

## Appendix A: Music Advisory Group Transcript

**Date:** February 20, 2026

**To:** PELSB Board Members

**From:** Steve Rollin, Rulemaking Attorney

**Re:** Music Teacher Licensure Advisory Group - Transcript

This transcript is a record of the PELSB music advisory group’s deliberations. It was recorded via WebEx and revised for accuracy. For the full report, see the [Revised Music Advisory Group Memorandum DRAFT \(Report\) 021026.docx](#).

Date of Meetings: January 14 and 28, 2026

Members in attendance:

ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERS		
<b>Mallory Alekna</b>	Augsburg University	Assistant Professor of Music, Human Development, and Learning
<b>Max Clifford</b>	Wayzata Public Schools	Orchestra Director
<b>Josh Danderand</b>	Fond du Lac Ojibwe School	Music Teacher
<b>David Davis</b>	St. Louis Park Public Schools	Music Teacher
<b>Rachel Gorden Mercer</b>	ISD 192 Farmington School District	Middle School Band Director
<b>Kevin Huseth</b>	Cloquet Public Schools	High School Instrumental teacher
<b>Michael Lipset</b>	4 Learning	Executive Director
<b>Aaron Lohmeyer</b>	Winona State University	Professor of Music Education & Jazz Band Director
<b>Kim Morford</b>	ISD 750 ROCORI	K-12 Vocal and General Music
<b>Evan Ronken</b>	Buffalo-Hanover-Montrose School District	Director of Human Resources
<b>Tony Streng</b>	South Washington County Schools	Music Teacher
<b>Richard Thomas**</b>	Foley Public Schools	Intermediate Music Teacher
State Support and Facilitation		
<b>Yelena Bailey</b>	Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board	Executive Director
<b>Michael Buck</b>	Perpich Center for Arts Education	Music Specialist

<b>Alina Campana</b>	Minnesota Department of Education	Arts Specialist
<b>Max Clark-Vail</b>	Perpich Center for Arts Education	Leadership & Data Specialist
<b>Lucy Payne</b>	Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board	Teacher Preparation, Board Chair
<b>Steve Rollin</b>	Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board	Rulemaking Attorney

\*\*This member was unable to attend the deliberation and voting meeting.

## OPTIONS

The music advisory group considered three options that the PELSB board was asked to consider at the November 2025 meeting:

- **OPTION 1:** Discontinue the K-12 Vocal and Classroom Music and the K-12 Instrumental and Classroom Music licenses and replace them with a single PK-12 Music license with specialization embedded in the standards
- **OPTION 2:** PK-12 General Music License + 2 endorsements (Choir and Band/Orchestra), adding music production, recording arts, and popular music standards into the general music license
- **OPTION 3:** Keep the current licensure structure and change through standards revision only (Add music production, recording arts, and popular music standards into the existing two-license structure)

## CLARIFICATIONS

### Michael Lipset

First, I would love a review before we start to discuss the three options of those options. Second, reflecting upon last meeting's review of the options, it was clearly were derived from a survey that was disseminated mostly to licensed folks. And I have a deep interest in seeing unlicensed folks gain license, particularly folks who historically have been gate-kept from licensure through all sorts of access opportunities or barriers to access. And so to come up with options for licensure reform as it were, by asking only folks who have been licensed. Seems to me to be a huge echo chamber of ideas that is keeping out the exact kinds of people that we would like to see more of in the profession, and I think I'm almost case in point.

Even though I am not one of those people, I was not originally within the considered group for this group, but was allowed in and I'm very grateful to be allowed in, and in so doing seems to be one of the only voices expressing this exact opinion either this week or last week. And so already we see the benefit of opening conversation to folks who might not originally have been considered. And so while I'm very grateful for the process, it seems like there's a huge elephant in the room, and the other half of that elephant is that we're asking to now make a decision after having been introduced to these other options one time over the course of 90 min. So thank you for the invitation. I'm very happy to be here, I'm very happy to contribute, but NO, I don't feel very comfortable with the process as it's presented.

### Steven Rollin

Okay, I hear you Michael. We put out the invitation for this work group as far and wide as we could do it. So you are an invited representative to this group. You are one of the persons that we were looking for in the category of alternative teacher providers. So you represent them on this work group. When we get to the round table, we're going to go around to each person. I would encourage you to elaborate on what you've just said and let us know how you would want the board to proceed. What this group has been tasked with by the board is to look at the three options, and they haven't empowered us to go beyond that. Now that doesn't mean we can't go ahead and add other options. The other thing we could do Michael, is we could talk outside of the workgroup and see what you think needs to be added in and I could run that by the full work group as well. So if there are things you want in there that you're not seeing, let's add it in as a part of the report back to the board. Let's keep things where we are for now and we'll go around the table, add in what you want besides the comments you've made already when we get to that.

### **Michael Buck**

Thank you, sorry. Could you quickly clarify the difference between, we talked about an endorsement and specialization - can you just quickly cover the difference?

Steve Rollin - So the 1st option was to discontinue the PK-12 vocal music and classroom music and the PK-12 instrumental and classical music licenses and replace them with a single pre K twelve music license with specialization embedded in the standards. Option two is K-12 general music license and two endorsements, one for choir, the other for instrumental. And then finally changing through the standards revision, which is leaving things pretty much as they are.

Max and Alina, could you answer the question on the endorsements and specialization?

Max - Sure, I'll address the specialization versus endorsement question. When there is an endorsement in place, it means that only people who have pursued only people who have received the endorsement may teach in those courses. So if choir, band, or orchestra became an endorsement, you would have to have that endorsement to teach that. That's not accounting for alternative pathways or like portfolio, but that's it in terms of our traditional licensure structure. Whereas the specialization does not create a gate of who can and can't teach what, it is used to demonstrate what expertise you have so that in hiring you're able to say this is someone who has more depth in this area. So endorsement says only someone with this license can gain access to this license and only someone with this license can teach this content. Specialization says this is something I have gone deep in and communicates that.

### **Alina Campana**

I was just going to add that specialization could show up in some way in the licensure standards depending on how those are written, so it could be built into the licensure standards and it could also show up in the way the degrees and requirements are set up. Often people get a degree in some music specialty area and a music Ed degree.

### **Kevin Huseth**

Is an endorsement a two way street, meaning if I have a instrumental, I can only be assigned to teach an instrumental class?

### **Max Clark-Vail**

No, that's a good question. So if you had a general license and you had an instrumental endorsement, you could be assigned to any class with your instrumental license or instrumental endorsement and any content within music that doesn't require an endorsement. So if you had a band/orchestra endorsement, but didn't have choir endorsement, you could not be assigned to choir unless you had the endorsement.

Okay, any other background questions before we get started?

## **DELIBERATIONS**

### **Steven Rollin**

Okay, so let's go around the table. I want to hear your thoughts. This is an advisory group, so that now is the time for you to give some advice to the group where you stand, even if it's not much to add, add it in anyway. We need to hear from you.

### **Mallory Alekna**

Okay so, I teach at Augsburg University oversee the music Ed program and have been a K12 music educator, for a long time. I think that for me when I'm choosing between these options, I don't want to just make a necessary change but an exciting change. And I think that the change to a single license also reflects the good work that we're already doing. Where students are at the center and they're thinking dynamically about how they can bring their skills into a lot of different areas. I do believe that we are producing better teachers and those who are adaptable and prepared. Even though we have a split license system right now, we essentially operate as a single license program already because our small programs are not going to be able to tease out into really small groups. So we do a lot of cross-listed classes and the students are learning a lot from each other in those ways.

My expertise would say that the endorsements are really only going to be viable at large institutions, and that a single license is something that all institutions are likely able to find a way to maneuver through. I also don't want to make a choice that's planning for the inequity in other parts of our system. I've heard the concern that administrators might abuse this or cause issue. I hope that this is the exception and not the norm, but I want us to choose what makes sense because we know it's exciting, what's best for students and not planning for areas that are outside of our purview.

Fewer licenses is in line with other states, and this also represents my own background. I'm from Illinois. We do K-12 music licenses, and I've taught in six states across the country, and those states also do single licenses. So yes, some bias there. But also I have seen this work in a lot of different states across the country. Yeah, so a single license I think is the reality of what higher Ed can provide, but also shows a really great opportunity and exciting opportunity for us to say that music education is about serving all students and that we still have opportunities for students to get specified when they do professional development or when they ultimately choose to go on and do some additional graduate coursework.

### **Tony Streng**

I just thought that option two with the endorsement seemed very similar to like the current model we have now, and I was wondering, what is the difference between the current model we have now and the endorsement model?

### **Max Clark-Vail**

It is definitely similar, you're right, Tony. It does create a little bit of a middle ground. One difference is that our choir/band/orchestra folks would have to pursue additional credential to be eligible to teach those courses. Folks new to the field would pursue a side license and then additionally an endorsement. So there's that level of difference. It also means right now, there's general music that it across the both licenses and then there's it's split, so you can't be shifted from one to the other. Assignment there's a thing that's come up. This kind of takes that and says, well, here's another way to do it, but still allow more flexibility for entering the field so that you could go and just get a K12 general license if you wanted. But if you want to teach Band/Choir/Orchestra, you would need to pursue additional training in that second option.

### **Max Clifford**

Okay. Well, good afternoon, everyone. I'm Max Clifford I teach Orchestra and guitar at Wayzata High school. I'll also be speaking in support of the 1st option moving to that all encompassing license and I kind of frame my notes in a skeptic to supporter fashion. I entered our 1st meeting being with a lot of reservations. I think like many survey respondents I was specifically concerned about, you know, curricular integrity, would that broader license water down the collegiate curricula and how would that impact program quality over a number of years? Could that lead to lower performing ensembles?

As a fairly early teacher I was also thinking of the long term impact, you know, I have a teacher in a district known for its excellence in the performing arts and I was thinking about implications over the next 20 to 30 years for colleagues that I would be hiring and working with under this new structure. And then I also had some concerns about feasibility from a teacher preparation programming standpoint, specifically instrumental techniques and vocal pedagogy requirements and how that would fit into this new structure. But despite these initial concerns having the chance to reflect over the past couple weeks, I have moved towards support of that option for a couple important reasons. The biggest one being that equity for non traditional pathways is my primary why. A personal example, I currently teach guitar as a self-taught instructor to fill a need in our department. My students are successful, after our last meeting I found myself asking or am I the most qualified person to teach this content having had an orchestral strings background, being someone who taught myself the instrument and developed the program, be simply because I was the person who had the FTE available to do it. And I framed it through the question of would we feel comfortable asking somebody who self-taught violin and bass two years ago leading one of our high performing string ensembles? And so the question of holding those different things to different standards was a big turning point for me. And increasing student engagement under current structure, our guitar teachers, electronic music, other popular styles must come from a band, orchestra or choral background, so that's their main experience, and that guitar popular music experiences typically a secondary one for them. So opening up this more all-encompassing license would help us provide that pathway for highly qualified specialists in those areas, not just a band director that's teaching a music production course because that's the person who could teach it. So we can really have the opportunity to provide those high quality excellent experiences for our students who are not drawn to typical ensemble offerings. And I think the end result of that will be more students making more music, which is a good goal for all of us.

And I also find myself, this is my last thing here, thinking about specialization when I reflected on my own experience, an experience of my peers who went through our college prep program together, I graduated from St. Olaf, a well-regarded institution, but when I think on my own experience, my specialization didn't really occur within that collegiate coursework, even though I was a instrumental music education major. I think that college programs provide that really solid foundation in teaching music, but the specialization, at least in my experience, really occurred during field experiences, internships, student teaching, all of which would remain with a change

in the structure. So, I think while I had those initial questions, I believe a lot of those details can be addressed effectively in that rulemaking process and in the curricular redesigned in the teacher prep programs, and so I am in favor of moving to that 1st option, that single PK-12 license.

### **David Davis**

I'm David, I teach in St. Louis Park Band/Orchestra/general music. I've evolved a ton as a teacher myself. I started very traditional and now I am very passionate about innovation and systemic change in our field. I feel like our system is currently built to reinforce the system and it seems like a lot of the structures currently in place keep divergent and non-traditional musicians out. So it's kind of like holding onto that power that worked for me and worked for other traditional music educators. I am wondering how do we expand because I know there's tons of people out there that are very qualified and could be very inspiring to the students. I also think it's like our field to me feels like it's kind of dying. Fewer and fewer people are finding what we do relevant especially the traditional bandwidths. So I think just like businesses, if we don't adapt and change, we're going to keep being seen less and less relevant, and I think we need those innovators and divergent thinkers to keep our field healthy and relevant. So I think change is way past due. I'm wondering mostly if a licensure change is the way to do it. So that's where I'm currently at.

I do feel like option three feels like the option for people that are afraid of change, so I don't think I'm in favor of that one, seems like there's so many things that are very niche and narrow in how we currently do music education and license music education. And I wonder if teaching music at large through instruments, digital, vocal or blend of all in any of it would actually be better for teachers and students rather than becoming so narrow and niche in. Yeah, so I don't think I'm in favor of option three.

Option two might facilitate some more innovative non-traditional music educators, but I think option two maybe does it by making it just harder for band/choir because it sounds based on what we talked about last time, it sounds like people that want to teach band/orchestra/choir would have to potentially have a fifth year in college or get like that extra few classes, which almost feels like a disincentive to do that. Well, maybe that would make it easier for the non-traditionalists. But then my worry of option two is even if that is the case, that that would be hurtful to our field at like just fewer and fewer people would then want to be music teachers, so that's my concern with option two, so I'll share that I'm also leaning towards option one cause I think that one would best facilitate being inclusive of the divergent music educators that I think have been historically kept out and our field desperately needs, is now also the right time to ask a question?

Okay, so with option one that I'm leaning towards, a concern that was brought up that I'm also very much wondering about is that administrative misuse that was talked about back when this was done 30 or 40 years ago, I think it was said if we open up licensure to those more divergent innovative teachers if that administrative abuse would happen more with those types of teachers. And I'm saying that because I've experienced this 1st hand, where I had to do things outside the box as a band/orchestra teacher, I had an administrator, a few years ago who thought I wasn't teaching music correctly, particularly because I was teaching Ghanaian music from Africa in my band and he said world music has NO place in our bands, so he thought I was ruining the rigorous and excellent traditions of the music program in this district, so he tried to get rid of me, and so I'm wondering if

one of our goals is to have less gatekeeping and allow more of those culturally diverse innovative music educators. Is there anything that can be done if we go with option one to protect from that administrative abuse, especially if we have administrators that are used to the status quo and the tradition and are ignorant of the changes and they could very I could easily see administrators just assuming that those non-traditional music educators are bad at their job and I'm going to do anything I can to get rid of them. So that's my biggest concern.

### **Max Clark-Vail**

My immediate thought David, is that there's not a structure in place through the licensure mechanism currently that sort of thing can be done with like grade levels, right? And it happens with moving people to different grade levels or into gen general music or in other areas. That being said, there may be work that can be done in other arenas to address that sort of thing. So, I'll just leave that there and say that that should be an ongoing conversation when there is change about like how to make implementation authentic and as best as possible. But I don't, I don't personally see a mechanism in the licensure stuff to address that, that element of it.

### **Evan Ronken**

Let's just that from a district end of things. I'm the director of human resources. So there's kind of two different angles on that. The main one is that Unrequested Leave of Absence (ULA) language is going to, and bumping rights are going to dictate anytime if there's any sort of reductions, so the narrower a license, the more likely somebody would be placed on ULA. Now to the point about being it's an unrequested leave of absence, so when there's, a budget cuts that have to be done, it has to be done in an order that first identifies probationary teachers and then after that it's based upon areas, but if somebody doesn't hold the license for any classes that are currently being offered, there really isn't an option for them. You can't place them outside of their area. So having a broader license would allow more job protections in a ULA. Now the other concern about would that allow a principal to assign somebody to many different classes? Yeah, it would.

### **Josh Danderand**

Well, 2nd and 3rd option seem like the same to me. Just for fun, I went and just grabbed my license because I have it right here behind my degree, and it says instructor or band, orchestra and classroom music. So that looks a lot like option two as well. It's like I have a general license with endorsement for band and orchestra, which is so funny because I could not teach Orchestra right now. I don't think I know enough to speak as eloquently as all the rest of you. I have such a unique position. I work only on the reservation K-12 school. And not only that, there was NO music here before me, so I started the program from nothing and I've had fantastic support from administration, principals and superintendents because they had NO clue what the music program would be like. They just wanted one. And so I had the freedom to do whatever. Now I didn't exactly do modern band because I thought it was cool. I did it because there was six guitars here in the closet when I showed up, and then one of the teachers upstairs had a drum set that they said you guys could use. So like I started two weeks after I graduated college and that's what I had.

Luckily I do have a humongous background in rock and roll as I've been in rock and roll bands my whole life since I was 18, so I used the training, I got in college, but the instruments that I learned as a rock star I guess, and we made this thing. I start in 4th grade with modern band and we go all the way through high school and every single day is rehearsal and it is modern band.

The last comment that was made about administration taking advantage of if you have a general license, it's like, they need to have a meeting on how to be better administrators then and they need to have their own licensure discussion because excluding students and excluding qualified teachers is the worst. And if they want to just continue to do that, then I guess they're going to, and we have to have these meetings, but at the end we just have to advocate for ourselves. I guess it's a matter of showing what you're doing and then using the standards that we have to justify those things, because if an administrator has never been in music, they don't know anything and they say oh you're ruining the traditional, well they what do they know? You come see what to do, but that's just ranting I mean, like I said, I don't think I'm qualified and speak this well and I have such a unique job that it doesn't exactly align with everyone else.

If I had to pick an option I pick option one because I feel like that's just what I have. I of course have an instrumental license, but I teach singing every day to high schoolers and to little kids and I just teach music with whatever the kids need and whatever this community needs.

### **Rachel Gorden Mercer**

Hi. Yeah, I'm Rachel Gordon. I teach a middle school band in Farmington, and I think I would echo a lot of what's already been said. Some of the things I was trying to figure out for myself was that difference between endorsement and specialization. I kept coming up with more questions than answers. I know that currently one of the things that we run into and in talking with other music teachers about is that worry being a fine line of being too broadly licensed to teach anything and being able to and yet not feeling that you yourself are qualified to do that. And so, you know, we've run into the Issues where you know somebody has had an old license that was music, whatever band/choir/orchestra, they could teach everything, but she didn't feel like she was a choir teacher and an administrator put her in a choir situation, and she didn't feel that she herself was qualified to teach that, even though that's what her license said she could teach. She was a band director. So that's the biggest fear that I hear from people is that situation happening.

What we've run into often is the lack of knowledge in the general music area and trying instead to get more kids involved in band and choir (we don't have an orchestra). Band and choir might not be the avenue they want to take. But our teachers don't feel qualified or comfortable to teach recording or modern band or some of those other electronic music and then they're just put into that position. You know, we were told last year you've got to come up with some electives that any of you would be able to teach. I mean that's because they didn't know which one of us it would work best for the schedule.

Well, one teacher says they could do musical theater and I say I could do modern band, but I don't really feel comfortable doing musical theater. There are so many different areas of music that I think it's really difficult. So all of that to say, I'm thinking that larger music with the specializations seems to be the most logical direction to take and where I'm leaning because music degrees tend to be heavy on credits to begin with. If you're adding this degree plus specializations, that is going to add years on to getting a music degree and will that make fewer people interested in that area. So making sure that it's doable in a four year degree and then does this change what student teaching looks like? So, if people have a general music degree, would they student teach in general music or would they have to do pieces in all of the spaces? Those were kind of the questions that came to my mind.

## **Kevin Huseth**

I find myself gravitating towards option two, but for a lot of the same reasons that many of you are singling out option one. I'm thinking maybe I'm envisioning option two incorrectly, but what I like about option two is, to me it feels like it offers the opportunity of a more pared down music license that an institution could fit into: a smaller amount of time and then the possibility of branching out in these endorsements on top of that. But I'm not over the moon about any of these options as they're currently written.

In an ideal world, if we go with option two, I would love to see there being more than just band and choir available. I think creating the possibility of an electronic music or a rock band or whatever sort of endorsements out there, I think that would be critical to making that meet the need that I think that we need to be meeting. With that I would also be very interested in some sort of like super radical idea that gets Josh's students and Michael's students to enter our profession because those are the kids that we want. We just had a professional development with Anton Troyer and he made the comment that there are only 59 American Indian students in the education preparation program across the state. 59. What? You know, those are the kids we want to reach and those are the kids that we're not hearing from right now, so they're not really represented in any of these options. So I think that's where I, that's where I stand.

## **Aaron Lohmeyer**

I'll probably wind up echoing what everybody else has said. I'll just offer a couple things related to each. When I look at option three, as a music coordinator, I might not say music ed coordinator. I am receiving requests for applicants for jobs that are far more off, and I think positions are changing and I think that a licensure needs to prepare for that. I am inspired by those who have already spoken about their own career evolution. I think that is one of the benefits of option one.

It allows teachers to move into areas that not just they feel passionately about, but particularly like what Josh was talking about, this is my school community. Now what am I going to do? Allow teachers the artistic discretion to, to choose the go-to that best fits their students without needless state requirements that say you can't do this or that. One thing about option three that as a coordinator, when I look at changing, just doing through standards revision, this point was already made, but I want to underline that the degree is already massive.

I worry about staying with the current structure and just adding in new standards related to popular music, more secondary general stuff, recording, and that just being what we've been complaining about. For years is that when we get a new mandate, it's like ok well that three credit course is now going to be three one-credit courses and to where now I have students that are taking up to 15-16 classes a semester, not credits, classes, and you think about what we're doing to their ability to focus in on anything, you know, so when we talk about specialization with the current structure, we're spreading them so thin. So I really don't think the current structure is working for students. It's burning students. And you know, just one little bit of personal on words like traditional and non-traditional, I was non-traditional. I did not start off as a music educator in a music ed program because I want to be a band director. And I loved music. I was a jazz musician, I was in rock bands, but I did not think music ed was for me because that meant I had to be a high school marching band teacher, right? And you know what, the curriculum largely said I did have to do that. But I was fortunate to have a university director who said, "No, you, you can major in music, you can be a music teacher and not just be the box that the profession tends to do."

That was in a state with the option one licensure, a K-12 licensure and that was in Florida, and one thing coming from a state where that was in place, you do have band directors who are also teaching guitar and keyboard and AP music theory. On one hand, it seems like, "Oh my gosh, that's a lot; I don't know if we can do that." But they do and I would say their programs are stronger for it. I would even argue that they are stronger for it too as they expand musically in their own practice. It's that kind of holistic direction that I think the field is headed. I like that.

A teacher good teacher can go take any job that they want and can be choosy and say, "I don't like those job assignments; I'm not going to apply." I think it gets more power to the teacher to respond to students. One last final thing since a lot of people are already kind of saying what I'm saying. On option two, in an ideal world, I love that. However, I worry that would create an extra burden for band/choir/orchestra.

I worry that universities with the current budgetary climate will say, "You mean we can offer Justin a music ed degree and we don't even have to do the endorsements?" And then we wind up just not doing it because it's easy for universities to make cuts on things like that because right now we cannot float new programs unless we can prove that they will make money. And I don't know if that will continue to honor that tradition which you know, we need to continue to have strong bands out there too. So I worry that that would actually threaten the future strength of those programs. And I think I'll stop there.

### **Kim Morford**

My concerns with option one are still about courseload both in the studies to gain depth of knowledge and the needed experiences to feel ready to teach, but also concerned about courseload in teaching placements, because I live in a more rural area and I can see that if I were assigned to teach both choir and band, it's a lot and that's my concern there. So that's why I like endorsements. However, I wish I had more training in modern music courses. They sound very exciting and I wish I was better equipped for that type of thing. So in that way, option one would be good because I would maybe get some more experiences with that. But also option two, you know, does also provide some concerns about courseload if you're getting the endorsements requires extra, so I'm sitting on the fence about them. I'm pretty sure that I would rule out option three, though, I don't know if there was more discussion about it beforehand and I'm not sure if I completely understand that.

### **Steven Rollin**

Okay, option three you have concern, you don't understand it.

### **Kim Morford**

Well, I think I would rule it out, but I'm also not sure if I completely understand all that, but everyone else is leaning against away from option three as well. So perhaps I'm understanding it enough.

### **Steven Rollin**

Option three is the closest to the status quo, what we have now, but we would match it up to academic standards.

### **Alina Campana**

Yeah, it would be the same structure of our two current music licenses, with the idea that the changes through standards would be embedding things like music technology, modern band capacities, more around “create and respond” that sort of thing. Building in more of that, what we've been talking about, is missing in current many current preparation pathways.

### **Michael Lipset**

If we're working within the three options presented, would have to pick either option one or two. I do want to preface first off, a lot of what folks have said is what I will also reiterate, but hopefully I can put a little more concrete structure to some of the ideas. And then the second thing is to recognize that what we're talking about already suggests in some ways and in a pathway towards music production and recording our specific licensure. I want to talk a little bit about that.

Credit overload or course structure at the university level where folks are getting these licenses has come up quite a bit. Standards revision seems quite a daunting task, but those are things that I think we can do and I want to echo folks who believe in a bold shift to make it possible to become licensed teacher educators.

I would love to see an update to the standards where we're redefining music literacy as multiple literacies where candidates can demonstrate musicianship through notation, oral and oral traditions and digital representation, which actually aligns with national music standards and emphasis on creating, performing and responding. I would like to see the creation of a real production or recording pathway, not one that is simply embedded. So for option one, that might mean a specialization strand inside PK-12 music standards titled recording arts and production that is weighted equally to the ensemble strands. And in option two, a 3rd endorsement called music production recording arts or something they're in that would also sit alongside choir and band or orchestra. And again this group already is recognizing the possibility of such a change. So I support that, but I think the important piece here is that it sits at an equal level, and that the standards are written in such a way where the demonstration of competence matches the actual pathway and the licensure that is delivered.

I would also like to see entry and assessment become practice based, not purely rooted in these traditional notions of reading and writing sheet music and orchestral ensemble arrangements and so on and so forth. We already have licensure via portfolio as a non-traditional pathway to tier three and additional fields, and so this would simply be to a recommendation to revise standards so they're written in a way that a working producer can actually evidence them through things like lesson videos, student work recordings, demonstrations of pedagogical practices like culturally sustaining pedagogy and so forth.

I do think standard design is at the root of a lot of these recommendations; unfortunately for folks who aren't so excited about that idea. And then I would also say to expand production of recording expectations that are authentic and don't reproduce inequity, we would then need to think through implementing some sort of system wherein the wealthier districts aren't getting studios and everyone else is getting garage band (e.g., we would want to make sure that everybody has the same access or at least the access needed to get them to the place where they're performing at a high level). And I have more around what standards might actually include, but that is the gist of what I would like to see come out of this. Again, my recommendation is option one or two with those caveats.

### **Evan Ronken**

Just something I could get on board with the 1st option is where I see an advantage to preserving jobs. When there are more classes that people can teach, our goal is always to get the best educators in. Regardless of the class, they're going to be good in front of our kids. But I do see the challenge that people could be put into positions that they may not be comfortable teaching and I think that is a genuine concern that would need to be considered as part of it. Option two, I'm kind of ambivalent towards it, that really comes down to what the operational requirements would be so that we're not overburdening and taking a four year degree and making a five or six year degree for that. So that's where I stand and so in the end, option three doesn't seem like a great option.

### **Tony Streng**

I'm speaking in support of option one. It could lessen the elitism in our field. I think it's possible that with option one, this choice could help our discipline move forward and make it easier for non-traditional music classes to be offered - non-traditional being classes that aren't choir, band or orchestra. I would hope that if this option were to move forward, that universities would prepare students to teach choir, band, orchestra, elementary music and other music courses. I do think the university music education track could be revised to better prepare people to teach music. I do think it is possible to learn other music disciplines. I taught choir for 20 years and this year half of my job is teaching band lessons. I've spent some time in August and I spent a little bit of time, about 30 min every day during the school day, practicing nine band instruments, learning those skills. So I do think that it is possible to learn those other instruments. I also think that this option could make it easier for staff to weather the yearly enrollment in course changes in music.

I did have a couple of concerns about option one. I really liked the idea of offering students opportunities, to do like a popular music band, just as an example, you say Dave Matthews band, a course like that. I think that'd be really cool. I think students would really like it. One thing I think of about band, orchestra and choir is that it's a way to teach music that works really well in schools because you can it's a subject that you can get, you know, 30 or more kids in a class. If you're going to teach Dave Matthews class, there's only five people in that band. I could see that as being a challenge trying to teach a popular music band to a group of 30 kids when a band is really usually made up of five people. When sometimes I hear people getting excited about offering other music opportunities for students to take, that's sort of a question that comes up in my mind is that discipline of music something that you can have 30 students in the class and teach? Schools aren't going to offer a class that only five kids can take. It's just not financially feasible.

And then my last concern I had for option one was administrator misuse. I would hope that most administrators would kind of look at the bigger picture and not do something like that. So again, I'm speaking in support of option one and those are my, my initial thoughts.

Steven Rollin:

I want to go now to the state folks MDE, PCAE, and PELSB and have some discussion.

### **Michael Buck**

I'm coming at this from 20 years in the K-12 world, 15 years at higher Ed as a music ed coordinator, and now at Perpich. I visited a lot of classrooms. As a matter of fact I talked to a lot of teachers. I think there are a lot of great things. I'll frame my comments in this way. I think there are elements of all three options that could work,

and I think there are ways that all three options could be suited to kind of meet the needs, some more so than others.

The principle that I'd like to kind of advocate for is that we need to create a licensure structure that meets the needs of our students to prepare them for careers and experiences in music, not just in the traditional ways we've done it. I think the tent needs to be bigger, I think it needs to include modern band and so forth. But I think we really need to make this student-centered focus on what are the needs of the students? And I think that the other things are definitely very real - what administrators need, what schools need, what communities need, but what is it that students really need and what are they telling us by what they're choosing to participate in? And I think that could mean in a variety of things. I do want to just give a quick shout out to for Tony making the comment about staffing. One of the things that's one of our greatest strengths and one of our greatest weaknesses is staffing issues around music. And so for instance, it's not uncommon for an elementary classroom teacher to have 300-400 students. I was just talking to one that had 900 students. She sees them once a week and she's got 900 elementary students. That's really impossible to really do, but yet she's making it work. But, because of the numbers, is it really financially feasible to offer a modern band class where you can only have ten kids or five kids or whatever versus a band, orchestra, or choir where we were typically seen, you know, 40-90, whatever. There's a little bit of the thought that music teachers are really good investments for schools because we're cheaper to provide.

### **Josh Danderand**

Just a couple things on things I heard from people talking. When it comes to modern band, because that's the label we have right now, we can't think of it like a regular rock band. Regular rock bands do only have five people, but that's because they're just like dudes that got together and made a band. You can have a modern band that's 40 people. It's about having the instruments. So for me, I do actually have a 30-student band, and we are a modern band. I just have five drum set players and I have seven keyboarders, I have four guitars, two base guitars, and I have 13 singers. So I'm just saying it is possible to just run it like a normal ensemble. Too many are worrying that modern band can only have five student cap. Modern band is really doable.

And then the other thing I wanted to hit on quick is we were talking about like some fear of the traditional music dying or just the community maybe doesn't want it. We played a concert in November and like I said, I have about a 30 person band, but we had 400 people at the concert. So it was way more than parents and siblings. It was like the whole community. Now I also have to do that caveat that we're on the reservation, things are just different. We are so community based and that's why it was such a huge turnout, and most of our concerts are between a hundred and 400 people that come to see, but there's just good advantages. To what is right now called modern band and even after all these meetings and whatever option is given, I would love it if any of you have questions, because now that I've done this for eight years, I feel super confident in teaching modern band at a grand scale.

So just find my email and contact me whenever you want because I'd love to talk to every one of you for lots of time and help you in any way that I can with modern band regardless of the outcome of this vote. So I'm just putting that out there, look up my email. Let's chat. I like to drive, so I'll come down and see you if I need to.

### **Michael Buck**

Just to kind of piggyback a little bit on what Josh was saying, I will say the endorsements, and I think Michael mentioned this earlier, trying to elevate and make like modern band on the same as band, choir, or orchestra. I'm worried about if it is an endorsement, it means you have to have the endorsement in order to teach it. And so what I would hate to have happen is we want to have a modern band program, but we don't have anybody that has that endorsement, so it makes it hard. That is why I asked the question of the difference between specialization and endorsement and what ways we can actually meet the needs. Again, I'm thinking the bigger picture of how can we do all these things and make it feasible. University programs to have some flexibility in how they structure, but also to still have some standards there that we want to hold, that we want to keep the rigor, we want to keep the ability to make music in the traditional ways. Whenever you widen the tent, I think it's a tricky thing to balance.

I want to think big picture, I want to be creative. I also don't want to ignore the past because tradition is there. There's a lot of great things that have brought us to where we are. We're not serving all the needs of everybody, and also just a shout out to PELSB I understand the variances that must have been a nightmare to try it because so many people are asking, can I teach this? Can I teach that? It makes their job very, very difficult, and that's a real world problem here.

So how we structure this and what we say if we're trying to really focus on the needs of the students, I think we can try to come up with a program. I would bet that it would probably be option one or two. It could potentially be option three, but the changes would have to be pretty monumental and that might be just harder than it's worth, so I'll leave it there.

### **Yelena Bailey**

I will say I've appreciated hearing the thoughtful input and that you all are genuinely wrestling with your experiences as well as what might benefit future teachers. And I've heard a few of you echo that you wish you had this this option or this training and that's really what this is about. I think the most useful feedback is doing this broader work to streamline licensure and it's better to have your advice and input on what that might look like, even if you're not fully on board with the streamlining, it's to say, ok, but if you are going to do it, here's what I think that should look like. And I'm having a parallel conversation with the special education advisory group, and so I appreciate the wrestling with what is not an easy piece.

I will just say one thing I know the teacher prep thing has come up a few times, but just a reminder that what you're discussing now, a lot of what you all are asking questions will be addressed in the year and a half to two years of rulemaking that this will take, and then the two years after that of teacher prep developing programs. It's clear that you all get teacher prep and higher Ed will have to do redesign to make this work because you can't have people taking five years. You can't have people trying to do the traditional programs and so some universities are already doing interdisciplinary work. I came from a grad program that was heavily interdisciplinary and that's the movement in higher ed if you're planning to survive it's the movement at higher ed. And so I think that this is very futurist thinking and so I just want to reiterate that that is the plan and that teacher prep would have to make adjustments.

### **Lucy Payne**

I'm extremely appreciative of the expertise you all bring to the table because I'm not a music educator and I can listen to what you say and think about my own area which is elementary. There are some parallels and there are some things that are very different. Hearing your passion for the field and your future's thinking and being

student centered and understanding the needs of that, but also understanding the tensions between teacher needs, district needs, and someone very early on said something about, "You know, where's the tension solved between administrators and schools and teachers and licensing and who's responsible?" And those are all the things we struggle with, right? We're in a big ecosystem that's not webbed and connected together necessarily in the right spots at the right times and this is one of those times. I appreciate the thinking that goes into the implications of this across all those areas, and I have just really appreciated your expertise in hearing the stories from the classroom. This is exactly why the board asked for this group to come together - to make sure we had very clear classroom-focused voice in this space. I thank you for your time because doing this time together and then the survey that Steve is going to send out is time taken away from kids, but you're thinking about the future of your profession and I really appreciate that.

### **Alina Campana**

I just want to echo I've found this very uplifting, like Michael said at the beginning with this was a big ask and to make sense of the options and all the works that's happened and then form opinions and share those and everybody has really combined your experience and systems thinking to prove to give some really helpful advice. And so I also want to thank you all.

I also want to add that I think it was also Michael was talking about the standards and that is our next step after this decision is made to revise and or craft standards for whatever the music license ends up being or licenses. So I wanted to just put a plug out there for all of you to consider applying to be on those writing groups because your voices and folks and folks like you will be critical.

### **Max Clark-Vail**

I'll just say a couple things about one thing that's been in my mind is I've listened to this conversation. Michael Lipsett brought up at the beginning this idea of entrance points for non-traditional musicians, and that was a big part of conversation and driving factor for our steering committee. I keep coming back to doing all this work. The thing that gets me excited most is I remember a couple of students I had who were so passionate about music and it was their life. There was no path forward for them in music, in education. And so that's the thing where I just get excited about. Anytime there's conversation about addressing that, I get so excited. It shows up in our data statewide too.

One thing I will mention about option three is that it does position things such that only a band/choir/orchestra-trained person is then considered the best trained teacher to teach modern band music production recording arts. And so I think that that's a little bit of a dilemma in that one. I really appreciate everything everyone has had to say here. I appreciate all the time. Very much so. It's been really interesting hearing your self-reflection and really questioning and digging into your profession and the field and thinking critically, so thank you.

### **David Davis**

Can you quickly repeat what you said about the dilemma? I didn't quite catch what you meant there.

### **Max Clark-Vail**

In option three, if we maintain the current license or structure but try to embed additional things into, it sets things up such that you still need to be someone who is primarily trained in band/orchestra/choir to gain entry to teaching modern band, music production, or recording arts. So that's just a dilemma with that option that I think I didn't hear that come up yet, so I wanted to throw that out there.

**David Davis**

What's the communication plan if licensure does change? I'm just predicting a lot of people being confused, having questions.

**Michael Buck**

Just quickly, of the survey results, the group that was the least excited about switching either option one or two were current teachers in especially in the band/choir/orchestra track. I just want to say out loud, we might want to be strategic about unveiling this because I have anecdotal evidence, but I see over a thousand music educators throughout the state a year and there is that that concern is real, so I just want to make sure that we're being strategic about how we try to make sure that we unveil that and let them know because that's one of the first questions I get asked every time I talk to him about this topic. What's your advice on this?

I think to some of the people don't want to let go of the current the status quo. And I think some of them are also worried that it may affect them as they finish off their careers, because they have, you know, 6, 8, 10, whatever years left. So I think there are ways that we can reinforce the message that, "No, it's not going to affect the people that are currently licensed." But they think it's going to be a tough pill to swallow for a few people.

**David Davis**

I mean maybe this is way down the road, but I would advocate like what Max was saying his students that were in love with me, like can I feel like change happens with storytelling. Can we like put stories in front of people being like, these are the kids that like we're trying to help and so that's one piece of advice I just thought of.

**Lucy Payne**

In the survey you're sending out, could the people on this call right now add those stories in that survey or can you add a spot or circle back to it? Those would be helpful for all of us and I see also in the chat there's a MMEA conference idea. Know that PELS is very supportive of those conferences and is willing to co-present and go with folks to help bring this across in those professional spaces. Thank you.