

# Arts Teacher Standards Steering Committee - January 2025

## Music Options Pros and Cons

Current structure:

1. K-12 Vocal and Classroom Music
2. K-12 Instrumental and Classroom Music

Option	Pros	Cons	Questions
<b>OPTION 1</b> <b>No change</b> Maintain same licensure structure and general content though may include standard revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DROPPED BY COMMITTEE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DROPPED BY COMMITTEE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DROPPED BY COMMITTEE</li> </ul>
<b>OPTION 2</b> <b>Change through standards revision</b> Add music production, recording arts, and popular music standards into the existing two-license structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asks everyone to have some sort of training/background in these areas (music production, recording arts, and popular music) ***</li> <li>Playing field is leveled - these areas (music production, recording arts, and popular music) not othered, but treated as equal to current fields of study. These expectations are embedded in instrumental/vocal-focused degrees.</li> <li>Path of least resistance - easiest for prep programs to add to; easier to adopt a course than make significant programmatic changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moves forward with structural focus of having an exclusively band/orchestra/choir orientation to music education and K-12 music.</li> <li>Teachers recreate what they study - someone coming out of a choral program may recreate that, regardless of additional expectations</li> <li>Media arts folks not having pathway to this specialization (when we get popular music students we send them to the creative media program because, unfortunately, there isn't a place for them in music)</li> <li>Adding more to administrative side of things. More for teachers to do, and higher ed admins to do. There may be pushback from these groups.</li> <li>currently licensed teachers - pushback because of perception that additions devalue their expertise/focus?</li> <li>Doesn't elevate popular music and recording arts to the same level because it is only embedded - the title doesn't live anywhere.*</li> <li>Grain size across approaches - similar to foundations in academic standards - if it is everywhere, is it diminished?</li> <li>Qualifications of faculty - who is leading these courses? What happens retroactively to be sure music education folks are able to teach about pop music, recording arts, and teach students from these</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General question/concern: volume - adding standards to what we already have.</li> <li>How do we maintain a valuing of current licensing?</li> <li>Who is leading these courses and what needs to be done retroactively to prep faculty</li> <li>How will current teachers in field gain training in these areas?</li> <li>If working toward that focus, do you really need band/orchestra/choir training?</li> </ul>

		<p>backgrounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Music education students already have a very heavy load as it is, adding more may not be reasonable - with expectations of program, some can't travel abroad, for example. Concert schedules and commitments outside class - it's a lot</li> <li>• Structure has the potential to keep out the folks who don't have the band/orchestra/choir background</li> <li>• Music production/recording arts people would still be required to specialize in band/orchestra/choir</li> </ul>	
<p><b>OPTION 3</b>  <b>Endorsement via Music Only</b>  Maintain current 2-license structure and add an endorsement for music prod/recording arts, accessible to 2 music licenses only</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good for current music teachers that would like to pursue this area - good add-on</li> <li>• Clearer focus for music teachers; simplifies</li> <li>• Consistent, doesn't drastically alter the current system</li> <li>• Identifies area of arts that could benefit from expanding ideas about media *</li> <li>• Good for kids in that it would ensure someone teaching this area would also have good training in this area</li> <li>• An attempt to bring in more training in this area</li> <li>• Maintaining current structure means not a lot of compliance updates - less change, easier to navigate</li> <li>• Creates perception of this area as having "rigor" - higher level specialization</li> <li>• Acknowledges music as larger than just band/orchestra/choir</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only impacts current teachers. If you don't have a license, you can't get an endorsement</li> <li>• Limited accessibility - music teachers only*</li> <li>• Silos, isolating this focus to only those that have the endorsement *</li> <li>• Interdisciplinary nature - could limit this</li> <li>• Leaves the creation of an endorsement up to decision of higher ed music department.</li> <li>• If tied to one department, if people will make cost argument against offering the program **</li> <li>• Worry about training and willingness to retrain</li> <li>• Worry about hiring in higher ed for this expertise</li> <li>• Perpetuate inequities in resourced and under-resourced higher ed programs *</li> <li>• Extra financial burden for students interested in this</li> <li>• Already big license and major. Worry that it won't come to fruition</li> <li>• At this point, wouldn't be useful outside MN</li> <li>• Endorsement only in music seems odd when other arts areas wouldn't have them.</li> <li>• Doesn't open up the door to engage any more candidates with diverse musical backgrounds; because they would still need to get an initial music license; Lots of gatekeeping, keeps the current centering on vocal/instrumental requiring any candidates to have to go through that meaning that the folks with the most expertise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the credentials/criteria for an endorsement? *</li> <li>• Wonder about delivery mode - could this be completely online? Music is traditionally face-to-face, would music hinder this from being online?</li> <li>• Would this lead to other endorsements, like with media arts? Or would it lead to confusion?</li> <li>• Would endorsement be transferable across states? *</li> <li>• And what about students who get a license in ND or WI but come to Minnesota to teach?</li> <li>• Note: entrance requirements to programs would need to change in this scenario</li> <li>• General question about whether endorsements are the way forward</li> <li>• How would we grandfather in current teachers?</li> </ul>

		<p>and passion for these types of music may be very unlikely to see it as a viable or valuable pathway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current structure doesn't get people in the door who are likely to have an interest in this. Different skill sets than band/orchestra/choir</li> <li>• Creating an endorsement reduces flexibility in who can teach these types of music and this would likely lead to a reduction in current access in K-12 schools because it would add an extra requirement that only those with the endorsement could teach these courses now</li> <li>• Cuts out media arts as a viable pathway</li> <li>• Teacher training programs would need to change</li> </ul>	
<p><b>OPTION 4</b>  <b>Endorsement via Media Arts or Music</b>            Maintain current 2-license structure and add an endorsement for music prod/recording arts accessible both to 2 music licenses and media arts license</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as above - highlights the importance of media arts and music prod/recording arts in schools.</li> <li>• Makes recording/popular music accessible to more</li> <li>• Supports by articulating where these skills live</li> <li>• Interdisciplinary work benefits both programs (music and media arts)</li> <li>• More faculty available than with just music endorsement, and less expensive if shared with 2 departments</li> <li>• By combining with media arts, invites engaging with new pedagogies that might be off the radar in music.</li> <li>• Opportunity to lean into more accessible delivery modes? (such as AI)</li> <li>• More accessibility and flexibility for different licensure pathways</li> <li>• Offers individual fields to specialize in a couple of areas</li> <li>• Opportunities in collaboration *</li> <li>• Reflects real world of arts world, blending</li> <li>• Supports more diverse pathway beyond band/orchestra/choir</li> <li>• Aligning with industry</li> <li>• Would support students to get certifications, such as industry certifications as well</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making assumption that current pathways around media arts or music are strong</li> <li>• Good training and good pedagogy is important, and making more difficult to get this because of needing initial license</li> <li>• license/endorsement will not help music in the long run</li> <li>• Timing, amount of investment for candidates</li> <li>• Creates less specialization by sharing, can't go as deep into music. Might keep us at surface level of dragging in loops and expressing what we feel.</li> <li>• Or we would need to create excessive pre-reqs for electronic music that would box media arts out</li> <li>• Keeps music prod/recording arts on periphery as an add-on</li> <li>• Programs' choices in this - difficulty and consistency, complexity, accessibility - different sets of qualifications depending on school</li> <li>• Different states - probably wouldn't transfer much</li> <li>• Potential for diluting focus?</li> <li>• Inconsistencies across programs</li> <li>• Hiring practices - districts might be confused. And additional monitoring/tracking needed?</li> <li>• PD - structures for state-wide PD?</li> <li>• Issues around funding in higher ed - software, certification, gear</li> <li>• Staffing could get messy, complicated</li> <li>• Even with multiple pathways, wondering about</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What pre-reqs might this impose upon media arts, and make it harder for them than music?</li> <li>• Wonder about general size of endorsement reqs - same for both music and Media Arts?</li> <li>• Way to standardize programs? How do we ensure candidates are adequately trained regardless of program and school?</li> <li>• Endorsement models across other states that we could look at? Something we could use as a model? Instead of reinventing wheel</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>multiple avenues toward endorsement</li> <li>Acknowledges pathway toward recording arts can come via more than just traditional music pathways</li> <li>Broadens scope of music learning</li> </ul>	<p>increase or decrease access for students (still has that gatekeeping element to it that would probably create barriers and are they necessary barriers?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>institutions will be trying to start up Media Arts licensure programs (might be good timing, but might create additional challenges)</li> <li>Creating turf wars with band/orchestra/choir?</li> <li>General unease about endorsements? Can be seen as flimsy, add-on. Perhaps also easier to go away</li> <li>Who would be qualified to offer this faculty-wise, and where would it live?</li> <li>Will likely still close the door to many potential candidates</li> </ul>	
<p><b>OPTION 5</b></p> <p><b>K-12 General Music + Three Endorsements</b></p> <p>Create a K-12 General Music license and add three endorsements for specializations: Instrumental, Vocal, and Music Production &amp; Recording Arts (Music Production and Recording Arts endorsement accessible to both Music and Media Arts licensed teachers; Instrumental and Vocal endorsements only open to Music licensed teachers)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wider pool of new teacher recruits</li> <li>Condensing to a singular central license may help higher ed and PELSB because we've streamlined things.</li> <li>Helps higher ed students just trying to graduate - some of the music specialization is a barrier. Creates an option with a lower barrier to entry by just getting a general license, they could add endorsements later</li> <li>Hiring -schools can customize to what they need, makes it more clear who can teach what than the current system. Reduces guessing game re: what the job actually is</li> <li>Well-rounded base structure.</li> <li>Great for teacher to have the opportunity to specialize - this passion will come through in the classroom</li> <li>Could make teachers more marketable</li> <li>Choice accommodates more of a range</li> <li>More options for folks - just K-12 license could be right for some</li> <li>This may be forward thinking</li> <li>Could this help get rid of red tape for candidates (for example, some students getting music degree then post bac; this is hurting ed department)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If we assume the K-12 license is a 4 year degree, then any specialization would take longer</li> <li>Need more PD - stronger, more specific *</li> <li>Are we creating more inequities between urban and rural schools, in terms of add ons and endorsements, and access to endorsement training, and who can hire teachers with increased specialization in licenses/endorsements</li> <li>Wonder about equity for education students in sense of time, taking longer, cost - increased requirements</li> <li>Music education community - remaining cohesive - how to continue to bring folks together</li> <li>Heaviness of licensing</li> <li>Could limit the success of music production or recording arts focus if candidate must choose over band/orchestra/choir</li> <li>Also making calculated decision regarding taking into account what jobs are most likely to be hiring</li> <li>If 3 endorsements, higher ed music department will vote for what endorsements they will offer and current depts. Likely won't have faculty with recording arts expertise, so that endorsement may never be offered by existing programs.</li> <li>Expands music tracks in an area where we are experiencing cuts already</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the strategy for buy-in from current teachers and teacher prep programs? What is the selling point?</li> <li>Could there be incentives for this?</li> <li>Wondering about # of students in higher ed in music - just one in Alicia's school this year</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legitimizes general music by making it the essential starting point - different frame from current. Then how does this challenges other core areas such as music theory - as central for all?</li> <li>• Like idea of creating general music degree, more bite-sized.</li> <li>• Deeper dive into one specialization becomes a choice. Some don't want to be led into high school band director culture.</li> <li>• If K-12 general music - entrance requirements to higher ed programs could broaden (but are higher ed programs ready for that?)</li> <li>• This decenters Band/Orchestra/Choir as a requirement for music production and recording arts.</li> <li>• K-12 general music is a good catch-all license. Can cover intro courses, pop music, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-12 general + endorsements, outside metro area, not really realistic in small district - not enough sessions, or going between multiple buildings</li> <li>• Degrees we have already have K-12 general music built in as "classroom and general music."</li> <li>• Changing licensure to encourage change in schools - will it work? Is increasing specialization the right pathway?</li> <li>• Bigger picture across country - general +1 - how does that impact folks coming into MN, and how might it impact folks moving out?</li> <li>• Increased specialization in practice may reduce the ability to be flexible as Music Prod &amp; Recording Arts are emerging. This could actually reduce access because an endorsement would be required to offer courses. Currently, there is an option for music teachers to add newer relevant offerings. This could stifle innovation because we would have folks getting trained, but would reduce opportunities for folks in schools with current licenses to start offering things.</li> <li>• Don't think field can handle this level of specialization in K-12 - if you want a variety of offerings, a school would have to have multiple part-time teachers or teachers will need multiple endorsements. Especially in teacher shortage era</li> <li>• Multiple license process - prospective teacher would need license +1 - combine general music with one endorsement in program. Like business degree + accounting, finance, etc.</li> <li>• We don't do this with any other arts area</li> <li>• Less local control, hiring districts would have more requirements for who they can hire for courses</li> </ul>	
<b>OPTION 6</b> <b>K-12 General Music + 2</b> <b>endorsements; Choir and</b> <b>Band/Orchestra</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like that the core degree is general music. We tend to focus on instrumental or vocal, and general gets left out. Not much focus on general. Idea of general being for all. Different perspective on how curriculum should be developed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cuts out media arts ed students all together? *</li> <li>• For some students, does this create a bigger degree? Do we have credit restraints on endorsements to ensure that we are not forcing essentially a double major? **</li> <li>• Complex for smaller universities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What would on-ramps be for media arts students to pursue digital/recording arts?</li> <li>• What would this look like in teacher training?</li> <li>• Just call it K-12 Music instead of</li> </ul>

<p>Create a K-12 General Music license with music production, technology, popular music, recording arts integrated. Move band, choir, and orchestra to endorsements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Seeking endorsement for those who want to go above and beyond.</li> <li>● General piece could be 120 credits, and students could tack on 16 credits for endorsement. Makes 136 elective. We are graduating so many students with over 200 credits. Not just Winona State. And they are paying for this. So this could reduce costs and increase equity/access.</li> <li>● Education vs. training as approach to teacher prep. Ensemble orientation is very presentation based. Learned through vocal/instrumental oriented methods, techniques, etc - all oriented to presentation. Training band directors, orchestra teachers, rather than general music education - this would help the field shift core principles of teaching in any setting. **</li> <li>● Could broaden pool of potential music educators, remove perceived barriers</li> <li>● May help with shortages; covering more courses in smaller districts</li> <li>● More training in music production - students asking for that and would attract more students into programs.</li> <li>● Aligns with diversity of modern music careers</li> <li>● Enhances interdisciplinary connections</li> <li>● Preserves traditional ensemble as well</li> <li>● (lots of agreement among group)</li> <li>● Useful for elementary music school teachers who may be less likely to need one of the endorsements</li> <li>● Creating flexibility</li> <li>● Could align with more interdisciplinary collaborations and pathways in CTE world</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Shift - challenge in teacher prep side. For example, resource allocation, technology - would that lessen the number of schools that do this? Could lead to equity concerns. Perpetuating or widening gap? *</li> <li>● Feels funny to need endorsement to teach in music when there isn't one in any other area.*</li> <li>● Time and money for college students</li> <li>● Big changes in higher ed course offerings</li> <li>● Wouldn't make K-12 course assignment more flexible, but would make it more rigid for Band, Choir, Orchestra</li> <li>● K-12 Music license wouldn't be as broadly useful as the current license because, effectively, to teach secondary in a traditional setting (band/choir/orchestra), you would have to have one of these endorsements.</li> <li>● Music has way higher standards of obtaining licensure than many other disciplines (all other arts areas) - is this really needed?</li> <li>● Creates more of a workload/burden - may be too much</li> </ul>	<p>General Music? Does "general" make people think of elementary?*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Could we have an endorsement in music production and recording arts that would be only available to media arts?</li> <li>● General question: Wondering about technical needs in music, compared to other arts areas. Like do we need a license or endorsement for band, or could there just be an emphasis like how visual arts requires areas of emphasis in the standards but doesn't have special licensing?</li> <li>● How long would it take to do an overhaul like this, with regard to state system?</li> <li>● Issue of labeling band/orchestra/choir as instrumental/vocal. Specify Instrumental ensemble? Reminder that clarity is important, for example, vocal couldn't teach piano/guitar until recently.</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION 7</b> <b>Music Production &amp; Recording Arts License</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Increases rigor for music production - highest quality degree for that track*</li> <li>● Innovative. Shows growth. As a media artist, would want to partner with music on building programs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For a student to invest time and \$ into this, need to see plenty of jobs in K-12</li> <li>● Leaves creating this track up to university depts that may not be equipped to deliver. Concerns about it taking off, undermining expansion in this</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If were to be implemented, would music ed programs have to offer all three tracks? (PELSB couldn't require, but could check to be sure), checked and verified that no, there</li> </ul>

<p>Add a 3rd license to the existing 2 license structure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industry alignment. Clear media arts connections. So many music jobs in media arts.</li> <li>• Rigor will pull people in from music production world.</li> <li>• Recognizes this area of music.</li> <li>• This is where we are now - We need music to stay up with the times so that more music higher ed programs don't close.</li> <li>• Narrowing gap between K-12 music ed and how music is made outside school</li> <li>• Expand the pool of potential teachers interested in teaching (having a pathway that doesn't require they learn areas they aren't as interested in)</li> <li>• Shows relevance, reflects how music ed is evolving. Current music ed is centered around band/orchestra/choir - this is niche. Only small group of people are actually musicking like that. Also makes what currently exists relevant - even band/orchestra/choir recordings had to be recorded.</li> <li>• Makes a clearer pathway with regard to teacher training. Reduces the need to be a jack of all trades.</li> <li>• Curriculum expansion</li> </ul>	<p>area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compartmentalizes teacher identity. Concern about pull-out lessons going away in MN (no pull out lessons in some other states). Evidence of how schools are finding economic value in teacher position. What if they spent that time in a class of guitar or keyboard? We need band directors that also identify as guitar, keyboard, etc teachers. Basically regarding teacher identity - there is a need to expand that so that you can teach more.</li> <li>• Keeps current silos.</li> <li>• Implementation concerns.</li> <li>• Would slice and dice K-12 positions and would be tough to get up and going from perspective of getting properly licensed person in classroom.</li> <li>• Is there enough demand to pull into a separate license?</li> <li>• Possible reduction in number of offerings in music production since now all the music teachers could teach it, but with this, you would need a specialized licensed teacher so it could backfire and result in cutting the very K-12 courses it is intended to promote.</li> <li>• Not sure the field is able to support this yet</li> <li>• If you want to offer music production, band, and choir K-12 courses, you'd need 3 licenses (whereas currently 2)</li> <li>• Anyone teaching music prod/recording arts would benefit from the additional learning of what it would take to teach instrumental and vocal. *</li> <li>• If program is blended, may complicate things regarding which teachers are actually qualified.</li> <li>• Districts that are already underfunded, do they have the resources to hire additional humans?</li> <li>• Could unintentionally exclude people. If this license is created but higher ed doesn't start offering it, it could be excluding of those pursuing a traditional pathway to licensure.</li> </ul>	<p>would be no requirement to offer all 3 programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What will details look like?</li> <li>• Creating easier or harder path for folks who are currently tier 1 teachers?</li> </ul>
<p><b>OPTION 8</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make it easier to put a music-knowledgeable person in classroom, rather than just</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The older, no longer offered, K-12 music license didn't prepare for broad music teaching. Hoping</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just call it K-12 Music instead of General Music? Does "general"</li> </ul>

## K-12 Music

Simplify licensing down to a K-12 Music that could encompass all music including music production, recording arts, and popular music

music-interested.

- There will still be teachers who have a focus in one area or another even if it isn't expressed via a specialized license.
- Makes it possible to move more toward more relevant and diverse music experiences honoring a wider range of musical culture and tradition.
- Like that it requires integration.
- Encourages continuing education beyond initial licensure. Keeping in mind that meeting the standards is the starting point and teachers continue to pursue additional learning all throughout their careers.\*
- Currently, not enough general music with one elementary ed course. They are forced to get more training to continue to grow as general music teachers. This asks secondary teachers to do the same.
- Great potential to have something more expansive. Look more broadly at: what is music learning. Luther College - sequence of music literacy. In most places, literacy and history of education happens over in college of ed. Lots of music specialization needs that are not met by the current specialization. If this allows us to expand, that would be a big benefit. But that is a big "if."
- Could help address access and equity issues in K-12 schools - expand offerings/student demographics (data shows white students over-represented in music courses, black and Native students under-represented and music a much smaller percentage of students overall than we would like)
- Why don't we have endorsements or license specialization in ceramics, photography, printmaking, etc - is music being viewed as somehow elevated over other arts areas suggesting that specialization in a limited and niche set of traditions is absolutely necessary for all music teachers?

that now this could be more complete, diverse, and broad. Not just hang onto band/orchestra/choir piece.

- Where are the teeth in making sure this leads to change, instead of just throwing more standards into the one music ed person. Current higher ed program structure: lots is carried by one music ed person, and that person can't carry change - but change is done by vote. Without significant change to what we call core - history, ensemble, etc... would need to have a serious conversation about studying music ed in a music ed degree - within music.
- Doesn't address the problem of music being a very large degree.
- Because this tries to do so much, has risk of limiting student choice in degree.
- Hard to get \$ from districts for continuing PD in arts areas to keep up with contemporary content and pedagogy.
- So much content. Potential dilution.
- High quality music ed - if you dilute it, then it may not ensure everyone has access to high quality
- Production/technology won't have separate speciality and focus
- Could be perceived as watered-down with less specialized music content in K-12 schools
- Would require teacher training programs to make their courses much broader
- This could create a negative reaction from in-service music teachers feeling like their specialization is being devalued, might not be broad support from the field for this kind of license
- Only 1 methods course is required; with endorsement, more methods courses required
- Impacting peoples' identity (current music teachers, new teachers coming in would enter new system developing identity alongside).
- Generalizing may dilute. Lose specialties like orchestral conducting (but this is a false narrative)
- Teachers often don't like sharing students

make people think of elementary?

- Lots of states have a K-12 Music degree (do music programs in those states suffer? Some of the best music programs in the country have only a K-12 Music license)
- How can we get programs to truly fundamentally change if programs are still able to not change that much? What other levers do we have if we go this route, to ensure that higher ed programs would meaningfully implement with fidelity. If we don't have other levers what does that mean for this option?
- I wonder if there could be a PERCA requirement of limiting how many standards could be addressed by a single course...as too many standards dilutes quality.
- Would some band/orchestra/choir be required for all?
- Mirrors vs windows. Who are we serving and why?



- Potential for crossover with media arts for all via standards
- Streamlined licensure\* (Music as one arts area, with one set of academic standards, one license, and one set of licensure standards).
- Have basics in everything; a master's degree could be useful for those who wish to go deeper
- Lots of out of state licenses that are K-12 - When out of state folks with a K-12 Music license come to Minnesota, they are likely to get both music licenses in our system.
- PELSB board is interested in reducing license areas
- Potential opportunity to reduce barriers to entering programs by not requiring band/choir/orchestra focus making room for skilled and passionate musicians from a wider range of musical backgrounds and traditions.
- Potential to offer broader range of offerings that may align more with how the general population engages with music now
- Open pathways to get hired, more flexible in what can be applied for
- Some room for specialization to remain. Can build into standards the need for some specialization, like visual arts - emphasis in 2. Maybe music has candidates choose an emphasis in 1.
- Gives more autonomy to local districts regarding who and how they hire. Rather than depending on licensure, the hiring district would make the call as to whether someone is best qualified for teaching their programming.
- Current music licenses are more granular than MN K-12 music standards. Tightens up - if we have arts area standards, we have an arts area license.
- This might have the most teeth for expanding breadth and offerings - these standards

because they say, you're killing my program. Or they say we're lowering the quality.

- Wouldn't reduce competition - may increase. Those who have been niched for so many years are competing against those who aren't.
- Resources - more course offerings, but do we have the resources and expertise to support this long term?
- Are we offering more by creating less quality? Potential to lose essence? But then again, it's up to the people who are there to get better.
- Communities may not like or understand - we have trophies and what we have works.

would be required by all music ed programs and portfolio candidates. (in other options being considered, the program could just not be offered)

- On identity— this one may turn the music ed community more into a ‘bridging’ community than the ‘bonding’ culture we seem to currently have. Bridging across identities vs bonding within identities.
- Helps districts out - more hiring flexibility. Esp. rural districts.
- General vs ensemble focus license. On higher ed side, students are often forced to choose a particular track - always ask, are you vocal or instrumental - does that really matter? It doesn’t have to. Forcing people into a particular thing that might not be necessary or play to student passions and interests.
- Could expand curriculum even across higher ed. Instrumental currently doesn’t get hardly any vocal experience. But everybody needs everything. This is why we have shortages, trying to niche everyone.
- Universities would be encouraged into being creative about course offerings. Have to diversify, it’s 2025.
- Would support more diversity in higher ed and K-12 teachers.
- Good for recruiting underrepresented populations? Which option will support this recruitment the best? (in state, goes back to universities and what they offer)
- Neurodiverse students - often aren’t given access to band/orchestra/choir - removes barriers to becoming a music teacher.
- Think about community schools like Walker West - wonderful community teachers who don’t have access to colleges and universities.

**Note:** Only external steering committee members show fist to five (not state agency employees, with the exception of Rebecca), \* indicates multiple people identifying the same item

## Additional Notes

- The committee unanimously voted to take Option 1 off the table before pros and cons conversation.
- Post pros & cons conversation: [Further Reducing Options](#)
- band/orchestra/choir refers to Band, Orchestra, Choir

## Ranking Rationale Conversation - June 3 2025

### Round 1

- Ranking Tool: [https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdKr8OJ9Suroi6\\_\\_fhGmDBnAHqs3sDrNswH2FfYw92dbNgB-w/viewform](https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdKr8OJ9Suroi6__fhGmDBnAHqs3sDrNswH2FfYw92dbNgB-w/viewform)
- Ranking results: [https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1VPKZleX5aaDcNu5\\_HDKTE6yQ83o2cj8tBG5fJoGfPiM/edit?gid=271731981#gid=271731981](https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1VPKZleX5aaDcNu5_HDKTE6yQ83o2cj8tBG5fJoGfPiM/edit?gid=271731981#gid=271731981)
- Every option made it into someone's top 3. We said we'd discuss anything in anyone's top 3.
- Aaron: mind on implementation at university. Then, making sure electronic and recording arts makes it into curriculum for everyone.
  - (1. K-12 General + 2 Endorsements, 2. K-12 Music, 3. K-12 General + 3 Endorsements)
  - Worry about separate endorsement for recording arts and not everyone getting it
  - #1 - attracted to option of smaller music ed degree. If general music license only, will probably keep at 136 credits. The general license plus endorsements could be more like 120. Then specialization is added on
  - Worry about just 1 license when we still have specialties at HS
  - 3rd: like core K-12 for potential for smaller degree. But have reservation because could still graduate folks without electronic or recording arts
- Betsy
  - #1: K-12 General Music, #2 3rd license Music Production & Recording Arts License, #3 standards revision
  - Run general license programs. Have had to navigate credits etc
  - Like K-12 general because can cast broadest net. Dance is also very specialized with overvaluing western styles - general license is great because any dance form can access
  - Standards revision: programs are closely married to the standards - this could be powerful way to require the content and focus we are looking for
- Adrian
  - K-12 General first: so broad. Thinking about aspiring teachers. If they don't want to lean into a speciality, they don't have to. But could down the road. Also doesn't exclude based on specific type of training.
  - 3rd license Music Production & Recording Arts License: we started this - need this separate speciality area for those not interested in band/orchestra/choir. thinking , again, about incoming teachers. Favors CTE programs.
  - K-12 general plus 3 endorsements: multiple doors. Versatile. More work on higher ed end.
- Rebecca (#1 General + 3 Endorsements, #2 K-12 General + 2 Endorsements, #3 Add endorsement via Music or Media Arts, #3 Music Prod License Standalone)
  - Endorsements attractive
  - Lots of conversation about 3rd license - see great value in that.
  - Likes music plus media arts endorsement option - like access of media arts to that.
- Wendy
  - Top: K-12 general music. Would want everyone to have some experience in all of the music components - producing and recording arts, vocal,

instrumental, (not necessarily band/orchestra/choir). Don't want us to be so different in MN that there are no other states that are similar. Mobility of teachers - worried about that.

- Staffing getting tighter and tighter. Worried about increased specialization, need for OFPs, etc - qualified from start instead of more hoops
- Otherwise, high on list is separate music license - but worry about staffing piece.
- Adrian: let's zoom out. Are we doing what we can for students - current diverse student population, and also hoping we are not trying to protect something where we have a massive teacher shortage. As we are talking about quality of teacher ed, what are we protecting? Also there is a certain level of mediocrity with current status quo. Media arts and music tech is on chopping block.
- Michelle Sandler: K-12 General is definitely appealing to districts, but there would have to be a reduction in depth of knowledge and already see a trend of programs decreasing credits (especially in music which typically has more credits than other program areas), consider that better prepared teachers are going to stay longer.
- Steve: K-12 General fits with board's goal of fewer licenses (big change), coming around on the K-12 General.
- Debby: Agree with Michelle and Steve about K-12 General but shares same concern as Michelle about the amount of content we can get in, concern about standalone Music Prod (is there enough demand from districts to warrant a full time job), if we can't get the content into a K-12 General then an endorsement.
- Alina: first decision, lots of continuation in what the standards look like, music is out of step with how folks create and engage with music today, thinking about the structure; how much is it important that band/orchestra/choir expertise is there? In terms of as many musicians accessing music ed as possible, versatility is important and the idea that everyone has some training in things like popular music is very important, Endorsements are deceiving because it looks like more options but on the hiring side it is more restrictive, because if we have a music prod license or endorsement then only that person can teach those courses.
- Max: in general license - the higher ed student can choose areas of speciality. Rather than being required via licensure.
- Wendy: across country - including MN - the average % students in band/orchestra/choir is 20%. Could we have more students in music of more offerings?
- Aaron: looking at some other states that have a K-12 general - universities still offer tracks. Don't see change in licensure as complete reorientation of how we train. Possibly allows greater provision of choice.
- Max - concerns about endorsements and other licenses. Minimalism and symmetry - opportunity for more elegant system. Academic standards with complementary license. Similarity with other states - could be useful. Our license may still look very different based on standards.
- **DROPPED OPTION #2 - change via standards revision only (everyone ranked below 3, and Betsy said ok)**
- Aaron: if we get rid of endorsement, are we ruling out media arts access?
  - Could look at standards and build in overlap making dual licensure easier.
  - Could also in theory have an endorsement open to JUST media arts, and have assignment open to media arts plus endorsement and music license in the future.
- Adrian: Which choice balances the cultural relevance of music production with the elitism that has historically existed in the systems of band, choir, and orchestra? The system - humans and structures around it - make it elite.

## Second Round RANKING

- **Endorsement only accessible via music - can cut this.**
- **Ranking results:**  
<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1nElaA1GWVCYyo0OojqzI0YYRojGLWUQxL2mSM8XaBp0/edit?resourcekey=&gid=1144712638#gid=1144712638>
- Rebecca: thinks she may be getting caught up - put general license lower than others - wondering about watering down - the idea that it's so huge. But could be persuaded. Just such a huge area of expertise. But music folks will see that more than anyone. Willing to switch vote to support this.

- Same with endorsement via media arts or music
- Recommendations:
  - For media arts and music: music learning in media arts
  - Recommend that there is one specialization required in music standards while also getting breadth
- As universities look at budgets - one possible advantage - this could be floated with a smaller department. But also might be concern from faculty.
- Aaron referenced [University of Illinois](#) as a way in which a state has a K-12 Music license but at the college level tracks are possible (4 degrees: Instrumental, Choral, Technology, and General; but all lead to the same license K-12 Music)
  - Illinois Music license standards: <https://www.isbe.net/Documents/27ark.pdf> (Music (Ill. Admin. Code tit. 23, § 27.320))
- **DECISION: Reached consensus: group chooses K-12 General Music License (Rebecca changed her vote to be in alignment with the rest of the group, all others ranked this #1)**