



**Evaluating High School String Orchestra Literature Composed in 1965 or Later**

Jessica Lynne Villante  
98 Sourwood Drive  
Hatboro, PA 19040

1 June 2015

Marc Dicciani, Director of the School of Music  
Elizabeth Sokolowski, Division Head of Music Education

The University of the Arts  
College of Performing Arts  
School of Music

Master of Music in Music Education

**EVALUATING HIGH SCHOOL STRING ORCHESTRA LITERATURE  
COMPOSED IN 1965 OR LATER**

**JESSICA LYNNE VILLANTE**

**Approved as to style and comment by:**

**ELIZABETH SOKOLOWSKI**

**Division Head Music Education**

**MARC DICCIANI**

**Director of the School of Music**

**JAMES SAVOIE**

**Associate Provost who oversees Graduate Studies**

## ABSTRACT

### **Evaluating High School String Orchestra Literature Composed in 1965 or Later**

(June 2015)

Jessica Villante, M.M, University of the Arts  
Research Project Supervisor: Elizabeth Sokolowski

The purpose of this empirical study is to discover, examine, evaluate, and compile a body of repertoire that is musically viable and educationally appropriate for an intermediate high school string orchestra. Furthermore, the pieces included in this study will all have been composed in 1965 or later, in the hopes of compiling a well-rounded body of repertoire from the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. This repertoire will be discovered through use of a survey of local high school orchestra directors, and evaluated at a sight reading session through a written rubric.

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Purpose.....	1
Rationale .....	1
Motive.....	2
<b>Chapter 2: Historical Context, Repertoire Foundations, and Parameters.....</b>	<b>4</b>
History of String Orchestra.....	4
History of High School Orchestra.....	5
Why is Repertoire Choice Important?.....	6
Resisting Temptation.....	7
“Good” Repertoire.....	8
Parameters.....	10
<b>Chapter 3: Method of Study and Findings.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Overview.....	13
Survey.....	13
Preparation for Sight-reading Session.....	17
Sight-reading Session with PYO Interns.....	19
Sight-reading Sessions at Harriton High School.....	21
<b>Chapter 4: Conclusion.....</b>	<b>27</b>
The Elevator Speech.....	27
Secondary Observations.....	27

Reflection.....	28
Looking Forward.....	30
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>32</b>
Appendix A: All Responses from Director Survey.....	32
Appendix B: Repertoire Compilation.....	37
Appendix C: Rubrics Used in Sight-reading Session.....	43
<b>Works Cited.....</b>	<b>45</b>

## Chapter 1

### **Evaluating High School String Orchestra Literature Composed in 1965 or Later**

#### Purpose

The purpose of this empirical study is to discover, examine, evaluate, and compile a body of repertoire that is musically viable and educationally appropriate for an intermediate high school string orchestra. Furthermore, the pieces included in this study will all have been composed in 1965 or later, in the hopes of compiling a well-rounded body of repertoire from the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. This repertoire will be discovered through use of a survey of local high school orchestra directors, and evaluated at a sight reading session through a written rubric.

#### Rationale

When asked about the stalwart repertoire for string orchestra, compositions such as the Tchaikovsky *Serenade for Strings* Op. 48, the Dvořák *Serenade for Strings* Op. 22, and composers such as Vivaldi, Holst, and Corelli comprise the core body of common repertoire and are knee-jerk responses. However, this core repertoire is focused in musical eras gone by, and tends to demand technical prowess that high school musicians do not yet possess. A compilation of more modern works is needed, and while orchestra directors have undoubtedly discovered their own modern repertoire standards, little communication and codification exists for this

subset of string orchestra repertoire. This study aims to discover and solidify a body of literature that maintains musical integrity while allowing high school musicians to further hone their technical skills, all composed within the last fifty years.

### Motive

The motive for this thesis stems directly from my experiences as a music educator. As a violinist, I am well versed in orchestral canon. However, that body of repertoire falls short in an educational setting for a variety of reasons. Some pieces, such as the Tchaikovsky *Serenade for Strings*, require extensive technical prowess rarely found in a high school ensemble; others, such as the Bach *Brandenburg Concerti*, require basso continuo or other instrumentation not often found in a high school setting. In short, there is a gulf between professional string orchestra repertoire and educational string orchestra repertoire. This disparity is not new; it has been addressed at conferences such as the 1963 Yale Seminar, and addressed in initiatives such as the Young Composers Project and the Contemporary Music Project (Allen et al. vol.1, 25). Today, I find myself in the same situation as those from the Yale Seminar. As a music educator, after five years of teaching I have found a small body of repertoire from a variety of time periods that works well for intermediate string orchestra. However, this discovery process has simply been trial and error in an aspect of the profession where errors prove costly and detrimental to the program. Compiled repertoire lists often eschew modern works for high school string orchestras. For example, the entire *Teaching Music Through Performance in Orchestra* series mentions only eighteen level four, three level five, and one level six selections composed in 1965 or later. By



contrast, there are twenty-nine selections written after 1965 in level three alone (Allen et al. vol. 1-3).

Additionally, the repertoire selection process is both ongoing and constantly shifting. Ensembles perform at least two major concerts a year, and once a piece has been programmed it should not resurface during a students' high school career. No end point exists for the repertoire selection process, which makes the need for a well-constructed baseline of repertoire all the most urgent.

To be clear: there is a wealth of string orchestra repertoire written before 1965 that is crucial to a well-rounded string education. When technically feasible, composers such as Holst, Elgar, Vivaldi, Corelli, and Dvořák all belong in a string orchestra folder. However, there must be a balance between tried-and-true warhorses and new compositions, and the tendency is to default to the masterworks even if they are too difficult for a given ensemble. Why? Bergonzi cites the belief that the music educator's job is to teach the masterworks and the masterworks alone, and offers the observation that teachers simply do not know where to start (Allen et al. vol. 1, 26). I hope to find that starting point.

## Chapter 2

### Historical Context, Repertoire Foundations, and Parameters

#### History of String Orchestra

The string orchestra medium has a long and storied history. The first string ensemble was established by King Louis XIII and called the *Cingt-Quatre Violons du Roi* (Twenty-Four Violins of the King). By 1670 the term “orchestra” was used to describe any ensemble that consisted of strings with more than one player performing each part (Burkholder 359). This medium quickly spread to Italy, where the 1670s saw the birth and rise of string orchestras in Rome, Bologna, Venice, Milan, and other major metropolitan areas (Burkholder 397). In Rome, Archangelo Corelli wrote many string orchestra works and greatly helped to integrate string orchestras into Roman life, both conducting and writing for the preeminent string orchestra of the time (Burkholder 397-398). Corelli’s *Concerti Grossi* still comprise a significant portion of professional string orchestra repertoire. In Venice, Antonio Vivaldi benefited greatly from Corelli’s work. During Vivaldi’s tenure at the Ospedale della Pieta, his orchestra most likely “consisted of twenty to twenty-five string instruments, with harpsichord or organ for the continuo. The strings were divided into what was becoming the standard arrangement of violins I and II, violas, cellos, and bass viols (today basses)” (Burkholder 425). Today, string orchestras employ that same orchestration. Vivaldi composed at breakneck speed throughout his career, and his more than five hundred works can be heard today in concert halls around the world.

From Italy, the genre spread north to Germany, Austria, and England. In Mannheim, Germany, the Mannheim Orchestra quickly rose to international fame as the first professional orchestra. In Germany, both Georg Philipp Telemann and Johann Sebastian Bach led orchestras in the 1700s and 1730s respectively (Burkholder 449 - 450). Both Telemann and Bach also composed extensively for the genre. Bach in particular expanded on the medium in terms of duration and complexity through his works, notably the six *Brandenburg Concerti* (Burkholder 449). In short, both the string orchestra and a significant portion of its repertoire were firmly established by 1750.

Throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, orchestras continue to grow in size and popularity. While orchestras expanded their instrumentation to involve woodwinds, brass, and percussion within their ranks, composers still wrote music for string orchestra. Tchaikovsky, Dvořák, Elgar, Holst, Mendelssohn, Britten, Janáček, Gershwin, Glass, and others all wrote for the genre, and new works continue to enter the rich and vibrant canon.

### History of High School Orchestra

Within the American public school setting, the first high school orchestra was founded in Richmond, Indiana in 1898 (Mark 123). Throughout the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century, there were isolated instances of high school orchestras, but no national presence (Mark 124). In response to this emerging market, instrument manufactures created both student instruments and student competitions, and by 1936 there was a dedicated National School Orchestra Association (Mark 126). This growth and standardization of orchestra as a part of the high school music curriculum continued throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and with it, the search for musically sound, educationally

based music. For example, the Julliard Repertory Project began in 1964, which sought to bring “together scholars and teachers to research and collect music of the highest quality for teaching music” (Mark 144). Similarly, the Contemporary Music Project intended to create a composers-in-residence program, in which eminent and fledgling composers alike would write music for public school programs (Mark 147).

With over three hundred years of compositions at their disposal, why were educators rejecting existing classical music? As Robert Schupp wrote in a 1964 MENC Journal, “A great proportion of the orchestral literature which has resulted from the impressive heritage listed above has been written for the professional orchestra” (97). Professional repertoire left much to be desired, and in the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there has been a deluge of compositions written with the student in mind. The options can be overwhelming. As of January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2015, J.W. Pepper lists more than six hundred original concert works in their “Basic Library for String Orchestra” alone (J.W. Pepper). In fact, “There has never been a time when there has been so much excellent repertoire from which to choose” (Reynolds 33). However, these works must be actively researched, as Reynolds continues, “At the same time, an enormous amount of questionable music is being produced as well” (33). Blindly ordering music will not do. Indeed, an educator must be able to sort through and find music that fits the musical needs and technical skills of their ensemble.

### Why is Repertoire Choice Important?

Why is so much care given to the selection of music? Why does it matter if there is a proverbial clunker thrown into the mix? In short, the repertoire chosen determines the skills,

ideas, techniques, and overarching topics the educator will teach in the day-to-day classroom. Indeed, “selecting high-quality repertoire for our students to perform is a central component of our curricular planning and goals and one of our primary responsibilities. Choosing repertoire that is well matched to our ensembles requires considerable time and expertise, and experts have written that it is one of the most difficult aspects of the entire profession” (Hopkins 69). With repertoire at the crux of the class content and everyday classroom proceedings, it stands to reason that “when repertoire has not been chosen wisely for an ensemble, no amount of charisma or creative teaching can undo the initial mistake. In fact, the careful selection of high-quality literature may be one of the most important things that we do as music educators” (Persellin 17). Carefully chosen repertoire can elevate an ensemble, and when repertoire has been thoughtfully planned, “Appropriately sequenced repertoire leads directly to student carryover, mastery of concepts, and the natural progression of learning that accelerates an ensemble’s growth” (Gerald 7). Repertoire selection is nothing short of crucial.

### Resisting Temptation

When faced with the constant demand to program new literature, countless educators shouting from the proverbial rooftops the importance of literature selection, and the overwhelming amount of unfamiliar concert material, defaulting to the masterworks that dominate the history of the professional string orchestra is tantalizingly easy. However, these works must be viewed as compositions written for adult, professionally trained musicians, and not high school ensembles (Hopkins 70). Programming such works can easily lead to over programming, which is “the practice of performing repertoire that is well beyond the technical

capabilities of music maturity of students in the ensemble, and can have serious consequences for the overall health of our programs” (Hopkins 70). In short, reliance on the professional level repertoire undermines high school orchestra programs. Specifically, “music that is too far beyond the technical capability of any particular section in the orchestra can lead to serious frustration among the members of the group,” and this frustration can easily manifest itself into decimated motivation and decreased participation (Scruggs 55; Hopkins 70). In sum, James Kjelland, associate professor of music at Northwestern University, writes “The point of music education is missed entirely when the quality of a performance takes a backseat to the prestige of the works being played” (qtd. in Hopkins 70).

### “Good” Repertoire

With reliance on the masterworks dismissed and a laundry list of compositions ahead, where does one even begin? What does one actually want for their ensemble? At first, the answer “good repertoire” seems trite; however, by defining what good music actually is, one can develop a sense of what exactly they are truly searching for. Good repertoire “is durable and can stand up to intense rehearsal. Music of excellence has vitality, originality, and musical integrity. It introduces students to new musical ideas, styles, composers, and places of origin. Through good-quality music, students learn more about the world around them, as well as themselves” (Persellin 17). Hilary Apfenstadt defines good music as follows:

[Good music is] that which possesses craftsmanship and expressivity. Well-written music finds the balance of tension and release, structural symmetry and asymmetry, and anticipation and surprise that makes listening and performing it a

worthwhile experience. Expressivity means that the music expresses in its form and content something of depth, something that draws human beings to its artistic qualities. (19)

These musical ideas take precedence over whatever technical skills a piece may demand. Indeed, to allow for expressive and musical growth, good repertoire most often lies squarely within the technical bounds of any ensemble (Reynolds 32).

Selecting good repertoire requires careful thought and critical evaluation. Indeed, repertoire must be suitable not just as programmed piece for a concert, but must be suitable to be rehearsed, often for months. This repertoire must demand the students to grow as musicians and human beings. Hopkins mentioned just some of the reasons we may choose a piece when he writes the following:

When choosing repertoire for our ensembles to learn, we may select a piece because we believe it will help our students learn specific technical skills such as tone quality, articulation, intonation, phrasing and dynamics, or rhythmic precision. We may also program a piece of music to expand students' musical understanding about a composer, historical period, musical genre, style, or world culture. We may pick repertoire that provides opportunities for structured or free improvisation or challenges students to expand their thinking about the very nature of music. (69)

Educators must be properly equipped to find such repertoire. Many curated resources such as state lists, MENC's website (now NAFME), the GIA *Teaching Music Through Performance* series, colleague recommendations, and the *Strategies for Teaching Strings* series can assist in the discovery of repertoire (Reynolds 32; Scruggs 55). However, these resources do

not contain all or any answers, for the lists and recommendations “do not substitute for a teacher’s discriminating choice of repertoire based on musical value and learning needs of students” (Scruggs 55). Indeed, every single repertoire choice is a factor of both the repertoire itself and the situation into which it is called into service. Individual teachers, school environment, and strengths of an ensemble will all help to determine what good repertoire actually looks like. Ultimately, “programming is personal. Choose pieces that resonate with you, but constantly work to broaden your horizons and deepen the way you look at music” (Gerald 78). Gerald reminds the educator, “these core pieces are not entire state contest lists but instead are a few selected works that you and your colleagues in the broader profession believe are of the highest quality. Each individual teacher should have a short list of fifteen or twenty pieces he or she believes all students should play or sing over a period of several years” (77). The driving force behind this thesis is the need to create such a list.

### Parameters

Perhaps the most important decision in the planning stages was to determine precisely what type of repertoire I wanted to collect and curate. This process focused on two distinct aspects of the repertoire: what type of musical ensemble I wanted to collect repertoire for, and what date range I wanted the repertoire to stem from.

Deciding on performing forces was simple: I teach high school string orchestra and wanted this list to reflect on and apply to my everyday teaching situation. Between three ensembles, I program approximately a dozen string orchestra pieces a year. Over a thirty-five year career, that translates to approximately 420 unique repertoire selections. For a student,



assuming they are in one ensemble for the duration of their high school career, it means they will rehearse and perform roughly sixteen pieces. Given that well-planned repertoire creates the framework for an excellent music curriculum that in turn fosters the musical growth of our students, there is no time to waste on repertoire that is not great (Reynolds 31). Focusing exclusively on high school string orchestra repertoire would most greatly benefit my work, and therefore is the focus of this thesis.

However, whether the piece could involve additional performing forces outside of the string orchestra setting - for example, a soloist – remained open. I chose to leave that open because frankly, we all hope to have students that we can spotlight in a solo, or hope to be able to employ non-traditional instrumentation. Personally, I have had an all-eastern concertmaster sitting in the same orchestra class as a student who lacked basic technique. A solo would be a great way to feature an outstanding musician and maintain their interest in the program.

After much deliberation, I chose to eliminate string arrangements of symphonic orchestral compositions more than fifty years old from this study. I chose this boundary because I am familiar with the orchestral canon, because an adaptation of old material is still old material, and practically because my high school students also participate in full orchestra. As a result, compositions such as arrangements of Mozart's overtures were eliminated, but arrangements of Williams' *Schindler's List* fell within the parameters of my study.

Technical difficulty or level also remained wide open. While the term "high school" refers to age, it does not specify any level of technical facility. Even the term "intermediate" provides a nebulous description of skill. This description allowed for a range of repertoire in order to provide for the myriad of situations that can happen every year, and change from year to year. Student technical facility aside, factors such as instrumentation, staffing changes,

administrative climate, other activities going on that year, state testing, and countless others all factor into the technical appropriateness of a piece for any given ensemble at any given point. Because those factors can change year to year, I wanted as wide of a technical range as possible.

I also sought to collect music of different genres. Music educators can no longer endorse and program exclusively classical music while ostracizing all other genres. To cling to the belief that only classical music holds musical or educational merit is closed-minded at best. In fact, “we must challenge our students and ourselves to learn musics [sic] that embrace a wide span of time, a range of cultures and traditions, and a variety of styles. It is a tall order, perhaps, but one essential to musical growth and understanding” (Apfelstadt 46). The Vision 2020 Summit recognized this need, writing that “all music has a place in the curriculum. Not only does the Western art tradition need to be preserved and disseminated, music educators also need to be aware of other music that people experience and be able to integrate it into classroom music instruction” (Mark 172).

I chose to exclude compositions more than fifty years old from this study in order to eliminate all composers that I as a string educator consider to be an old world standard. While composers such as Corelli, Vivaldi, Dvořák, Tchaikovsky, Britten, Grieg, and Holst all belong in a well-rounded body of repertoire, they comprise the body of repertoire I know. Contemporary music certainly has a place, and “introducing students to music of the Renaissance or the Romantic period, in addition to contemporary examples from both their own heritage and those of others, is vital in order to help them achieve a sense of music history and development” (Apfelstadt 21).

It is time to go outside of my comfort zone.

## Chapter 3

### Method of Study and Findings

#### Overview

To create an initial list of repertoire, I created and distributed an online survey to numerous high school orchestra directors. Once I had a sufficient number of responses, I sorted, edited, and compiled the list and obtained all of the repertoire mentioned by multiple directors. On April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015, music teachers and high school mentors in the Philadelphia Youth Orchestra organization sight-read through the repertoire, and during this session students rated the pieces from one to five regarding how excited they would be to play a given piece in their high school orchestras. From May 5<sup>th</sup> to May 20<sup>th</sup>, Harriton string orchestra sight-read through the same repertoire while I evaluated the works through a written rubric.

#### Survey

The first step in completing my repertoire compilation was to build a body of repertoire from which to pull. To do so, I created a four-question survey to email to local orchestra directors and post on various social media platforms. The form was first sent out on February 24<sup>th</sup>, and I solicited responses until April 10<sup>th</sup>. The survey asked directors to answer the following questions:

1. What is your name?

2. Where do you teach?
3. What grades do you teach?
4. What String Orchestra Repertoire selections, composed in 1965 or later, is deserving of a spot in high school orchestra curriculum?

Although no identifying information will be used in this thesis, I asked for directors' names and school districts both as means of verification and to see if teachers in the same district or geographic region recommended the same repertoire.

Collecting responses proved a multi-step process that required constant balancing of the need for more responses and the desire for quality responses. First, I emailed every director I had a close relationship with, addressing them by name and ensuring the emails were personalized in order to improve the likelihood of any individual director filling out the survey. From this initial list of twelve orchestra directors, I garnered ten responses. Next, I turned to social media, namely Facebook. By sharing the survey on my Facebook wall (and many of my friends and colleagues were kind enough to share it on theirs) and posting to three different music educator and orchestra groups, I hoped to collect more responses. I also posted the survey to a music educator forum on Reddit. Social media garnered a number of responses, and the responses were from individuals I otherwise would not have reached. Reaching out to my undergraduate Alma Mater, Temple University, netted radio silence. Additionally, I built a list of high school orchestra directors in both Pennsylvania Music Educators Association (PMEA) District Eleven and Twelve and emailed the survey to all. I also reached out to the presidents of the PMEA Districts One through Ten, asking for assistance distributing my survey to the directors in their respective districts. Three presidents responded; their assistance resulted in a few additional responses. To further widen my net, I posted a link to my survey on [nafme.com](http://nafme.com), [pmea.net](http://pmea.net), and [violinist.com](http://violinist.com). I

chose NAFME (National Association for Music Education) and PMEA (Pennsylvania Music Educators' Association) because they represent the state and national level organizations for music educators, and violinist.com because it is a well respected website within the professional violin community. As of April 10<sup>th</sup>, twenty-five unique directors had completed my survey, and I had the responses I needed to move on with my project.

The sheer number of unique pieces mentioned both by individual directors and by the pool as a whole is astounding. While some directors suggested one or two pieces, lists of ten or more pieces of repertoire were not uncommon (one director even mentioned sixteen). All told, these twenty-five directors suggested 164 pieces of repertoire. The director responses can be found in Appendix A, with the names and school districts removed. These responses cover a wide swath of styles, instrumentations, levels of complexity, technical demands, and genres. After accounting for repetitions and eliminating pieces that did not fit the parameters of my study, there were 118 unique pieces of repertoire to pull from. Appendix B shows the 118 pieces of literature. Pieces that did not fit the parameters of my study were compiled into a separate list, with the intention of further examining those works at a later date.

I had anticipated a significant amount of repetition and crossover in the repertoire; stunningly, this list shows the exact opposite. Between twenty-five directors, the most commonly mentioned piece was mentioned four times, or by fifteen percent of respondents. Only twenty pieces were mentioned more than once; only eight pieces were mentioned more than twice. Often, if a piece were mentioned twice it was by two directors who are either in the same district or teach in geographically close districts. Table 3.1 lists all pieces that were mentioned more than once and the number of directors who responded with that selection.

**Table 3.1: Repertoire Mentioned by Multiple Directors.**

<b>Title of Composition</b>	<b>Times Mentioned</b>
Suite for Strings	4
American Sketches	3
Bailes Para Orquesta	3
Calypso Jam	3
Drifen	3
O Magnum Mysterium	3
Schindler's List	3
Voyage	3
American Landscape	2
Fantasia on a 17th Century Tune	2
Kashmir	2
Lion City	2
Lux Aurorum	2
Maharaja	2
Mountain Spring	2
October	2
Palladio	2
Prayer for Peace	2
Red Rhythmico	2
Rondo in Blue	2

When examining what composers were mentioned, there seems to be the same amount of discord. There are eighty-two unique composers mentioned by directors; only seventeen composers have more than one piece mentioned, and many of those are by one director (for example, all of the Stephen Melillo pieces were mentioned by one director). Three composers had more than four pieces mentioned: Richard Meyer, Soon Hee Newbold, and John Williams. These names are not surprising. John Williams is one of the most preeminent composers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and Richard Meyer and Soon Hee Newbold are cornerstones of string education repertoire. However, Richard Meyer and John Williams only had eight pieces mentioned, and Soon Hee Newbold six. Those pieces represent less than twenty percent of all suggested material. Again, while I had expected variation within the results, this is far above and beyond what I anticipated. Both in selections and composers mentioned, few commonalities exist.

#### Preparation for Sight-reading Session

After repertoire suggestions had been gathered and compiled, preparation for the sight-reading sessions began. Sight-reading sessions were built into the study to allow me to evaluate the music in a live performance and to gather student opinions. By listening to the music in an ensemble setting, I could determine if a work were technically appropriate for a high school ensemble, musically rich, and compositionally complex. Student feedback would provide insight into how my students would likely react to a given selection. I, along with many of my colleagues, coach at Philadelphia Region Youth String Music (PRYSM), and to hold a sight-reading session before rehearsal seemed like an ideal scenario. The Philadelphia Youth Orchestra

(PYO) organization allowed me to collect direct student input from the high school aged interns that assist at PRYSM. The sight-reading session took place on April 24<sup>th</sup>, 2015.

Reflecting upon the sheer number of repertoire selections suggested by directors, it became immediately obvious that to sight-read through all of the 118 selections would be impossible. Drastic cuts would need to be made in order to make a sight-reading session logistically feasible. To create the pared down list, I limited the sight-reading session to only those pieces that have been mentioned by more than one director. Given the scattered results of the survey, this does not mean by any stretch that the pieces only mentioned once do not hold artistic and educational merit. Twenty pieces of repertoire, while ambitious, was far more possible than 118 and became the list that would see live performance. The remaining ninety-eight stay in the compilation and will be evaluated more fully going forward. Of the twenty pieces mentioned by more than one director, I had immediate access to six selections. I set about acquiring the last fourteen.

Acquiring the music was stunningly easy. While I had not considered availability in the planning stages of my project, an unexpected benefit of limiting the repertoire to the past fifty years was that only one selection was out of print and easily acquired by borrowing. In fact, nineteen of the twenty pieces of repertoire found in Table 3.1 are readily available on J.W. Pepper. All selections arrived within a week of ordering. This availability benefits both this study and the long-term goal of building a phenomenal string orchestra library. From a purely practical standpoint, availability of the music certainly affects programming choices. To date, I have not programmed the Britten *Simple Symphony*, simply because it is a rental. Ease of acquisition is not to be taken lightly.



### Sight-Reading Session with PYO Interns

The sight-reading session admittedly was small in number. Three high school students, two music educators, and I sat down and sight-read through the twenty selections. However, even with a small sample size I believe that I gained valuable insight into the preferences of high school students; namely, that the results will always be surprising.

We started at the beginning of every piece of literature (with the exception of *Lux Aurorum*) and read for approximately fifty measures. After reading through a selection, students rated the work on a scale of one to five based on how much they liked the piece and how appropriate they thought it would be for a public high school orchestra, with one being the least and five being the most. Students were instructed to use their gut feelings and their own personal tastes. They were diligent in their responses and took the work quite seriously. Students actively struggled to rank pieces that hailed from so many genres, especially when they encountered pieces outside of the Western classical canon. Table 3.2, found below, shows the student rankings of works.

**Table 3.2: Student Ranking of Compositions**

Composition	Student 1	Student 2	Student 3	Total
Palladio	5	5	5	15
Maharaja	4	5	5	14
American Sketches	3	5	5	13
Fantasia on a 17th c. Tune	5	3	5	13
Rondo in Blue	5	4	4	13

Schindler's List	5	3	4	12
Mountain Spring	5	3	4	12
Kashmir	5	3	4	12
Suite for Strings	2	4	5	11
Bailes Para Orquesta	4	3	4	11
Drifen	4	4	3	11
Lion City	2	5	4	11
Prayer for Peace	4	3	3	10
American Landscape	4	2	4	10
Lux Aurorum	4	3	3	10
Red Rhythmico	3	4	2	9
October	3	2	3	8
O Magnum Mysterium	3	1	3	7
Calypso Jam	1	4	1	6
Voyage	3	2	1	6

Notably, many pieces outside of the traditional classical genre far out-performed some of the traditional pieces (including the Rutter *Suite for Strings*, the most often mentioned piece by directors). To the PYO interns, Led Zeppelin bested Eric Whitacre, John Corigliano, Morten Lauridsen, and beat one of John William's compositions and tied with *Schindler's List*. These students all participate in the Philadelphia Youth Orchestra, a high selective youth orchestra, and if anything I anticipated them having a bias towards classical compositions and composers with name recognition. I found no such bias. Few pieces were divisive – the majority of ratings for

any given piece were within two points of each other, with *Calypso Jam* the sole exception. Additionally, only *Calypso Jam* received the lowest possible score from more than one student, and I suspect difficulties sight-reading the rhythms contributed to that score. *Palladio* alone received a perfect score, a work I would have discounted simply because of its name recognition and association with DeBeers diamonds. This session showed that the best way to learn students' preferences and opinions is simply to ask.

Reflecting on the reading session led to the conclusion that more exposure to the works was necessary for my evaluations. The PYO sight-reading session proved quite valuable, but evaluating and programming pieces without exposure in a public high school setting felt inauthentic. It is impossible to gauge the appropriateness for a high school ensemble when all of the students boast technical mastery far beyond the average high school student. While direct input and recordings of the sight-reading sessions at Harriton were not permitted, four rehearsals in May were dedicated to sight-reading through the twenty selections

### Sight-Reading Sessions at Harriton High School

I have directed the string orchestra at Harriton for five years. There is one class of orchestra at Harriton, comprised of approximately forty-five students. These students run the gamut in terms of ability, and an all-state musician may well sit in the same section as a student who lacks baseline skills. Harriton orchestra tends to perform fairly advanced works, and works from the Western classical canon comprise the bulk of their repertoire. Students learned of the goals and motivations behind the sight-reading sessions, and were more than willing to spend

rehearsals reading through the twenty pieces of literature that the PYO interns had read through two weeks prior.

The logistics proved simple. These sessions occurred after the Spring Concert, so rather than rushing through a work, each composition received ten minutes of rehearsal time. Seniors had left for the year, leaving the core of next year's ensemble. Using the same set of music from the PYO session in the same order, Harriton students sight-read between five and six pieces a day. Additionally, students anonymously rated all selections from one to five using the same criteria as the PYO interns; those sheets are in a sealed envelope that I will open in August. While not for this study, the rankings from the Harriton sessions will help to determine next year's repertoire selections for that ensemble. The students reveled in the opportunity to provide feedback on literature and assume partial ownership of their repertoire; they conferred with each other and clearly communicated many of their opinions to their peers and me. Side conversations were personal and nuanced, and helped to reinforce the idea that students deserve to have input into their repertoire. Students did not read through the Rutter *Suite for Strings* because they had performed the work at the spring concert, and I had been at the podium.

It quickly became apparent that the Harriton orchestra's preferences and opinions were drastically different than the PYO students. For example, *Palladio* was loved by PYO but abhorred by the Harriton students, shown through comments about the boring bass and cello parts and what they perceived as trite melodic fragments. The Harriton students also made strong distinctions between pieces they enjoyed performing, and pieces they would enjoy rehearsing. *Kashmir*, a work that the PYO students also loved, was such a work that Harriton students liked to play, but did not want to spend months rehearsing. Harriton students, in general, also eschewed pieces that contained prominent solos in favor of pieces where all voices were more

fully represented. By observing the differences between the two groups of students, the most important takeaway is simply that on any given year, any given ensemble will have a different set of preferences.

While the Harriton students sight-read and rehearsed, I evaluated the pieces more fully. Standing in front of a realized ensemble, hearing a piece for more than thirty seconds, and not feeling pressed for time allowed for a much more complete view of the piece. I rated all selections on a scale from one to five in four different categories: technique, musicality, composition, and intrinsic. The rubrics I used are found in Appendix C.

Technique refers to the appropriateness of the technical demands across all instruments. The piece should be demanding but not impossible, and allow for students to focus on the musicality of the piece. Additionally, pieces should contain technical challenges for all parts.

Musicality refers to the expressive qualities of the work, both for individual parts and for the work as a whole. The piece should allow for expressive development and exploration of meaning, and should carry emotional weight.

Composition refers to the structure and richness of the piece itself. The piece should be well written and interesting, while still maintaining a sense of integrity and completeness. It should be rich and nuanced, and contain enough material to warrant not only performance, but also rehearsal time.

Finally, the intrinsic refers to all of the intangibles that prove impossible to quantify and yet are vital to the delivery of a piece. In a sense, it is my own educated preference. The piece should be a composition I can imagine living with, learning, rehearsing, and performing with a specific ensemble.

Table 3.3, found on the next page, shows my rankings of all twenty works.

**Table 3.3: Director Ratings of Musical Selections.**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Technique</b>	<b>Musicality</b>	<b>Composition</b>	<b>Intrinsic</b>	<b>Total</b>
American Sketches	5	5	5	5	20
Suite for Strings	5	5	5	5	20
October	5	5	5	5	20
Drifen	5	5	4	5	19
O Magnum Mysterium	3	5	5	5	18
A Prayer For Peace	4	5	5	4	18
Rondo in Blue	3.5	4	5	5	17.5
Bailes Para Orquestra	4	4	4	4	16
Fantasia on a 17th C. Tune	3	5	4	4	16
Red Rhythmico	4	3	4	4	15
Mountain Spring	4	4	3	4	15
Lion City	4	4	4	3	15
Schindler's List	2	5	4	3.5	14.5
American Landscape	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	14.5
Kashmir	3	3	3	5	14
Lux Aurorum	3	5	4	2	14
Voyage	3	4	5	1	13
Calypso Jam	4	3	3	3	13
Maharaja	3.5	3	3	2	11.5
Palladio	3	3	3	2	11

Undoubtedly, the repertoire mentioned by multiple directors is a strong body of repertoire. As I evaluated, there were certainly times it became difficult to quantify differences between pieces, and I would not universally dismiss any of the pieces based on scores alone. Three pieces received perfect scores; those three represent the most often mentioned piece (*Suite for Strings*), one piece mentioned three times (*American Sketches*), and one piece mentioned twice (*October*). *October* and *American Sketches* certainly will help push Harrington orchestra in their technical and musical development, and while *Suite for Strings* was programmed for Harrington this past year, I am certain it will reappear more than once during the span of my career. Currently, I do not believe that the bottom six selections represent appropriate repertoire for Harrington orchestra for a variety of reasons. Students did not enjoy reading through these pieces, often because they were at an inappropriate technical level for more than one part. This does not mean that when faced with a different ensemble, or Harrington orchestra at a different point in time, these works would not be in the running. Indeed, the very thing that hurt *Palladio* (the repetitious cello and bass parts) could very well be an asset, depending on the strength of those sections.

While these scores certainly add dimension and weight to repertoire choices, they do not determine repertoire alone. As we read, it became apparent that to create some ultimate list was going to be impossible. While all of the pieces on the list hold artistic merit, the idea of creating a universal “to do” list proved naive. Strengths and weaknesses of students, other programming choices from both past and present, and educational goals for a particular semester all have great effect on programming. For example, both *October* and *O Magnum Mysterium* received very high scores, but because of their similarities, would not be programmed on the same concert. It

would be foolish to program *Schindler's List* without a standout violinist, and students should have exposure to virtuosic parts before attempting the Rutter *Suite For Strings*. With the changes that occur year-to-year in a given ensemble, I found myself thinking much more in terms of what ensemble would flourish with a given piece, instead of ranking the universal appeal of any given work.

Indeed, I have found myself using the numbers primarily not to create rankings or prioritized works but to provide more information about a given piece. Rather than cycle through the top rated pieces every four years, it is important to use these rankings as a guide to better inform the decision of choosing repertoire that will be most beneficial for all.



## Chapter 4

### **Conclusion**

#### The Elevator Speech

After the completion of this project, I have compiled a large, vibrant body of repertoire. I believe that this repertoire is educationally and artistically viable and through it, an educator can find repertoire applicable to any high school orchestra situation, although no single piece is applicable to all. This list represents the starting point for my repertoire selection going forward, and the process of creating this list will continue to mold how I view and evaluate repertoire. Finally, this list represents a living document, and the work is far from over.

#### Secondary Observations

Collecting colleague recommendations revealed a startling lack of communication between orchestra directors. A brief survey in one's chosen profession, where the final list would be emailed back to participants, should have elicited a better response. To solicit responses from eighty-nine colleagues and to garner so few responses is troubling. Additionally, the lack of a membership directory in PMEA District Eleven was surprising to say the least. This lack of communication between directors manifested itself in the lack of overlap in terms of repertoire. Indeed, it seems little communication occurs between directors, and what communication does exist happens on a small scale in close geographic proximity.

Some directors actively declined to take the survey, and their reactions were also noteworthy. Among the motivations for declining were professed ignorance and that their ensembles only perform worked scored for full orchestra. No one who claimed these reasons thought there was anything wrong with having these beliefs, and no one who claimed ignorance requested the results of this project.

The ownership students assumed of the repertoire far exceeded expectations. The PYO students took time out of their lives to participate in this project that held no specific benefit for them, and were diligent in sight-reading and evaluating the material. Harriton, admittedly, had a vested interest, and spent much more time reading through the repertoire. All told, Harriton sight-read for approximately four hours. When asked to evaluate any piece, they often would engage in short conversations with their stand partner or section leader, and the snippets I would overhear would be conversations on everything ranging from the specific technical demands of the piece to what repertoire one would program to balance out a particular work. Every piece received equal attention, and at no point did students check out, even if they were playing through a piece that clearly did not meet their standards. Going forward, I plan to involve students more in repertoire choices in all of my ensembles.

### Reflection

When approaching this project, my goal was to have a workable, multi-faceted body of repertoire that I could use to program for my ensembles. In fact, I wrote that the purpose of this empirical study is to discover, examine, evaluate, and compile a body of repertoire that is musically viable and educationally appropriate for an intermediate high school string orchestra.

Reflecting on that purpose, I believe that I have merely started this work. However, I have a great start, and have a more honed skill set to continue a project that on some level will span the duration of my career.

Through discovering the repertoire I have learned the avenues through which to go when collecting repertoire suggestions. Rather than casting a wide net, going forward I plan to collaborate with that initial ten who responded to my first email. Avenues of communication need to stay open, and even informal repertoire suggestions will always be welcome.

Examining the repertoire has opened my eyes to the mammoth amount of quality repertoire, and the many different genres, forms, and styles this repertoire can come in. It has helped me to cast off my personal preferences and opinions, and be more open to programming world music, jazz, rock, and many other formats not just as “novelty” pieces or to fulfill some imaginary quota, but as crucial components to a well-rounded body of repertoire. In addition, I have learned that recognition of title or composer does not mean the work is viable in a given ensemble. Examining the repertoire has enabled me to develop a more solid set of priorities when looking at a work and the confidence to stick to my proverbial guns. Technical demands across all parts, quality of composition, and musical integrity are not simply stock phrases, but hard and fast must-haves.

Evaluating the repertoire has led me to believe that no piece, no composer is universally and consistently appropriate, which means that conversely, the ideal repertoire always exists for any given ensemble. This process has reinforced the need to balance out objective measure with the intrinsic values I as a music educator hold dear. Going through the evaluating process with the students truly opened my eyes to the depth at which they would discuss and rank a piece of repertoire. Time spent both with the PYO interns and the Harriton students was invaluable, and

proved beyond a doubt how crucial it is to evaluate any given piece of music within the actual ensemble one plans to program it for. Most importantly, evaluating the repertoire gave me a far better picture of how to determine quality of a piece as it relates to a specific and unique ensemble, and not judge quality by universal abstracts alone.

### Looking Forward

Due to time constraints, logistical limitations, and availability, the examining and evaluating only occurred for the pieces of repertoire that were listed by multiple directors. While the pieces that make up this subset are certainly noteworthy, I do not believe that they are exclusive, simply because there is too little overlap for it to be significant. With the lack of resources and communication about post 1965 string orchestra repertoire, it is far more likely a piece was not mentioned by more than one director not because it is lackluster, but because the other directors simply have not discovered it yet. From my own personal experience, I am familiar with some of the works that were only mentioned by one director, and believe some of those works hold great potential. With this in mind, I look forward to continuing to examine and evaluate all of the works that were mentioned by only one director.

This compilation is a work-in-progress. The current product is not finished, and as it stands provides information on 118 pieces of literature and detailed insight on twenty of those selections. All of the pieces in this compilation warrant fair and detailed examination, and hopefully this list continue to grow. A second list of pieces that were suggested by directors but do not fit the parameters of this study was also compiled, and I plan on examining those works as

well. With this document, I believe that I can find a vast number of pieces appropriate for my ensembles not just for this year but also for the years to come.

### Appendix A: All Responses from Director Survey

Responder	Title	Composer
1	Music for Lamentation	Raul Quines
1	Conversations in Silence	Conni Ellisor
1	Preludio	Paul Whear
1	Ripe for Plucking	Alan Shulman
1	Drifen	Shirl Jae Atwell
1	Bailes para orquesta	Richard Meyer
1	Lion City	Soon He Newbold
1	Glosses Sobre Temes De Pau Casals	Ginastera
1	For a Star Filled Night	Peter Askim
1	Blackberry Winter	Conni Ellisor
2	American Sketches	Joshua Reznicow
3	Perseus	Soon He Newbold
3	Iditarod	Soon He Newbold
3	Idylls of Pegasus	Richard Meyer
3	American Sketches	Joshua Reznicow
3	O Magnum Mysterium	Lauridsen / Dackow
3	Palladio	Karl Jenkins
3	Lion City	Soon He Newbold
3	Ice Sculptures	Brian Balmages
3	Dartmoore 1912	John Williams/arr. Stephan Bulla
3	Red Rhythmico	Kurt Mosier
3	Today	Robert Gardner
3	Rondo in Blue	Robert Longfield
3	Molly on the Shore	Grainger / Dackow
4	All	Elliot Del Borgo
4	All	Richard Meyer
4	Incantations	Richard Meyer
4	Air for Strings	Norman Dello Joio
4	Akerwis	Atwell
4	All the Pretty Little Horses	Douglas Townsend
4	Waterloo Station	Alan Lee Silva
4	Tango Mysterioso	Susan H Day
4	10 Pieces for Children	Bartok / Weiner

4	Tibetan Dance	Albert Wang
4	Windjammer	Carl Strommen
5	Lux Aurorum	Eric Whitacre
5	Desafinado	Jobim
5	Legend of Sleepy Hollow	Richard Meyer
5	Dreams of a Midsummer's Night	Richard Meyer
5	Irish Legend	Soon He Newbold
5	Hatikvah	trad. arr. Leavitt
5	Schindler's List	John Williams
5	Harry Potter	John Williams
5	Star Wars	John Williams
5	Indiana Jones	John Williams
5	The Patriot	John Williams
5	O Magnum Mysterium	Lauridsen / Dackow
5	West Side Story	Leonard Bernstein
5	Sleigh ride	Leroy Anderson
5	The Typewriter	Leroy Anderson
6	Jazz Waltz	Feese
6	Our Waltz	Rose
6	Rounds	Diamond
6	Serenade	Dag Wiren
6	Don't Tread on Me or my String Quartet	Peck
6	Spirituals for Strings	Morton Gould
6	Of Glorious Plumage	Richard Meyer
6	Mountain Spring	Barrage
6	Calypso Jam	Barrage
7	A Hero's Journey	Soon Hee Newbold
7	Driften	Shirl J Atwell
7	American Landscape	Soon Hee Newbold
7	Elegy	Jack Jarett
7	Egyptian Legacy	Soon Hee Newbold
7	American Sketches	Joshua Reznicow
7	Red Rhythmic	Kurt Mosier
7	Illumination	Bob Lipton
7	Suite for Strings	John Rutter
8	Bold Venture	M.L. Daniels
8	On a Hymnsong of Philip Bliss	David Holsinger
8	The Dance of Iscariot	Kurt Mosier

8	Ellis Island	Alan Lee Silva
8	Carpe Diem!	Richard Meyer
8	Dublin	Bob Phillips
8	Fantasia on a 17th century tune	Richard Stephan
8	Sanseneon	Robert S. Frost
8	Arcane Sage	Jeffrey S. Bishop
8	Reverie	John Corigliano
8	Voyage	John Corigliano
9	Suite for Strings	John Rutter
9	Lux Arumque	Eric Whitacre
9	Water Night	Eric Whitacre
9	Boy and a Girl	Eric Whitacre
9	October	Eric Whitacre
9	Beyond This Place of Wrath and Tears	Stephen Melillo
9	Stormworks	Stephen Melillo
9	Voice for the Silent	Stephen Melillo
9	China my Heart and Longing	Stephen Melillo
9	O Magnum Mysterium	Lauridsen / Dackow
9	Alleluia	Ralph Manuel
9	A Rose for Emily	McBeth
9	Folk Tune Air and Folk Dance	Safford
9	Mountain Spring	Marshall
9	Libertango	Piazzolla
9	Prayer for Peace	John Williams
10	Bailes Para orquesta	Richard Meyer
10	Calypso Jam	Arthur Bachman
10	Fantasia on a 17th century tune	Arr. Richard Stephan
10	I'll Be Bach for Christmas	Arr. Michael Hopkins
10	Masters in this House	Arr. Don Hart
10	Mock Morris	Grainger / Dackow
10	Moondance	Michael Hopkins
10	West Side Story	Arr. John Moss
11	Bailes Para orquesta	Richard Meyer
11	Palladio	Karl Jenkins
11	Calypso Jam	Dean Marshall
11	Lebedike Honga	Lieberman
11	Overture Allegro	Steinohrt
12	October	Eric Whitacre



12	Rondo in Blue	Robert Longfield
12	Voyage	John Corigliano
12	Choreography	Norman Dello Joio
12	Come to the Waters	Paul Jones
12	Various Hymn Arrangements	Jeremy Strong
13	Simple Song from Mass	Leonard Bernstein
13	Angela's Ashes	John Williams / Moss
13	Ashokan Farewell	Jay Unger
13	Bashana' Haba'Ah	Nurit Hirsh
13	Drifen	Shirl Jae Atwell
13	Folk Tune and Fiddle Dance	Percy Fletcher
13	The Music of the Night	Andrew Lloyd Webber
13	Ose Shalom	John Leavitt
13	Pirates of the Caribbean: At World's End	Hans Zimmer / Bulla
13	Red Pony, The	Aaron Copland
13	Rhosymedre	Ralph Vaughan Williams
13	Suite for Strings	John Rutter
13	Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory	Bricusse & ewley / Longfield
13	John Williams Trilogy	John Williams
14	Hoedown	Aaron Copland
14	The Faraway Place	William Hofeldt
14	Suite for Strings	John Rutter
14	Westridge Overture	Meyers
15	Prariesong	Carol Strommen
15	American Landscape	Soon Hee Newbold
15	Queen Noir Suite	Robert Washburn
16	Irish Aire and Jig	Robert Kerr
16	Maharaja	Doug Spata
16	Paranoid Android	Radiohead / Gorfain
16	Schindler's List	John Williams / Longfield
16	Strip the Willow	Ralph Huntgren
17	Piece For Strings and Percussion	Andrew Lipke
17	Aethelinda	Jeffrey Bishop
18	Zampa Overture	arr. McLeod
18	St. Paul's Suite	Holst
18	Barber of Seville	arr. Gruselle
18	The Abduction from the Seraglio	arr. Hoffman

18	Brandenburg No. 3	arr. Isaac
19	Concierto de Aranjuez: Adagio	Joaquin Rodrigo
20	Schindler's List	Williams / Custer
20	Maharaja	Doug Spata
20	The Lamb	John Tavener
20	Prayer for Peace	John Williams
20	Voyage	John Corigliano
20	Kashmir	Led Zeppelin / McCarrick
21	Kashmir	Led Zeppelin
21	Clocks	Coldplay
21	Christmas Concerto	Corelli / Dackow (??)
22	Shaker Loops	John Adams
22	Ramifications	Ligeti
23	Caulderon	Keith Sharp
23	La llorona	Keith Sharp
23	River Fiddle	Timo Jarvela
23	Stormrider	Timo Jarvela
24	<p>I teach an atypical program that combines strings and winds of all ability levels, so I am not at all representative of the usual string orchestra director. My groups chose their own music and, if I need to transpose or combine parts, I am happy to do so. My groups have done nothing older than 1965, ever. I got my M.M.E. from Boston University, so I am very progressive in my approach. I believe in making music accessible to all, not something unattainable for the "normal" person!"</p>	
25	Twinkle	

## **Appendix B: Repertoire Compilation**

The following appendix, while comprehensive and multifaceted, is presented as a living document. The appendix is organized alphabetically by title. Count refers to how many unique directors mentioned a particular composition. The notes column notifies the director of any out-of-the-ordinary aspects of the piece, most often the presence of solos. The JW pepper number refers to the unique code used to find the literature on J.W. Pepper. If a piece is not on J.W. Pepper, a live link to purchase the music is provided. Level refers to the level that J.W. Pepper ranks a given work. When available, numerical level was provided as well. Not all information was available for all titles.

<b>Title</b>	<b>Composer</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Publication Date</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>JW Pepper #</b>	<b>Level</b>
<b>10 Pieces for Children</b>	Bela Bartok / Weiner				5050927	M
<b>A Hero's Journey</b>	Soon Hee Newbold		2007	opt. piano	10027385	ME
<b>A Rose for Emily</b>	W. Francis McBeth				2415248	ME
<b>Air for Strings</b>	Norman Dello Joio				128439	E (3)
<b>Akerwis</b>	Shirl Jae Atwell		1999		2422574	M
<b>All the Pretty Little Horses</b>	Douglas Townsend		2001		2466167	M
<b>Alleluia</b>	Ralph Manuel / arr. LaBrie		2011		10280210	M
<b>American Landscape</b>	Soon Hee Newbold	2	2006	Piano (doubling)	10008710	ME (3)
<b>American Sketches</b>	Joshua Reznicow	3	2010		10085874	MA (4)
<b>Angela's Ashes</b>	John Williams / Moss				2433050	ME
<b>Arcane Saga</b>	Jeffrey S. Bishop		2004		2478784	M
<b>Ashokan Farewell</b>	Jay Ungar arr. Calvin Custer			Opt. percussion	2238723	ME
<b>Bailes para orquesta</b>	Richard Meyer	3	1998	Two Violin Soloists	2397628	M (4)
<b>Bashana' Haba'Ah</b>	Nurit Hirsh		1970	piano, percussion, violin solo	2333698	ME

Title	Composer	Count	Publication Date	Notes	JW Pepper #	Level
Beyond This Place of Wrath and Tears	Stephen Melillo		2008	large forces, harp, percussion	<a href="http://www.stormworld.com/music/catalog/c21_beyondthisplace.html">http://www.stormworld.com/music/catalog/c21_beyondthisplace.html</a>	MA - A (5-6)
Blackberry Winter	Conni Ellisor		1997	Dulcimer Soloist	<a href="http://ellisormusic.com/compositions/blackberry-winter/">http://ellisormusic.com/compositions/blackberry-winter/</a>	
Bold Venture	M.L. Daniels		2000		2469500	M
Boy and a Girl	Eric Whitacre		2011		10400825	
Calypso Jam	Arthur Bachman / Dean Marshall	3	1999	percussion optional	2479914	M
Carpe Diem!	Richard Meyer		2007		10027605	ME
Caulderon	Keith Sharp				<a href="http://musichouse.com.au/index.php?page=catalogue&amp;listing=caulderon">http://musichouse.com.au/index.php?page=catalogue&amp;listing=caulderon</a>	M(E)
China my Heart and Longing	Stephen Melillo		2008		<a href="http://www.stormworld.com/music/catalog/china.html">http://www.stormworld.com/music/catalog/china.html</a>	ME (2)
Choreography	Norman Dello Joio		1972		2273670	MA
Clocks	Coldplay arr. Robert Longfield				10096325	M
Come to the Waters	Paul Jones		2003		<a href="http://www.pjonesmusic.us/html/instrumental_solos_duos.html">http://www.pjonesmusic.us/html/instrumental_solos_duos.html</a>	
Conversations in Silence	Conni Ellisor		1997		<a href="http://ellisormusic.com/compositions/conversations-in-silence/">http://ellisormusic.com/compositions/conversations-in-silence/</a>	
Dartmoore 1912	John Williams/arr. Stephan Bulla				10343640	ME
Desafinado	Antonio Jobim / Ligon				10054699	M
Don't Tread on Me or my String Quartet	Peck				<a href="http://www.russellpeck.com/chamber_music.html">http://www.russellpeck.com/chamber_music.html</a>	
Dreams of a Midsummer's Night	Richard Meyer		2006		10015098	ME
Driften	Shirl Jae Atwell	3	1997		2389427	M (4)
Dublin	Bob Phillips		2008		10049907	ME
Egyptian Legacy	Soon Hee Newbold		2006		10008712	M
Elegy	Jack Jarett		1981		10307187	MA

Title	Composer	Count	Publication Date	Notes	JW Pepper #	Level
Ellis Island	Alan Lee Silva			cello solo	2480638	M
Fantasia on a 17th century tune	Arr. Richard Stephan	2	1995		2343515	M (4)
Folk Tune Air and Fiddler's Fury	Alexander Safford				2703092	M
Folk Tune and Fiddle Dance	Percy Fletcher				4964359	ME
For a Star Filled Night	Peter Askim		1999		<a href="http://www.pet-eraskim.com/for-a-star-filled-night/">http://www.pet-eraskim.com/for-a-star-filled-night/</a>	
Harry Potter	John Williams				Multiple editions, all on JW Pepper	
Hatikvah	trad. arr. Leavitt		2000	piano	2453728	M
I'll Be Bach for Christmas	Arr. Michael Hopkins		2014		10454936	M
Ice Sculptures	Brian Balmages		2009	cello solo, Piano	10063417	ME
Iditarod	Soon He Newbold		2010		10091996	MA
Idylls of Pegasus	Richard Meyer		2003	cello solo (short)	2475421	MA
Illumination	Bob Lipton		2013		10370773	ME
Incantations	Richard Meyer		2004	2 violin solos, viola solo	2478662	M
Indiana Jones	John Williams				Multiple editions, all on JW Pepper	
Irish Aire and Jig	Robert Kerr			Out of print	2442689	ME
Irish Legend	Robert Kerr and Soon He Newbold		2008	Solo violin, optional piano / drums	10047958	M
Jazz Waltz	Feese				4977468	ME
John Williams Trilogy	John Williams arr. Calvin Custer				2401503	M
Kashmir	Led Zeppelin / McCarrick	2	2009		10066843	ME (3)
La llorona	Keith Sharp			optional percussion	<a href="http://musichouse.com.au/index.php?page=catalogue&amp;listing=la-llorona">http://musichouse.com.au/index.php?page=catalogue&amp;listing=la-llorona</a>	M
Lebedike Honga	Lieberman		2007		10026993	ME
Legend of Sleepy Hollow	Richard Meyer		2009		10066953	M
Libertango	Astor Piazzolla / arr. James Kazik		2014	piano, 2 percussion	10461611	M
Lion City	Soon Hee Newbold	2	2009	Percussion (rain stick)	10066399	ME
Lux Aurorum (Lux Arumque)	Eric Whitacre	2	2004		not available	
Maharaja	Doug Spata	2	2011		10280360	M (3.5)

Title	Composer	Count	Publication Date	Notes	JW Pepper #	Level
<b>Masters in this Hall</b>	Arr. Don Hart		2008	Violin Solo	10038506	M
<b>Mock Morris</b>	Grainger / Dackow		1996		2353696	M
<b>Molly on the Shore</b>	Grainger / Dackow		1993		5665377	M
<b>Moondance</b>	Van Morrison / arr Michael Hopkins		1970	Piano, Drumset	10049917	ME
<b>Mountain Spring</b>	Dean Marshall / Arthur Bachmann	2	2002	Optional Piano	2480220	M
<b>Music for Lamentation</b>	Raul Quines		2007		<a href="http://www.quinesmusic.com/merch">http://www.quinesmusic.com/merch</a>	
<b>O Magnum Mysterium</b>	Lauridsen / Dackow	3	2006		10023619	M
<b>October</b>	Eric Whitacre / arr. Paul Lavender	2	2008	Cello solo, opt Percussion	10042806	M
<b>Of Glorious Plumage</b>	Richard Meyer		2007		10026991	MA
<b>On a Hymn song of Philip Bliss</b>	David Holsinger		2000		5896253	ME
<b>Ose Shalom</b>	John Leavitt			short violin solo	2480506	ME
<b>Overture Allegro</b>	Steinohrt				Out of print	ME (3)
<b>Palladio</b>	Karl Jenkins	2	1996		5523170	MA
<b>Paranoid Android</b>	Radiohead / arr. Eric Gorfain				10092308	M
<b>Perseus</b>	Soon Hee Newbold		2009		10066401	MA
<b>Piece For Strings and Percussion</b>	Andrew Lipke				Not available	
<b>Pirates of the Caribbean: At World's End</b>	Hans Zimmer / Bulla				10034692	M
<b>Prayer for Peace</b>	John Williams	2	2005	opt. Harp / Piano	10016077	M
<b>Preludio</b>	Paul Whear				579870	
<b>Queen Noor Suite</b>	Robert Washburn				2267342	M
<b>Ramifications</b>	Ligeti				7052608	A
<b>Red Rhythmico</b>	Kurt Mosier	2	2010	2 violin, 2 cello solos	10091987	MA (4)
<b>Reverie</b>	John Corigliano				2041929	ME
<b>Ripe for Plucking</b>	Alan Shulman		1987		<a href="http://www.capital.net/com/ggjj/shulman/works.htm">http://www.capital.net/com/ggjj/shulman/works.htm</a>	
<b>River Fiddle</b>	Timo Jarvela				out of print	
<b>Rondo in Blue</b>	Robert Longfield	2	2003		2474325	M (4)
<b>Rounds</b>	Diamond			out of print	5024351	MA

Title	Composer	Count	Publication Date	Notes	JW Pepper #	Level
<b>Sanseneon</b>	Robert S. Frost		2000		5945076	M
<b>Schindler's List</b>	John Williams / Longfield	3	1993	also arr. Custer	10041857	ME
<b>Serenade</b>	Dag Wiren		1993		9545953	A
<b>Shaker Loops</b>	John Adams				6105837	A
<b>Simple Song from Mass</b>	Leonard Bernstein arr. John Moss				2482144	M
<b>Spirituals for Strings</b>	Morton Gould			Out of print	5022199	A
<b>Star Wars</b>	John Williams				Multiple editions, all on JW pepper	
<b>Storm Rider</b>	Timo Jarvela				<a href="http://www.simplyforstrings.com.au/jarvela-storm-rider-for-so.html">http://www.simplyforstrings.com.au/jarvela-storm-rider-for-so.html</a>	ME (2.5)
<b>Stormworks</b>	Stephen Melillo		1988, revised 2013	flexible instrumentation, pre-recorded percussion track	<a href="http://www.stormworld.com/music/catalog/works1988.html">http://www.stormworld.com/music/catalog/works1988.html</a>	MA (4)
<b>Strip the Willow</b>	Ralph Huntgren		2005		10027007	M
<b>Suite for Strings</b>	John Rutter	4	1971		10008820	MA
<b>Tango Mysterioso</b>	Susan H Day		2012		10310529	ME
<b>The Dance of Iscariot</b>	Kurt Mosier		1997		2382380	ME
<b>The Faraway Place</b>	William Hofeldt				10012474	M
<b>The Lamb</b>	John Tavener		2006		10034980	ME
<b>The Music of the Night</b>	Andrew Lloyd Webber arr. Calvin Custer			Violin Solo	2401495	ME
<b>The Patriot</b>	John Williams arr. John Moss				2453694	ME
<b>Tibetan Dance</b>	Albert Wang and Huadong Lu				10050610	M
<b>Today</b>	Robert Gardner		2012	Optional percussion	10310622	ME
<b>Various Hymn Arrangements</b>	Jeremy Strong		2003		<a href="http://www.pjonesmusic.us/html/instrumental_solos_duos.html">http://www.pjonesmusic.us/html/instrumental_solos_duos.html</a>	ME
<b>Voice for the Silent</b>	Stephen Melillo		2012	Flexible instrumentation	<a href="http://www.stormworld.com/music/catalog/c21_voiceforsilent.html">http://www.stormworld.com/music/catalog/c21_voiceforsilent.html</a>	M (3-4)
<b>Voyage</b>	John Corigliano	3	1978	Three Violin Solos, Three Viola Solos	4967634	
<b>Water Night</b>	Eric Whitacre			out of print?	2475771	MA

<b>Title</b>	<b>Composer</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Publication Date</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>JW Pepper #</b>	<b>Level</b>
<b>Waterloo Station</b>	Alan Lee Silva		2008	Piano (doubling)	10046271	ME
<b>West Side Story</b>	Arr. John Moss				2475748	M
<b>West Side Story</b>	Leonard Bernstein				Multiple editions, all on JW Pepper	
<b>Westridge Overture</b>	Richard Meyer		2014		10453658	MA
<b>Willy Wonka and the Chocolate Factory</b>	Bricusse & Newly / Robert Longfield				10062565	M
<b>Windjammer</b>	Carl Strommen		2009	Piano , Percussion	10071036	ME



### Appendix C: Rubrics Used in Sight-reading Session.

#### Technical

1	2	3	4	5
This piece is completely inappropriate for all parts	This piece contains few appropriate technical challenges, and is too easy or too difficult for most parts.	This piece contains some technical challenges, but is too easy or too difficult for some parts.	This piece has technical challenges that are appropriate, but not for all parts.	This piece has technical challenges that are attainable and appropriate for all parts.

#### Musical

1	2	3	4	5
This piece contains no expressive elements nor musical value	This piece contains few expressive elements and no musical value	This piece contains some expressive elements and minimal musical value	This piece contains many expressive elements and some musical value.	This piece is replete with expressive elements and holds rich musical value

#### Composition

1	2	3	4	5
This piece appears to have no sense of cohesiveness. It is boring or unintelligible.	This piece has little thought, and has very little to unify the piece. It is predictable.	This piece has some thought and some unifying aspects. It is predictable and trite.	This piece is well thought out but somewhat predictable. It is somewhat interesting and contains many unifying aspects.	This piece is well thought out and original. It is interesting and has a sense of unity. It contributes to the orchestral canon.

**Intrinsic**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
This piece is not at all a good match for my ensemble.	This piece is not a good fit for my ensemble, and there are few elements I can see myself rehearsing.	This piece is neither a good fit nor a bad fit. There are elements I could work on, but others are lacking.	I like this piece, and can imagine myself programming it. There are many elements I could work on.	I love this piece, and actively plan to program this work in the near future. There is a wealth of material that I could teach.

## Works Cited

- Allen, Michael, Louis Bergonzi, Jacquelyn Dillon, Robert Gillespie, James Kjelland, and Dorothy Straub. *Teaching Music through Performance in Orchestra*. Ed. David Ault Littrell and Laura Reed. Racine. Vol. 1. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2001. Print.
- Allen, Michael, Louis Bergonzi, Jacquelyn Dillon, Robert Gillespie, James Kjelland, and Dorothy Straub. *Teaching Music through Performance in Orchestra*. Ed. David Ault Littrell. Vol. 2. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2001. Print.
- Allen, Michael, Louis Bergonzi, Jacquelyn Dillon, Robert Gillespie, James Kjelland, and Dorothy Straub. *Teaching Music through Performance in Orchestra*. Ed. David Littrell. Vol. 3. Chicago: GIA Publications, 2008. Print.
- Apfelstadt, Hilary. "First Things First: Selecting Repertoire." *Music Educators Journal* 87.1 (2000): 19+. *NAfME*. Web. 22 Apr. 2015.
- Geraldi, K. M. "Planned Programming Pays Dividends." *Music Educators Journal* 95.2 (2008): 75-79. *NAfME*. Web. 22 Apr. 2015.
- Grout, Donald Jay., J. Peter Burkholder, and Claude V. Palisca. *A History of Western Music*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2006. Print.
- Hopkins, Michael. "Programming in the Zone: Repertoire Selection for the Large Ensemble." *Music Educators Journal* 99.4 (2013): 69-74. *NAfME*. Web. 22 Apr. 2015.
- "J.W. Pepper Sheet Music." *J.W. Pepper Sheet Music*. N.p., n.d. Web. 28 Jan. 2015.
- Mark, Michael L. *A Concise History of American Music Education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education, 2008. Print.
- Persellin, Diane. "The Importance of High-Quality Literature." *Music Educators Journal* 87.1 (2000): 17-18. *NAfME*. Web. 22 Apr. 2015.
- Reynolds, H. Robert. "Repertoire Is the Curriculum." *Music Educators Journal* 87.1 (2000): 31-33. *NAfME*. Web. 22 Apr. 2015.

Schupp, Robert C. "Selecting Music for Junior High School Orchestra." *Music Educators Journal* 51.2 (1964): 97. *NAfME*. Web. 22 Apr. 2015.

Scruggs, Bernadette. "Constructivist Practices to Increase Student Engagement in the Orchestra Classroom." *Music Educators Journal* 95.4 (2009): 53-59. *NAfME*. Web. 22 Apr. 2015.

