ATMI Business Meeting Agenda and Minutes
October 31, 2014 at 3:00 p.m. – St. Louis, MO

1. **Welcome from the President Scott Lipscomb**

2. **Future ATMI/CMS conferences and Organizers**
   a. 2015: Indianapolis, IN, Nov. 5-7 2015 – Judith Bowman
   b. 2016: Santa Fe, NM, Oct. 27-29, 2016 – Rick Schmunk (volunteered)
   c. 2017: San Antonio, TX, Oct. 26-28, 2017 – TBA (maybe Jane Kuehne?)

3. **Pre-conference workshop 2015 – logistics and potential topics**
   a. Logistics
      i. There was an inadvertent issue with the pre-conference. This will not happen again.
      ii. Rick Dammers – CMS hosts and receives proposals for the pre-conference, though it is labeled with as both CMS and ATMI event.
      iii. Judith Bowman – Proposals for CMS Pre-conference due January 31, 2014.
      iv. Note: CMS deadline is November 25, 2014, but this is not for conference proposals, not pre-conference topic proposals.
      v. V.J. – Do ATMI proposals need to be tied to CMS deadline? We have typically gone to mid-December/very early January. In order to have the planning meeting in Feb with CMS, we have to have an idea of what is needed by the end of January to prepare for that meeting.
      vi. Over the last couple of years, the ATMI deadline has been extended (somewhat frustrating for those who rushed to meet the initial deadline). As a result, it may be better to move it further back, rather than so early so more proposals can be submitted on time.
         1. Related to this: we need more proposals, so please submit and consider working with a colleague to submit a proposal.
      vii. Rick Schmunk – Moved that we move the ATMI proposal deadline to December 31, 2014 at midnight.
         1. Tabled by president to determine feasibility. December 31, 2014 seems like a good deadline, but we will need to work with CMS to be sure we can get everything completed in time for preparation meetings.\
   b. Topics – a Please suggest topics – a day-long or ½ day (1p.m.-5p.m.).
      i. What has been done? Distance Learning, Project-based learning, Peter Webster has a list (could send).
      ii. Damon – App Development – We've had several shorter presentations on app development, but a more expansive treatment would be very useful.
      iii. Peter – Using Technology in Assessment – What role can technology play in helping teachers assess not just students, but in program assessment, and other forms of assessment?
      iv. Rick – Distance Education was done several years ago, but things have progressed so much that it may be time to revisit this.
      v. Charles – Tablet applications and use. Beyond basics. Understanding the differences between a tablet and a computer. It is not a computer, but a separate tool.
      vi. Technology requirements for teacher licensure (from discussion below).

4. **Approval of Fall 2013 Business Meeting Minutes**
   a. Members asked to scan QR code to view minutes.
   b. No one moved to accept. Tabled – will send out to membership and ask for approval electronically.

5. **Nominations for Keynote presenters for 2015 & 2016**
   a. Sherry Turkel (http://www.mit.edu/~sturkle/)
   b. Todd Macko – has done this twice.

c. Question – V.J. – what if we tried to find a bigger name, producer-type, etc. Someone who could engage more students (advertising). Several members agree.
d. Jay LeBoeuf – (http://www.linkedin.com/in/jayleboeuf)
e. Mason Bates (http://www.masonbates.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Mason-Bates-short-bio-JULY-2014.pdf)
f. Secretary's note: I looked up each individual included where more information about each could be found)

6. **Elections**
   a. Reminder and clarification from 2013 voted upon and approved changes. There is an addition of the president-elect and the president cannot be elected for consecutive terms. He/she may be elected in non-consecutive terms.
   b. Seeking nominations
      i. President-elect: Scott Phillips
      ii. Vice President: Sue Piagintini
      iii. Treasurer: Brendan McCongle (name may be incorrect)
      iv. Will send an email formally asking for nominations

7. **NASM technology standards (Scott Phillips)**
   a. We have been in contact with NASM and we are approaching this diplomatically, yet systematically. We hope to leverage ATMI as a (or the) "go to" organization for support in this area; ATMI members may serve as the technology experts in this case.
   b. Please volunteer to be part of the working group for NASM standard changes and for implementation. The goal of this process is to determine or help determine what all music students need to be able to know and do regarding music technology when they graduate. This is not just working on standards, but working on a multitude of ways to implement prospective standards.
   c. Others who are interested in helping with this: Rick Schmunk, James Ackerman, Richard Sussman, Charles Menoche (and those on Scott Phillips' list).

8. **CMS *Symposium*: Instructional Strategies (Peter Webster)**
   a. Endorsement of all outlets for publication (JTME, JTML, and Symposium).
      i. Different strata within the Symposium, one is (ITMI) technology – online and allows multimedia and text.
      ii. Peer-reviewed
      iii. Welcome that may or may not be data-driven.
      iv. If you have work in technology education, consider this publication outlet.
      v. APA or Chicago style.
      vi. Peter Webster, editor, indexed in JStor – quick turn around.

9. **JTML update; vol. 5, no. 2**
   a. Just preparing Vol 5 (2) and should be out by the end of the year. See list of articles on ATMI website, abstracts from ATMI presentations will be published in JTML.
   b. JTML is shooting for one issue a year with a fairly quick turn around for authors. Note that JTML does focus on research but will also review and consider instructional-based works.

10. **Licensure requirement re: technology (Gena Greher)**
    a. The requirements for teacher certification in some states (specifically Massachusetts) ignore music technology. (Gena explained Massachusetts certification testing requirements which do not include technology, nor do they include American Music past 1950).
    b. When including technology in the curriculum, it is difficult to find teachers who use technology in the ways we train students to use it.

c. We need to re-consider how we view what "music teaching" is. When we are able to shift students' ideas from music teaching = general music band/choir/orchestra, we find that they cannot apply their skills because the teachers with whom they are placed do not have the equipment nor the skills for interns (or lab students) to apply what they've learned. As a result, often students revert back to age-old ideas of what music teaching is rather than maintaining new ways of thinking about it.
d. Discussion
e. Do we have the mechanism which informs the state?
   i. Gena – revision of MTEL (Massachusetts) licensure exam occurred and as mentioned no music technology was included. Are others finding the same thing, or feeling the same way? Students who want to teach technology find multiple barriers to teach music technology instead of band/choir/orchestra. We need to give them 21st century skills, but teach in 19th-20th century settings.
f. Rick – One approach perhaps is through outreach to school-level administrators.
g. Richard – Does this go with NASM? A little push from them would help.
h. University/College program requirements may be a better path to take instead of trying to tackle state departments of education.
i. V.J. – If looking at licensure exams, what would the questions look like? What should be on the test?
   i. Not sure, but there was no acknowledgment of technology.
   ii. This returns to what is a "music technology class" in a PK-12 school setting and how do we change music teaching perspectives?
j. Jane – Consider starting at the grass roots level, maybe with one teacher, direct teaching experiences, working with that teacher on grants, who then can help teach future teachers how to gain funding for moving into technology-based education (rather than band/choir/orchestra). Sometimes working form a public relations perspective with the students, being real with them, letting them know "you're going to have to work to implement this" is a first step.
k. Damon – Echoed these comments (Rick and Jane). We're going to beat our heads against the walls with NASM, State Departments of Education, other accrediting agencies. We need to change students' perceptions, and start with student demand, and try to work to increase student demand for alternate programs (like music technology classes).
l. Keith – Pre-Conference Idea? (see above)
m. Richard – Most of his students are gung ho about technology.
n. Member – Nephew in Germany in a school without ensembles and he's in a technology-based class (Garageband-type class) and they see this as valid music education. We need to change the perception of what music education is/can be.

11. Treasurer's Report – Rick Dammers
a. Generally sliding down though slight increase in dues, still sliding.
b. Need more membership.
c. Invite one colleague to submit a proposal for next year. This should help with some of the membership issues.
d. Note – 2014 numbers are only through October. When the bills arrive for the conferences come at different times.
e. By and large, we're okay.
f. For the long term, we need more members.
g. Membership
   i. We need to increase membership through recruiting. One way is to encourage people to submit proposals. Another is to "bring a friend" to next year's and future conferences.

12. A Word About a Dear Friend – Scott Lipscomb
a. Jenny Snodgrass – please think of her (send an email if you can). She hates not being here. Would be a good gesture from the membership.

13. Other Business
   a. Rick – TI:ME leadership academy for undergraduates and graduates – looking for more students. All they have to do is write an essay (see TI:ME website for more information). If selected up, their travel and registration costs are paid (up to $400 for airfare).
   b. V.J. – Can we consider a new logo? The current one is about 8-9 years. V.J. would be happy to be a part of that process.
   c. Richard – CMS Task force – members are not necessarily technologists. We need to
   d. New Member – Very little activity on the Facebook page. Needs to be more activity.

14. ATMI Dinner
   a. 7-9 p.m. at J. Buck's (101 S. Hanley Rd.); if you RSVP'd via email, plan to meet in the hotel lobby promptly at 6:45 p.m. to walk together to the restaurant.

15. Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.