, production, skills and songwriting. The faculty at UM have diverse portfolio careers with substantial awards and accolades. In accordance with questionnaire data, the faculty at UM indicated that they are dedicated to the success of the program and its students.

In reference to data collected in the questionnaires to the popular music faculty, 80% of the respondents have over eleven years of teaching experience, with over half having been at UM for at least ten years. With the exception of one participant, all faculty members reported as Lecturers. Based on website data, of the eight faculty specifically designated as connected to the MADE program, there are 0 adjuncts, 6 Lecturers, 1 Assistant Professor, and 1 Full Professor. The Assistant Professor and Full Professor are tenured or tenure track positions.

However, these eight faculty are not the only support for the contemporary program. As noted in the footnote, there are 7 adjuncts that teach a large portion of the private lessons as well as core songwriting courses and ensembles. Musicology, Music

---

9 Although not reflected in the website data, there are currently seven adjuncts working within the MADE program and serving the contemporary principal students.
Theory, Music Business, Music History, History, Music Education and Music Engineering also lend their expertise and teach many of the courses within the major.

Some of this cross-curricular teaching is due to the fact that it is not possible to major in Contemporary Vocal Performance/Drums/Guitar/Bass/Keyboard/Laptop at Frost. Instead, contemporary performance minded students major in MADE. However, MADE majors are not the only major allowed to take contemporary lessons. As stated previously, the majors able to take contemporary principal lessons are: Music Education, Music Therapy, Music Engineering, Music Writing and Production and Music Business.

At Frost, lesson instruction is also tied to the theory track (classical, jazz, contemporary) as well as skills (classical, jazz, contemporary) and ensembles (classical, jazz, or contemporary). As discussed previously, the CAM minor is open to the entire Frost school regardless of major, so often there are mixed genre students within classes associated with the CAM minor and students within the CAM minor have the option of taking a contemporary lesson. All students at Frost are allowed to take courses and audition for ensembles outside of their major. All of this cross-genre student interaction can appear to be messy, however it seems to create a very un-siloed environment that allows for the sharing of ideas and philosophies across departments, as well as offering students opportunities to explore different genres with qualified faculty. Berg (UM) commented on this approach, “At our school we try to breakdown the silos. So here's the organized pedagogy, here's the organized curriculum, but if you're interested in this thing over there we'll find a space for you to go do that.”

In addition to Rey Sanchez, now Dean of Strategic Development and Initiatives, as well as the director of the CAM minor and initial songwriting instructor, Frost was
fortunate in finding faculty amongst some of the existing jazz and voice faculty, and was able to secure voice, piano, guitar, drums and bass instruction for contemporary students. Sanchez recounts:

We basically had to build an entire contemporary faculty. Now the good news is we were able to borrow that faculty initially from other areas. For example…who teaches guitar for us now, was the jazz guitar TA at the time and was also teaching for us, and then later was a lecturer that was working with both jazz and us, because he was able to…our first contemporary voice person, was actually teaching in both classical [and contemporary]. On the classical side, she was teaching musical theater [students], and she was also teaching for the jazz department. We were able to borrow some of her time. Keyboard, we were able to do the same thing…The one person that was able to help us from the get-go that, again, [who] would have been very difficult to do this without that wasn't already here, it was the first person I brought in from the outside, because the other three were here.

The outside addition Sanchez referred to in the above quote is Program Director Carlos Rivera, a guitarist and composer who had been living in Los Angeles and teaching at USC alongside Sampson during the early inception of the BPM. Previously teaching a similar course at USC, he was brought on to teach skills in fall 2010. As Rivera described it: “Theory, but with Rock instead of Bach.” Rivera describes the chain of events regarding his move from USC to UM:

I literally cold called [Shelly Berg]. I said…hi my name is Carlos Rivera, you probably don't remember me, but I remember you. ‘Cause I was at SC [USC], you
know, a TA and just, you know, a student and getting my composition degree, but you were that guy, you know, everybody knew. I'm thinking of moving to Miami, and I've been teaching in the skills courses for the popular music program that Chris has started…I'm looking to move to Miami and I was wondering if there's any positions for me to teach? He goes, well that's pretty bold of you…But, you know what, I can actually forward you to someone who is actually doing something like that, with the minor. I say, okay great. His name is Rey Sanchez…then I call Rey and I say, I'm in Miami for vacation because I always came here for vacation because all my family is here. He says, yeah I'll meet with you, whatever. There was a class that he needed help in. One class. So I came in here teaching one class. That was it. For the fall [2010].

Rivera gradually took on more responsibility, teaching not only skills and theory, but also CAM ensembles. Continuing in his roles, in 2017 Rivera became the Director of the newly minted MADE program.

Rivera described the faculty in a recent, unpublished NASM self-study report:

None of our MADE faculty are the kind of teachers that fit a traditional line–nor should they be. Ours is truly a new kind of faculty, one that encompasses where the needs of our incoming students are headed. Today’s music industry demands musicians who have the ability to succeed and move within multiple platforms and abilities and our faculty is no different. They are good at not just one thing, but many, and are what we described earlier as having “portfolio careers”- musicians who throughout their careers gained diverse responsibilities and skills through their interactions with the various opportunities presented to them and
thus are able to work in diverse settings with ease and a high level of
achievement. This faculty has garnered varied acumen as opposed to the one thing
one [faculty member] would typically focus on in a traditional music performance
degree.

In 2012, Frost brought on a songwriting instructor to teach the lyric writing class,
songwriting class, a songwriting ensemble, and some private instruction on songwriting.
With the exception of the voice position, and the addition of Rivera and the songwriting
instructor, the contemporary faculty has remained largely the same since the CAM minor
began in 2007. Sanchez reflected on the contemporary faculty:

They're the real deal all the way around. That helped us immensely. Yes, we had
this crossover from the beginning from jazz, but as things grew and developed,
what happened was the loads for those individuals became more and more in our
area to the point where now none of them could teach in the jazz area or should,
because there's just too many students here now.

Moore reflected on the make-up of the faculty:

Full-time faculty is a little bit cobbled together, and fortunately there are some
good people, smart people, did amazing things, but you're going to also lose some
good people…you can't just have people who are one foot into the professional
world. You've got to have some people who are really…Like, this is their life.

As stated earlier in this study, there are no degree programs that are currently
granting graduate degrees in popular/contemporary/commercial music performance or
pedagogy. This creates a challenge for many universities that require terminal degrees for
hiring, as well as finding faculty that are able to teach coming from industry experience.

Moore continued regarding some of these challenges in finding additional faculty:

It's even more challenging in popular music and degree programs where there aren't PhDs [faculty holding them]. So now you're bringing people from industry in who don't always work well or have knowledge of academia, and...there are problems that occur... Because people do not understand the system they've been put into, and there's no training for it really.

At Frost, there is faculty ‘buy-in’ to helping the students succeed and not only learn the material, but also learn how to use it and help them develop themselves. They cited enjoying seeing students discover new aspects of music and incorporate them into their own playing, watching someone learn to create, and, “encouraging students to recognize and utilize their unique skills and talent.”

Within the given questionnaire, faculty respondents self-reported that they felt valued by their colleagues and that their teaching practices added to the overall implementation of the program. One faculty member stated, “I am constantly focusing students toward the development of preparation of professional and personal goals. I help students learn to take responsibility for their own development.” Other faculty reported in the questionnaire responses stated similar awareness and goals and included positive reinforcement, developing young artists, harnessing creativity, helping students build solid foundation in musical skills that allows for creative freedom, and leading by example to create both creative and business opportunities that are achievable with skills, knowledge and effort.
In addition to regular faculty, there are guest performances and master-classes given by alumni, up and coming artists, and established artists during the course of the school year.

**Summary**

Faculty at both universities have diverse portfolio careers with multiple strengths and abilities that they bring to their teaching and practice. Based on the structure of the programs, there appears to be a more slightly more siloed approach to the HPME program at USC than at UM. As of the date of this study, at Thornton, there are 100 BPM students total. At Frost, there are 115 contemporary principals, of which 45 are MADE majors. According to the questionnaire, the majority of the faculty at Thornton self-report a higher rank than the faculty at Frost. There is no tenure within the BPM at Thornton. Based on the questionnaire, faculty at both institutions self-report as feeling valued and stated that they felt their teaching practices added to the overall value of the program for the students.

**Students**

Although questionnaire data was not collected from students, administration and faculty at both institutions recognized that popular/contemporary students are different from those traditionally attending music schools. As Sampson was quoted earlier, referring to the popular music program, “It’s a different kind of student. It’s a different type of learning environment.” Elaborating, Sampson stated:

Well, I think you’re going to…have, a wider and very different range of preparations and very different experience and I think any institution is going to have to make a decision how to handle those students. So, we don’t have the
same structure in our field as say somebody who started on Suzuki violin when they were six, or going through a graded piano curriculum, or even really the outlets of the jazz musician who gets the opportunities to learn literature in big band through high school and those types of things. We’re going to have the self-initiated musician, a lot of times, who makes music with their friends, makes music on their computer, their type of music literacy is going to be different so instead of standard notation they may understand music in terms of a midi-scroll, so it’s—I think every institution sort of has to wrestle with— or come to terms with how we’re going to work with this new type of student, so I think that’s a clear difference. And also, they’ll be a wide range, because it’s been my experience that we’ll have some students in a popular music degree who have just as much theory background as a traditional music student shoulder to shoulder with someone who has absolutely none. And yet at the same time they deserve to be in the room together and deserve to have all this.

Sanchez had a similar view of the students in the popular music program:

The reality is, the freshmen that come in to contemporary—the CAM program or just general contemporary - they come from all kinds of musical backgrounds. Some will have…[gone] to Interlochen and have had three years of theory already and know their stuff. Others have been using Ableton in their bedrooms and just learning music instinctively, or maybe learning to play guitar from YouTube on tabs or something and just happen to be really talented. How do we get all those people to speak the same language?
In accordance with these thoughts from Sanchez, based on my observations and experience, students within these programs have very disparate backgrounds and experiences, skills and knowledge coming into these programs. Some can read music, some cannot. Some can play by ear, some cannot. Some have had AP theory in high school, some learned theory from the internet. Some have worked within a DAW for years, some have never heard the term. However, by the time they graduate, they are more or less on equal footing with each other in all of these musicianship skills, which I found to be a heartening and inspiring aspect of these programs. Some will have practiced more, some less, some will have gained skills, some will have stayed relatively the same.

As stated in many of the interviews—they are musicians, they are creators and composers and they want to be learn and be given the opportunity to become what and who they choose to be—even if that sometimes means pursuing a career outside of music while maintaining their musical selves. These programs are affording them a path to pursue their passion and purpose.

Chapter Summary

In summary, both institutions have origins within a songwriting course. Although their challenges have manifested in different ways, both schools had challenges within their implementation.

USC launched its BPM in the fall of 2009. UM launched its CAM minor in the fall of 2007, and their MADE major in the fall of 2017.

Challenges to implementation at both universities included negative viewpoints from administration, faculty and students; naming; and resources such as space,
equipment and finding qualified faculty. Leaders at both institutions noted that HPME programs are a place for students who heretofore did not have a place in higher education music schools. They each cite that maintaining a high level of quality and musicianship in their programs as important.

Both programs have similar courses in their curriculum. These include courses in business, ensembles, general education, lessons, musicology, performance class, theory, skills, songwriting, and technology. This indicates an awareness for the growing need to educate music students for portfolio careers (Bennett, 2007).

Each school had the challenge of working with what they have in terms of space and facilities, a puzzle that is an ongoing challenge for each institution. This includes updating existing spaces, building new spaces, and maintaining equipment and technology to industry standards.

Faculty at both institutions have years of experience, credentials and credits. Most have what would be considered a portfolio career. They professed a desire and passion to teach, share and pass on their knowledge to developing young musicians. Students within these programs have a passion to learn, create and explore. They often come from very disparate backgrounds, with a diversity of experiences and knowledge.

The leaders of these programs continue to be excited about the possibilities of HPME programs. They are aware of the many differences and challenges these programs present to the many music traditions in higher education settings. However, they are excited that change is occurring, and grateful they have had a role in creating and witnessing these transformations.
CHAPTER FIVE

CREATING CONNECTIONS

In the previous chapter, the first research question, “How was each popular music program started, and what challenges occurred during this process?” was answered through the examination of the more concrete aspects of each program, such as the challenges with implementation, courses of study, resources and spaces, faculty and students. Chapter four also provided a background for understanding and discussing the conceptual and philosophical aspects of each of these two programs. These included areas explored in the review of literature that relate to curriculum, interactions, authenticity, pedagogies, and concepts connected to value and success.

This chapter will answer the remaining research questions regarding: (a) how these the administration and faculty of these programs conceptualize their curriculum and its implementation; (b) whether or not interactions appear within and through these programs; (c) what and how pedagogies endemic to popular music are being addressed; and (d) perceived ideas about the value and success of these programs.

In reference to the conceptual framework (Figure 4), this chapter will address the center of the design, examining issues related to pedagogies, interactions and curricular frameworks; as well as the far right of the design relating to the value and success of the programs.
Figure 4: Conceptual Framework 1.3

The information in the following section will provide connections between the established knowledge about the programs, the aforementioned research questions, the literature reviewed for this study and the data collected from interviews, observations, and documents from each university. Similar to the format of Chapter 4, comments from the seven individuals interviewed during this study (Cutietta, Sampson, and Rushen from USC, and Berg, Moore, Sanchez, and Rivera from UM) will be identified using their last names (see Chapter 4, p. 106, for their full titles).

Curriculum and Implementation

Serving to answer the second research question, “How do these programs conceptualize their curriculum and its implementation,” this section examines the overall goal and vision of the curriculum and program, how the leaders and faculty view those
goals being implemented, and aspects of authenticity related to these views. This section also explores what curricular framework, if any, was most represented in this vision and implementation.

As discussed in the review of literature, curriculum is at the heart of all educational programs, and the philosophies that drive its design have an effect on a program’s implementation and pedagogies. At both institutions, the overall vision and goal of the program, the context and history of the department, the attitudes of the administration and faculty, and the resources at their disposal all shaped the way the curriculum was designed and implemented (Carfoot et al., 2017). Themes that emerged from research findings in connection with this question were that of preparing students for lives as musicians, making an impact on society, and authenticity to popular music traditions.

At USC, the overall vision and goal of the program is clearly stated in the BPM Program Learning Objectives (Appendix Q) posted on the USC website:

The Bachelor of Music in Popular Music Performance is a professional degree designed for students wishing to become uniquely qualified musicians of advanced skill who are comfortable in a variety of professional popular music environments and who will successfully compete as leaders and innovators global music industry and in a changing music market place.

Similarly, in an unpublished NASM self-study (Appendix R), UM states the mission of the MADE program:

The Bachelor of Music in Musicianship, Artistry Development, and Entrepreneurship (MADE) is a professional degree program designed to provide
the highest level of preparation for qualified performers and creatives to thrive in all aspects of the contemporary music industry.

Both institutions list similar bullet pointed objectives for the students graduating that include: (a) demonstration of a high level of musical skill; (b) demonstration of a diverse understanding of the music industry; (c) ability to transfer musical skills to non-musical activities; (d) the ability to work as a leader, and (e) demonstration of an understanding of the interactions, societal impact and ethical responsibility of a professional musician. These goals align with previously discussed ‘portfolio careers’ (Lebler & Weston, 2015; Bennett & Bridgstock, 2015; Hughes et al., 2013b). They also align with a hybridized framework of curricular creation, one that includes aspects of both employability and cultural frameworks (Barrett, 2009; Bennett 2008; Higgins, 2012; McLaughlin, 2017; Negus, 1996; Smith 2000, 2013; Parkinson & Smith, 2015).

In opposition to what is observed within traditional music programs where specialization on only one or a few goals is the objective (Bennett, 2007), at both institutions this list of objectives indicated a shift in way these programs are constructed. These shifts, as evidenced by the program objectives above, indicate an awareness by the administration and faculty that the student population within HPME programs need a diverse skill set to be successful in today’s musical plexus and that specializing in only one skill is no longer a viable means of supporting a successful career as a musician (Bennett & Bridgstock, 2015; Hughes et al., 2013b; Lebler & Weston, 2015). Associate Dean Moore (UM), when discussing the curriculum at Frost and its shift towards a less specialized and dictated approach stated:
People can make themselves the way they want to be. They can create themselves here, and they don't do it with one monolithic thing. They bring in various gears, Lego-like, and you create yourself in a different way than we tell you to do. You know, like some flexibility. To me, that's the future, and so a lot of the degree programs you will see have space.

Based on answers within the faculty questionnaire about the overall goal of the program, and thus how the curriculum is viewed, faculty participants at both programs supported their respective objectives and curriculum goals. Their responses to the question, “What do you view as the overall goal of the program,” included phrases such as:

- To prepare students to be above-and-beyond prepared to meet any challenge they encounter in all aspects and contexts of contemporary professional musicianship (rehearsing/writing/recording/performing/producing) on the one hand (i.e. cultivating top-notch musicians-for-hire) while also nurturing and/or expanding each student's individual artistic vision and voice (i.e. cultivating musical revolutionaries).

- To train musicians, songwriters and singers for entry into the contemporary music industry

- As I see it, the overall goal of the program is to assist our young artists to become the best overall musicians and professionals they can be.

- To prepare students for success in the real world of popular music. Ideally, the program should help the student find their unique voice, which would enable them to become artists.
• To guide students in developing their artistic vision in contemporary music. To prepare students to not only meet professional goals, but to also meet and create personal musical goals. To prepare students for lifelong learning. To give a traditionally marginalized population of students an educational outlet for their professional aspirations.

Many of the goals stated by faculty included aspects of preparing students to be leaders in their field, having myriad skills with which to achieve this goal. These goals mirror what Lebler and Carey (2008), Bennett (2007) and Hughes et al. (2016), regard as necessary ingredients in 21st century music performance and HPME programs.

Additionally, aspects of curricular design that allow for individual growth, the ability to learn how to learn, and to guide students in developing their autonomy and artistry alongside their ability to make a living are all important aspects of curricular design discussed by Moir (2017) and Lebler (2008) in their research on HPME. The Deans and Program directors at both schools mirrored these values. USC Program Director Rushen spoke about what she hopes these goals provide students:

My feeling is that, if you do this, if you have this kind of education, and it comes from this place, you can do anything. You know how you learn, you know what it means to be on a team, you know what it means to have personal responsibility and goals, you know how to do some very difficult things conceptually that allow for you to be able to transfer this information to a lot of different places. That's the other thing, is it takes the fear out of it, that because I want to be a musician, I'm walking down this very narrow path. No, you're not. You want to be a musician
and it is teaching you how to walk any path. Any path. And that's the way you want it.

USC Dean Cutietta stated that the goal of the program was to ‘expand’ what the students already do – to provide them with a space to grow and learn, along with the background and understanding of how what they do interacts with the world. These viewpoints mirror what Elliott and Silverman (2015) proposed in their philosophy of music education as an inextricable link between the doing of an action and how it affects the person doing the action. Similar to Rushen and Cutietta, Sanchez (Associate Dean, UM) stated:

The goal of the [MADE] program is specifically to develop contemporary music professionals, let's put it that way. Here's what that means. Anybody that graduates from here, I would love to think that they would have the skills, capabilities, and true options to have a career in contemporary music, not just pie in the sky. Here's the path that will take me there. [You] can't guarantee anybody's success, but you can guarantee equipping somebody for success.

In the interviews conducted with Sampson (USC) and Sanchez (UM), it was evident that they wanted their students to succeed on their own terms, be leaders in their field, have influence on the music of the global ecosystem, and, as Sampson quoted from one of his favorite books by Cal Newport (2012), “be so good they can’t ignore you.” Moore (UM) echoed these statements:

They need to earn a living, and I'm a very pragmatic person that way because if you love music and you want to do music, then you need to find a way to make music sustainable for you…I want to give those students that opportunity, and I
know people say, "Follow your passion," and all that as a cliché, but I don't know a better one.

Berg (UM) had a similar viewpoint regarding this kind of multi-faceted career, “Which [the goal] is that really smart and talented musicians will come out of here with a certain uniqueness that they curated here and a breadth of skills at a very high level that will help them succeed in the world.

In addition to wanting the students to have numerous possibilities and be strong musicians and entrepreneurs upon graduation, there were other aspects of the curriculum deemed important to the overall goal of the program at both USC and UM. These goals connect to the theme of making an impact. Relating his overall vision and goal of the program, Sampson (USC) also stated:

I’d like our students to be a part of this new marketplace. To actually, instead of responding to it–actually shaping it. Then I’ll know I’ve done something significant. If they’re the ones who actually shape and craft this new music marketplace moving forward, that to me is my ultimate goal…I want them to be…upstanding artist citizens that are going to also make a contribution that’s not exclusively tied to a marketplace. They see themselves as artists as well. And artists in a world that they’re going to comment on, they’re going to influence, they’re going to shape. And I would like to never lose sight of that as well. We can make that a goal and a challenge because you never want to lose sight of that.

At UM, there were analogous goals and objectives of the curriculum. Similar to Sampson’s (USC) comment about “upstanding artist citizens,” Director Rivera (UM) stated, “The overall goal, and I think that Chris (Sampson) probably said this, because it's
very wise, is for them to turn out to be good people on Earth. I mean that.” Moore (UM) expressed a similar sentiment, where he reflected that along with the high levels of musicality, there was a “respect for differences among people” and a “commitment to high standards of thought and communication.”

At both institutions, the goal of creating good human beings, or citizens, was discussed as important to the overall scope of each program, both in their mission statements and in their philosophies of the Deans, Program Directors and Faculty. These goals mirror what curricular theorists (Pinar, 2005; Barnett & Coate, 2005) discuss as important aspects of creating effective curriculum that provide spaces for learning and skill development as well as discovery, relationships, communication, collaboration and possibility (Barnett & Coate, 2005). Sampson (USC), Rivera (UM), and Moore (UM) reflect what Smith and Parkinson (2015) suggest are an important aspect of developing musicians as citizens and that many people who pursue music are deeply invested in what they do and have an awareness of their power and place within the world (Bennett 2008; Green, 2006; Higgins, 2012; Negus, 1996; McLaughlin, 2017; Smith 2013).

Another stated goal at both universities was that of having high levels of musicianship. In accordance, these goals were observed in numerous classes at each university. In one example, in relation to a high level of skill and applicable understanding of the music industry, in *Arranging in Popular Music* (USC) students learned about how to produce horns in a session and how to arrange for this instrumentation. A projection of the arrangement [a score from a major motion film] was placed on a large screen at the front of the room and students were underneath the screen in the front of the room sight-reading the score as it went by in real time. This allowed
the students to hear and see the arrangement, and engaged the students in performing, critically listening, and reading. The instructor was well versed and knowledgeable and was keen on sharing his knowledge with the students. “Arranging is like playing chess – you can learn it in an afternoon but it takes a lifetime to learn how to be a master.” There was also discussion about what to do when you’re the horn player on a session (bring a pencil, listen, mark difficult passages) as well as how to effectively arrange parts. This concomitantly informal and formal learning environment (Folkestad, 2006) also highlighted the desire of faculty to engage the students in the learning process, facilitate experiences, and to give them an understanding of what it’s like to work in the real world (Bennett, 2013; Hughes et al., 2013a, 2013b).

In another example of developing high level musicianship skills was observed in the American Music Ensemble (AME) (UM) rehearsal. AME is a DownBeat award winning auditioned ensemble that generally has only juniors and seniors in its membership. They perform original music written and arranged by the members of the ensemble. This MADE ensemble tours regularly, playing festivals such as GroundUp™ and Okeechobee™ as well as opening and backing up-and-coming and established artist in South Florida..

In the observed rehearsal, the director of the group discussed how to write more effective charts, as well as tips on effective rehearsal techniques and musical input. Yet, he gave the students power to call the shots and direct their own music, sharing feedback such as, “This tune is not a polite tune. Don’t be afraid to not play it safe.” Additionally, students were given the space to self-assess their own rehearsal–asked what they need to work on, what they need to fix–and they received support for their efforts in a positive
manner. All the students responded with excitement and there was a sense of community amongst the ensemble that resembled a band that works together well. All of these are skills that are found in popular music contexts—the ability to communicate, self-assess, learn to learn, and improve (Bennett, 2013, 2017; Lebler, 2007, 2008; Lebler & Carey, 2015; Smith 2013, Hughes et al., 2013b; Green, 2007; Bennett & Bridgstock, 2015).

Aspects of authenticity wove itself into almost all the research questions. The theme of wanting to be authentic to the traditions of popular music permeated the philosophies within the leaders (deans and program directors) and faculty. Not all faculty enjoyed the term ‘authentic’ as they felt it could be used to exclude certain populations. However, overall, questions posed about authenticity were welcomed and appeared to be an important aspect of the thought put into the creation of these programs, as well as how they are being implemented.

Both authentic attitude and experience emerged as themes within the programs’ curriculum creation and implementation. Sampson (USC), when asked about concepts of authenticity within the program, replied:

Having a genuine connection with the music is really super important…

Authenticity to me is sort of like—really recognizing that you have to dive into this music and it has to be part of your bones. Otherwise, it’s actually going to be wrong. The performance practice isn’t going to be there. The understanding isn’t going to be there. And this is where I’ve actually seen this is the turning point—the pivotal moment—that allows me to recognize that this, this is its own vocabulary. Its own curriculum…You have to go do your homework…For me. That’s the authenticity part of things. It’s that connection—it really doesn’t have
anything to do with truth—it’s you have to put in that time. It has to be in your bones.

Berg (UM) shared these ideals:

So I think authenticity is we're training people to have jobs and careers. Yeah you may want to be a songwriter and you may have this thing you want to do, but if you get a chance to write something in a style for a movie and you try to get that gig, if you can't authentically do that. Or if you get a chance to play a session or play a tour with somebody these are all great gigs. We should be training people to have authenticity so if they get a tour and Zack Brown calls me tomorrow and says, "Do you have a keyboard player there that can join my band?" I want to be able to say, "Yeah, I got a guy that can authentically play what Zack Brown needs."

Cutietta (USC) had a similar viewpoint regarding the authentic experience for the students in relation to the expertise of the faculty:

Well, that’s [authenticity] really important to us. …when they do their Motown unit Lamont Dozier\textsuperscript{10} often comes in for their juries…In fact we’re running into that right now…Students are standing up saying–you have no right to teach me about this. You have a doctorate in this but you have no authenticity…

Sanchez (UM) reflected on what an authentic experience for the students is within the context of placing popular music into higher education institutions and the challenge of replicating a ‘real world’ experience for the students:

\textsuperscript{10} Dozier was a member of Holland–Dozier–Holland, the songwriting and production team responsible for much of the Motown sound and numerous hit records by artists such as Martha and the Vandellas, The Supremes, The Four Tops, and The Isley Brothers.
When you say authenticity, the first thing that comes to my mind is how authentic is the experience that a student gets here going to be vis-a-vis what they're going to have when they leave here? Is it going to be radically different? In some ways, there's one thing that we cannot replicate inside these walls. I think we can replicate everything else, but I think there's one thing that we can't replicate, and that is the overall environment and culture that they're going to be in outside of here. That's for a very, very simple reason. It's because the fact that we're being so selective and essentially less than 10% of our applicants end up here means from the get-go that everyone that shows up inside these walls is somehow special. It's like the X-Men. It's like that school that all those X-Men grew up in…That's not the real world. I tell students all the time, "You will never ever again be around this many creative people, this many really great musicians, never ever…All in one place, all under one roof, all hanging out, all making music together"….That's the one thing we can't replicate.

These sentiments are supported by Parkinson and Smith (2015), Moir (2017), Thwaites (2013), and Wilf (2014) in regards to the intermingling of authenticities surrounding the learning and teaching of popular music within institutional contexts. Additionally, Green (2006) stated that: “If authentic production and transmission practices are missing from the curriculum and our teaching strategies, we will be dealing with a simulacrum, or a ghost of popular music in the classroom, and not the thing itself” (p. 107). However, in regards to the authenticity of faculty experience in relation to the authority they have to teach there exists little research (Johnson & LaBelle, 2017), indicating a need for more study in this area.
In relation to curricular organization, at both institutions, the questionnaire responses indicated that almost all faculty respondents viewed the curriculum as either cultural or hybridized. A cultural framework has within the goal of a program to educate students towards cultural value – both for themselves and for the music that they create. A hybridized framework combines employability (ability to be financially solvent) and a cultural framework to create successful, creative individuals able to monetize the skills they possess (Negus, 1996; Green, 2006; Bennett 2008; Higgins, 2012; Smith 2013; Smith & Parkinson, 2015; McLaughlin, 2017). Faculty reported: “A student has to know who he/she is before pursuing an artist career…[hybridized] is the only model in which students are receiving the kind of guidance necessary to be authentic in their craft.” And another faculty stated: “Popular music is represented, taught, and learned through the authentic experience of our faculty, through the prescribed interactions between students, and through the thoughtful development of the curriculum.”

In summary, and in answer to my second research question of how these HPME programs conceptualize their curriculum and implementation, the overall curricular goals for both institutions included: (a) wanting students to graduate with a high level of musicianship; (b) developing a diverse acumen of skills such as business, technical, communication, self-assessment to allow them to succeed in portfolio careers; and (c) overall entrepreneurial skills to give them the tools to succeed in the global music industry. The promotion and awareness of authentic attitudes and experiences, making an impact on society and preparing students for lives as musicians emerged as important themes within the interviews, questionnaire responses and observations.
Interactions

This section will serve to answer the third research question, “Are interactions being addressed through these curriculums?” As discussed earlier in both the introduction and review of literature, interactions are those mechanisms that engage students in generating and sharing meaning within music (Kotarba et al., 2013). All music has the potential to share meaning, but due to the potential reach of popular music to a large and broad demographic, exploring these interactions within HPME programs is important to understanding their possible impact on society.

This question sought to explore if aspects of social agency, social justice, social awareness, personhood and artistic citizenship were being taught either directly or indirectly through the curriculum. It also sought to examine whether interactions should or should not be directly included within these programs. Themes that emerged from exploring this question were that of making a difference, being good citizens, and empathy.

In connection with the theme of making a difference, Deans, Program Directors and faculty at both institutions supported the idea of helping students not only become multi-faceted and skilled musicians and entrepreneurs, but also citizens of the world and empathetic human beings. Exploring this further, based on responses from the questionnaire for this study, faculty at both USC and UM viewed the potential social impact of popular music as an important aspect to consider in their practices. One participant wrote:

Our students are embarking on careers in music that will absolutely contribute to the value our society places on music and entertainment in the years ahead. These
young students reflect the culture of their generation every time they write - giving them a unique and powerful position that other generations can't fulfill.

Another wrote:

I believe that increasing the amount of music in the world is an inherently positive thing for many reasons, including that music has the power to reach people's emotions and unlock their sensitivities. This is a very noble and worthy purpose of all music. I believe that popular music in particular is the music of today's people in today's moment and, therefore, can have the greatest positive impact on society, from helping individuals find happiness to wider benefits of societal change and hopefully social justice.

And another stated:

Popular music spans the range from deeply personal to simply commercially viable. Both of these have a value to society and can be far-reaching and lucrative. In its best expression, popular music has had enormous effect on social injustices and has been the soundtrack of change.

Each of these statements by faculty supported a desire to help students understand their industry by showing them how their music fits into society and offered them a space for the discovery, discussion and dissemination of the link between culture and context (Hooper, 2017, Woodward, 2017).

Relating to the idea of citizens and social awareness, in connection with learning objectives of the BPM (Appendix S), in Careers in Music (USC), students were presenting and discussing the social media of various artists on the current popular music scene and discussing whether or not they felt they were representing themselves and their
platforms authentically. This seemed to lead to students viewing real-life examples of media and how it affects the perception of the artist (Frith, 1998).

Mirroring the UM mission statement (Appendix R), In Lyric Writing (UM), students were sharing their original compositions with their peers and professor. Although many students were visibly uncomfortable with the process and often self-defamatory in their discussion about their work, the professor and other students strongly supported their creative efforts. This kind of personal awareness has been shown to lead to autonomy and personal growth both in and out of institutions (Lebler, 2007).

When asked about the role popular music plays in society, faculty responses included:

• It [popular music] provides a voice for those who have traditionally been underrepresented in music education. This in turn creates artistic output that is relevant in today's culture. This output can influence people on a large scale.

• I think popular music has a very important role to play in our society. That being said, it must be used carefully and with good intentions and without untruths, grandstanding or arrogance.

Bowman’s (2004) research corroborates these ideas that when popular music is placed in educational contexts, there becomes a need to address both cultural relevancy and contradictions and that it must be situated within issues such as struggle, defiance, control and power. Participants at both universities affirmed the importance of the inclusion of social topics and cultural placement in popular music curriculums. Responses to the question of whether or not social issues should be part of the curriculum included:
• Yes, students in the program need to grow as people not just as musicians. It's the function of the university to promote thought and reflection about the world we live in.

• Yes, of course. I would never tell the students what social causes they should make music for but we need to talk about why all their favorite artists made all their favorite songs. The students need to connect the music to its context and to feel that their music can also have social impact if they want it to be. They can choose their own causes (or no cause at all) when they write, but we would not be able to get inside the music and process of their influences deeply enough to learn how to be artists if we didn't talk about social topics in and around pop music.

• Yes yes yes! If not, there are no roots, only flowers

• Yes. Discussing social topics within a popular music program immediately creates a sense of urgency and a call to action. To my knowledge, no other music program incorporates real world elements in this way. It would set the program apart.

• I think positive, constructive and productive discussion on social issues can be of benefit in the right context. A course on social topics not so much. It is one thing to encourage my students to think, it is quite another to encourage them to think like you.

These statements align with what Hooper (2015) described as a necessary element and responsibility of HPME to offer students to participate in culture as both creators and
commentators and to focus on music, but not isolate it. Cutietta (USC), discussing a new initiative at USC called “Artists Transforming Society,” said:

That’s what this whole initiative is about. I mean, I was playing gigs all through the sixties. You couldn’t get through nights without playing protest songs – I mean, we ended the Vietnam war/ the songs–it was the songs–I mean “four dead in Ohio”–it changed… anyways, so I believe in that strongly…In fact, I gave a commencement address where I asked–why aren’t you doing this? So, that isn’t just popular music–it’s part of the whole school–part of all six art schools and all six arts deans have bought into it big time. I mean the thing that was so amazing was how much was being done already–that gets into the permeating thing about USC–so, of course we do it…So, it permeates everything, not just in the music school. It’s huge.

At USC, the idea that art can transform society permeates the philosophy of the entire school, not just the BPM. Rushen (USC) stated, “…the byproduct of them being at least conscious of that [impact they can have on society] will change the perception of what it means to be a musician. In a statement relating the value of the BPM to these kinds of social interactions, Sampson (USC) stated:

Yeah well, I think that especially, if anything it’s that point that really actually really truly justifies why this program, or why a program like this should be in a university environment. And that it should be not just about the music. This is making more of the point that your liberal arts education, your general education, your living and meeting a diverse group of people, your understanding of the world and the human condition that you know–you can’t get by learning [just] secondary
dominant chords…So, that to me actually makes even further the case of why a program like this should belong in a university setting so that we can actually leverage those studies, those experiences and infuse it into our music making in a very powerful way. In a deep way, not just in a surface way, not just in a ‘oh I’m angry about that’ it would be the equivalent of a Facebook rant– the graduates that I see that are making true end-roads into this and impact understand the issues.

At UM, there were similar philosophies regarding the value of social interactions and their importance in the curriculum. Berg (UM), when asked about the importance of interactions in the curriculum responded with, “So this respect for each other, I think is critical because you're dysfunctional without it. I think that good cultures are self-reinforcing…but they require many moments of reflection and dialogue.” Parkinson & Smith (2015), along with Bennett (2013), Green (2016), Hallam and Gaunt (2012), Smith (2013c), surmised similarly that “students in higher music education are at a critical time in their lives and development as musicians. As such it seems prudent to consider the strong connections identified between learning and identity—the being and becoming of students (Parkinson & Smith, 2015, p. 115). Relative to this, Sanchez (UM) stated:

Something that I highly, highly value is the unique musical voice. That unique musical voice isn't just musical. It's actually completely holistic, because it has everything to do with what somebody's into and what they want to say...I really want students thinking about their lives in a very big way, not just in a, you know, trinkets, comfort, and possibly get famous way. It can't just be that…You give people permission to dream big, go for it. If you feel very passionate about human trafficking….If you're drawn that way, then okay, I know you need to do
gigs and things to make money, but don't hesitate to write about that as well either. What are the ramifications of that? Yeah, we're [MADE program] not just about writing for the next American Idol. This is bigger than that...I think that it's part of the whole human being...That's really, really important. This isn't just boom. This isn't just a trade school. You're not just going to learn how to do a forensic analysis of Beyoncé's song and write another one...that's the thing I'm getting at is part of the whole human being...this music thing and what they're doing and whatever, it's got to be bigger...

Rivera (UM) echoed these sentiments, but felt they weren’t directly being taught through the curriculum:

The world is all sorrowful, and be the joy that goes into an all sorrowful world.

That's exactly how I feel about everything. If I can do that, I'm going to die okay...I think statements like that are ideals, and as long as they're clearly ideals and they're what you see to remind you of what a goal is, that's good. But I don't think it's fair to say, oh yeah, that's definitely being adhered to. I think the intent of it is being adhered to...How the students treat each other, ultimately, and treat the faculty...I think we are in the practice of that...

These statements by the leaders at both institutions are supported by the research of Woodward (2017) who discussed how educators need to nurture student voices, by Ginwright and Cammorota (2002) who detailed that social action has three main stages – self, community and global – and that accessing these stages requires students engaging with their communities, and by Bridgstock (2012), who found that many similar programs fostered the development of art for the purpose of contributing to society.
Within interactions, a theme that emerged from the research was empathy. Empathy, as defined by Merriam-Webster (2018) is:

The action of understanding, being aware of, being sensitive to, and vicariously experiencing the feelings, thoughts, and experience of another of either the past or present without having the feelings, thoughts, and experience fully communicated in an objectively explicit manner.

Sociologist Brené Brown (2007) discusses empathy as being able to see the world as others see it, being non-judgmental, understanding other’s feelings and communicating an understanding of some else’s feelings. It is a skill that grows with practice and allow for the space to be vulnerable and share. Building on this, Woodward (2017), in a chapter on social justice and popular music, describes aspects of empathy within popular music education settings such as: analyzing pop songs, sharing personal stories, social issue discussions, view and discuss videos of challenging world topics (Woodward, 2017, p. 397).

Examples of empathy were observed in many of the classes at both institutions. In almost all the ensembles observed in both programs, students were the leaders of the class, with the faculty facilitating discussions. Many ensembles had students with varying abilities, skills and attitudes. However, all students critiqued, questioned and helped other students grow and learn. As all students were placed in each position—as both person being critiqued and the commentator—awareness of how word choices and comments affected their peers, and as well as themselves, was apparent. Even in the singular class where it was observed that a faculty member shamed the students into
learning, there appeared to be a great deal of empathy and support from the students towards each other, regardless of the attitude of the faculty member.

When asked about other ‘take-aways’ faculty hoped the students gained from their instruction, many of the questionnaire responses as well as interviewees related the importance of developing empathy within the students. Responses included the following:

- Empathy towards their fellow musicians. Also, very important is the collaborative element of listening out to what is going on around each individual musician. After working for years to hone one's craft, and being very focused on developing one's self and technique, it is easy to forget to listen out to what's going on around you both in your musical collaborations and in one's activities in general. To be able to "hear out" and truly make music in concert with those you're playing with is a very important attribute we like all of our young artists to be aware of.

- I hope they learn how to be kind people, empathetic, how to work within a group and most importantly I hope to light their fire for seeking knowledge and skill beyond that which they already have.

- The young artists in our program often speak to me of the many course offerings they encounter in their four years of schooling that stimulate a breadth of awareness and understanding of socially important topics that help them refine a keen empathy that informs their music making.

Empathy, especially where social factors were found to reinforce autonomy and self-awareness within students, helps to create self-motivated musicians able to help
themselves as well as others succeed and sustain careers in their chosen field (Lebler, 2007; New & Ghafar, 2012).

Sampson (USC), when discussing why programs like the BPM should be in higher education settings stated:

[Students] Know how to research the issues. Are in touch with the people that are having the issues. Understand the nuances of it and therefore they’re able to speak in a way that takes all of that into consideration – it’s not like they’re art is a blunt object – it is actually truly shining a light on it – and motivating people-

This comment supports what DeNora (2000) stated when discussing that music has power and has influence on how people use themselves, act, and how they feel about themselves, others, and situations.

In summary, and in answer to the third research question, interactions were observed at both universities. Many were embedded in the philosophies of the faculty and within popular music pedagogies observed and discussed in interviews and questionnaire questions. All music offers possibilities for interaction, social awareness, change, and empathy building. However, there is a density of original music found within these HPME programs, and the need to continually assess, self-assess, critique and discuss creative work and skill through engaged feedback helps foster understanding of these interactions. Lastly, empathy emerged at a strong theme that persisted through all aspects of the curriculum, pedagogies, interactions and implementation therein.

Moving from there, with the possible impact popular music can have to society due to the large demographic it has the potential to reach, it is worth considering the inclusion
of discussions, courses, and pedagogies that enhance and support these human and holistic goals on the same level of importance as musical skills and knowledge.

**Pedagogies**

This section will serve to answer my fourth research question, “What and how are pedagogies for popular music being addressed through the implementation of the curriculum?” In the introduction to this study, the different kinds of pedagogies often located within popular music were discussed. Additionally, in the review of literature, there was an exploration of might be considered authentic practices and pedagogies of popular music. The pedagogies most common to popular music environments include informal, formal, non-formal, student-centered, and peer learning (Green, 2006; Folkestad, 2006; Parkinson & Smith, 2015). Themes that emerged from investigating this question were that of communication and creativity.

Informal pedagogies often have activities that are not chosen ahead of the instruction, but instead, the activity itself creates the space for working, playing, connecting, and sharing (Folkestad, 2006). Folkestad (2006) found that these kinds of informal (aural) pedagogies are often found within formal spaces, and vice versa. They are student-centered and often peer-learning driven, and were observed at both institutions. These kinds of informal pedagogies allowed the students to create and work within small communities that supported their creativity.

Sampson (USC), spoke about this challenge of placing popular music within a formal institution, with all the traditions that come with each paradigm, especially those
relating to learning things aural verses standard\textsuperscript{11}. Aural tradition is often thought of as part of an informal learning process, while standard is often nested within formal learning practices. Sampson stated:

I think actually, what’s more critical, and this is actually speaks to one of my fears about the future of popular music. But what’s more critical is that this music lives in an oral tradition. This is, if you’re really are talking about the origins of American popular music, we aren’t talking about notated tradition, we’re talking about an oral tradition and that is where our performance practice lies. That is where our nuance and stylist understanding lies. It’s not from a notation system. If we make popular music an overly academic pursuit and forget that, my fear is that we are going to strip all of the spirit, intention and heart out of this music…

Sampson continued:

[There is] this ongoing very wonderful, precarious friction between the aural tradition and a standard tradition is I think not only the most fascinating thing, but also the hardest to balance, and the hardest to manage. And think that, I don’t know if we’ll ever actually get that balance absolutely perfect, but it requires this ongoing monitoring, but I actually find that push-pull between an oral tradition and the standard really, really dynamic, fascinating, and essential, absolutely essential.

And Rushen (USC), shared a similar viewpoint:

This could so easily go the way of classical music if we don't switch this up a little bit into a model that allows for them to learn by doing. Maybe not be able to do it well at first, but empower them and motivate them to go back and try it

\textsuperscript{11} Aural refers to learning by rote or ear. Standard refers to reading musical notation.
again, don't back and just do it again. Let's play, let's do this. Let them see it happen and that this is part of a process and it is not like, "Learn all these tunes in every key." For what?

Sanchez (UM) had corresponding viewpoints and noted the need to provide the popular music students will the ability to have standard skills:

How do we get all those people [popular music students] to speak the same language [as traditional musicians and with each other]? Really the first two years in particular involve heavy emphasis on skills, because we need them speaking the same language. We need them to become, and I hate this term, but "real musicians". They need to be able to speak and understand the musical language and the tools at their disposal.

Continuing, Sanchez reflected on the need to develop aural skills as well:

When they're at a restaurant, and a track comes on and they hear something they really like, and they think, "I might be able to use that," they can immediately hear it and know what's going on, and they don't have to think twice about it. Go home and do it, not just, "Wow, I wonder how they did that." That's skill.

Moore (UM) also commented on the need to develop both oral and standard skills, as well as to develop a deep knowledge:

So I kind of believe in that deep knowledge in one subject area…In the popular music program, it should line up a lot with what everybody's [traditional musicians] is. I want them [popular musicians] to do all the things they came in with [oral/aural skills], but I also want them to be able to read music.
These beliefs are supported by Elliott (1995), who posits that musical literacy is not concomitant with musicianship and that while it should be learned, it should be learned within the larger context of making music. The practice of aural and oral transmission is supported by Boespflug (1999), who discussed how popular music evolved primarily from musicians who listened, re-created and experimented with what they heard (p. 34).

These statements also mirror what Jorgensen (2003) stated regarding that with new developments, educators must choose what to keep and what to discard. Studies on popular music programs in education supports this idea, and found that as society becomes more complex, people need to constantly adapt and develop new strategies in education for dealing with the challenges this brings (Barnett & Coate, 2005; Lebler, 2008; Lebler & Weston, 2015; Till, 2017). Additionally, Parkinson and Smith (2015) found that due to the slow addition of popular music into higher education, there has been time to consider alternative pedagogical practices authentic to genre and to find ways of inclusion.

Another aspect of informal learning is creating spaces for student-centered activities. This in turn helps build community and communication amongst the students and faculty. In most of the ensembles I observed at both institutions, faculty acted as facilitators of the learning, while the students were directing the activities in the class. Positive and constructive feedback, reinforcement and encouragement was found in the communication between other students and faculty at both institutions. In a Midi Technology class at USC, students were being asked to: *Create a sequence using at least 4 Massive synths (a specific plug-in). Two of the patches need to be programmed from*
scratch. 2 can be modified presets. Must use different wave tables, oscillator combinations, filters, performer, stepper, insert effects, insert EQ, and envelope. For those unfamiliar with this technology or language, they were being given parameters for creating a musical sequence in a Digital Audio Workstation (DAW).

Although students were set up in a formal setting, with all computers facing the front of the room and the instructor in the front of the room to start the class, each individual student was given a large amount of creative freedom to create their project. Once the initial direction was given, the instructor walked around the room and sat down next to each student, discovering what they were working on, what help they might need, where they were thinking of going…etc. Some students seemed to need more help, some less. Research by Carey and Lebler (2012), Flynn and Vredevoogd (2010), (Lebler (2007, 2008), Folkestad (2006), support this informal learning environment and the need for students to take control of their own learning as active and proactive autonomous producers and managers of materials, portfolios, and solutions.

At UM, in the American Modern Band (AMB) ensemble, all the music the ensemble played was composed and arranged by the students in the ensemble. Students brought in their own songs, and were placed in co-writing situations to create original content for the group. Final song selections were chosen by the faculty, however once the songs were chosen, the students created the charts, decided what instrumentation they want on the song, and ran the rehearsals with the band. Faculty interjected when necessary, to fine-tune, offer suggestions for the arrangement, and keep the rehearsal running in an efficient fashion. The majority of the work, communication, collaboration
and discussion occurred between the students, indicating peer-to-peer as well as student-centered learning (Barnett & Coate, 2005; Lebler 2007, 2008).

Reflecting on his position as Program Director for MADE as well as the instructor for several classes, Rivera (UM) supported this informal learning environment, “My job is to serve the students. They have their own, that's their own universe too. They have attitudes, and they're, I see myself in so many of them.” Another faculty member stated, “Most important is the collaborative effort between the instrumentalists, vocalists and songwriters during the rehearsals and other activities leading up to the various concerts, gigs or recording activities.” These statements reflect the building of community and helping students be autonomous learners within these programs (Lebler, 2007, 2008).

In respect to learning repertoire and canon in these informal environments, Herbert (2011), Lebler (2008), and Small (1998) discuss the need to engender respect for the past while providing ways to engage that knowledge in the present. Both programs involved learning repertoire in history and musicology classes, as well as ensembles. Yet these classes were not just about learning and replicating repertoire. They were about respecting the past and the rich cultural heritage while simultaneously celebrating the creativity and energy that the students brought to the process (Herbert, 2011; Lebler, 2008; Small, 1998; Smith & Shafighian, 2013). This ties into the theme of creativity and finding a unique perspective on music to share with the communities that are formed both within and outside of these institutions.

At USC, through the required popular performance class, students are placed in groups and are required to rehearse on their own throughout the week leading up to a performance class on Tuesday. In the freshman and sophomore years, specific repertoire
is assigned to the students by faculty. They are given a selection of songs and accompanying recordings, and their assignment is to figure out how to play the song with their group. They must figure out what part each instrument plays, what the groove of the song is, write charts, learn harmonies – all on their own with one student being the musical director for the week to have someone as the leader for the group. Then, they come into the performance class and each group performs the same 3–4 songs in front of their peers and instructor. They receive feedback from their instructor at that time on how well they executed the song, groove, etc., however the majority of learning this music is occurs in an environment that is informal, student-centered, and peer-learning driven. A faculty member at USC commented on this aspect of the program:

Students are given opportunity to understand they are part of a larger system, impacting the future of music as others have done before them. They do this by studying historical figures in the industry and their music, broadening their understanding of what they themselves can potentially create. They are required to participate in and lead ensembles, placing them in a variety of roles as players. Rushen (USC) reiterated this, “It's a student-centric program. It's not about us. It's like, "Well, we might be able to save you a decade or two if you pay attention to what we tell you."

At UM, in the freshman, sophomore and junior years, there are ensemble classes that work with repertoire. Observation of several ensembles evinced that students were learning repertoire from diverse historical periods in the popular music canon, but then modeling\(^\text{12}\) or bringing the older songs into the 21\(^\text{st}\) century. The freshman iteration of

\(^{12}\) Creating a new song by utilizing the form, chord progression, lyrical prosody and construction, style, and attitude of the original work.
this ensemble has varied repertoire from all genres and time periods—almost like a survey
class—where students are either asked to work alone or placed in groups and asked to
learn a given song or songs on their own outside of class. In the sophomore and junior
years, there is a more linear approach to the repertoire, moving from early American
popular music into today. Again, students are given specific songs and asked to either
‘model’ these songs or bring the old songs into the 21st century by arranging them in
creative ways. Berg commented on this modeling, “I really like the modeling thing. I
really like the start by understanding whose shoulders you're standing on when you're
about to embark on a career in any kind of music.” These pedagogical and participatory
practices support what Lebler (2008), Lebler and Weston (2015) and Till (2017) view as
important aspects of participatory and democratic approaches to learning that they
suggest as good practice for popular music.

Formal learning environments were also observed within both programs. These
were found in theory, ear-training, history, musicology, and business classes. However,
there were many aspects of informal learning observed in each class. Students were
engaged often given short in-class projects to create with other students, given
opportunities to share and/or perform and learn from others while simultaneously finding
space for effective feedback. Songwriting classes were a mixture of informal and formal
learning, as well as peer-to-peer learning. In many classes, students were required to
submit weekly reflective journals about their experience in class as well as their process
on whatever project was assigned. This kind of reflective awareness is cited by Lebler
(2007, 2008), and Carey and Lebler (2012) as an important part of developing autonomy
in students as they prepare for a career in the music field.
Connected to these aspects of creativity and finding a unique perspective were ideas of authenticity related to previously discussed pedagogies and creativity. This supports what Herbert (2011) and Thwaites (2013) stated regarding the connection between creativity and authenticity and the creation of content as an empowering activity within popular music contexts.

Faculty spoke about the need to have an authentic representation of their style while still maintaining the ability to be a chameleon in situations where that is warranted. Questionnaire responses in reaction to asking what other skills students learn reflected ideas about creativity and authenticity:

- We teach our students to be fearless with their creativity and encourage them to break new ground. This is what I see as the authentic spirit of pop music. There is no definition in terms of instruments, styles or traditions that is satisfactory, in my opinion. I think whether something is pop or not is in the eye of the creator and then subsequently interpreted by each audience member. Our students are the creators, so I back up each individual student's definition of what pop music is to them.

- The most important part of popular music higher education is providing students with an outlet and tools to access their own unique voice.

- Concentration on stylistic flexibility among the many styles represented in the popular music landscape.

- We listen to and take apart a lot of music. All the greats who didn't go to music school learned by listening to and learning what their influences did. They learn by doing on the bandstand. The school of the street. Well we
happen to be a private university, but we create environments for learning in a school-of-hard-knocks style. It is very active, hands-on, direct processing of information from our students' musical influences and very individualized trial-and-error learning how to apply this information to their own original music.

Rushen (USC), when asked about authenticity in HPME responded:

It’s a difficult question because I don't know that our definitions always apply to reality. I think what we try to do in this situation is present the music that they think they want to do, in such a way that they get that it didn't start with them. That there was stuff before you that led to this. And we address the authenticity issues, specifically where the music is concerned, vis-a-vis a vocabulary that allows you to speak more eloquently when you get to your stuff. A byproduct of that is that they figure out for themselves a certain definition of authenticity that's based in a certain truth about the music and the way it communicates to people.

Berg (UM) echoed these sentiments:

Then there's another kind of authenticity. That is in how you represent yourself as an artist. That's where you strip everything away and represent who you really are and how you really feel and your inner-most insecurities, longings and everything else in order to really communicate with people.

Sanchez (UM) spoke about the value of developing unique voices, “Something that I highly, highly value is the unique musical voice. That unique musical voice isn't just musical. It's actually completely holistic, because it has everything to do with what somebody's into and what they want to say.” These statements are supported by Hickey
and Webster (2001), and Karlsen (2010), who found that creativity is a skill characteristic of authentic practices in popular music. Additionally, Bennett (2017) found that creative practices offer a more holistic approach to learning popular music and that programs need to find a balance between learning and creating so as to enable students to find their own paths as they enter music careers.

In summary, within both programs, informal and formal pedagogies were observed, sometimes concomitantly occurring in the same classroom (Folkestad, 2006). Peer-to-peer and student-centered learning environments were prominent in most ensemble settings, where the faculty facilitated, but the students created many of the learning paradigms. These practices support the theme of community. Although repertoire is learned and studied within each program, emphasis is placed on awareness and respect for the history of popular music, rather than an exact replication of a recording. It is not only the ability to play the song, but also the ability to capture the attitude of the music that is significant to the learning of a canon. Both institutions addressed authentic practices to popular music in their pedagogies, which included an awareness and emphasis on oral/aural traditions, creativity, and the development of unique artistic voices.

**Success and Value**

This final section will serve to answer my final research question, “What is the perceived value of the HPME program from the perspective of the leaders and faculty?” This question investigated not only the value of the program, but also the views on success in relation to both the program and the students graduating from it. The review of literature analyzed many ideas about value and success in relation to music and popular
music. In exploring the leaders’ (Deans and Program Directors) and faculty viewpoints on the success and value of these programs, themes that emerged in this area were those centered around finding a unique voice, othering, portfolio careers, and impact.

Value relates to what is considered good, bad, right, wrong, important, inconsequential…etc. Many values are implicit and are rarely articulated with clarity in every day life (Parkinson, 2015; Smith 2012). Success is linked to value as an implicit relationship often associated with a transaction–success is achieved, therefore there was value in the things that lead to that success (Parkinson, 2014). In the case of this study, as shown by the conceptual framework where the arrows from success and value are bidirectional, the value is a degree in popular music that leads to the success of students and thus the success of the program, which affects the design of the curriculum.

Based on data collected from the faculty questionnaires and interviews, faculty viewed success for students graduating from both universities as measured by satisfaction with ones choices, making a difference, and finding a unique voice within the music industry. When asked what students needed to succeed, faculty responses included that students needed a wide variety of skills, needed be open to learning from others and to trust the process, and to needed develop a deep sense of responsibility and accountability to their peers.

Rushen (USC), in response to what helps students succeed and what she views her role and the faculty role in this goal, stated:

To be able to show people what that looks like is to be able to help them understand that it's bigger than any one category of the music. What do you want to do? And
then your passion and your purpose have to meet. That's part of our job, is to help you get in touch with that.

Lebler and Weston (2015) found that helping students find their unique voice and individual artistry was important in creating relevant curriculum and courses. This was reflected in the comments from faculty members and leaders about success and the value of the program. Berg (UM) stated, “Success is overcoming the things that would cause you to fail,” and continued by stating that it is “becoming the person, musician and artist that you aspire to be.”

Within the questionnaire, one faculty member commenting on success wrote, “I believe that popular music, at least at my institution, addresses the development of the musician as an artist more than other areas of music.” Another commented, “They need open minds to learning and willingness to actively transform themselves into the artists they discover they want to become.” And, “The student should find their unique and personal voice, and develop their ability to communicate that voice to the listener.”

Sampson (USC), talking about societal impact and how it permeates the curriculum and ideas about helping students succeed on their own terms:

A huge impact can mean that your work, your artistry, has a platform, has a message – or it could mean that you moved 30,000 people at Madison Square Garden to tears because it was just so beautifully done. Impact. And so, for me…tying it to success - I’d like for them to have success on their own terms – and feel like they’re making a contribution and impact.

Sanchez (UM) reported wanting to help students develop their unique voice of the students in a holistic way. Berg (UM) echoed view of Sanchez in relation to helping
students develop their voice in a holistic manner, “The great thing about a school is that you can have breadth across things beyond that narrow slice that you're in and it's probably that breadth that's going to help your success more than anything. It will help you become the unique you that you become.” This intersection of success, education and artistry is part of the value of an HPME program. With spaces for discussion, learning, failure, experience, and mentorship these programs can help to bring to understanding and awareness to these crossroads in education (Abramo, 2011; Carey, 2005; Hughes et al., 2016; Hooper, 2017).

However, the value of these programs does not end with student success. In discussions with the leaders and faculty at both institutions, another theme to emerge was that of no longer “othering” students who didn’t look like band, choir or orchestra. These ideas about no longer negating students who have a different way of realizing music appeared in a discussion in a previous section in chapter four on why these programs were created. HPME programs offer opportunities for students who are musical, creative, and want to learn. With the addition of HPME program, there is a path for students who play a guitar or write songs or make music in a DAW on a laptop to get a degree while they pursue their purpose and passion.

Another question connected to value is one often posed about placing popular music in higher education: “why bother?” The argument is that people have been doing popular music since music began and some dispute that there has never been a need to have it institutionalized before. However, based on the findings from this research as well as literature on popular music programs, there is a need to address the growing desire of non-traditional music students wanting to attend college and a need to change the musical
domain in higher education institutions (Bennett, 2007; Bowman, 2004; Lewis, 2014).

Cutietta (USC) commented on why the BPM has value:

If you want to be a pop star or a dancer, why would you want to go to college? You cannot waste your prime time—because my 30 it’s over. So, we really had to struggle with why would we start a popular music program—and the question—the answer to that question—is you want a career in popular music. If you really want to be the next Taylor Swift—probably not [the place for you]…But if you want to be the next Patrice Rushen or something like that - who is a music director, arranger, musician, and performer. I mean, we’re not excluding that [being Taylor Swift], but that’s not the goal. We’re not American Idol. We are trying to turn out people who as a career could make popular music be a popular music performer.

Cutietta continued:

But more, it’s crossing boundaries. Yeah, you’re a musician. But you don’t really come here to just study guitar as you would in a more traditional—or a violinist or whatever it is…you come here to study and there’s so much cross pollinating—you’re in the recording studios, you’re learning about the business of music, you’re playing in different bands all the time—you’re actually playing different roles in the band—you’ve never sung before but you’re going to sing—you’re a songwriter—so, it’s really putting the student through a whole bunch of other things. And I don’t want to say we’re not letting them specialize—they’re just specializing in a broad area of things—
These comments are supported by the literature that advocates for HPME programs to create multi-faceted career musicians (Bennett, 2012; Parkinson & Smith, 2015; Smith, 2013). Additionally, this connects to the theme of portfolio careers. Faculty at both institutions had viewpoints that supported the research on the need for multi-faceted, portfolio careers. Comments such as: “The students need a wide variety of skills as it's likely that they'll need to be collaborative in different ways at different times,” and, “For the most part they must be musical ‘Swiss army knives,’” were found in the faculty responses within the questionnaires.

Rivera (UM) stated:
A successful person is truly what the main idea is. Which is, they can go into any room and serve musically. Meaning, the jack of all trades is something that I've been and many of us are, most of these faculty, we get to do more than one thing, and know pretty well about more than one thing…We're in a society in which you have to be and have the tool set, and on principle, to not just be good at what you do, but good at the business side of it…

Berg (UM) paralleled this idea of multiple skills and abilities within and outside music, discussing the implementation of through lines\textsuperscript{13} within the entire Frost school.

Our ideals for our students is that they will present themselves well—whether that's onstage, or in a meeting, or trying to get a donor. Our ideals for our students is that they will be able to write well because there are times they are going to have to describe what they do for right to advocate for something. Our students will understand marketing and those kinds of communications so that they can be a pro-

\textsuperscript{13} Through lines are: Create, Relate, Engage, Analyze, Teach and Employ and are used within Frost to unite ideals across disciplines with similar learning objectives and goals.
active force in the selling of themselves and their career. Our students will understand technology at eye-level—able to record and video themselves and use the appropriate technologies at a level that they will need in the twenty-first century world. Our students should be creators of music, and for popular music that is already a given…They're going to be creative beings that can improvise or be able to write and compose in a range, write songs. Our students should be able to teach others because they're hardly any music career that doesn't involve teaching in one way or another. So we created this whole list of ideals and then there are cultural ideals just within the culture as well. Okay then how do we achieve those? How do we prioritize those and achieve those and what does a curricula look like that does that?

These comments support what Bennett (2013) and Lebler and Weston (2015) discuss about portfolio careers and how they can create multiple opportunities for success in the global music ecosystem.

Faculty at both universities had similar comments in relation to othering and portfolio careers within the questionnaire when asked about the value of having an HPME program:

- It brings the real world of music and society into music teaching and learning.
- With the shrinking opportunities in the traditional classical field, as well as jazz being at an all time low in consumer percentage, popular music is the only way to provide a talented young musician who is neither a jazz or classical musician, with an opportunity to study music and become a college educated person
• These students have immense potential as people and professionals, and many interested musicians go on to try to succeed in the industry with or without guidance through an education. Our culture may view this program as a luxury, where no one would think of entering the business world, for instance, without a degree. The music industry is a business, and those who think creatively and with intention can find success and fulfillment there.

• To not teach popular music would be living in a bubble; in complete denial of the marketplace.

• This is an inherently interdisciplinary program that helps students become better artists, historians, sociologists, psychologists, entrepreneurs, writers, thinkers, philosophers, socially successful and empathetic individuals prepared to contribute substantially to the whole of society. By nature it attracts out-of-the-box individuals who believe in themselves. We need to bring those individuals into a rigorous program of self-exploration and improvement that makes them more empathetic, more intelligent, more active members of our world whatever they choose to do when they graduate.

Portfolio careers support multiple creative and non-creative roles and HPME programs that can draw on and embed multidisciplinary aspects all equally important to the development of the student (Bennett, 2012; Bennett & Bridgstock, 2014; Cloonan, 2015; Hickey and Webster, 2001; Moir 2017; Théberge, 2015).

Lastly, again the theme of impact emerged from the data. Discussed previously in this research are ideas about how the students moving through these programs will have an impact on the music industry and society. In connection with the value of these
programs, the theme of what the impact these new HPME programs will have on music education overall emerged.

Leaders and faculty at both universities wanted to see their graduates become leaders in the field of popular music and hoped that they would make a difference and impact on society. However, the viewpoints on how each institution would like to have an impact on the educational and musical climate differed between each institution.

At USC, based on the interviews, there appeared to be a desire to change the way music education as a general practice was conceived and implemented, and that by using some of the principles and discoveries within their creation, implementation and running of the BPM, that perhaps they could be a model for other to follow. Cutietta (USC) stated, “My goal is to shake up the field a little. And I really wanted to do that. I wanted to show that this could be done.” Sampson (USC) shared his vision on what impact the BPM at USC could have on the health of music education and music professions in general:

And I think, what we’re doing in popular music actually shows and example that will shape–reshape–all of that [music education]…if our popular music curriculum contributes to the ongoing health of classical art music. That would be something...If you really want to know the utopia vision for all this. It started with creating the popular music program. And then through their energy and dynamic we wanted to make that a bit more infectious and expand it to other areas–jazz, film scoring–other industry–so we created the division of contemporary music. And that term is an imperfect term. And I always thought, well, what if we just call everybody contemporary musician. What if everybody was in the contemporary
You could be holding a cello, you could be holding a violin, or electric guitar—and I’m not talking about throwing everybody in the same room or the same curriculum—because they all have their own individual needs—but if we all thought in the same terms that we’re all contemporary musicians. We’re all finding our path. We need to be in that same community together to create those opportunities. Then we’d have something.

At UM, the vision differs, but still maintains an attitude of wanting to change the way music programs are conceptualized. Berg (UM) remarked that sometimes schools don’t always have an entrepreneurial spirit, and that sometimes its necessary to try something new and see if it works and then discover where to go from there. This aligns with Bowman’s (2004) research on popular music education and its willingness to adapt and change that needs to be examined for how to take advantage of its instructional and pedagogical practices and allow it to change education. In addition to needing to have the ability to change and adapt to a changing music industry, Sanchez (UM) reflected on what he hoped these programs could be in relation to the industry:

I have a vision that I would love to see, for example, this become…The way the industry has evolved, record companies, publishing companies no longer really do much in the area of artist development and in the area. A and R really is very much an outside function, more so than it used to be. I would like to see this [the popular music program] become a farm team, if you will, that executives from companies all around the world, different styles of music will routinely come by and say, "Hey, what's going on here? What are we doing? Let's hear some music," kind of
thing. To that end, I'd actually like to build a mechanism to connect industry with what's going on here…

This viewpoint reflects similar goals to that of the employability framework and connections to authenticity that align with market value (Frith, 1998). In some ways it is in direct contrast to other goals the MADE program ascribes to support, such as those of creating good people and impacting social change. Yet in other ways, it is supportive of these goals, for if the students within these programs are educated within a hybridized curricular framework, they would also have an awareness of the impact their music could have on the global music ecosystem. Connecting them directly to this ecosystem could prove advantageous for the advancement of their desired interactions. Regardless of perspective, it is still a shift in philosophy for what purpose an HPME program serves its students and the larger music and educational community.

Bowman (2004) argues that if we are to do justice to popular music in educational contexts, we must allow it to change us. “We must allow it to complicate our professional lives, to enrich our understanding of music’s nature and power, to extend our assumptions about which students we presume to educate, to broaden our vision of the ways that music education can occur, and to reconstruct our views of who music educators are, what they do, and how they do it (Bowman, 2004, p. 34). In my observations, questionnaires and interviews, it became apparent that these programs are allowing popular music to change the way education is perceived both within their institutions and outside.

In summary, and in answer to my final research question, themes that emerged regarding the value of these two HPME programs were those centered around finding a
unique voice, othering, portfolio careers, and impact. Each program wanted to aide
students in the discovery of their unique voice. Additionally, both programs viewed the
value of their program as having an effect on the larger music education environment by
creating a space for previously ‘othered’ students the opportunity to pursue their passion
and purpose in higher education. Goals included in this pursuit were that of developing
the skills and knowledge to be able to pursue a multidimensional portfolio career after
graduation. Lastly, both institutions wanted to have an impact, not only on society and
popular music, but also on music education and the perceptions of what a higher
education music degree has to offer its students.

**Chapter Summary**

In summary, connected to research questions two through five, this section has
discussed curriculum, interaction, pedagogies, value and success. In respect to the second
research question, there are many facets of curriculum and curricular philosophies and
the interactions and pedagogies embedded within them affect their implementation. Both
programs seemed to exhibit a hybridized framework of curriculum that included aspects
of employability and culture within their design and relation to authenticity. Themes that
emerged surrounding curriculum were that of preparing students for lives as musicians,
making an impact on society, and authenticity to popular music traditions.

Anent to the third research question, due to the diverse and broad demographic of
popular music to potentially impact society, addressing areas of interaction within HPME
programs is important. Each institution has within its goals and mission to engender
aspects of interactions within its curriculum and implementation therein. Themes that
emerged from exploring these interactions were that of making a difference, being good citizens, and empathy.

Further, concerning the fourth research question, informal, formal, non-formal, student-centered and peer learning are all pedagogies endemic to popular music and were found throughout both programs. These pedagogies are viewed as authentic practices to popular music and were observed in classes, as well as espoused by faculty and leaders as important aspects of their program. Themes that emerged from examining these pedagogies were that of communication and creativity.

Finally, in respect to the fifth, and final research question, exploring the perceived ideas of success and value of HPME programs, themes centered around finding a unique voice, othering, portfolio careers, and impact were most prevalent. Together, the programs imbued ideas of helping students find their unique voice and through that making and impact, and gaining skills and knowledge to pursue a portfolio career. Leaders desired to change the way music education is perceived and taught.

Throughout all these explorations, the discovery that HPME programs need their own set of rules, informed by the past, but always looking towards the future was apparent. These programs use what they have to build what they need. They are student-centered and focused on communication and connection, not only within their programs, but also with the outside world. These programs and their leaders want to be a voice for change, both in the larger music education world, but also in the global music economy.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION AND CLOSING THOUGHTS

Returning to the Conceptual Framework

Through my original conceptual framework (Figure 5), now highlighted to reflect the movement through this study, designed specifically to examine curricular design in HPME programs, this study examined the motivations, challenges, leadership and
resources; the frameworks, pedagogies and interactions; and what constitutes success and value of programs. Some of these ideas will be transferrable to other developing programs, some will not, and other ideas will need to be substituted for the ones laid out in this study. However, based on the literature reviewed for this study, as well as the examination of these programs, each of these aspects is something to consider when embarking on designing new HPME programs as well as examining existing programs.

Although neither USC or UM used this conceptual framework to design their curriculum, it is interesting that many of the aspects I sought to find were located within their design. As HPME programs continue to be established within the higher education musical environment, these interactive concepts can aide in the development of intuitive, malleable, bespoke and flexible curricula that meets both the needs of the school in which it is situated, but also the students and faculty that make up its population.

**Summary of Similarities and Differences**

Overall, there were many more similarities than differences between the two programs. Each program was student-centered with a focus on communication and connection, not only within their program, but also the outside world. Each program was interested in developing empathy within their students. Both programs seemed to adhere to the idea that popular music programs need their own set of rules, informed by the past, but looking towards the future. Additionally, it was discovered that both popular musicians and HPME programs seem to use what they have to build what they need.

Both USC and UM offer tailored and bespoke education endemic to their faculty, institution and surroundings, although the latter was less apparent overall. Success at both universities seemed to be measured by the ability of the administration and faculty to help
students find a unique voice within the music industry, to enable students the abilities to make an impact, and to help students learn to be fulfilled doing what they are doing. Both programs viewed the value of their program as affecting the larger music education environment by creating a space for a different kind of student an opportunity to pursue their passion and purpose in higher education. Both schools had similar motivations for creating and developing a popular music program in wanting to serve a previously “othered” population. In addition, each school wanted to create space for popular music to be learned at a high level of musicianship. Beyond these similarities, there were differences between the two programs. They will be addressed by moving through the curricular framework (Figure 5) from the left to the right.

The difference in challenges at each school were largely related to resources. The BPM program at USC had the opportunity to occupy a large number of recently vacated spaces that were similar in their capacity to support popular music. The MADE program at UM had the opportunity to occupy new spaces that helped to support their program. Both schools had similar challenges in what to call the program and with philosophies surrounding attitudes towards popular music.

Leadership within Thornton (USC) seemed to be more philosophically aligned from the top to the bottom than at Frost (UM). This seemed in part due to the diversity of objectives and cross-curricular programs within Frost. Additionally, as the BPM at USC is just past its ten-year mark, they have had much more time to create cohesiveness, while the MADE program at UM is only in its second full year of being an official major. Differences are also apparent within the organization and efficiency of each program.
In terms of pedagogy, there appeared to be more emphasis placed on replicated repertoire learning at USC than at UM. While both schools use repertoire to understand aspects of popular music such as genre, groove, musicality and history, UM appeared to create greater avenues for exploration and creativity within and using repertoire.

The vision and overall within the BPM program at USC is to contribute to the health of other music and music education and change the field to the point where everyone is considered a contemporary musician, regardless of genre. The vision and overall goal within the MADE program at UM is to grow the program to be able to contribute and connect directly to industry with the goal of helping students launch individual careers. Each of these visions and goals are similar in that they each want to be a voice for change, both in the larger music education world, but also in the global music economy.

**Contributions**

Results of this study have contributed to the literature in five major areas:

1. The first contribution is to research on HPME in the United States. HPME programs of this size and impact in the United States have heretofore not been examined with this level of scrutiny. This study adds to the global body of knowledge on HPME and reveals an American perspective on HPME programs.

2. The second contribution is the emergence of the importance of authenticity within these programs. The voracity with which this concept ran through all aspects of this study was surprising—everything from history, to pedagogies, to curricular frameworks, to ideas about value and success—were found to be affected by
authenticity. This work therefore adds to the growing body of work on authentic practices in popular music education at all levels.

3. The third contribution is an examination of curriculum in higher education music performance-centered programs. There is little information on the curriculums of music schools that encompasses all aspects of what makes up curriculum—the motivations, leaders, resources, pedagogies, interactions, values and perceived ideas about success. This study provides more knowledge about how effective curriculum in HPME programs can be designed.

4. The fourth is that of the discovery that these programs seem to be developing empathy within their students. This interaction and many others is one that merits further study within these programs, for these programs have the potential to affect social change (Woodward, 2017).

5. The fifth contribution is the discovery of many areas for future research in HPME. Throughout all of this exploration and examination, there are themes and ideas that have emerged as implications for future programs and areas of research that are still woefully underrepresented within music education research. They include research on (a) bespoke education, (b) continual change, (c) authenticity of faculty, (d) history of HPME in the United States, (e) HPME programs, (f) student outcomes from HPME programs and (g) interactions.
Implications for Future Research

Authenticity of Faculty

An avenue for future research also resides within the aspects of authenticity relating to faculty experience and the perception of students on the ability of the faculty to teach that information.

Traditionally, at many music schools, programs highlight the fame and accolades of the faculty as a reason to come to that particular school. As discussed, this comes with sometimes serious ramifications for student learning, as many of the people ‘in the business’ have little to no experience teaching. When faced with actually creating effective spaces for students to learn, as well as the planning, bureaucracy and administrative duties that often coincide with being in higher education, many performers and industry professionals fall short, especially upon their initial induction into the system.

Research on how these programs can develop tracks whereby professionals with invaluable skills and experience in the field of popular music who want to teach have access to resources that can help them transition their skills and knowledge into pedagogical ideas and concepts.

Bespoke Education

There is little information on HPME programs and their need to develop specialized curriculum based on their strengths and weaknesses. The biggest idea for future creators of programs that emerged was that each of these programs offers a bespoke education to their students. This education is tailored to the abilities, achievements and skills that the faculty can provide, while simultaneously encouraging
the creativity, expression, and unique voices of the students within the program. Exploration into the development of programs that cover all aspects of what it is to be a musician, but specialize in doing this in nuanced ways, similar to the way popular musicians create music is warranted. These programs do not offer everything to everyone, but rather help and guide students to find their unique path by gaining knowledge, skills, awareness, and autonomy over their own learning.

As more HPME programs continue to be added to higher education institutions in the United States and throughout the world, research on how each program can develop its own unique voice has merit. This will be influenced by geographic location, faculty, educational philosophies and existing resources.

Popular music is so broad that to cover every existing—and yet to exist—genre at the same level would be almost impossible for any school integrating a popular music program into an existing music landscape. The ability therefore, to develop the original and nuanced voice of a program will serve to enrich the culture and available exploration for musical expression. The more bespoke and unique the environment, the more unique the voice of the student can be developed.

**Celebrity of Programs**

An avenue for exploration is an examination of how a program and the students within and graduating from it are the celebrity. Research into how HPME programs themselves are the attraction for students to attend that particular school. Explorations could include how each program offers in-roads to success, the exploration of self, spaces to discover themselves, and a community of musicians with which to build their career.
Continual Change

There exists a need to examine how programs can continue to refine, shape, and be open to change–both from a curricular, but also pedagogical structure. Those programs that can set up systems within higher education that allow and embrace more rapid change and shifts will have more flexibility and ability to change and adapt to the changing musical field outside institutions.

Should popular music become canonized within higher education, the vibrancy and creativity of this music may diminish. Therefore, there needs to be research on developing strategies and systems in higher education that continually allow for change. Strategies that pay respect to the past, learn from and through the past–but then listen, create, arrange, and move towards the future. This will necessitate a continual re-imagining of the goals and curricular structure of HPME programs. Furthermore, research on ways to for these programs to create spaces for any student with the passion and drive to achieve their goals–allowing students who learn music in their bedrooms and off the internet–or whatever medium is in the future–to attend these programs is a necessity to the success and vibrancy of HPME programs.

Gender

An examination of gender roles and the continued prevalence of white male dominance within higher education music programs, and even more specifically, within HPME programs would be useful. Investigation of how to encourage more women and LGBT populations to pursue careers in the field of popular music education at all levels of education would be welcomed.
History of HPME in the United States

Another area for research would be a history of HPME in the United States. There is a wealth of information on popular music in programs in the K-12 bracket, but there is a dearth of information on the history of HPME in the United States—from both a time-line perspective and from a curricular perspective.

HPME programs

Implications for future research also include more studies on HPME curriculum in general in the United States. As of the date of this study, there have been only a handful of studies done on the HPME programs within the United States. Parallel studies to those done on HPME programs in Europe, Scandinavia and Australia could prove to be worthy research subjects within popular music and serve to make valuable connections for education. Research on the commonalities and differences between all global HPME programs would be welcomed.

Interactions

Further exploration on the impact these programs and their curriculum can have on society and education would be welcomed. I have only managed to scratch the surface on this topic within this research, however what I found indicates that this is something that administrators and faculty are considering when designing and implementing these programs. If these interactions and discussions about them become a hallmark of these HPME programs, might music education be able to truly change society? Examining how to connect the communication and collaboration as well as empathy and understanding as part of the fabric that runs through all music programs would be welcomed.
Popular Music

An examination of what encompasses popular music would be welcome. Additionally, an exploration of how programs in different locations, both within the United States and globally, are utilizing the music of their communities within their popular music programs would add to a growing understanding of what constitutes popular music. In regards to both of the programs explored within this study, popular music seemed to exclude many musics that are considered popular by some cultures and races. As they were not represented, popular musics such as reggaeton and mariachi seemed to be excluded from the definition of popular music within these programs. Hip-hop, reggae, rap and other more African-American influenced musics were also not as represented as the more Anglo-American popular music genres within these programs. Punk and ska were also under-represented within these programs. These exclusions seem to indicate a certain kind of othering within the construct of these programs and are worth examining.

Power

Investigations into who has the power in relation to HPME programs would be welcomed. Is it the government? Is it industry? Is it the leader? Is it the economy? How does the government affect the outcomes of these programs and the leadership within them? How does the global popular music economy affect the power within these programs?

Student Outcomes

Implications for research on HPME programs specifically as they relate to student outcomes would be welcomed. Student opinion and outcomes of these programs were
outside the scope of this study, however future research could look at if the goals and outcomes of these programs and student perceptions and abilities match. Additionally, a survey of students’ experiences within these programs and how they affected the trajectory of the students five and ten years out of these programs would be invaluable.

**Final Thoughts**

We are all storytellers. Whether we are writing a dissertation, a song, a book, painting a picture, baking a cake, or sharing our experiences with our friends and family, we all have something to say. Some of us get to make a large impact, some of us small, but it is not the size of the impact that matters. What matters is that you were there. You showed up. You did your thing..

Through this research, as well as my own personal journey into a better understanding of popular music education, I discovered that HPME programs are complex entities filled with multiple philosophies and challenges. Effective and thoughtful curriculum is one way to bring cohesiveness to the various resources, philosophies, pedagogies, frameworks and interactions that make up an HPME program.

My hunch that interactions were embedded in these programs is something that was extremely exciting to observe, for, like so many of the participants, I too feel music can be a vehicle for change. I was heartened at the passion the faculty and leaders with whom I spoke with and observed had in support of these interaction, as well as their passion for teaching popular music and the traditions and authenticities involved and embedded in its practices. Especially compelling was the emphasis on developing empathy within the student body.
Concepts and philosophies surrounding authenticity emerged from the research and the literature, and while it was not initially something of which I was aware, became something that I could not ignore as I continued on this road. I believe authenticity and an awareness of what it encompasses is a key component to any popular music education.

Lastly, the thoughts on the impact these programs could have on the fields of music and music education were profound in their broad strokes of change and possibility. The potential to change the landscape of music education as a whole because of the work and outreach of these programs, as well as to alter the way in which music education, and specifically higher music education, is structured is exciting.

I hope the information contained within this research can help to inform and change the way we imagine music and what it can do for the world. As I stated in my dedication, it is my hope that music can heal humanity.

This has been my small contribution to that cause.
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APPENDIX A

Interview Guide

Topic: The Creation and Implementation of Two American Popular Music Programs

Participant: Deans Interview Guide

Complete informed consent procedures

Thanks for meeting with me! I’m doing a study on the creation and implementation of the popular music program and curriculum at your university

Today, I’m looking to discover your role in the creation of the HPME program. I will be asking you questions about your experiences as an administrator, educator and musician in order to get your perspective about your philosophies in regards to these experiences. Additionally, I hope to gain some insight into how you feel those philosophies shape the way you administer, teach and perform, and how those ideas shape how the current curriculum was written and executed.

I expect that this interview will take about one hour. I will be using an audio recorder during the interview in order to make sure that I get everything you say; however, please feel free to request I turn it off at any time. When I write up the results of this interview I may quote certain things you say. Do you have any questions before we get started?
Personal Background Information

1. To begin, what did your path to becoming a musician look like?
   - Probe - How was music a part of your life prior to becoming a musician?
   - Probe - Was music a part of your childhood and adolescence?
   - Probe - Did you feel you were supported in your endeavors to pursue music as a career? How? Why?

2. Can you tell me a little about your experience as a musician?
   - Probe - What motivates you as a musician?
   - Probe - What was your definition of success?
   - Probe - What philosophies drive your understanding of your relationship to music?
   - Probe – How does being a musician inform your relationship to the world in which you live?

3. How do you feel your musical, educational and administrative philosophies inform your leadership?
   - Probe – How do these philosophies inform the way in which you structure your leadership?
• Probe – How do these philosophies interact with the faculty member’s philosophies?

4. Tell me a little bit about your specific responsibilities at the university and in relationship to the HPME program.

•Probe- How long have you been working within the program?
  o Where you in favor of its addition? Why? Why not?

• In what ways do you support the HPME program?

HPME Program History and Curriculum(RQ 1, 2)

5. Could you tell me a little bit about the HPME program?

• Probe - What, if any, was your role in its implementation?

• Probe - What was the overall goal, as you perceive it, of the HPME program?

• Probe - What kind of input do the students have in the creation of the curriculum?

• Probe - What kind of input do the faculty have in the creation of the curriculum?

6. I’m looking at three aspects of curriculum organization – Knowing (skills), Acting (using), and Being (education of the person) – in relationship to forming holistic higher education music performance programs. Which of these aspects do you view as being most prevalent within this program? Why?
• Probe - What are the strengths of this curriculum organization?
• Probe - What are the challenges of this curriculum organization?
• Do you see these three aspects working together? How?
• Better question?

Challenges, Authenticity and Innovation (RQ 3)

7. What elements of innovation do you see within the HPME program?
   • Probe – What affect can these innovations have on other departments?

8. Authenticity was important to when working within these new programs. How do you think HPME programs can most effectively be authentic to the traditions of popular music while continuing to be included in academia?
   • Probe – What are challenges to this authenticity
   • How do you see authenticity being practiced at this institution?

9. What are challenges you see to the maintenance and growth of this program?

Artistic Citizenship (RQ 4)

10. Describe/discuss what this was – I’ve been reading a lot about AC…describe – have you heard of that? If not/yes, do you see aspects…..What aspects of Artistic Citizenship (educating students with an awareness of social responsibility within the global landscape) do you see imbued in the HPME music program?
   • Probe – How are these implemented within the curriculum?
• Probe – Was AC something you feel was important to include?

Success & Value (RQ 5)

11. What do you believe that the students within the HPME program need the most to succeed?

• Probe- What was your definition of success for the students?
APPENDIX B

Faculty Questionnaire Guide

Topic: The Creation and Implementation of Two American Popular Music Programs

Participant: Faculty at HPME programs UM, USC

Complete informed consent procedures

Thanks for agreeing to participate in this study! I’m doing a study on the creation and implementation of the popular music program and curriculum at your university.

I’m excited to discover your role in relationship to the HPME program. This questionnaire will consist of questions regarding the HPME program and curriculum, ideas of success and authenticity, and artistic citizenship. I will also be asking questions about your experiences as an educator and musician in order to get your perspective about your philosophies in regards to these experiences. My hope was to gain some insight into how you feel those philosophies shape the way you teach and perform, and how those ideas shape how the current curriculum was implemented.

I expect that this questionnaire will take about one hour to complete, depending on the length of your answers. This can be completed in separate sessions and you can stop and come back to this questionnaire as many times as needed until your final submission. While I will know what answers belong to what respondent, when I write up the results of
this interview I may quote certain things you write but I will not identify you personally in any way.

Thank you for your time, dedication, and interest in participating in this study. I will follow-up this questionnaire with any questions I may have during my analysis of the data. I very much appreciate you taking the time to complete this questionnaire with honesty and authenticity. Your answers to these questions are extremely valuable.

Please feel free to email me at: kreinhertmusic@gmail.com should you have any questions before, during or after completing this questionnaire.

**HPME Program and Curriculum**

12. Did you have a role in the creation of the HPME program at this institution?

   - Yes
   - No

13. If yes, briefly describe your role in this creation. If no, skip this question.

14. What do you view as the overall goal of the HPME program? Please provide ways in which you perceive this goal to be achieved.

15. I’m looking at three aspects of curriculum organization – Knowing (knowledge and skill acquisition), Acting (use of skills in and across disciplines), and Being
(education of the whole person, not just musically) – in relationship to forming holistic higher education music programs. Which of these aspects do you view as being most prevalent within this program? Why?

16. In regards to the curricular aspects of Knowing, Acting and Being, how do you feel these three aspects work together within the overall program?

17. Briefly describe what class or setting you observe Knowing, Acting, and Being coming together most holistically within the program?

18. HPME programs are often viewed as employing innovative (when compared with traditional conservatory or tertiary music programs) educational methods and ideas within the broader higher education landscape. What aspects of innovation do you observe within this program and/or employ in your teaching?

**Authenticity**

1. Authentically representing popular music, as well as the ethos of popular music innovation, was considered a challenging issue when placing it within a higher education landscape. How do you feel authentic representation of popular music was achieved within this program?

**Success & Value**

2. What was your definition of success?
3. What do you believe that the students within the HPME program need the most to succeed?

4. What do you perceive the value of having a HPME program in academia to be?

**Artistic Citizenship**

1. Some people believe that you can teach artistic citizenship - an attitude of social awareness, efficacy, change and justice within arts programs. What are your thoughts on this? Do you already practice this in your teaching?

2. What might be motivating factors that would influence the addition of these ideas into curriculum?

3. Why might these ideas be worth adding into the curriculum?

4. Other than musical knowledge and skills, what take-aways do you hope your students to learn from your instruction?

**Personal Background**

**Musical**

1. How long have you been a professional musician?
   a. 1-5 years
   b. 6–10 years
2. Briefly describe your path to becoming a professional musician.

3. What do you enjoy most about being a professional musician?

Educational

4. How long have you been an educator?
   a. 1-5 years
   b. 6–10 years
   c. 10 years +

5. What do you enjoy most about being an educator?

6. Briefly state your personal teaching philosophy.

Institutional Background

7. How long have you been employed at this institution?
   a. 1-5 years
   b. 6–10 years
   c. 10 years +
8. What was your title at this institution?
   a. Adjunct
   b. Lecturer
   c. Professor of Practice
   d. Associate Professor
   e. Assistant Professor
   f. Full Professor
   g. Other: please specify

9. What courses do you teach at this institution? Please select all that apply.
   a. Ear Training
   b. Ensembles
   c. Composition
   d. Music History
   e. Music Business Related
   f. Musicology
   g. Pedagogy
   h. Private lessons
   i. Recording
   j. Skills
   k. Songwriting
   l. Technology Related
   m. Theory
APPENDIX C

Consent Form

University of Miami

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Developing Popular Music Programs in Higher Education: Exploring the Possibilities.

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to participate.

What the study is about: The purpose of this study is to explore two tertiary popular music programs. I am exploring what curriculum modes are being used and explore what challenges arose during the creation of the program and continue in the implementation. I am also exploring ways in which these programs are creating artistic citizens through their programs, see if there are authentic practices to popular music being implemented in the pedagogies of the program, and explore the perceived value of the program from the perspective of the administration and faculty.

What I will ask you to do: If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete one or all of the following:

1) **Interview.** The interview will take about one hour to complete. The interview will be audio recorded. In the interview, you will be asked questions about your role in the creation and implementation of the program and curriculum at your school, your current role in relation to the program, your background as a musician, and your ideas about authenticity, artistic citizenship, and success.

2) **Questionnaire.** The questionnaire will take no more than one hour to complete. The questionnaire will be distributed either in person or using an online questionnaire. In the questionnaire, you will be asked questions about your role in the creation and implementation of the program and curriculum at your school, your current role in relation to the program, your background as a musician, and your ideas about authenticity, artistic citizenship, and success.

3) **Observation.** I will observe various classes in connection with the curriculum implementation of the program. These may include ensembles, skills courses, or private lessons. Only field notes will be taken. No audio or video recording will occur.

4) You may be contacted at the end of the study for clarification purposes.
**Risks and benefits:** No risks or direct benefits are expected to you participating in this.

**Compensation:** There is no compensation for this study.

**Your answers will be confidential.** The records of this study may be used for educational purposes such as dissertation data analysis, presenting at conferences, journal paper submissions. Research records will be kept in a locked file; only the researcher will have access to the records.

Answers may be quoted directly and attributed to you in publications with your permission.

The U.S Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) may request to review and obtain copies of your records. Your records may also be reviewed for audit purposes by authorized University or other agents who will be bound by the same provisions of confidentiality.

**Taking part is voluntary:** Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. If you decide not to take part, it will not affect your current or future relationship with your institution. If you decide to take part, you are free to withdraw at any time.

**If you have questions:** The researchers conducting this study is Kat Reinhert. Please ask any questions you have now.

If you have questions later, you may contact Kat Reinhert, under the supervision of Dr. Don Coffman (contact information) at 917.597.6498 or k.reinhert@miaimi.edu You may also contact the University of Miami Human Subjects Research Office at 305-243-3195.

You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

**Statement of Consent:** I have read the above information, and have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study.

Your Signature ___________________________________ Date _______________

Your Name (printed) _______________________________________________________________________________________

OPTIONAL: In addition to agreeing to participate, I also consent to the audio recording, as well as photographs that may be taken.

Your Signature ___________________________________ Date _______________

Signature of person obtaining consent ____________________ Date _______________
## APPENDIX D

Observation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UM</th>
<th>USC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean Interviews</strong></td>
<td>4 – face to face</td>
<td>3 – face to face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td>≤ 10 faculty questionnaires</td>
<td>≤ 10 faculty questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Observation</strong></td>
<td>2 ensemble (1LL, 1UL)</td>
<td>2 ensemble (1LL, 1UL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 skill (1LL, 1 UL)</td>
<td>2 skill (1LL, 1 UL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 other (ILL, IUL)</td>
<td>2 other (ILL, IUL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documents</strong></td>
<td>Institutional website, program pages, academic bulletin information</td>
<td>Institutional website, program pages, academic bulletin information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Visits</strong></td>
<td>1 – 2</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

USC BPM Course of Study

Performance (Popular Music) (BM)

Overall

The Bachelor of Music in Popular Music is designed for students interested in pursuing a career in the performance of popular music. This program consists of course work in the major performance area, core music classes, USC’s general education and writing, as well as electives to take advantage of the offerings of the Thornton School and of the entire university.

Entrance Requirements

Admission to Thornton programs is granted through the USC admission process. Applicants are screened by appropriate faculty selection committees. Specific entrance requirements are reviewed on an annual basis and published online at music.usc.edu.

General Education Requirements

The university’s General Education program provides a coherent, integrated introduction to the breadth of knowledge you will need to consider yourself (and to be considered by other people) a generally well-educated person. This program is effective for all students entering USC in fall 2015 or later, or transfer students beginning college elsewhere at that time and subsequently transferring to USC. It requires eight courses in six Core Literacies, plus two courses in Global Perspectives (which may double-count with courses in the Core Literacies) and two courses in writing. In addition, all entering freshmen are expected to complete a General Education Seminar during their first year at USC. These seminars satisfy one of the Core Literacy requirements above.

Note that courses within the major will also satisfy certain Core Literacy requirements. Please work with your major adviser to determine those courses.

Capstone Project

A capstone project must be completed under approved faculty supervision and guidance. The faculty of the department of the student’s major program determines the detailed requirements of the project, including content, length, format and other specifications. In cases in which a performance venue is required in order to present the project, reservations must be made according to the current guidelines of the Music Operations office.

Curriculum Requirements

General Education *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Term Taken</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 150 Writing and Critical Reasoning: Thematic Approaches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Literacies

- GE-A: The Arts (one course)
- GE-B: Humanistic Inquiry (two courses)
- GE-C: Social Analysis (two courses)
- GE-D: Life Sciences (one course)
- GE-E: Physical Sciences (one course)
- GE-F: Quantitative Reasoning (one course)

Global Perspectives

- GE-G: Citizenship in a Global Era (one course)
- GE-H: Traditions and Historical Foundations (one course)

Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Term Taken</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 340 Advanced Writing</td>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lessons, Forum and Performance Class (24 units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Term Taken</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 100 Popular Music Forum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units total of MPPM 300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 120 Popular Music Performance I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units total of MPPM 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 153 Individual Instruction</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units total of MPPM 153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 253 Individual Instruction</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units total of MPPM 253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 320 Popular Music Performance II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 units total of MPPM 320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Music Ensembles (2 units)

Music Ensemble at the 300-level: two 1-unit courses
Program Intensive Courses (20 units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Term Taken</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 240 Drumming Proficiency for the Popular Musician</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 250 Keyboard Proficiency for the Popular Musician</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 325a Arranging in Popular Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 325b Arranging in Popular Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEC 245 Introduction to MIDI Sequencing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTEC 246 Introduction to Audio Recording and Editing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUIN 270 Introduction to the Music Industry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 255 Songwriting I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select one course from the following:

- MTEC 443 Desktop Music Production
- MTEC 446a Computer Assisted Recording and Editing

Core Thornton Academic Courses (30 units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Term Taken</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 350g A History of Popular Music</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJO 131a Harmony in Popular Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJO 131b Harmony in Popular Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJO 132a Aural Skills I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJO 132b Aural Skills I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJO 133a Theory I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJO 133b Theory I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJO 232a Aural Skills II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJO 232b Aural Skills II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUJO 250g Music and Ideas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select one course from the following:

- MUJO 350g Western Art Music History I
- MUJO 351 Western Art Music History II
- MUJO 353g A History of Jazz Music
- MUSC 102gw World Music
- MUSC 115gw Western Music as Sounding History
- MUSC 200gmw The Broadway Musical: Reflections of American Diversity
- MUSC 210gw Electronic Music and Dance Culture
- MUSC 250gmw The Music of Black Americans
- MUSC 320gmw Hip-hop Music and Culture
- MUSC 371g Musical Genre Bending
- MUSC 372g Music, Turmoil and Nationalism
- MUSC 373g Writing About Popular Music
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Term Taken</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 460 Film Music: History and Function from 1930 to the Present</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 465 Music, Television and American Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Electives (22 units)**

**Capstone Projects (2 units)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Term Taken</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gen Ed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 450a Final Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPM 450b Final Project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total required for degree: 132

*With correct planning, only 32 units (6 GE and 2 Writing courses) will be needed outside of your major requirements.

**Drummers will substitute a class in guitar or voice.

***Keyboardists will substitute a class in guitar or voice.

Notes:
**B.M. IN MUSICIANSHIP, ARTISTRY DEVELOPMENT, AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

The MADE major allows the freedom and flexibility for students to focus on their preferred areas of emphasis, with outcomes that lead toward a viable career of their own choosing.

**Educational Objectives**

Upon graduation, students will have:

- a highly competitive skill set in musicianship, artistry, and entrepreneurship, including performing, writing, arranging/orchestration, recording, musical direction, marketing and promotion, copyright management and administration, as well as the ability to write basic agreements and licenses;
- a diverse and applied understanding of the music industry;
- the ability to create and execute a sound business plan, as well as a portfolio/EPK that best showcases their brand identity;
- a minor in Music Business and Entertainment Industry.

**Degree Requirements with a Music Business and Entertainment Industry Minor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 105</td>
<td>English Composition I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 106</td>
<td>English Composition II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 113</td>
<td>Finite Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST_XXXX</td>
<td>STEM Cognate (some approved minors satisfy STEM)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS_XXXX</td>
<td>People &amp; Society Cognate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMX 100</td>
<td>The University Of Miami Experience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 140</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; MMI 107</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship I and Skills Lab I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 141</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; MMI 108</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship II and Skills Lab II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 240</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship III</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; MMI 207</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship III and Skills Lab III: American Song Traditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 241</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship IV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; MMI 208</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship IV and Skills Lab IV: American Song Traditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKP 140</td>
<td>Keyboard Studies I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKP 141</td>
<td>Keyboard Studies II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCV 140</td>
<td>Experiencing Music</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCV 141</td>
<td>Musical Traditions (AWC)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 173</td>
<td>Introduction to the Music Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or MMI 310</td>
<td>Music Business and Entrepreneurship for Musicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 250</td>
<td>Essential Technologies For Musicians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 378</td>
<td>Music Business Agreements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 530</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship for Musicians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 537</td>
<td>Recorded Music Operations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI Elective</td>
<td>Experiential Electives (200 level or higher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 315</td>
<td>Contemporary Songwriting I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 543</td>
<td>Music Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 445</td>
<td>Senior Project/Portfolio (AWC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC 404</td>
<td>Live Performance Musical Direction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG XXX</td>
<td>ENG 200+ or COS 333 (recommended courses</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG XXX</td>
<td>ENG 230 or ENG 331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MXO XXX</td>
<td>Approved Arranging/Orchestration Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MXO XXX</td>
<td>Approved Music Electives (200 level or higher)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experiential credits = 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course in the MADE Major**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMI XX3</td>
<td>Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class Level 3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or (semesters 7-8, 2 credit hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 274</td>
<td>Introduction to Music Copyright Law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI Elective</td>
<td>Experiential Electives (4 semesters, 1 credit hour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 315</td>
<td>Contemporary Songwriting I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 530</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship for Musicians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 537</td>
<td>Recorded Music Operations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total credits for EMC core courses = 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approved Electives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMI 15</td>
<td>Made Forum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI XX1</td>
<td>Principal Instrument Lesson &amp; Studio Class Level 1 (semesters 1-4, 2 credit hours)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI XX3</td>
<td>Principal Instrument Lesson &amp; Studio Class Level 3 (semesters 5-6, 2 credit hours)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Experiential credits = 54**

**Total Credit Hours**

1. EMC core courses require a grade of "C" or higher. Lessons require a grade of "B-" or higher
Advanced Writing and Communication Skills

Courses
All students are required to successfully complete 3 Advanced Writing and Communication Skills (AWC) courses. Student degree requirements will include courses that meet the desired communication outcomes in evaluated and revised writing, speaking, stage presence, and audience engagement.

All music students will successfully complete:

• MCY 141 Musical Trends and Traditions, which will include substantial evaluated and revised writing components.

• MMI 445 Senior Project/Portfolio, this course is the capstone for both the CAM and MADE programs. Students will develop and compile a portfolio of creative works that showcase their individual artistry, including but not limited to recordings, videos, songs, scores, and/or other applicable media elements. Students will also be required to organize a public performance/showcase their works. Requisite: MADE Major or CAM Minor

• ENG 230 Advanced Business Communications, COS 333 Business Communication, or ENG 331 Legal Writing which will include discipline specific communication skills.

Assessment
There will be at least 2 specific assessments in each Advanced Communications Skills course for communications or writing equivalent to 4000 words, evaluated and revised.

Plan of Study with Music Business and Entertainment Industry Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 15</td>
<td>Made Forum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI XX1 Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 140 &amp; MMI 107</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship I and Skills Lab I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCY 140</td>
<td>Experiencing Music</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKP 140</td>
<td>Keyboard Studies I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 105</td>
<td>English Composition I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTH 113</td>
<td>Finite Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM 100</td>
<td>The University Of Miami Experience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 15</td>
<td>Made Forum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI XX1 Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 141 &amp; MMI 108</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship II and Skills Lab II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCY 141</td>
<td>Musical Traditions (AWC)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKP 141</td>
<td>Keyboard Studies II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Year Two |                                            |              |
| Fall     |                                            |              |
| MMI 15   | Made Forum                                 | 0            |
| MMI XX1 Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class | 2            |
| MMI 240 &amp; MMI 207 | Experiential Musicianship III and Skills Lab III: American Song Traditions | 4            |
| Approved Music Elective (200 level or higher) | 3            |
| MMI 173 or 310 | Introduction to the Music Business (required minor) or Music Business and Entrepreneurship for Musicians | 3            |
| STEM Cognate |                                            | 3            |
| Ensemble |                                            | 1            |
| Credit Hours |                                            | 16           |
| Spring   |                                            |              |
| MMI 15   | Made Forum                                 | 0            |
| MMI XX1 Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class | 2            |
| MMI 241 &amp; MMI 208 | Experiential Musicianship IV and Skills Lab IV: American Song Traditions | 4            |
| Approved Music Elective (200 level or higher) | 3            |
| MMI 274 | Introduction to Music Copyright (required minor) | 3            |
| Ensemble |                                            | 1            |
| Credit Hours |                                            | 13           |
| Year Three |                                           |              |
| Fall      |                                            |              |
| MMI 15   | Made Forum                                 | 0            |
| MMI XX3 Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class | 2            |
| Approved Arranging/orchestration Elective | 3            |
| Approved Music Elective (200 level or higher) | 3            |
| Choose one of the following: |                                            | 3            |
| MMI 378 | Music Business Agreements (required minor)  |              |
| MMI 530 | Entrepreneurship for Musicians             |              |
| MMI 537 | Recorded Music Operations                  |              |
| MMI Elective |                                        |              |
| STEM Cognate |                                            | 3            |
| Ensemble |                                            | 1            |
| Ensemble |                                            | 1            |
| Credit Hours |                                            | 16           |
| Spring   |                                            |              |
| MMI 15   | Made Forum                                 | 0            |
| MMI XX3 Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class | 2            |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMI 315</td>
<td>Contemporary Songwriting I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 378</td>
<td>Music Business Agreements (required minor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 530</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship for Musicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 537</td>
<td>Recorded Music Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year Four**

**Fall**

| MMI 15 | Made Forum | 0 |
| MMI XX3 Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson & Studio | 2 |
| ENG XXX | ENG 200+ or COS 333 (recommended courses ENG 230 or ENG 331) | 3 |
| Choose one of the following: | | 3 |
| MMI 378 | Music Business Agreements (required minor) | |
| MMI 530 | Entrepreneurship for Musicians | |
| MMI 537 | Recorded Music Operations | |
| MMI Elective | | 1 |
| Ensemble | | 1 |
| Approved Elective | | 3 |
| STEM Cognate | | 3 |
| Credit Hours | | 15 |

| Spring | | |
| MMI 15 | Made Forum | 0 |
| MMI XX3 Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson & Studio | 2 |
| MTC 404 | Live Performance Musical Direction | 3 |
| MMI 445 | Senior Project/Portfolio/Business Plan (AWC) | 1 |
| MMI 543 | Music Marketing | 3 |
| Approved Elective | | 3 |
| Ensemble | | 1 |
| Credit Hours | | 13 |
| Total Credit Hours | | 120 |

**Musicianship, Artistry Development & Entrepreneurship with Music Business & Entertainment Industry and Creative American Music (CAM) Minors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 15</td>
<td>Made Forum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI XXI Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 140</td>
<td>Experiential Musicianship I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; MMI 107</td>
<td>and Skills Lab I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCY 140</td>
<td>Experiencing Music</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKP 140</td>
<td>Keyboard Studies I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 105</td>
<td>English Composition I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMX 100</td>
<td>The University Of Miami Experience</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year Two**

**Fall**

| MMI 15 | Made Forum | 0 |
| MMI XXI Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson & Studio | 2 |
| MMI 141 | Experiential Musicianship II | 4 |
| & MMI 108 | and Skills Lab II | |
| MCY 141 | Musical Traditions (AWC) | 3 |
| MKP 141 | Keyboard Studies II | 1 |
| ENG 106 | English Composition II | 3 |
| MTH 113 | Finite Mathematics | 3 |
| Ensemble | | 1 |
| Credit Hours | | 17 |

| Spring | | |
| MMI 15 | Made Forum | 0 |
| MMI XXI Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson & Studio | 2 |
| MMI 240 | Experiential Musicianship III | 4 |
| & MMI 207 | and Skills Lab III: American Song Traditions | |
| MMI 250 | Essential Technologies For Musicians | 3 |
| MCY 221 | Anglo-American Song Traditions | 3 |
| MMI 310 or 173 | Music Business and Entrepreneurship for Musicians (required minor) or Introduction to the Music Business | |
| Ensemble | | 1 |
| Credit Hours | | 16 |

| Spring | | |
| MMI 15 | Made Forum | 0 |
| MMI XXI Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson & Studio | 2 |
| MMI 241 | Experiential Musicianship IV | 4 |
| & MMI 208 | and Skills Lab IV: American Song Traditions | |
| MMI 274 | Introduction to Music Copyright Law (required minor) | 3 |
| MCY 222 | African-American Song Traditions | 3 |
| STEM Cognate | | |
| Ensemble | | 1 |
| Credit Hours | | 13 |

<p>| Year Three | | |
| Fall | | |
| MMI 15 | Made Forum | 0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMI XX3</td>
<td>Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 307</td>
<td>Skills Lab V: American Pop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC/MSJ/MMI</td>
<td>Approved Orchestration Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 320</td>
<td>Contemporary Lyric Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCV 311</td>
<td>Modern American Pop Music</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 378</td>
<td>Music Business Agreements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 530</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship for Musicians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 537</td>
<td>Recorded Music Operations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMI 15</td>
<td>Made Forum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI XX3</td>
<td>Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 308</td>
<td>Skills Lab VI: American Pop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 378</td>
<td>Music Business Agreements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 530</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship for Musicians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 537</td>
<td>Recorded Music Operations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Cognate</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Year Four**

**Fall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMI 15</td>
<td>Made Forum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI XX3</td>
<td>Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 543</td>
<td>Music Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG XXX</td>
<td>ENG 200+ or COS 333</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Cognate</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose one of the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 378</td>
<td>Music Business Agreements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 530</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship for Musicians</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 537</td>
<td>Recorded Music Operations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMI 15</td>
<td>Made Forum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI XX3</td>
<td>Principal Instrument/Voice Lesson &amp; Studio Class</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC 404</td>
<td>Live Performance Musical Direction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMI 445</td>
<td>Senior Project/Portfolio/Business Plan (AWC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Elective: 3
Approved Elective: 3
Ensemble: 1
Credit Hours: 13
Total Credit Hours: 117

1 MMI 320 substitutes for MMI 315.
2 MMI 307/MMI 308 will count towards ensemble requirements.
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USC BPM Learning Objectives

University of Southern California
Thornton School of Music
Bachelor of Music in Popular Music Performance
Program Learning Objectives

Popular Music Performance (B.M.)

The Bachelor of Music in Popular Music Performance is a professional degree designed for students wishing to become uniquely qualified musicians of advanced skill who are comfortable in a variety of professional popular music environments and who will successfully compete as leaders and innovators in the global music industry and in a changing music market place. Upon completion of the Bachelor of Music program in Popular Music Performance, students will:

a. demonstrate achievement of professional, entry-level competence in their chosen instrument or voice;
b. demonstrate professional entry-level songwriting, production and ensemble leadership skills;
c. demonstrate an understanding of the musical/industry aspects, traditions and current trends of popular music – particularly American popular music;
d. be able to leverage creativity, artistry, industry knowledge and entrepreneurial skills in the creation of performance careers;
e. demonstrate practical knowledge of music production, arranging, musical direction, music licensing, music administration and teaching;
f. be able to transfer musical skills to non-music related careers;
g. be able to communicate to professionals and lay persons musical ideas, concepts, and requirements related to the practice of their major field through musical, oral, written and visual means;
h. demonstrate an advanced level of musicianship and a broad knowledge of musical elements, structure, repertoires, and contexts;
i. be able to work as a leader and in collaboration in areas of musical interpretation and performance;
j. have an understanding of the societal impact of music and the ethical responsibility of a professional musician;
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UM NASM Unpublished Self-Study Preliminary Report

NASM Self-Study Report

Bachelor of Music in Musicianship, Artistry Development, and Entrepreneurship

By Dr. Carlos Rafael Rivera

Assistant Professor and Program Director

1. Mission Statement

The Bachelor of Music in Musicianship, Artistry Development, and Entrepreneurship (MADE) is a professional degree program designed to provide the highest level of preparation for qualified performers and creatives to thrive in all aspects of the contemporary music industry.

Upon graduation, students will:

● Demonstrate a highly competitive skill set in musicianship, artistry, and entrepreneurship, including performing, writing, arranging/orchestration, recording, musical direction, marketing and promotion, copyright management and administration, as well as the ability to write basic agreements and licenses;

● Demonstrate a diverse and applied understanding of the music industry;

● Demonstrate the ability to create and execute a sound business plan, as well as a portfolio/EPK that best showcases their brand identity.

● Complete a minor in Music Business and Entertainment Industry.

● Demonstrate the ability to transfer musical skills to non-music related careers

● Demonstrate an understanding of the interactions of music within the larger global ecosystem
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Code Manual

A - Accountability : Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Attitude about being accountable - make a plan, execute your plan. Do the thing you say you’re going to do. Refers to things that people are learning in these programs.

A - Background affects : Groups: MA - MOTIVATING ATTITUDE

Attitude about how faculty background affects their teaching. Attitude towards student’s abilities and backgrounds. Refers to how instruction is contextualized and thought of in respect to past and current usage.

A - Challenging : Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Attitude regarding challenges to creating program

A - Collaborative : Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES

Attitude towards working with others. This refers to the attitude of collaboration that is bred and encouraged within these HPME programs. It is noted that most participants include collaboration as an important aspect of their program’s curriculum and pedagogies. Collaboration, while not exclusive to PM, is something found often within PM makers.

A - Communication : Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Attitude about communication between people. Refers not only to the communication between faculty, but also between students and how they learn to be good communicators.

A - Creativity : Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Attitude about being creative.

A - Different Groups: MA - MOTIVATING ATTITUDE

Attitude about pop music being different. This refers to how the participants view PM as being different than other genres – classical and jazz mostly - and that it therefore needs to be taught and learned differently. Students within these programs are not like other traditional music majors.

A - Empathy: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Having concern for others - able to put themselves into others shoes and relate. This refers to the overwhelming mention empathy throughout the participant surveys. Many
participants mention this as an important aspect outside of skills that students develop throughout their tenure within the HPME. This coincides with the collaborate code that would necessitate empathy in order to be most effective

A - Fear: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Fear of something This refers to having fear of something

A - Fearless: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Unafraid of what will happen This refers to the ability to deal with the unknown with grace. An aspect of Fearlessness is required to work in the music world and succeed

A - Flexible: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES

Ability to be flexible and change when necessary This refers to the ability of student graduates and educators to have a flexible attitude when it comes to changing surroundings and musical landscape

A - Frustration: Groups: MA - MOTIVATING ATTITUDE

Frustration at not seeing what they want This refers to participants not seeing what they want within HPME programs or within the HE landscape

A – Fulfilled: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

This refers to being fulfilled as career musicians and artists. This code means that the students and teachers feel valued and able to succeed on their terms

A - Happy: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

People’s attitude as happy in their chosen career path

A – Hope: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Hope for the future This refers to both faculty and students having hope for the future of music as well as the world in which they will operate.

A – Inclusionary: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES

Attitude of including people

A – Inspirational: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Attitude of inspiration Refers to how the pm students have become inspirational leaders in their community

A - MOTIVATING ATTITUDE: Groups: A - ATTITUDES
Attitude about some aspect of the program. This refers to the general overall attitude someone has about the program.

A - Negative Perception to Contemporary Students: Groups: MA - MOTIVATING ATTITUDE

Attitude of negativity Refers to negative attitude by other students and faculty about the Pm program and the students involved in it.

A – Nurturing: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

This refers to the attitude of nurturing that is cited as being a requirement to provide to students along the road during their time in HPME.

A – Perception: Groups: MA - MOTIVATING ATTITUDE

Perceptions about popular music and musicians This refers to what the faculty and students perceive about what they’re doing and how they are doing it.

A – Safe: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

This code refers to the environment and attitude of safety that is created and provided to the students within the HPME Creativity has trouble growing when there is not a safe environment for growth.

A – Stupid: Groups: O - OTHERING.

Perception that pop musicians and music is/are stupid This refers to the attitude that pop music is easy and therefore lesser.

A- Change: Groups: A - ATTITUDES

Attitude that change must occur This refers to the belief that change must occur in order for programs to stay relevant.

A- Doing things they care about: Groups:

MA - MOTIVATING ATTITUDE

This refers to success - and that people feel successful when they are doing things they care about.

A- Mindset: Groups: MA - MOTIVATING ATTITUDE

Refers to attitude of faculty within program.

Au – Attitude: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY

Authenticity relating to attitude of music This refers to a general attitudes regarding
authenticity relating to authentic representation of pop music in HPME

**Au – AUTHENTICITY: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY**

In relation to general term This refers to a general idea of authenticity relating to authentic representation of pop music in HPME

**Au – Environment: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY**

This refers to the authenticity of the environment as closely mirroring that of historical popular music learning being maintained within the HPME program

**Au – Faculty: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY**

Authenticity of faculty experience to world and being a musician This refers to the attitude that faculty have towards how they teach authentically as well as how they are authentic themselves within the world of PM

**Au - Genuine Connection: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY**

Refers to needing a genuine connection (real) to the music - whatever that means

**Au – Link: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY**

This refers to how representing PM authentically means that it needs to be linked to many aspects of musical learning and knowledge

**Au – Name: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY**

Refers to what to call program

**Au - Of Self: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY**

Authenticity of being oneself - true to being This refers to an understanding of how to help students learn how to be authentic to themselves

**Au – Pedagogies: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**

Authenticity relating to pedagogies that reflect studies on how pop musician’s learn

**Au – Philosophy: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY**

Authenticity relating to philosophy of curriculum

**Au - Put in the Time: Groups: AU - AUTHENTICITY**

Needs to be in your bones - digested

**Au – Repertoire: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**
Authenticity relating to repertoire and playing repertoire

**Au – Representation: Groups:** AU – AUTHENTICITY, AU - PEDAGOGIES

Authenticity relating to representing pop music appropriately

**Au – Roles: Groups:** AU - AUTHENTICITY

This refers to how the roles musicians play are authentic representations of PM

**Au – Spirit: Groups:** AU – AUTHENTICITY, AU - PEDAGOGIES

This refers to the term popular music and its definition - that the spirit is what dictates the authenticity of the music

**Au – Standard: Groups:** AU - AUTHENTICITY

Relating to the standards/reertoire

**Au – Style: Groups:** AU – AUTHENTICITY, AU - PEDAGOGIES

Authenticity relating to style

**Au – Training: Groups:** AU - PEDAGOGIES

How one learns affects how authentic you are Ability to be aware and learn in an authentic manner

**C - Action Centered: Groups:** C - CURRICULUM

Curriculum focused on doing of to learn/process/create This is a sub-category of Employability framework

**C - Cultural Value Framework: Groups:** C - CURRICULUM

Curriculum relating to cultural value of learning

**C - Employability Framework: Groups:** C - CURRICULUM

Curriculum relating to organizing with lean towards employability of students after graduation This refers to those participants that describe the overall goal of the program to be helping students achieve the skills and knowledge to get a job after graduation

**C – Flexible: Groups:** C - CURRICULUM

Curriculum that is flexible in its design - ability to change

**C - Goal - Good people: Groups:** C - CURRICULUM
This refers to the goal of educating and aligning the curriculum to help students be good people - that this is the overall goal. Being Centered Cultural Framework

**C - Goal – Prepare: Groups: C - CURRICULUM**

This refers to creating curriculum with the intent of preparing students for what will come after graduation. This is different than simply getting a ‘job’ but rather preparing them to work in multiple situations and places and to be able to walk into many professional spots and feel comfortable - portfolio career creators....additionally, that they have empathy, can connect with others. This would fall under a hybridized framework.

**C - Goal - Shape Marketplace: Groups: C - CURRICULUM**

Refers to the curricular goal of changing the pm landscape.

**C – Holistic: Groups: C - CURRICULUM**

Curriculum encompassing holistic education of student - both skills and person. This would fall under a hybridized curriculum.

**C - New Created: Groups: C - CURRICULUM**

Refers to curriculums that are new - compared with traditional curriculums.

**C- Being Centered: Groups: C - CURRICULUM**

Curriculum relating to engaging human aspect of learning. This would fall under a cultural framework of curriculum.

**C- CURRICULUM: Groups: C - CURRICULUM**

Refers to the way a program is organized - with all aspects - resources, leadership, pedagogies, interactions and frameworks/philosophies affecting its design.

**C- Hybridized Framework: Groups: C - CURRICULUM**

Curriculum relating to melding of any two kinds. This adds employability and cultural together - as well as knowing, acting and being.

**C- Knowledge Centered: Groups: C - CURRICULUM**

Curriculum valuing knowledge above anything else. This refers to the belief that the most important curricular goal is knowledge about a subject area, but about music in general.

**C- Organization: Groups: C - CURRICULUM**

This refers to the general overall organization of the curriculum.

**Ch – Change: Groups: R - RESOURCES**
Challenge of change

**Ch – Financial: Groups: R - RESOURCES**

Financial Challenges

**Ch – Rules: Groups: R - RESOURCES**

Challenge of keeping/changing the rules

**Ch – Size: Groups: R - RESOURCES**

Size challenge

**G - Goal - Change Music Education: Groups: G - GOALS**

Refers to the leaders of the programs goal and vision for the program

**G - Goal - Change Music Landscape: Groups: G - GOALS**

Refers to the leaders of the programs goal and vision form the program

**G – Goals: Groups: G - GOALS**

Refers to general goals

**I – Advocacy: Groups: I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS**

Interaction of advocacy in music

**I - Artistic Citizenship: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS**

Being a citizen and interacting purposefully with the world to change it

**I – Artistry: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS**

Interaction through artistry

**I – Autonomy: Groups: I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS**

Ability to have own sense of awareness

**I – Citizen: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS**

Good citizen of the world

**I – Communication: Groups: I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS**

Interaction relating to communication with others and world
I – Community: Groups: I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS
Community of school

I – Contribution: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS
What students give to world

I - Crossing Boundaries: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS
Crossing boundaries w music

I – Culture: Groups: I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS
Culture affects interactions

I – Diversity: Groups: I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS
Interaction with diverse population

I – Empathy: Groups: I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS
Interaction to have empathy towards others

I – Impact: Groups: I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS
What impact do I have?

I – Important: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS
Interaction is important

I – Innovator: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS
Changing things - new

I – INTERACTION: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS
How we interact with the world

I - Make a Difference: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS
Make a difference

I – Network: Groups: I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS
Networks are needed

I - Purposeful Art: Groups: I - INTERACTIONS
Creating purposeful art

**1- Respect: Groups:** I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS

Need to have respect for each other - reinforces interactions/cultures

**I - Social Awareness: Groups:** I - INTERACTIONS

Ability to have awareness that music has power

**I - Social Capital: Groups:** I - INTERACTIONS

Refers to interactions revolving around social capital

**I - Social Change: Groups:** I - INTERACTIONS

That social change can come from music

**I - Social Justice: Groups:** I - INTERACTIONS

Refers to interactions that involves social justice

**I - Song Expression: Groups:** I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS

How to help students thing about their expression and/in the songs they are creating

**I – Spiritual: Groups:** I - HIDDEN CURRICULUM, I - INTERACTIONS

Refers to interaction of spirituality

**L – Dean: Groups:** R - RESOURCES

Leadership of the dean

**L – Faculty: Groups:** R - RESOURCES

Leadership of the faculty

**L – Leader: Groups:** R - RESOURCES

Leader in general

**L – Structure: Groups:** R - RESOURCES

Leader in structure

**L – Student: Groups:** R - RESOURCES

Student leaders
**L- Mission Statement: Groups:** R - RESOURCES

Leader in mission

**O – Discriminatory: Groups:** O - OTHERING.

Left out of the party

**O - Left Out: Groups:** O - OTHERING.

Refers to popular musicians being left out of HE

**O - No Place for Pop Music: Groups:** O - OTHERING.

Attitude about academia not being the place for pop

**O – OTHERING: Groups:** O - OTHERING.

Positives in response to experiences with othering: Alternative Transforming Changing Countering

**O- Not Accepted: Groups:** O - OTHERING.

Refers to feelings of non-acceptance

**P – Authentic: Groups:** AU - PEDAGOGIES

Pedagogy authentic to PME Bring the real thing into the program/curriculum

**P – Engaging: Groups:** AU - PEDAGOGIES

Pedagogy that is engaging/student centered most likely

**P - Formal Created: Groups:** AU - PEDAGOGIES

Formal pedagogy

**P – Mentoring: Groups:** AU - PEDAGOGIES

Mentoring

**P – New: Groups:** AU - PEDAGOGIES

Developing new pedagogies

**P – Oral: Groups:** AU - PEDAGOGIES

Oral vs. written

**P – PEDAGOGY: Groups:** AU - PEDAGOGIES
Refers to the kinds of pedagogies found within these programs

**P – Philosophy: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**

Philosophy of how they develop pedagogies

**P - Self directed learning: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**

Student centered

**P – Sharing: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**

Sharing/collaborative learning - peer learning

**P – Standard: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**

Developing new standards

**P - Student Centered: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**

Refers to pedagogies that are student-centered in their implementation and design

**P - Teacher Centered: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**

Refers to pedagogies that are teacher centered in their implementation and design

**P –Informal: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**

Refers to pedagogies that are informal in their implementation and design

**P -Peer Learning: Groups: AU - PEDAGOGIES**

Refers to pedagogies that are creating collaborative and peer learning environments in their implementation and design

**R – Equipment: Groups: R - RESOURCES**

Refers to how they deal with equipment needs

**R – External: Groups: R - RESOURCES**

Refers to external resources

**R – Faculty: Groups: R - RESOURCES**

Refers to needs of faculty resources - how they deal with them

**R – Financial: Groups: R - RESOURCES**

Refers to financial needs that affect program operation
R – Infrastructure: Groups: R - RESOURCES
Refers to infrastructure/spaces needs

R – Organization: Groups: R - RESOURCES
Refers to how faculty help with organization

R – RESOURCES: Groups: R - RESOURCES
Refers to resources - faculty, staff, leaders, space, financial

R - Space Created: Groups: R - RESOURCES
Refers to spaces/structures

R - Technology Groups: R - RESOURCES
Refers to tech needs

R – Internal: Groups: R - RESOURCES
Refers to internal needs and resources

S – Accountability: Groups: S - SUCCESS
Success in terms of being accountable for actions

S - All Different Groups: S - SUCCESS
All opinions of success are different

S - Be Ok with failing Groups: S - SUCCESS
Success is being ok with failing

S - Being Prepared: Groups: S - SUCCESS
Success for students is being prepared (preparing students)

S – Career: Groups: S - SUCCESS
What is a successful career?

S – Connection: Groups: S - SUCCESS
Success is being open to collaboration and connection with peers and the music industry

S – Control: Groups: S - SUCCESS
Success related to having control over what happens

S - **Doing what you love: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is found in doing what you love - with passion and purpose

S – **Entrepreneur: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success as entrepreneur

S – **Famous: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is fame

S – **Feedback: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success comes from having honest feedback

S - **Feeling good about where you are: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is about liking where you are

S – **Impact: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is making an impact

S - **Leader Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is the ability to be a leader in the field

S - **Lifelong Career: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success means having a lifelong career making music

S - **Lifelong Learning: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is wanting to continue to make music throughout their life - and to teach students how to learn how to learn

S - **Making Money: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is the ability to make money and provide for oneself

S – **Network: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is the ability to network

S - **Not famous: Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success doesn’t mean you need to be famous - that cannot be the goal - byproduct, but
not goal

**S - Of program:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success of the program - what defines success of and within the program?

**S – Passion:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is passion for something

**S - Passion meets Purpose:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is passion meets purpose

**S - Portfolio Career:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is ability to maintain portfolio career throughout life

**S – Responsibility:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success means strong work ethic and responsibility to self and others

**S – Skills:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is having the skills to get where you want to go - or ability to learn those skills

**S - So good they can't ignore you:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success is being so good they can’t ignore you

**S - Strong work ethic:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success means having a strong work ethic

**S – SUCCESS:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Refers to definitions of success

**S – Sustainable:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Refers to ability to maintain career and music making as viable financial living

**S - Unique Voice:** **Groups:** S - SUCCESS

Success means developing a unique voice

**V - High level musicianship:** **Groups:** V - VALUE

Refers to wanting high levels of musicianship in program
V – Relevant: Groups: V - VALUE

Relevant in relation to value

V - VALUE of HPME: Groups: V - VALUE

Refers to the value of having a HPME

V- Reputation: Groups: V - VALUE

Value in relation to reputation