



Barriers and Affordances for Curricular Change in Music Teacher Education

Jill Wilson, Natalie Steele Royston, & Brian Weidner



Background Literature

Critiques of current curriculum—NAfME Vision 20/20, CMS Manifesto

(Campbell et al, 2016; Confredo et al, 2023; Kimpton, 2005; Sarath et al., 2014; Thornton et al., 2004)

Overemphasis on canon and large ensemble

(Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Barrett, 2005; Miksza, 2013)

Need for including contemporary and creative music practices

(Kratus, 2007; Prendergast & May, 2020; Williams, 2011)

Imbalanced racial and gender representation

(Elpus & Abril, 2019; Lam, 2018)

Methods for reform and innovation of undergraduate curriculum

(Weidner, 2019, in press; Wilson...Royston, 2021)

Research Questions

- 1) What are the philosophical differences between the expectations of performance faculty and music education faculty of what the end goals of music teacher education should be?
- 2) How do these philosophies influence the curricular priorities of performance faculty and music education faculty?

Method



Semi-structured interviews on three college/university campuses

- All music education faculty
- 2 ensemble directors
- 2 studio teachers
- 1 music theory professor
- 1 music history professor



Themes

- Willingness for change
- Protection of one's own territory
- Emphasis on the conservatory
- Lack of understanding of music education

Reform Processes on Your Campus

<https://forms.gle/f4mvQJDfWxjXxbot7>



Perspectives from Three Institutions



BUTLER
UNIVERSITY

LUTHER
COLLEGE

Affordances to Search For

- Desire for quality students
- Shared interests
- Greater relevance
- Changing pedagogies
- Value for versatility
- Personal interests



Barriers to Be Aware Of



- Systemic challenges
- Territorialism
- Prior experiences
- Understanding of music education

Messaging for Non-Music Education Colleagues

- Shared interests
- Current situations in K-12
- Potential overlaps
- Situated needs



References

