Despite the threat of wintery weather throughout the region and even though some presenters encountered delays because of the snow, the AFACCT Conference on January 7 and 8, 2010, was a measured success. Held at the College of Southern Maryland in La Plata, Maryland, this conference was the 20th annual planned by AFACCT. Its theme was comprehensive: “The Role of Community College Faculty in Achieving the Goals of the Maryland State Plan for Higher Education.” Judging by the variety of challenging topics addressed by peer presenters, the State Plan afforded many an opportunity to share their experiences about teaching and working with today’s community college students.

The Conference attracted a total of 317 faculty members, educational professionals, and some students from the 16–member community college system of Maryland. Thursday’s keynote speaker was Dr. James E. Lyons, Sr., the Secretary of Maryland’s Higher Education Commission (MHEC). His keynote address focused on the role that Maryland’s community college system plays, particularly its faculty, in the State’s economic, social, and cultural development. In particular, Dr. Lyons stressed the importance of faculty in helping to improve the completion rates of students attending Maryland’s institutions of higher education. On Friday, the keynote speaker was Dr. Sue Blanshan, Director of Academic Affairs at MHEC. She spoke about how faculty members can support the State’s goal of enhancing student–centered learning.

Along with these featured speakers, 65 peer presentations were offered, including four poster sessions. In addition, several organizations held their annual meetings as part of the AFACCT Conference, among them the Developmental Education Association of Maryland (DEAM), the Maryland Mathematics Association of Two–Year Colleges (MMATYC), and the Maryland Council of Community College Chief Academic Officers (M4CAO).

On behalf of the entire AFACCT Board of Representatives, I am grateful to the staff and faculty of the College of Southern Maryland for their hospitality and assistance in making the event run smoothly. Without their assistance, it would not have been possible for me to coordinate the conference. I am most grateful also to each of the presenters who gave informative, creative, and entertaining presentations. Finally, to read abstracts and view PowerPoint shows of some of those presentations, go to the AFACCT website and click on the link for AFACCT Conference 2010 Proceedings: <http://www.afacct.csmd.edu/>.

Richard J. Siciliano
College of Southern Maryland
La Plata, Maryland
richs@csmd.edu
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Our Community Supports AFACCT With Door Prizes

Orlando Correa
Associate Professor of Psychology
Behavioral and Social Sciences
Harford Community College
OCorrea@harford.edu

Every year AFACCT’s conference is supported by the generous contributions from publishers, businesses, theatres, and, of course, Maryland’s great community colleges. This year AFACCT was again extremely fortunate to receive numerous “door prizes.”

Annually, we have acknowledged the donors of these generous gifts on our AFACCT website at <http://www.afacct.csmd.edu/conference20/donors10.htm>. We also wish to thank our donors by name and list a few of the generous donations in this issue of Communitas.

The AFACCT Board extends a special appreciation to the following contributors who provided donations: a weekend stay at the Dunes Manor Hotel in Ocean City, Maryland, won by Margaret Bolton of the College of Southern Maryland (CSM); tickets to the Folger Theatre, Washington, D.C., won by Kim Lukas of CSM; tickets to the Woolly Mammoth Theatre Company, Washington, DC, won by Nancy Thorpe of CSM; tickets to Toby’s Dinner Theatre of Columbia, Maryland, won by Joe Burgin and Barbara Johnson of CSM; tickets to the Harford Community College, won by Chris Heard of Harford Community College; passes to the College of Southern Maryland’s Latin and Jazz Festival and Ballet Project of Southern Maryland, won by E. Marie Struble, Charles Dold, Cynthia Hardman, and Fred Russell—all of CSM.

As in the past we also received funds to support breakfast or lunch and book donations as giveaways from the following publishers: Pearson Education, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, provided funds and books. McGraw Hill Higher Education, New York, New York, provided funds and books, and Wadsworth/ Cengage Learning, Belmont, California, provided funds. All of the above companies are multi–year donors, and we cannot thank them enough for their generosity.

We extend special thanks to Ms. Lauren Prendergast, Director of Sales, Dunes Manor Hotel, who has supported AFACCT for many years. Dunes Manor offers oceanfront rooms with a magnificent view of the Atlantic. It is perfect for family vacations or group events.

Congratulations to all our winners. We hope to see all of you at next year’s conference at the Community College of Baltimore County—Essex Campus.
The Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL) at CCBC has been in existence college–wide since January 28, 2008—following the successful tradition of campus based centers. The motto and main mission for CETL is “Transforming lives through teaching and learning.” Given this underlying concept, CETL tries to address the needs of all faculty (full–time and part–time) with workshops and various other initiatives.

After an initial focus on training all faculty in our new Annual Professional Evaluation system, which was created by faculty for faculty, the center expanded its offerings quickly. A semester calendar filled with workshops related to pedagogy, classroom management, stress management, and other job–related issues is at the heart of CETL’s daily work. Every week there is a specific focus that is addressed via a workshop, which is usually facilitated by a faculty member thus highlighting on a consistent basis the expertise of CCBC’s faculty. These workshops range from “Teaching Millennials,” to “Formative Assessments” to “How Counseling can help our Students Succeed,” integrating and connecting all aspects of CCBC for the benefits of students and employees alike.

Dr. Solomon Gebru is with Goldbelt Falcon and with the Food and Drug Administration’s Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition (CFSAN), Office of Applied Research and Safety Assessment (OARSA), in the Division of Molecular Biology. Currently, he is working as an assay development specialist working on rapid method development for emerging foodborne pathogens strain characterization and identifications. He received a B.A. in Journalism, B.S. in Biochemistry, MSc. in Clinical Biochemistry from Donetsk State University, and his Ph.D. in Cell and Molecular Biology from Howard University Washington, DC. He taught different biological courses as a faculty and adjunct faculty at the University of Maryland, Prince George’s Community College, and Howard University. He has authored two books: *Acriflavine Inhibits the Proliferation of Trypanosoma Musculi and Uterotrophic and Antuterotrophic Actions of Estrogen and Tamoxifen*. 

Meet the Newest AFACCT Rep

Dr. Solomon Gebru
Prince George’s Community College
Largo, Maryland
gebruST@pgcc.edu

The Center for Excellence In Teaching and Learning (CETL) at Community College of Baltimore County (CCBC)— proudly introduces its newest AFACCT Rep.

Nelda Nix–McCray
Assistant Professor of Sociology
CCBC—Catonsville
nnix@ccbcmd.edu

Rosemarie Cramer
Professor of Management
CCBC—Dundalk
rcramer@ccbcmd.edu

The fall of 2009 semester marked the beginning of two main new threads in the center’s offerings and focus. We began to incorporate holistic topics as well, which is where many centers across the nation are going responding to a need among employees, faculty, and staff alike. The new monthly meditation workshops and the audio recording, which the CETL director is producing with the help of our TV & Recording Team, is a clear success on the way to establishing the holistic leg of CETL as well. The other thread is the creation of a six–part, two–semester Global Citizenship program, which will lead to a “Certificate in Inter-cultural Competency” for those participating in all six workshops and completing the work. This series is very popular, and we are planning the remaining three workshops for the spring 2009.

The success of this Certificate course is leading into the proposal of a “Classroom Disruption Management Certificate” also being developed and launched in the spring 2010 semester. This will be a four–part workshop series.

CETL is also working with various faculty cohorts, such as the “New Faculty Learning Community” (NFLC), “Connections” (Veteran Faculty Learning Community), and the Coordinator Cohort. The NFLC is a long–standing, one–year learning community for all new, full–time faculty joining CCBC. “Connections” is CCBC’s Veteran Faculty Learning Community, which is directly facilitated by a faculty member. Here groups of faculty (full–time and part–time) with five or more years of teaching at CCBC are collaborating on a specific issue/topic.
that will result in a major project. This project and its results are shared with the rest of the colleagues at our various college-wide events. Last year’s “Connections” Team, for example, focused on “Formative Assessment” in the classroom, while this year’s group has decided to focus on and explore “diversity” issues in the classroom.

To help further more cross-discipline communication, Natalie Kimbrough, the CETL Director, also created the “New Coordinator Cohort” in which coordinators meet monthly to discuss issues that have come up, as well as share training needs to help the CETL director work on the upcoming calendar of events.

The Center is also closely connected with the Culturally Responsive Instruction/Pedagogy Course that has been an enormous success for faculty training for the last four years at CCBC. This program has an online component throughout the spring semester, which culminates in an eight-day, face-to-face training in early summer. All faculty are invited to apply, and the cohorts develop projects for their respective class to be implemented in the coming semester.

The Center is also charged with organizing major college-wide events related to training and information, such as our annual Fall Focus (our college meeting at the beginning of the semester) and the Winter Adjunct Conference in January (our college conference for all adjuncts, which includes longevity awards and other forms of recognition).

In the spring 2010 semester CETL will be launching another initiative, this time one focused mainly on faculty who have been at CCBC for 2–5 years. This will be a “Partners in Teaching” initiative based on the concepts of peer mentoring to support and increase pedagogical discussions and exchanges across various disciplines.

ETC’s and Instructional Design Initiatives

How can a college provide quality training for a growing population of 384 full-time faculty and 723 adjuncts while experiencing 14% enrollment increases for credit courses? Faculty training demands are proportionally increasing; so creativity and efficiency are solutions practiced by the Employee Technology Centers (ETCs) at the CCBC. Updated computer and instructional technology equipment serve the three campus Centers which seat 12–15 training participants. Technology support assistance is available for trainers regularly. Use of technologies such as Adobe Connect and remote conferencing expand options for participation. Scheduling training is noticeably more competitive but manageable with the training calendar readily visible to staff on an internal platform, SharePoint.

The Employee Technology Centers frequently serve the new Instructional Design team the college invested in to promote quality in online instruction. This staff provides professional development for faculty in workshop and presentation settings as well as an entire 100–hour program, which guides faculty through the process of creating online courses. Celeste Stratton, Coordinator of Instructional Design and Training, says, “this program serves faculty in developing courses with an emphasis on quality, effective uses of the learning management system, and strong instructional design principles. The result is prepared faculty and satisfied students.” The College supports standards set by nationally recognized Quality Matters rubric, which underlies online faculty professional development initiatives. CCBC recently piloted a blended course in which collaboration between the instructional designer resulted in faculty awareness that quality teaching online improves face-to-face teaching as an unintended consequence. According to CCBC’s experienced Instructional Designer, Dionne Thorne, “collaboration is the key to develop successful and high quality courses that meet the needs of our rapidly increasing and diverse student population.”

The Employee Technology Centers and Instructional Design Team—under the leadership of the Senior Director for Instructional Technology, Margaret Gilbert—serve the Instructional Technology Department at CCBC providing quality services, offering flexibility, and managing expectations that are necessary to maintain favorable and productive relationships with ever-valued faculty.
General Education Meets the Challenge

Nicholas Plants
Department of Philosophy
Prince George’s Community College
Largo, Maryland
plantsnr@pgcc.edu

Maryland’s commitment to a system that is academically excellent as well as effective is the basis for its 2009 Plan for Postsecondary Education. Because this system should “produce graduates who excel in their fields and demonstrate the capacity to think and communicate creatively, critically, and clearly,” the plan calls for postsecondary education to be supported not only for its economic benefits, “but also for the personal and intellectual enrichment that the pursuit of learning provides our diverse citizenry.”

The stipulation that postsecondary education be supported by intrinsic motives as well as extrinsic ones is a challenge for community college faculty for at least three reasons. The first is economic. In an economic climate such as the one we find ourselves in, the economic benefits of an education are at even more of a premium than they are in the best of times. This is especially the case at community colleges, where students are often impacted more by economic fluctuations than students at four–year institutions are. The second reason is cultural. Contemporary American culture tends toward a skepticism regarding intrinsic motives anyway, and often adopts a deeper skepticism when a struggling economy renders extrinsic motives even more important.

Because extrinsic motives are usually more important to community college students given their economic constraints, they are additionally skeptical of intrinsic motives, even more so than for the cultural reasons they also share with their counterparts at four–year colleges.

The third reason—the one with which I will concern myself here—is conceptual. The stipulation that Maryland community college faculty should support postsecondary education with intrinsic and not only extrinsic motives is one that is made harder by the cultural and economic challenges already mentioned, but that immediately raises the conceptual question of how to balance the intrinsic and extrinsic motives for learning. Responding to this question is crucial because there will forever be economic and/or cultural challenges that make educating our students even more challenging a task than it already is. The truth is that the more we respond to this conceptual question of balance the better able we are to thereby address the economic and cultural challenges that make educating our students even more challenging a task than it already is. The truth is that the more we respond to this conceptual question of balance the better able we are to thereby address the economic and cultural challenges that make educating our students even more challenging a task than it already is.

Intrinsic motives are thought to be the case because any extrinsic benefit might have the effect of leading me away from my intrinsic motivation to learn, toward the extrinsic motivation of doing so for the sake of some economic benefit, like an attractive salary. Because the activity of learning is seemingly compromised for the sake of its anticipated result in this manner, the conclusion is often drawn that intrinsic and extrinsic motives are mutually exclusive. Thus, the same conclusion is also drawn in the opposite direction, even if by the same logic. For if I learn for the sake of some extrinsic benefit rather than for the sake of learning itself, I must not benefit other than extrinsically. Such is thought to be the case because, as before, any intrinsic benefit might lead me away from my extrinsic motivation to learn, toward the extrinsic motivation to learn for the sake of the economic benefits, and toward some intrinsic motivation, like learning for personal enrichment. The anticipated result of learning is seemingly compromised for the sake of this activity itself such that not at all less than the intrinsic one of personal enrichment, the extrinsic motive of an attractive salary is taken to exclude its supposed rival. Either way we arrive there; the end is a mutual exclusivity that seems to render it impossible to balance these two motives for learning other than by excluding one in the name of the other.
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Whether it is drawn by a learner who is extrinsically motivated or by one who is motivated intrinsically, the conclusion that these two motives are mutually exclusive is as often maintained as it is drawn, and vehemently so. I cannot tell you how many times I have had students inform me (often on the first day of class) of which side they are on and how vehemently they are so. On the one hand I have the militant millionaire who long ago mapped out his entire college curriculum, and who has since decided that any class not devoted to immediately enabling him to make his first million is merely just another hurdle under some intrinsic guise or another, whether it be personal enrichment, general education, or, even, perish the thought, ethics! And, on the other hand, I have the resentful retiree who has come back to school solely for personal enrichment and who has no interest whatsoever in what grade she earns for the course, much less to secure a lucrative job because she held that job for longer than I have been alive, thank you, and is only in the class to learn that intrinsic stuff she was not taught the first time.

Though it took me longer than I would like to admit, I have run into enough of these drastically opposed, yet similarly based, convictions that I realized that whether any given student was intrinsically or extrinsically motivated to learn was not the key question. For regardless of how they were motivated, I had students whose vehement convictions regarding what should motivate their learning were so because they had long since concluded that regardless of what their own motives for learning happened to be, intrinsic and extrinsic ones are necessarily mutually exclusive. So, if I, as an educator, were to follow suit and stake my claim on one side of this debate rather than the other, I would ironically be fostering the same dilemma that has resulted in so many students being such vehement defenders of the conclusion that intrinsic and extrinsic motives are mutually exclusive, that they fail to learn half of what they would learn if only they realized that the two are mutually inclusive! It is for this reason that the key question we face is not whether our students are intrinsically or extrinsically motivated to learn so much as whether they participate in thinking and communicating creatively, critically, and clearly about the crucial question of whether intrinsic and extrinsic motives can be mutually inclusive. This and other such non–discipline specific questions are precisely the ones we must confront our students with, regardless of which discipline we teach, because it is only by thinking and communicating their way through such questions, and thereby gaining the skills and values they need in order to gain the discipline–specific knowledge they also need, that their postsecondary education can be personally enriching and economically beneficial at one and the same time.

The resentful retiree and militant millionaire are actually two sides of the same coin. She wants to make up for not being intrinsically motivated to learn back in the day when she was just as extrinsically motivated as he is, and he wants to make sure that he does not lose his extrinsic focus because if he does he will never have the money to retire early and go back to school with intrinsic motivation. Each is afraid of compromising the motivation they have but they have that motivation, whether it be intrinsic or extrinsic, only because they already concluded that it was impossible for their own learning to be supported by intrinsic and extrinsic motives at one and the same time. As a result of mistakenly proceeding as if learning can only be an instance of personal enrichment or economic benefit, they subscribe to only one motive in the very setting in which they so desperately need to learn that they need not choose one rather than the other because intrinsic and extrinsic motives for learning are mutually inclusive.

The best way to illustrate the truth that the two are mutually inclusive is to return to the classroom with the militant millionaire and the resentful retiree, both of whom are convinced that allowing for a motive for learning other than the one they are committed to would compromise their learning. Far from compromising it, supporting their learning with both motives rather than one alone actually enhances their postsecondary education by ensuring that it is both academically excellent as well as effective. The non–discipline–specific skills and values one gains in the pursuit of knowledge in a specific discipline enhance the economic benefits one gains as a result of earning a degree, just as surely as the converse is the case. The militant millionaire disdains the intrinsic motives that support personal enrichment as a hurdle because he thinks that his pursuit of economic benefit is solely an extrinsic affair. But it is not. Even if he successfully navigates the classes he hurdles his way through to get his degree, finding his intrinsic motivation along the way would not hurt, especially if doing so motivates him to
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does his million in a business he finds personally enriching. The resentful retiree, meanwhile, disdains the extrinsic motives that support economic benefit as beneath her because she thinks her pursuit of personal enrichment is solely an intrinsic affair. But it is not. Even if she manages to avoid the economic benefits of learning when done for its own sake, finding her extrinsic motivation along the way would not hurt, especially if doing so motivates her to tell her story just because she did finish the first time around and not only the second.

It is because intrinsic and extrinsic motives for learning are mutually exclusive only at their peril that the conceptual challenge of revealing they need not be so is well worth our efforts. Given the scope of this conceptual challenge, not to mention those of the economic and cultural challenges we also face, can faculty manage what Maryland’s 2009 plan stipulates? Can we support postsecondary education with both intrinsic and extrinsic motives?

The fact that the 2009 Plan stipulates we do so is both a boon and a bust. It is a boon in that it is an official reminder that intrinsic and extrinsic motives are mutually inclusive despite the multiple conceptual, economic, and cultural pronouncements we receive that they are mutually exclusive. It is a bust, however, because it does not identify the balance between the two that enables intrinsic and extrinsic motives for learning to remain mutually inclusive in the way they must if postsecondary education in Maryland is to be academically excellent as well as effective. We community college faculty need to look elsewhere for a response to the question of how to balance the intrinsic and extrinsic motives for learning. Believe it or not, we all have just such a resource: the general education programs of our various institutions. Any general education program should, if not in letter then at least in spirit, articulate how it aspires to balance the discipline-specific knowledge that all students need in order to enjoy the economic benefits their chosen discipline offers with the personally-enriching skills and values that are required if they are to pursue learning in the form of any specific postsecondary discipline. It is within general education programs that the balance between intrinsic and extrinsic motives for learning are struck because it is in such programs, and more specifically in the courses that define them, that personal enrichment and economic benefit are initially supported to some extent or another. The crucial question is to what extent are each, and we hope, both, supported? Our responses reveal the balance between intrinsic and extrinsic motives for learning at our respective institutions. We can and should compare them.

Turning to the general education programs of our various institutions for guidance in no way excuses us as faculty from individual responsibility for whatever balance exists between these motives for learning, however. Such is the case for at least two reasons. First, we are responsible for the current constitution of our general education programs, if not alone then at least in large part. If our fingerprints are not all over these programs then we are to blame, just as if our fingerprints are on them we are responsible for which motives support them and to what extent. That we can and should turn to our general education programs for guidance and compare them is one more reason to be sure that we as faculty have a decisive hand in their genesis no less than their development. Second, whether we teach general education classes or not, faculty are properly responsible for developing the discipline-specific knowledge we teach, not in a vacuum, but by the light of the non–discipline–specific skills and values that enable students to pursue learning as one instance of personal enrichment.

This is obviously true for someone like me who teaches only general education courses, but it is no less true for faculty who teach none. Whether we introduce these skills and values or reinforce them, we are responsible for revealing to our students that either extrinsic or intrinsic motives for learning are not enough. Both motives come up short if either alone are what motivate them to learn. The idea is not for our students to think and communicate critically, creatively, and clearly only in their chosen disciplines, but in every field of inquiry they encounter. And in order for this to occur, it is not enough for us to support extrinsic motives to learning alone any more than it is for us to support only intrinsic ones. A graduate without knowledge of any discipline is as much of a disappointment as one without all of the skills and values that enable any knowledge to thrive in the form of economic benefit, no less than in that of personal enrichment.

What is the spirit behind, or better, the letter of, the general education program within which you currently teach? What particular balance between intrinsic and extrinsic motives for learning does it support? If this balance is articulated in spirit more than in letter, how have
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Owning the Golden Bubble

Serap Bastep–Gray
Frederick Community College

Have you ever wondered why the exceptionally talented daughter of your friend quit playing the piano when she left home for college or marveled in the self–determination of your fifty–some–thing neighbor tackling the technical intricacies of his latest violin piece between his corporate meetings? What is the secret behind the differences in levels and duration of motivation amongst music students?

Psychologists, educators, parents and business people have been pondering the explanation for the motivation puzzle for centuries, albeit for different reasons. The common theme among many approaches and theories to explain the whys and hows of motivation is the need to satisfy an inner longing. It is this need that creates the drive to initiate the internal processes that lead us to start, to direct and to sustain an activity. What exactly, then, is the longing that aches in the depths of students’ psyches that drive them to come to their lessons week after week? Is it curiosity or exploration? Is it a need for belonging, power or achievement? Approval from an authority figure or guilt relief? Is it nature or nurture? Is the need and the drive genuinely internal to the student or is it a need for an incentive—maybe to get a chance to boost a college application resume or to receive creature comfort privileges at home in return for his or her hard work?

Any instrumental teacher worth her salt knows that the answer is a complex combination of internal needs and external rewards unique to each student, and it is under constant reconstruction in reaction to evolving needs and rewards brought about by the very nature of living. As musicians and educators of musical arts, most of us choose to focus on providing the best technical and musical instruction to our students, hoping that our efforts will lead to love and appreciation of music and, if we encountered the right type of student, will bring to life some sort of long term musical involvement. In our zeal to become the best teacher we can, we strive to enhance our understanding of instrumental pedagogy; we dissect technical and musical skills into building blocks; we sharpen our diagnostic eyes and ears to determine efficiently and solve problems; we provide models for healthy practice and effective performance habits; we arm ourselves with a variety of strategies to guide students in their quest to a better command of their instruments. And we do all this with joy and love of music that emanate from the very core of us. Yet, we all realize that the apprenticeship of any given student under our guidance is only a moment in his or her lifetime; the true master is the companionship of a well–developed
inner drive through the rest of their musical journeys.

The question is then, as the bearers of the torch, what can we do to pass the burning fire of a lifetime involvement in musical arts to our students who for whatever reason are finding themselves in our studio, sleeves rolled up, ready to tackle what we dish out in that lesson?

The road to foster a long term inner drive for musical involvement might well go through rendering the act of making music in itself satisfying and rewarding, therefore weakening its dependency on countless and ever-changing inner needs or outer incentives. Psychologists Ryan, Deci and their colleagues believe that an act that in itself is rewarding or satisfying in some internal manner leads to intrinsic motivation—the act itself becomes the reason to perform it. The power of a well developed intrinsic motivation is evident in human history that hosts numerous artists and scientists who stuck to their artistic and scientific endeavors at the expense of satisfying other inner needs.

Scientific evidence suggests that intrinsic motivation is enhanced when a person feels competent and has a sense of control on their actions. The feeling of competency is highly dependent on the student’s perception of success, which in turn is under constant influence from outside feedback. Repertoire and didactic material within appropriate level of difficulty, a flexible and non-judgmental approach of teaching that is tailored to the individual learning style of each student, clear instructions, attention to patterns of mental activity to enable the student to receive instruction at their peak levels of focus will facilitate efficient learning and result in successful outcome, while positive feedback in the form of well-timed and well-targeted praise, mentored performance opportunities within a supportive environment will help shape a student’s perception of success.

A sense of autonomy and control in the students with respect to their learning process will benefit from being presented with choices that are predetermined to be context appropriate by the teacher. This “choice presentation” can be easily applied in different areas such as appropriate repertoire, order of practice routine, order of tasks within a lesson and so on. Encouraging students to actively participate in shaping the contour of their learning process will likely enhance the communication and reciprocal feedback between the teacher and students and bring about a better understanding of the students’ personality traits and value systems.

Important to note is that today’s music students are coming from a background where their free time is parcelled between several activities, with little say in their schedules that are either designed by well-meaning parents following cultural norms or by extracurricular activities mandated by school systems. A good portion of these activities are in a group setting where following instruction for the good of the “team” is the main expectation. Precollegiate or collegiate alike, today’s music students need our help in evolving from passive followers to active participants who claim ownership of their time and their art.

Lessons that deal heavily with performance skills are an excellent medium to emphasize the notion of ownership that empowers students to assume the role of the master of their art. Cue formation to prevent and alleviate stage fright, by its nature, is a powerful tool that reaches deeper into the psyche. Including statements that shape the students’ perception of self as the owner of their art into the associative statements for the cue seems to be an effective initiator of change. I often observe an immediate increase in students’ confidence levels, perhaps owing to the realization that what they do with the instrument is their business and in a different category from the many other activities where they find themselves in a role to please an authority figure. With frequent reinforcement during their lessons and during their practice routine, most students begin to enjoy the sole ownership of their art, something that belongs to them and cannot be taken away.

The personal relationship based on trust and reciprocal feedback that is unique to one-on-one instrumental instruction provides us, the instrumental teachers of today, with a privileged position to help create and shape an inner drive in our students, the bearers of the musical torch of tomorrow. Let us make sure we use our musical, pedagogical, and personal wisdom to help create a new generation that continues to appreciate the aesthetics of a music that is self-created and not merely a product to be consumed.