

**Policy ASPA and NAFME Advocacy Staff Quarterly Meeting
Monday, November 23, 2015 12 p.m. EST**

Agenda

Notes by Lynn Tuttle, NAFME and Carla Aguilar, SMTE Policy ASPA Co-Chair

1. Welcome and introductions

Carla Aguilar – Metropolitan State University, Denver
Chris Woodside – NAFME
Lauren Kapalka Richerme – University of Indiana, Bloomington
Suzanne Barton – University of Delaware, Dover
Ben Helton – PhD student – University of Illinois
Christopher Dye – Middle Tennessee State University
Lynn Tuttle - NAFME

2. Update on ESEA Reauthorization

Music will be listed separately from other arts in the updated revision of the ESEA. New ESEA bill is based on the Senate work (over the House work). Early in the process it was unclear if there was going to stay as a list of subjects, but list of subjects was maintained.

Major Transition: Section has been retitled – now called “Well-Rounded Education” instead of “Core Academic Subject.” Provisions are basically the same. This is considered a major accomplishment of every subject listed.

Importance of music listed in ESEA –

- a) symbolic nature of being listed as part of “well rounded education” is very important.
- b) for advocacy reasons, teachers at the grass roots level have been able to use this language to bolster their programs and strengthen their access to resources on the ground
- c) question of clarity – one of the most valuable reasons for pursuing this listing so strongly – the issue of what was included in the “arts” – was music included? Or not?

Helps us fight for sequential, curricular teaching of music. It makes this obvious.

- d) there is evidence that this listing drives funding decisions at state and local level. Has been some evidence of arts-related grad requirements in a few cases
- e) there is evidence that there is more connective tissue to well rounded throughout the rest of the bill – particularly not being pulled out of music for testing or remedial services

QUESTION: Is there emphasis to collect data on music at the state level? States to be required to collect data at the state level and provide more information on what’s happening at each state level?

Chris – immediate response is yes – the clarity part of this will be transformative for purposes of data collection.

Looking at some of the national data collection surveys – annual and semi-annual processes – is really related to the arts as a whole. That can sometimes make it difficult to look at information for music specifically.

QUESTION: Section on Core Academic Subjects is eliminated – absolutely no language on core academic subjects? No separate between the tested subjects and music in the bill?

You are definitely going to hear people say that the section is gone. That is incorrect. The section exists – but the title has changed from core academic subjects to well-rounded education. This change is because core is a toxic word after Common Core. The section is the same, the purpose of the listing is the same. Anywhere throughout the bill – there were provisions that referenced core academic subjects (e.g. for funding, for professional development) – now swapped out for well rounded education.

A couple of new contenders that have thrown their hats in the ring – those groups that are part of the coalition – TOAD.org – computer science and technology – plus physical education added in as well.

QUESTION: On some level – this could be detrimental to have a whole bunch of subjects listed. How do you see this playing out in local advocacy? Recommendations to the states on how to do that?

Chris – we will do everything in our power to equip our membership to use this to their benefit. The real decisions are made at the state/local level – would love to see similar level at those levels. From the standpoint of what the actual intended power of the provision is- it's pretty limited. It is not a mandate – it doesn't force teaching. The federal government is getting out of the business of "being a national school board." This is a statement of national educational priorities that was demanded by a lot of different constituencies. This is a degree of guidance of what we felt all kids should be getting. The actual ability of it to mandate state and local decisions is very limited. This section could be helpful – but it isn't a mandate.

As far as whether or not it is detrimental to have all of these areas listed? I don't think so – it's the nature of this work. All of these subjects are important – a difficult proposition to see what fits there and what doesn't?

QUESTION: Suzanne – when we are talking about students in the ESEA – it is elementary and secondary. We have standards for PreK as well? Are we including PreK in the policy writing?

Chris – whether we'd think this is a priority area – as NAFME – yes! As this legislation operates – I don't think I can say that this is something that will impact PreK in any demonstrable way.

Suzanne – PreK is often absent from standards discussion – would be nice to see more of this in NAFME’s website and other work going on.

Chris – specific piece on early childhood added late in the game. Don’t know what the impact will be. It was a very strong passion of Patty Murray’s – may have more information on this soon.

3. Update on HEA Reauthorization and US DoE Rulemaking

Chris – there has been talk for much of 2015 to reauthorize this. The Congress ran out of time. Bobby Scott during the conference committee that this is still an outstanding priority – reminded Chairman Kline that we should get this done, too! Not much more to share on this at this time.

Teacher regs – the word on the street is that they will get them out the door (US DoE) by end of the calendar year. Unclear whether there is the political will to do this, or enough negative reaction from higher education community to stifle this in the short term.

4. Update on State Level Policy Advocacy

Shannon Kelly – Director of Advocacy and Policy at NAFME. First time I’ve joined an ASPA call – We have been working with the last year with building what we have dubbed the Advocacy Leadership Force or the ALF – built out of anecdotal evidence that states would benefit from opportunities to act as peer mentoring and to share resources state by state. Given the level of interest that states have for advocacy – to create a structured method/way for states to do this. Intended to help states get to their individual advocacy goals by building a network of state folks interested in advocacy. We do monthly calls and cover a range of topics – from national policy priorities (e.g. ESEA engagement earlier this year for members to engage with Congress on our Core Subject ask) and state level issues – state drive-in day at the capitol; build grassroots advocacy; the art of building coalitions; utilizing social media in your state level advocacy. We’ve had a lot of success with state level advocacy. In 2015, 14 states did state level advocacy days for music education (up from 3 a few years earlier); more organized grass root advocacy efforts. We are still learning a lot about how the states are doing advocacy as well as what the local/state issues are.

This year, we are trying to tighten up the work with the states – what are their goals? How do we assist them? Challenging states to up their advocacy game – seeing what they can do and how they can measure this success over time. Next ALF call is set for Tuesday (Nov 24) – continuing our model of monthly calls plus one and one relationships. Including Lynn on the call as well. Focusing a lot of our work moving forward on ESEA implementation over time in the states.

Carla – who are the people who have been the initial members of the group? How were they chosen? Selected? Voluntold?

Shannon – it's been a mix. When we started publicizing this in September, 2014, we sent that communication out to state leadership – state exec directors, state presidents, through our state promotional team – that's how we got responses from states initially. In certain states, the ALF representative has changed based on changing understanding in the states. In some cases, it has been the interest of a person who has become the “go to” person for advocacy in that state. Our current membership is up to 31 states. We can share which states are currently on the ALF. We want to continue to promote it so folks know of this option. Obvious to make certain we do a 2nd push.

Lauren - Are there ways in the Policy ASPA and Susan as president of SMTE – making us aware – how can higher education be useful to you? Or the CNAfME chapters, too? It would be great to get them involved early? Maybe brainstorming moving forward would be really helpful!

Shannon – the list will include the ALF representatives for the states as well.

5. Update on the Teacher Certification/Evaluation survey instrument

Working on data related to teacher certification/evaluation requirements to have on NAFME website so that the most up to date information can be available. Currently, there isn't a centralized place where this information exists for music education.

Lynn has drafted a survey that she is working on sending out to state leaders to get the data in one place. Includes kinds of licensure, tests, summative performative assessments, reciprocity, alternative certification, and teacher evaluation practices in each state.

Suzanne – would love to give feedback on the draft survey

Chris Dye – feedback, please – thank you!

6. Overview of President's Broader Minded Task Force

The Broader Minded Task force has been charged by Glenn Nierman to review of advocacy campaign for Broader Minded and consider ways to improve the campaign. NAFME wants this campaign to work in the greatest service to music education and to music education students. Task force information can be put out to ASPA members. The Task Force charge was drafted at the Nashville In-service conference. Task Force is working on a survey and they want to include all members and also policy makers, parents, school board member stakeholders.

The group is meeting as a task force and going over the charge and timeline. Lynn is leading. Goal is to have an updated campaign by March MIOISM.

Recommendations for research from higher ed community? Strengths of the campaign?
Recommendations from SMTE – would value other people’s voices prior to this process.
Will share the template for the stakeholder groups – direct those energies productively. The Task Force does have a specific charge – so if we could focus the feedback towards the intent of the charge – that would help everyone by keeping the information applicable.

Lauren – when reaching out to stakeholders – curious- done in a systematic way? Valid and reliable? Reaching out to a broader perspective?

7. Policy research needs from NAFME

Will be forthcoming on the next call

8. Policy research interests from ASPA members

Ben – the implementation of EdTPA in the state of Illinois – turning into a larger project – probably coming turning into my dissertation. Specifically for music education – possibly an evaluation tool – consequential in a lot of other states- an instrument – a way to look at the EdTPA as its policy – its effective policy.

Suzanne – exit assessments – portfolios – created through – PPAT - ETS assessment. Coming up pretty strong – prefer ETS over Pearson – getting a broader view of the landscape may be possible.

Moving away from objective into alternative evaluations – a general move. Is this because of nudges from federal government than from the states? May be for states to make it look like we have more qualified new teachers coming in? This is a hot issue- more summative portfolio types of assessments are more effective than the 3 state tests.