

New England Conservatory
The Music-in-Education
National Consortium Dissemination Project

2008-2010 Final Project Report

U.S. Department of Education FIPSE Grant (P1168070245)

Submitted by

Larry Scripp, Ed.D., Director of the Center for Music-in-Education,

FIPSE Project Director and Principal Investigator

With contributions from

Randy Wong, Ed.M., Project Coordinator and Digital Portfolio Systems

Patrick Keppel, M.A., Publication and School Report Coordinator

December 24, 2010

The Music-in-Education National Consortium Dissemination Project Narrative Report

(a) Introductory Overview

As of September 30, 2010, New England Conservatory's Research Center has completed the final phase of the three-year Music-in-Education National Consortium Dissemination Project.

The main purpose of the MIENC Dissemination Project was [a] to create a national model for music education reform primarily administered by researchers and educators at a leading institution of higher education (New England Conservatory) and a leading arts learning organization (Metropolitan Opera Guild) and [b] to establish rigorous action research-based standards for its dissemination in 15 Learning Laboratory School Network (LLSN) sites in eleven states.

The first phase [2007-2008] resulted in the creation of Music PLUS Music Integration curricular and assessment frameworks¹, Music-in-Education Digital Portfolio Systems², the formation of a national Guided Practice Consultant Team (MIENC consultants plus NEC staff), seminars and training for local site Guided Practice Consultant teams³, and a two-week Music Leadership Institute at the University of Maryland⁴ that prepared MIENC site leadership to go forward with project dissemination in the final two years of the project (2009-2010).

The NEC Research Center staff, in partnership with MIENC site leadership, created and supervised implementation standards for program dissemination. The dissemination process was supported primarily by the creation of collaborative Music Learning Leadership teams at each MIENC site in the final two years of the project. After consultation with our FIPSE program officer, it was agreed that Music Learning Leadership teams in each dissemination site would apply for pre-approved funding and NEC staff support time for their site-based action research based dissemination proposals. Once Music Learning Leadership applications were approved by NEC staff and the MIENC Executive committee, each site proceeded with their dissemination plan for that year. Funding for each local pre-approved dissemination plan was provided only after each site submitted school digital portfolio documentation of project work, provided an annual narrative report, and, when applicable, submitted a case study research report that detailed the impact of the dissemination process. All submissions were guided and approved by the NEC staff and MIENC senior leadership.

The MIENC laboratory school site dissemination processes – as documented through the completion of each site's Music Learning Leadership projects over the past two years – provide a national model for the dissemination of innovative certification and policy standards that support expanded responsibilities of Music-in-Education teams in schools and led to positive results in Music PLUS Music Integration teacher professional development and student learning. This dissemination model is based on the development of team leadership skills that music educators and their collaborators need in order to create, sustain and disseminate Music-in-Education curricular reform to local partnerships among arts organizations, institutions of higher education, and public schools. By developing new methods for strengthening MIENC laboratory school centers and by initiating innovative Music Learning Leadership and Guided Practices Consultant programs (both local and national) developed in this project, the MIENC was able to document each site's efforts to meet the stated objectives of the project:

¹ http://musiclearningleadership.com/book/orientation_frameworks/7-MplusMI_Definition.pdf

² <http://music-in-education.org/digital-portfolios/featured-digital-portfolios/>

³ <http://musiclearningleadership.com/book/chapter6/>

⁴ http://musiclearningleadership.com/book/wp-content/uploads/2008/07/ml_l_agenda_72008.pdf

Objective 1: To incorporate the Artist-Teacher-Scholar-Action Researcher framework into Music-in-Education professional development and guided internship programs.

Objective 2: To expand the focus of music in schools to include a comprehensive Music PLUS Music Integration program model that supports children and youth engaged in a wide range of musical arts learning experiences that are integrated into the schools' curriculum.

Objective 3: To develop further synergistic relationships among public schools, arts organizations, higher education institutions, and school reform groups to support music's role as an agent of change in school practices, applied research, and education policy.

A final conference designed to summarize and celebrate the final online publications and other results of the project was held in New York City at the Metropolitan Opera Guild in September 2010.

Larry Scripp, Ed.D. Project Director and Principal Investigator
31 Matchett St., Brighton, MA 02135
(617-905-7366)

Titles of Project Reports and Products:

Project Evaluators Report (David Reider)

Journal for Music-in-Education (Scripp, L., Keppel, P., & Wong, R.)⁵

MIENC Web Sourcebook⁶

(b) The Problem of Scale-Out Dissemination

For the past three years, NEC staff and MIENC leadership focused on our action research guiding question: How can innovative Music-in-Education National Consortium team training programs, curriculum and assessment practices be advanced in the context of new standards for public school reform and accountability in elementary schools within and across school districts?

As outlined in the project proposal, the problem of project dissemination is framed by the following *assumptions* of partnering organizations that have joined the Music-in-Education laboratory school network:

- Schools and school districts in this era of education accountability want research-based approaches to reforming music teaching and learning to ensure that music can improve school performance.
- Schools and school districts will invest in music-in-education strategies if evidence of their effectiveness leads to increased student arts & academic achievement and social-emotional development.
- Universities desire opportunities to provide ground-level, relevant internship and/or apprentice programs for their students.
- Arts organizations desire research-based, innovative approaches to serving their constituents both programmatically and in terms of standards-based learning outcomes in the arts.

⁵ <http://journal.music-in-education.org>

⁶ <http://musiclearningleadership.com/book>

Although MIENC school, arts organization & school district leaders believed they would benefit from Music PLUS Music Integration programs, whose purpose is to improve school performance in arts, academic, social development, and create a more positive school culture, the Consortium members were concerned at first that they did not have adequate models for pre-professional and professional training to support program implementation.

According to MIENC site leaders, the dissemination of effective Music-in-Education practices among all the school partners depended on meeting the following pre-conditions for success:

- Find MIENC partner organizations and local schools that will work together to support the future expansion of innovative, accountable and sustainable music-in-education programs in schools beyond the scope of this project.
- Make sure that school districts, arts organizations, and college-conservatories partnerships are willing to invest and/or take on cost-sharing responsibilities for music in education research-based program dissemination, which includes planning time, documentation, data collection, evaluation and embedded research.
- Ensure that schools are willing to invest in teacher training policies and practices that support collaborative, team-based pre-professional or on-site professional training methods designed to foster whole school transformation through comprehensive Music-in-Education teaching and assessment practices.
- Make sure that the school professional learning culture accepts that the rigorous documentation assessment of action research-based implementation of Music PLUS Music Integration practices will be necessary to ensure that the programs improve teaching and benefit every child musically, academically, and social-emotionally.

After these preconditions had been met, then each site was challenged to engage in the following four principal strategies for dissemination to ensure that optimal conditions for program development and sustainability were embedded throughout this project:

- Create a Local Music-in-Education Music Learning Leadership Team that is committed to providing high-quality music-in-education professional development for interns, music teachers, teaching artists and collaborating teachers focused on action research-based music plus music-integrated curriculum development, teaching, documentation, and assessment, guided by experienced teachers, researchers and other experts in the field. As cited previously, Music Learning Leadership initiatives are guided by action research proposals that specify pre-approved funding for local and national leadership to supervise program development in compliance with the parameters of the FIPSE project.
- Engage national and train local Guided Practice Consultant Teams to provide mentoring relationships with experienced teachers, novice teachers, administrators, and guided interns in schools, as they conduct project documentation and create reports, digital portfolios and research reports.
- Develop MIE Guided Intern Programs to provide additional support action research-based, comprehensive Music PLUS Music Integration practices & research in each MIENC laboratory school site.
- Use MIENC interstitial support systems to inform, document and evaluate progress throughout the project, such as [a] facilitated conference calling, [b] participation in local and national conference, professional development institutes & seminars, [c] a continually updated school site digital portfolio, [c] web-based resources as support materials for dissemination.

According to MIENC members, the problem of dissemination of an education model within or across school districts is similar to the problem of sustaining and expanding participation within schools. That

is, the purpose of Music-in-Education programs must be clear, the methods for dissemination systemic, the process empowering to teachers, and the impact beneficial for all children and the school culture. Through the expansion of the Consortium's work in this project, educators, researchers, and arts administrators committed themselves to scale out dissemination practices based on the belief that innovative music education practices should take root in the context of whole school improvement. These practices include establishing rigorous standards for curriculum integration, professional learning based on practitioner research, research and evaluation that can provide reliable and relevant evidence for learning outcomes related to music and music-integrated learning, and enacting authentic, comprehensive and standards-based music and arts learning objectives that further the cognitive, neurological, aesthetic, and social-emotional development for all children.

(c) Background and Origins of the Project

The completion of the MIENC Dissemination Project represents the culmination of a series of institutional Music-in-Education initiatives at New England Conservatory (NEC) since 1998. The “enduring question” that guided all manner of music education reform practices in all of these projects has been to ask, *What is the essential role of music and musicians in 21st Century education?*

Prior to the Music-in-Education National Consortium Dissemination Project reported here, NEC had directed music education reform initiatives over the past nine years seeking to answer variants of the “enduring question.” Below is a brief description of the three phases of these initiatives that served as a *background and origin* for resources, materials, methods, and tools eventually used as strategies for scale dissemination projects, including the most recent project reported here.

Phase 1 Initiative: From 1998-2000, NEC initiated its *Music Education Curriculum Reform Project* in order to test the efficacy of the Artist-Teacher-Scholar (ATS) framework as the basis for transforming music education at the New England Conservatory (NEC).⁷ In the pre-professional curriculum and training reform phase of initiatives, the stated problem was that music education was not being offered to performance majors in leading schools of music for either the benefit of school music education programs nor for the benefit of the well-rounded music major who can develop both as a top echelon musician and effective contributor to music education in schools.

The principal objective of this initiative was to offer NEC performance majors courses and related educational opportunities, including guided internships, that emphasized the overlapping skills required of today's performers and teachers. The chief accomplishments of this initiative were (a) the creation of a new Music-in-Education (MIE) concentration and guided internship program and (b) the creation, staffing, and activities of NEC's Research Center for Learning Through Music (RCTLM), responsible for documenting and assessing the impact of authentic, comprehensive, music and music-integrated programs to public schools in the Boston area. Among the immediate benefits of these initiatives seen at NEC were: [1] a six-fold increase in students taking music education courses; [2] the development of portfolio-based assessment for students in Music-in-Education certificate programs, [3] a substantial increase in students who have engaged in guided internships in the community; and [4] strengthened partnerships between NEC and local public schools and arts organizations.⁸ Following the lead of the NEC, now

⁷ Scripp, L. and Fletcher, A. (1998). *The Artist/Teacher/Scholar Framework: A New Model for Institution-Wide Music Education Curriculum Reform at New England Conservatory.*

⁸ See *The NEC Journal for Learning Through Music I (2000)* in the Appendix or at music-in-education.org for a description of the work of NEC faculty and their guided interns in the context of authentic, comprehensive, and interdisciplinary music plus

virtually every school of music is training performance majors to support school outreach projects, though few have matched the sophistication or standard of internal curriculum reform and assessment that NEC has sustained in its program over the past 12 years [1997-2000] funded by FIPSE and SURDNA Foundation, GE Fund; Spencer Foundation; Walton Foundation, see results of the project published in the JLTM 2000]⁹.

Phase 2: From 2001-2004, the *Music-in-Education National Consortium (MIENC) Dissemination Project* was created as a means for testing the efficacy of the ATS framework at four institutions of higher education and their arts organization partners. Results from this project, coordinated by Research Center at NEC and guided by the newly formed Music-in-Education National Consortium, demonstrated the positive effect of Music-in-Education programs on pre-professional training of performance majors as developing ‘artist-teacher-scholars’ and the positive effect of MIE guided interns on laboratory school programs¹⁰.

Georgia State University and the Atlanta Symphony created MIE programs as a way to attract performance majors into the music education program and, at the same time, to broaden the curriculum for traditionally trained music education majors to include music-integrated curricula in collaboration with academic teachers in their partnership schools¹¹.

In Chicago, *Northwestern University* students from both the Schools of Education and Music worked with the Chicago Arts Partnerships in Education (CAPE) through guided internship programs to provide music residencies and music-integrated curricula in Chicago public schools¹²
13

In Boston, *New England Conservatory’s* MIE program was expanded to include courses and internships in community collaborations¹⁴, residencies, and digital music-making at community centers and in Boston Public Schools through a partnership with the Boston Symphony Orchestra.

And in New York, the *Mannes School of Music* and the Metropolitan Opera Guild used this framework to create a new MIE program that provided vocal majors with guided internships in NYC public schools. Moreover, the work of the Consortium merited additional funding from the National Endowment for the Arts, which supported publications,¹⁵ professional development exchanges across the consortium sites, and three conferences that, taken together, represented an

music integration programs in Boston area elementary schools guided by the newly formed Research Center for Learning Through Music.

⁹ Scripp, Larry. “Mental Stretching in Action: Research and Program Development at the Conservatory Lab Charter School.” *Journal for Learning Through Music*. Boston: New England Conservatory, 2000. <http://music-in-education.org/articles/1-Q.pdf>

¹⁰ Scripp, L., Keppel, P., and Wong, R. (2007). “From Mentorship to Empowerment: Guided Internships as Entry Points to Music-in-Education.” In *Journal for Music-in-Education*. http://journal.music-in-education.org/pdfs/JMIE2007_PartTwo_Full.pdf

¹¹ Myers, D. (2007). “Evolution and Collaboration: A New Paradigm for Teacher Preparation.” In Scripp, Keppel, and Wong, Eds. *Journal for Music-in-Education*. http://journal.music-in-education.org/pdfs/JMIE2007_Myers_article.pdf

¹² Burnaford, G. (2007). “Mentoring and Being Mentored: Guided Internships and Arts Partnerships.” In Scripp, Keppel, and Wong, Eds. *Journal for Music-i-Education*. http://journal.music-in-education.org/pdfs/JMIE2007_Burnaford_article.pdf

¹³ Burnaford, G. (2007). “Higher Education Partnerships in Arts-in-Education: What We’ve Learned So Far in the MIENC.” In Scripp, Keppel, and Wong, Eds. *Journal for Music-in-Education*. http://journal.music-in-education.org/pdfs/JMIE2007_Chicago-Burnaford_sidebar.pdf

¹⁴ Scripp, L. (2007). “Taking a Personal Approach: When Music Performance Majors Prepare to Teach.” In Scripp, Keppel, and Wong, Eds. *Journal for Music-in-Education*. http://journal.music-in-education.org/pdfs/JMIE2007_Scripp_Boston-intern.pdf

¹⁵ See *The NEC Journal for Learning Through Music II (2003)* in the Appendix or at music-in-education.org for a description of the creation of the Music-in-Education National Consortium and its research and program development in five cities.

initial step toward enacting much needed nationwide reform in music education in public school partnership-driven programs [2000-2004; funded by FIPSE, National Endowment for the Arts, see results published in JLTM 2003 and the JMIE 2007]^{16,17}.

Phase 3: From 2004-2007 NEC's Research Center and the Music-in-Education National Consortium coordinated the *MIENC Learning Laboratory School Network (LLSN) Project* in order to focus on evaluating the impact of music-in-education reform in the context of schools that chose to adapt comprehensive 'music *plus* music integration' teaching and learning programs as an avenue for the improvement of overall school quality.

The MIENC created its *Learning Laboratory School Network (LLSN)* as a coalition of 15 school reform partnerships with higher education and arts organizations in eight states united by ten principles of school reform through music,¹⁸ and shared key strategies for music-in-education program development among the 15 schools.¹⁹ The components of this work include:

- [1] digital portfolio assessment systems and website/blog support (mieatnec.org) for MIE students in pre-service and guided internship programs at all MIENC sites²⁰;
- [2] digital portfolio assessment systems for documenting and evaluating the impact of LLSN school music-in-education programs²¹;
- [3] professional development exchange program designed to share innovative curricula and assessment practices across MIENC sites;
- [4] a central MIENC communications website (music-in-education.org) where faculty, college students, administrators, and researchers from higher education, arts organizations, and partnering laboratory schools can share work, data collection, and publications relevant to LLSN activities²²; and
- [5] MIENC "working conferences" convened for LLSN participants to share successful practices and to plan collaborative projects across cities.

In the final year of this project, NEC created a Center for Music-in-Education as an umbrella organization for coordinating its FIPSE supported initiatives that include the MIE Academic and Guided Internship Program, its Research Center, and the Journal for Music-in-Education²³, all poised to support the MIENC and its LLSN Scale-Out Initiatives in the MIENC Dissemination Project from 2007-2010.

¹⁶ Burnaford, G. and Hickey, M. (2007). "Preparing Artist-Teacher-Scholars for Arts Partnerships: Implications for Universities." In Scripp, Keppel, and Wong, Eds., *Journal for Music-in-Education*. http://journal.music-in-education.org/pdfs/JMIE2007_Burnaford-Hickey_article.pdf

¹⁷ Burnaford, G. (2003). "Crossing Boundaries: The Role of Higher Education in Professional Development with Arts Partnerships." In Scripp, L. and Keppel, P., Eds. *Journal for Learning Through Music*. <http://music-in-education.org/articles/2-S.pdf>

¹⁸ See *Ten Principles of the MIENC* in Scripp, 2007, *Journal for Music-in-Education*. [music-in-education.org].

¹⁹ See *Journal for Music-in-Education* (2007) sample articles outlining results of guided internship programs, school reform strategies through music, digital portfolio systems, and statistical results from prototype Learning Laboratory school programs in Boston and Minneapolis.

²⁰ See <http://portfolios.mieatnec.org/digital> for examples of pre-service and guided internship program digital portfolios; also visit <http://mieatnec.org/blog> for examples of NewsBlog posts

²¹ <http://music-in-education.org/digital-portfolios/featured-digital-portfolios>

²² MIENC main website: <http://music-in-education.org>

²³ Journal for Music-in-Education website: <http://journal.music-in-education.org>

Evaluation from the LLSN project focused the growing capacity of schools [a] to become centers of implementation, inquiry, documentation, evidence, and reflection that share best practices and research-based outcome data demonstrating the value and sustainability of music-in-education programs in public schools and [b] to translate their action research processes into positive changes in program outcomes. Ratings criteria for program evaluation outcomes were based on site observations, survey data, and digital portfolio presentations that provided evidence of growth according to eight types of MIE program outcomes²⁴: [1] pre-professional training, [2] curriculum design, [3] teaching and teaching for transfer practices, [4] documentation of student work, [5] assessment of student work, [6] teacher professional development outcomes, [7] organizational advancement, and [8] dissemination of practices to partner organizations. This project provided documentation and analysis of exemplary case study laboratory site partnership practices in 15 locations in eight states [2004-2007; FIPSE, National Endowment for the Arts; Alan Dworsky Family Foundation, see published results in JMIE 2007].

Taken together, the continuity of past initiatives provided background and principal assets to bear on the *MIENC Dissemination Project* (phase 4 initiative) from 2007 to 2010. That is, the principle strategies for scale-out dissemination in the *MIENC Dissemination Project* drew explicitly on the tools and materials developed in the previous three phases of NEC initiatives.

In addition to importing specific program frameworks developed in previous projects – such as the Artist-Teacher-Scholar Framework for pre-professional training or the Music PLUS Music Integration Frameworks for school curriculum reform – the MIENC used the most recent dissemination project to distill specific strategies for dissemination from its long experience of building consortium-based laboratory school networks²⁵.

By the time the MIENC Dissemination Project was proposed, the MIENC, guided by the principles and work of the NEC Research Center, had become a progressive, collaborative group of organizations and people dedicated to reframing the role of music in education through action research program development processes. While membership of schools changed over these years, the MIENC leadership council became a stable entity that continued to advise on the progress and scope of the MIENC projects both in terms of project results and proposals. Members of the leadership council served in the current grant as national Guided Practice Consultants, who in turn developed local Guided Practice Consultant Teams to guide the implementation of site-based Music Learning Leadership programs, a process that is now known to be a crucial factor in successful MIENC Dissemination sites.

As a result of building on the origins and background work of over the past nine years of initiatives at NEC cited above, the leadership of the consortium entered the final MIENC Dissemination Project each having developed and maintained local networks of schools, universities, and arts organizations to pilot the expansion of innovative approaches to music and music-integrated learning in education. Published case studies, materials, and exemplary curriculum and assessment practices served as a valuable resource for the dissemination MIENC practices and as a source of inspiration for schools that had come to believe in the essential role of music in education as a strategy for optimizing the capacity of all children to learn through the intensive study of music and its integration across the elementary school curriculum.

²⁴ Scripp, 2007, *Managing Complexity in Consortium School Research* in Journal for Music-in-Education. [music-in-education.org]

²⁵ Key foundational frameworks can be downloaded from: http://mienc.org/docs/MIENC_Key_Foundational_Frameworks.zip

(d) Current Project Description

The Music-in-Education National Consortium (MIENC), led by New England Conservatory's Center for Music-in-Education in Boston, Massachusetts and the Metropolitan Opera Guild in New York City, has completed its expansion of its music education reform efforts by broadening its Learning Laboratory School Network (LLSN), initiated in 2005 through the support of a previous FIPSE grant, to develop "scale-out dissemination" of these practices at the district and cross-district level.

The MIENC scale-out project has been guided primarily by representatives in the field of music and education in two institutions of higher education: the New England Conservatory and the University of Minnesota; by five partnering arts learning organizations: New York City's Metropolitan Opera Guild, the Music Center of Los Angeles, San Francisco's Music in Schools Today, Atlanta's ArtsNOW, and the Minneapolis' Learning Through Music Consulting Group; and by 15 Learning Laboratory Schools in eleven states.

This project has addressed the need for music education reform principally through the implementation of the following innovative approaches to team-based professional development: 1) developing local networks of musicians, music teachers, and their classroom teacher collaborators who are trained to serve as change agents in public schools through in-service action research-based MIENC Music Learning Leadership Programs; 2) teaching pre-professional music majors as 'artist-teacher-scholars' to document and assess diverse forms of music and music-integrated learning in schools through the MIENC Guided Internship Programs; and 3) providing professional mentors for teachers and teaching artist partners, professional development exchange conferences, digital portfolio systems, and guided research methods and publications through the establishment and coordination of local and national MIENC Guided Practices Consultants.

MIENC has applied these strategies for music education reform in a growing network of school districts in Chicago, IL; Hastings, NE; Fresno, CA and Atlanta, GA. The inaugural Music Learning Leadership Institute took place in July 2008 at the University of Maryland, and initiated the first stages of a certificate-based, two-year program that has yielded the development of MIENC-approved, research-based Music Learning Leadership dissemination projects based on the establishment of MIENC digital portfolio documentation methods, school partnership research and program evaluation reports that together provide evidence of the effectiveness of music education reform as a tool for sustainable school improvement in Music Plus Music integrated teaching and learning.

As the NEC Center for Music-in-Education staff and MIENC leadership collaborated in the expansion of the Learning Laboratory School Network's program development and dissemination efforts over the past three years, we have determined that those consortium sites most committed to action research-based adaptation of MIENC frameworks and practices through their Music Learning Leadership initiatives were also more likely to produce significant evidence of positive teacher transformation and student achievement linked with inter-related aspects of academic performance, arts learning, and social-emotional development. Based on the results of these dissemination efforts, four new AEMDD grants have been awarded to MIENC partnership sites over the past two years that will enable schools to expand and deepen further their research-based practices beyond the scope of this FIPSE dissemination grant during the next four years.

(e) Project Evaluation and Results

Project evaluation for the MIENC Dissemination Project is provided through three sources, all posted in the appendix:

(1) The Program Evaluator's Final Report for the MIENC Dissemination Project, submitted by David Reider as an outside evaluator, details results and findings from the examination of project event data, surveys and observations, and provides a summative analysis of site documentation, including several case study research reports [see Appendix 0].

(2) A Summary of MIENC Learning Laboratory School Projects by Patrick Keppel, NEC FIPSE project staff, provides a narrative analysis of school transformation throughout the MIENC dissemination process as reported by MIENC Music Learning Leadership team members in each school site. [See Appendix 2]

(3) Randy Wong, NEC FIPSE project staff, has assembled a full sample of MIENC Learning Laboratory School Digital portfolios that demonstrate the scope of documentation generated through the Music Learning Leadership action research proposals submitted by each active site. [See Appendices 3 and 5].

The following section of the narrative report will provide summaries of the operational development of the project and, drawing on results from the above-mentioned documents, a discussion of project results from the viewpoint of the project director.

Evaluation of Project Objectives

Because this dissemination project relied on running a national consortium of school partnerships with arts organizations and institutions of higher education, the path toward meeting project goals was complex, time-consuming, yet remarkably cost-effective. Budgets were mostly spent on staff supervision, the development and deployment of guided practice consultants, support for teacher leadership teams' documentation, and evaluation and research projects, and virtually no budget was directed to program costs, materials or supplies. Since each site's cost sharing supported planning time, teacher salaried time on project focus, and school materials and supplies, it was possible to see whole school transformation in music and music integration practices for \$3,500 to \$10,000 per site, per year.

Changes in the proportion of the school partners' budget expenditures reflected the formulation of cost-effective and substantive strategies that resulted in (a) administrative staff and other MIENC leadership serving also as principal national consultants (thereby saving on consulting fees and allowing for more travel to local sites and conferences) and (b) the training and development of local MIENC team leaders as Guided Practice Consultants who were paid to perform training, documentation, testing, and data collection tasks specific to this project. Changes in the allocation of funds were based entirely on the formulation and approval of Music Leadership Proposals throughout the final two years of the project, as forecasted to our FIPSE program officer in December of 2008 and as documented throughout the remaining years of the project.

Thus, the principal responsibility of the NEC staff was to supervise the development of new methods for strengthening and expanding existing laboratory school practices and by initiating new leadership and guided practice mentorship programs (both local and national) to support the process of program dissemination throughout the consortium, particularly with respect to guidance and expertise in documentation, data collection, curriculum design, digital technologies, research design, data collection and analysis.

The project goals required that the staff document each site's efforts to meet the stated objectives of the project, and key to this entire project's progress were the following five key professional learning and participation events, four key final products delivered by each site, and three key overall processes necessary to implement MIENC Dissemination strategies.

Five Key MIENC Dissemination Project Events:

- 1) *Ongoing participation in regular conference calls, meetings:* The planning, facilitating, participation, analysis and reporting of ongoing consortium national plenary conference calls (averaging two calls a month over three years), site specific conference calls (averaging four per month), special topic call (averaging one per month), executive leadership and/or staff calls and meetings (averaging three per week). These calls and meetings were opportunities for policy discussion, sharing of practices, and explication of processes and resources necessary for consortial project development.
- 2) *Attendance in MIENC national seminars:* In the first year, the focus of communications was primarily on the planning for and execution of five two-day *MIE program development seminars* at locations across the consortium. These seminars resulted in a vetted compendium of working documents called the *Fundamental MIENC Frameworks*. Once these documents were sufficiently refined, a common understanding of standards for program development, action research processes, Music PLUS Music Integration curriculum, digital portfolio system documentation, and music literacy skills assessments, among others, served as models to be adapted across the consortium according to the diverse contexts of each local site. This process naturally required constant editing, posting of drafts, and spirited discussion of standards for music education reform practices.
- 3) *Participation in local Music Learning Leadership programs:* A week-long initial professional development program at the University of Maryland launched the *Music Learning Leadership (MLL) Certification* program. Preparing and administering this program on the heels of the seminars proved essential for establishing standards for all sites' good standing in the project and the basis for research hypotheses that would be eventually investigated in elementary school environments. Though this certification program did not become a formal association, it nonetheless established standards for action research-based dissemination processes that consortium members, new and old, all determined were essential to the process of successful scale-out dissemination within or across school districts. Most importantly, the Music Learning Leadership proposals became the principal catalyst for building team leadership and spelling out the responsibilities for national and local *Guided Practices Consultants* and NEC staff support during the course of the projects. The MLL proposals became, in effect, virtually binding contracts for all work obligations and deliverables of all those funded directly by the FIPSE dissemination project.
- 4) *Formulation and approval of Music Learning Leadership action research site proposals:* As a result of attending an orientation session for the Music Learning Leadership certificate process, the follow-up formulation, approval, and evaluation of Music Learning Leadership (MLL) proposals in the first and second year of the project allowed for contracting pre-approved funding for these projects pending the submission of LLSN site digital portfolios, school report narratives, and research studies. [Samples of said proposals can be seen in Appendix 3]. The MLL proposals were subject to a rigorous approval process by the Executive Committee of the MIENC, and for those sites that were not able to complete their proposals, no funding was awarded. As evidence of stringent quality control measures, approximately 20% of MLL proposals were either abandoned due to the lack of capacity to carry out the proposal or the inability to file a final report or digital portfolio submission.

- 5) *Two annual MIENC retreat/conferences were hosted by the Metropolitan Opera Guild in New York City.* In October 2009, a retreat was held to clarify the goals and standards for Music Learning project reports, school narratives, and digital portfolio sessions and the organizational structure and membership criteria for the MIENC as an independent organization participating in the project. In September 2010, the Guild hosted a final conference for old and new members of the MIENC interested in sustaining the work of the dissemination grants, particularly with regard to research studies already funded through the federal AEMDD projects to continue local dissemination of consortium practices in continuing partnership with the MIENC.

MIENC site participation in the five key events led to responsibility for each site to produce *Four Key MIENC Dissemination Project Products*:

- 1) *The Annual Submission of MIENC School Digital Portfolios* based on documentation of work resulting from Music Learning Leadership proposals in the final two years of the project and in compliance with MIENC Digital Portfolio Guidelines [see sample in Appendix 4]. The digital portfolio system was facilitated successfully by NEC staff to the extent that all MIENC dissemination sites were able to provide documentation of their work as part of their obligations for the FIPSE project. The school digital portfolios served both as a tool for site dissemination of practices, but also as inspiration for new members of the MIENC project. The portfolios were cited in many school reports as a major influence on startup dissemination projects by the final year of the project.
- 2) *Annual MIENC School Narrative Report* submissions based on *Music Learning Leadership proposals* in the final two years of the project were principally used to summarize project documentation contained in the digital portfolios and to provide context for LLSN site action research processes and experimental research findings. Qualitative aspects of program development processes and outcomes were most often submitted by the leading Guided Practice Consultants in the MLL teams, and in some cases, the majority of local site funding (\$5,000 per year) was spent on compensating these local consultants for their roles as facilitators, mentors and documentation specialists throughout the dissemination process [see sample in Appendix 3].
- 3) *MIENC School Research Report* submissions based on Music Learning Leadership proposals in the final two years of the project depended on the capacity of local sites to employ research methods as they evaluated the progress of their Music Learning Leadership dissemination projects. [For those sites who were able to administer MIENC test instruments (Los Angeles, Atlanta, New York, Minneapolis, Oakland) and/or create their own data collection methods (Tucson, Chicago, El Dorado, Oakland, Los Angeles, Boston), research reports ranged from discussing pilot studies to the first stages of full-fledged pre-post studies. [Report summaries and URLs are in Appendix 2].
- 4) *“What We Have Learned” Final Reflections* from LLSN Site Directors on the FIPSE Dissemination project outcomes were collected from each site, analyzed and discussed during the final conference in New York. These documents provided data for our outside program evaluator to analyze the relative levels of effectiveness of dissemination processes and to look at varied profiles of evidence for dissemination that did or did not take place on a site-by-site basis. [See Appendix 5]

Discussion of Three Key Dissemination Process Objectives:

The final reflection data were particularly useful for evaluating the effectiveness of three principal process objectives for scale-out dissemination. Drawing the program evaluation report data displays (pp 52-54), we see that the grant succeeded in engaging all three of the objectives listed below, and that the process continues to gain presence depending on the maturity and commitment of the LLSN site.

Objective 1: To incorporate the Artist-Teacher-Scholar-Action framework into both Music-in-Education professional development and guided internship programs.

The Artist-Teacher-Scholar program in the Consortium initially focused on pre-professional training and guided internships for music majors. In the dissemination project this framework extended to the expanded persona of the Artist-Teacher-Scholar-*Researcher* for interns, music teachers and classroom teachers. As the dissemination project progressed, professional development sessions focused increasingly on documentation and collaborative practices, the project participants drew on the ATS framework as a model for role in consortium dissemination practices and their professional stature in their institution. According to project members, the highest level of incorporation occurred in taking on the role of Guided Practice Consultant, a role in the project deemed crucial to the success of Music Learning Leadership site action plans. In the program evaluator's report, David Reider concludes that the project development shifted from a model of participation in professional development exchange to a model of collaborative engagement as Artist-Teacher-Scholar-Guided Practice Consultants at virtually every level of MIENC dissemination processes.

Objective 2: To expand the focus of music in schools to include a comprehensive Music PLUS Music Integration program model that supports children and youth engaged in a wide range of musical arts learning experiences that are integrated into the school curriculum.

Prior to this project, the Music PLUS Music Integration (M+MI) concept functioned primarily as a model for curriculum design and assessment. In the MIENC dissemination project, M+MI became a tool for at least ten categories of school transformation and principally including (a) extent of musical knowledge attained by students in MIE classrooms, (b) extent of social-emotional changes attained by students in MIE classrooms, (c) extent of awareness and support of project by building principal or lead administrator and (d) extent of change in the role of research in the classroom. Music PLUS Music Integration is no longer just a particular teaching approach in MIENC schools. As the survey data show, M+MI programs serve as a medium for changing the nature of musical knowledge and social-emotional skill and understanding of children (ibid., pp 54-56). Since the case study reports demonstrate evidence that Music PLUS Music Integration practices melded with creative processes and social-personal learning goals predict a broader array of learning outcomes than do conventional music programs, Music PLUS Music Integration frameworks take on the role of "optimizing the capacity and range of student learning" in and through music, a principle essential to the MIENC network of schools.

Objective 3: To develop further synergistic relationships among public schools, arts organizations, higher education institutions, and school reform groups to support music's role as an agent of change in school practices, applied research, and education policy.

Survey data also show that school partnerships are not just a requirement for MIENC dissemination, but that these partnerships function as critical conduits for changes in institutional culture principally in terms of collaboration among all the partners and the role of research-based practices in all areas of program development. When these connections are established, in particular MIENC local partnerships, evidence for program continuation and expansion is more present and meaningful.

Music Learning Leadership projects appear not to be just frameworks for action research-based program development, but also to function as a major catalyst toward establishing research-based collaborative practices that are strongly evident in the most successful MIENC dissemination sites.

Project Impact

The project achieved a critical level of compliance with the FIPSE proposal goals by administering the five planned events, facilitating the four LLSN site products accessible in the MIENC archives, and providing evidence for the presence of key overall strategies for project dissemination.

The impact of the project on the schools was clearly documented, described and analyzed in the digital portfolios, school reports, and research reports posted in the appendix accompanying this report. The quality of this documentation illustrates not only how the program expansion occurred, but it also correlates with the level of success of the Music Learning Leadership action research projects at each particular site.

Evidence from the Program Evaluator's Report

The level of advancement of the dissemination strategies is also summarized in the Program Evaluator's report submitted in conjunction with the Project Director's program narrative report. The program evaluator's report indicates that seven strands of scale-out dissemination outcomes are clearly present across all schools, the largest gains being in the category of research-based practices [page 8]. This trend indicates the unmistakable influence of the program supervision and the effect of guidance from both national consultants and the development of on-the-ground research through training and support for local Guided Practice research consultants. As a corollary statistic, we see that, by year three of the project, research practices, rich documentation methods, and the presence of effective guided practice consultants – all forecasted by the Music Learning Leadership Dissemination strategies - are the principal indicators of site transformation (ibid. p 9-10).

The program evaluator's site analysis provides considerable evidence for the impact of the Music Learning Leadership proposal process: the sites rated highest with regard to engagement of effective dissemination strategies by year three of the project are linked strongly with approved MLL proposals that state most clearly the research objectives and the use of Guided Practice Consultants in carrying out these objectives. It appears also that the effort spent on crafting high-quality Music Learning Leadership proposals also indicates the level of institutional capacity needed to carry out scale-out sustainable dissemination practices within and across schools and school districts (ibid., pp 10-11). Indicating that school transformation is linked with the presence of Music PLUS Music Integration curricular programs developed in the context of Music Learning Leadership practices, Reider states,

“ In an analysis of 7 transformation variables, we saw positive change in all sites. Overall change across all sites from YR 1-3 place research and engagement of guided practice consultants at the high end, partnership changed placed at the low end, suggesting that the partnerships were stable, thus did not change much over the life of the grant. ... Nearly 60% of all sites show high promise of continued MLL practices including teacher action research and integrated lesson development.” (Program Evaluator's Report. p 12)

Data used for evaluation also reveals that sites unable to adhere to their Music Learning Leadership plans – particularly with regard to documentation, assessment and research methods - were no longer viable members of the MIENC Learning Laboratory Network (ibid., p. 16). However, those sites that did drop out of the Dissemination Project were nonetheless able to maintain their current programs, although they

were less able to take part in increasing depth and dissemination of practices. These data provide a useful distinction between MIENC sites that are committed as nexus sites for research-based dissemination versus demonstration sites that are primarily interested in maintaining their current level of MIE practices (see also Program Evaluator’s Report, pp 22-23). Elaborating on the implications of stable, generative aspects of MIENC program development, Reider points out that,

“Sites in general adhered to their original plans, suggesting the proposed efforts in developing MIE activities with teacher action research supported by guided practice consultants, all within the framework of an artist-teacher-scholar structure were realistic, if not always challenging. There remain strong indicators of all seven site plan variables, with MIE and Guided Practice Consultant engagement rated the highest, Guided Internship Program the lowest. ...Suggesting that such plans may be transferable to many schools and districts of varying contexts. (ibid, p 24)

... this speaks well not only of plan designs and viability, but of the ability for sites to garner and leverage resources toward their commitments to Music Learning Leadership. Additionally, it speaks strongly of the MIENC’s ability to support multiple sites (in-person retreats, ongoing phone conferences, guided practice consultant site-visits, etc.) multiple (between 9-13 sites) complex research contexts with an emphasis toward sustainability beyond the project’s end, a significant indicator of school or site change..” (ibid., pp 22-23)

Case Study Research Reports

MIENC sites that were able to complete research studies contributed significant evidence of the impact of research-based program development on student learning. The results of these studies suggest the potential impact of dissemination of MIE Learning Laboratory School practices in public school systems. Once student learning data in both music and academic subjects can be collected and analyzed systematically, then we begin to see the exciting ramifications of arts plus art integration programs on school performance, social-emotional development and/or school culture. In the case study report that collect both types of student learning variables, we can also analyze the relationship between arts and academic learning.

In Chicago, for example, patterns of correlation not only show that arts learning can predict academic achievement, but that arts learning is more likely to level the playing field for academic excellence through teaching artist collaboration with academic teachers. In Tucson, multivariate analysis reveals differences between control and treatment schools in terms of qualitative factors of opera learning combined with music instruction versus classrooms where these factors do not combine. Analysis by the district office found significant relationships between ten qualitative factors of opera learning in Music Plus Integration programs and academic performance. In Los Angeles, the study of achievement in music literacy skills developed in unconventional music programs correlated positively with both English and Math scores. As the project’s program evaluator reports,

“... it is the student’s ability in musical literacy skills that ultimately predicts higher levels of performance on CST scores. Conversely, those students who do not develop musical literacy skills through participation in the program are significantly less likely to demonstrate higher levels of math and reading achievement as measured by the CST scores.” (ibid, p 40)

“Analysis suggests causal links between the ‘degree of exposure’ to the Morrison-Music Center of Los Angeles curriculum that includes the development of music literacy skills and CST academic test scores over time.” (ibid, p 41).

“In any case, ongoing musical instruction focused on musical literacy and its application to other subjects appears to be a necessary, if not sufficient condition for its successful integration with learning in mathematics and language arts.” (ibid, p 42)

Overall, the compendium of MIENC research reports suggest that, as a result of conditions of support for research supported by the MIENC dissemination process, that sites have proved capable of sophisticated, ground-breaking research based on data collected in the course of their own program expansion process. According to Reider,

“... the examples cited above show a variety of gains in academic areas of ELA literacy, mathematics, world languages and social-emotional development, all in projects where the curriculum tied these subjects with music learning. The cases demonstrate a strong commitment and capacity of MLL schools, in partnership with arts organizations and higher education partners to carry out relevant and rigid research on arts learning, leading to innovative classroom projects and professional development.” (ibid, p. 43).

Perhaps most clearly indicative of program success, four of the MIENC schools were honored in the final year of the project. Two laboratory schools in the Atlanta area (Auburn and Hickory Hills Elementary Schools) were cited as the highest achieving schools in math and English Language Arts, an honor that leaders in both schools claim were linked to specific Music PLUS Music Integration projects in the first grade. In California the Thornhill Elementary School became the highest academically ranked school in the Oakland Unified School District and received the prestigious California Distinguished School award, an honor the school principal linked to the MIENC program as a distinctive contribution their school excellence and positive school culture. The Morrison Elementary School of Norwalk County, Los Angeles also received the California Distinguished School award for its category of achievement in the context of serving an extremely high percentage of ELA minority students. When Marsha Guerrero, the school principal, was questioned as to why the math program in particular improved so dramatically, she replied that “I had to say that our achievement must be related to our music learning program, if only for the fact that our faculty have not had one single instance of participation in a professional development program in math over the past ten years at our school. For the past few years we have chosen to make the connection of music learning to student’s ability to focus and to learning early literacy skills during these past few years in ways that changed the culture of positive student engagement in our school that clearly led to improved academic performance.” [see ref to Morrison follow-up study to research report]

(f) Summary, Conclusions, and Lessons Learned

During the course of this project dissemination occurred with varying degrees of success. Nine MIENC schools conducted dissemination within their schools by expanding the scope of the program across grade levels and four of these schools served as nexus sites for dissemination within their districts. Five MIENC schools initiated dissemination programs by the third year of the project. In the final year of the project, eleven new dissemination schools were linked with the MIENC school network while three of the original schools dropped out due to their lack of capacity to fulfill the requirements of the Music Learning Leadership Program. From the initial year of this project to the 2010-2011 academic year, classroom and music teacher participation in MIENC professional development programs and use of MIENC materials has increased from 87 to 446. As a result of Consortium teacher professional development dissemination strategies, the amount of students served by this project over this same period of time has increased from approximately 4,020 to 12,580.

To meet the project qualitative objectives in the final year of the project, the MIENC Dissemination Project staff increasingly focused on the need to document and assess the impact of MIENC dissemination strategies in a growing network of school districts and state agencies by evaluating: (a) the quality of planning and implementation of Music Learning Leadership proposals; (b) the effectiveness of Guided Practices Consultants as indicated by their leadership and contributions to the school reports, digital portfolio submissions, and research studies (c) the teaching and learning outcomes of the Music Plus Music Integration programs; (d) the overall quality of digital portfolio submissions; and (c) the progress of the site Music Learning Leadership projects.

Dissemination Processes that Improve the Quality of Teaching and Learning in the Consortium

In the process of using the Music Learning Leadership Curriculum Sourcebook and the MIENC Digital Portfolio System as criteria for the certificate program, we had the opportunity to examine improvement in teacher professional development outcomes, teaching practices in both music and teaching for transfer strategies across disciplines, guided intern learning experiences, and student learning that is captured in collaborative research projects and assessment systems that exist across the consortium.

In the first two years of this project, we had already seen remarkable instances of how dissemination practices may increase the speed of impact on teaching and learning in schools. [See Appendices 2 and 3 for Research Studies focused on the Music Center of Los Angeles-Morrison School project and the LTMCG-University of Minnesota-Ramsey School Project]. The criteria for Music PLUS Music Integration (M+MI) programs has been defined through the impact of program practices on both music and music-integrated teaching and learning objectives. In Minneapolis, Boston, and New York, the expanded presence of guided interns has resulted in the dissemination of models of curriculum development, documentation, and assessment practices that have already established new levels of capacity for program implementation that outpace program development practices in the first level of laboratory school development begun four years ago with a previous FIPSE grant.

Taking into account all sources of evidence reported here after the third year of this project in the Program Evaluator's report, and in the archive of work samples of MIENC work over the entire project displayed in the Appendix and MIENC website posts, we can conclude that the dissemination efforts over the past three years exceeds in every respect the scope and quality of work of achieved by the original members of the 2004-2007 Learning Laboratory Schools Network. Unanticipated at the beginning of this project, it appears that the dissemination processes and strategies developed for this grant produced start-up MIENC school sites in Atlanta that, after one year of implementation, exceed the highest levels of work of any school in the previous grant. Furthermore, this grant demonstrates that scale-out dissemination processes are designed to go beyond replication of site work to the generation of ongoing improvement of Music-in-Education program development in schools that began with the first laboratory schools twelve short years ago.

Adaptation of MIENC Practices in Scale-out Dissemination Planning

In order to support the adaptation of MIENC practices, the NEC Research Center team completed a web-based Sourcebook <http://musiclearningleadership.com/book/> for the Music Learning Leadership Certificate Program and for Guided Practice Consultant Teams to aid dissemination initiatives in the final year of the project and the future. The MIENC Web Sourcebook, which will be updated throughout the progress of future project implementation, contains a complete explication of underlying conceptual frameworks, examples of guided intern and laboratory digital portfolios, published portraits of LLSN schools, a framework for the dissemination of MIENC guided intern practices, a compendium of research projects, and examples of Music Learning Leadership planning portfolios [see also Appendix 4B for sample pages from these portfolios]. Reports filed by MLL teams participating in the certificate program

will be featured in web-based reports to be published through the Metropolitan Opera Guild.

Lesson Learned: The Need for Ongoing Program Evaluation in the Context of Scale-out Dissemination

The Consortium members are pleased that David Reider, our program evaluator, has determined a methodology of comparative indicators of program capacity and progress with dissemination. As sites are now implementing new research-based dissemination initiatives, we intend to confer with David about the need for more formative assessments that can affect the quality of the work as the dissemination process goes forward. We have learned that more time needs to be invested in the dissemination process responding to data analysis, to act on findings, to look at the value of research across the Consortium, to look at the results of teacher development and student learning, and to interpret and communicate findings to their local communities through publications.

Significant Challenges for the Future of the MIENC Dissemination Project

Indicators of Sustainability Need to be Expanded

Looking at the transition between the formation of a network of laboratory school network six years ago and the results of these new scale-out dissemination initiatives, it appears that the overall mission of Music-in-Education has been sustained in virtually all sites so far, and yet the focus on the dissemination process, though quite varied, is converging on common strategies and outcomes defined by the Music Learning Leadership program.

Particularly in the final project implementation year, there was a shift of emphasis from initial partial adaptation of curriculum frameworks to research-based implementation of action research-based Music Learning Leadership team initiatives. While M+MI programs became increasingly sustainable through reallocation of the school budget due to new priority for music curriculum reform, it is also clear that continued funding will be required to support the dissemination of Music Learning Leadership action research initiatives. Without professional development funds to support ongoing pre- and post-professional development for teachers, the documentation and assessment aspects of student learning in Music Plus Music Integration programs will be limited to smaller sample sizes and less statistical power for evaluating the impact of program initiatives on student learning. Therefore it is not surprising that only those MIENC sites that have procured federal AEMDD grants can support ongoing research in the midst of program expansion.

As a result of this project, the MIENC school network has distinguished itself by bringing about a culminating phase of the 12 years of Music-in-Education initiatives and creating new potential applications of Music-in-Education program development. Building on the products of the final phase of this grant, the Consortium can take the strongest site examples of MLL dissemination and create a network of Guided Practice Consultants and collaborative Music Learning Leadership teams that can serve as resources for new education initiatives awarded to states and local districts (such as federal AEMDD or I3 grants that address new federal emphases for improving schools (closing the gap of low performing schools, high standards and assessments, high quality teacher training, improving failing schools) through music and the arts). In this way the work of the recently completed FIPSE grant will be focused on future policy in the field of music and its essential role in general education.

One further challenge for the MIENC will be the development of renewed internal leadership. Though New England Conservatory has served well as the fiscal agent for the Consortium in the past, with the completion of the most recent FIPSE grant, the Consortium will be part of the newly formed Center for Music-in-Education located at the Metropolitan Opera Guild, a principal partner in all of the MIENC's previous work. Thus, the development and archiving of all resources as well as fiscal administration will be managed by the MIENC as an independent not-for-profit corporation in order to sustain the federal

investment in the Consortium projects currently being completed. As a result of what we have learned from this grant, the admittance of new members and the retaining of old partners will be contingent on the applicants' willingness and capacity to further the MLL Team program and to sustain the dissemination and research of the MIENC's Learning Laboratory School Network.

The ultimate value of this project will be judged eventually by the Consortium's credibility and capacity to contribute to federal, state, and district education reform initiatives in music and education in the future. Key to this credibility will be a) the application of rigorous standards for schools to continue to disseminate the principles and practices of the MIENC, b) the ability of the Consortium to attract new partners that are prepared to take advantage of the Consortium resources already developed for the dissemination of MIENC program practices through Music Learning Leadership process (e.g., ArtsNOW in Atlanta, or Mankato Symphony Orchestra Partnership (see Education Weekly June 13 2009 article "Mankato School Offers Music for English Learners" for evidence of new dissemination of MIENC program in Minnesota)), and c) the publishing of school-based research and program evaluation reports, such as the MCLA-Morrison report, which can provide the basis for full-scale, research-based program expansion in the future.²⁶

Budget narrative report: Comments on significant differences between the original budget and final expenditures

We did not spend \$298 of the grant allocation, as final grant expenditures were slightly lower than expected.

In addition, four significant differences between the original budget and final expenditures are itemized below.

Budget lines 3 and 6 experienced overages in actual spending versus the budget over the three years of the project:

Overage in Travel (line 3 - \$20,868) did not represent a change in our scope of work or objective. We decided to modify the planned individuals who would be conducting the work so that we could reach the same objective more cost-effectively and yet still with the qualifications needed to supervise research design, data collection and analysis relevant to the digital portfolio submissions, school reports, and research studies required of each site. Cost effectiveness was assured by having NEC in-house project staff perform the work of National Guided Practice Consultants, thereby incurring additional travel costs, but with no additional cost in salary or stipends for their work beyond what was already allocated to the FIPSE budget.

Overage in Contractual: Consultants and Consultants' Travel (line 6 - \$35,377) was overspent principally because resources were dedicated to develop Local Guided Practice Consultants in order to ensure the sustainability of project dissemination work and the production of final products for each site. The overage in Local Guided Practice Consultant time and related travel of \$19,672 was balanced by lower spending on materials, publications, and communications as leadership responsibilities shifted to local sites (see budget underspending in line 8). In addition, teacher stipends of \$23,164 were awarded because of the need for documentation and assessment work by Teacher Guided Practice Consultants. There was no initial budget for these stipends, but it was determined that such work was necessary to develop local site-based resources for the ongoing work in these schools.

²⁶ http://music-in-education.org/docs/Morrison_Study_Report_20090715-Final.pdf

Budget lines 8 and 10 were significantly below budget:

Underspending in Other (line 8 - \$40,983) relates primarily to \$37,590 of lower publication costs, which does not represent a change in the scope of the resources needed for the project, but rather the new economics of paperless publishing made possible by our website resources. Again, in-house staff members were employed to do all editing, web publishing and other work that was formerly allocated to outside parties. These savings were re-allocated to supporting the work of Local Guided Practice Consultants who needed more time to develop their own materials through digital portfolio submissions, school reports and research reports.

Underspending in Indirect Costs (line 10 - \$18,434) was the result of allowing disallowed indirect costs for years 2 and 3 to be reallocated to direct costs, as negotiated in December 2008. These monies compensated for the overages in Contractual spending and travel costs.

These five variances did not meet the criteria for prior approval from our FIPSE program officer for budget reallocations. These criteria are:

- changing the scope of work or objective of the project, even if there is no associated budget revision requiring prior approval;

Not Applicable

- changing a key person specified in the application or award document. Approving such a change requires a written justification. You should explain the reasons for the change in personnel and present the qualifications of the proposed replacement;

Not Applicable

- replacing the project director, or substantially reducing the amount of time the director would spend on the project;

Not Applicable

- administering a project for more than three months without an approved project director;

Not Applicable

- making a revision that would result in the need for additional Federal funding;

Not Applicable

- providing grant funds to a third party (contracting out work), unless described in the approved grant application;

Not Applicable – *We brought some of the work that was formerly expected to be done by outside consultants in-house instead; we did not contract or subcontract out additional work.*

- transferring substantial programmatic responsibility for your grant to a third party;

Not Applicable

- adding international travel that was not approved in the scope or objectives of the original grant application;

Not Applicable

- adding the purchase of equipment not approved in the original grant application;

Not Applicable

- transferring funds to a line item category that was not previously approved for expenditure; and

–

Not Applicable – *We moved among budget line items that were previously approved for expenditure.*

- transferring funds between direct and indirect costs.

After determining that New England Conservatory was not allowed to receive indirect cost funds to help administer the grant, our program officer subsequently allowed for the transfer of funds designated for year 2-3 indirect costs to be reallocated to direct costs

(December 2008).

(g) appendices, including advice for FIPSE.

Seven Appendices are submitted in conjunction with this report.

Advice to FIPSE

Our advice to FIPSE is based on our experience as a small institution of higher education that has received several grants over the past 12 years, some of which were comprehensive grants intended for curriculum reform at our institution, and the rest of which were complex consortium grants that involved many partners and dissemination of funds to other organizations.

Our advice has to do with our experience and perception of FIPSE's administration of program oversight. From our experience, there are three different types of FIPSE program supervisors: 1) those who supervise program implementation from a comprehensive viewpoint, 2) those that deal only with financial supervision and compliance with regulations, and 3) those whose job it is to focus on program impact evaluation. Our observation is that these program officers are stretched thinly. Our recommendation is to provide each grantee with two program officers: one for financial oversight and assistance, and the other for program development oversight and assistance, who work together closely to gain a holistic view of the project's operations and progress.

Our experience with FIPSE oversight changed dramatically over the past 12 years. During the first nine years as a FIPSE grantee with two different program officers, we had ongoing guidance on program development but less guidance regarding financial and administrative matters. In contrast, during the last three years as a FIPSE grantee, we have received constant financial and administrative oversight, but it has been quite separate from the guidance we have received on the programmatic aspects of the grant. We feel that benefits could have been gained by greater cooperation among our program officers.

We are in the process of responding to additional requests from Claire Cornell, the financial program officer for our grant, and would welcome the opportunity to provide additional feedback regarding the administrative oversight of our grant at a later time.