

TO: Region Representatives to the TMEA/UIIL Music Advisory Committee

FROM: Dr. Bradley N. Kent  
State Director of Music  
University Interscholastic League

DATE July 28, 2020 (Deferred from Spring to Fall due to COVID-19)

SUBJECT: MAC Agenda Items and 2020 Region Representative Voting Process

Below you will find proposals that have been submitted to the Music Advisory Committee for deliberation and vote at your fall region meeting (deferred from spring due to COVID-19). To do so effectively it is important that each proposal be reviewed and considered so that you will know how to vote on behalf of your region. **NOTE: In lieu of the summer MAC meeting that is typically held in conjunction with the summer music conferences, region representatives will vote via online survey in late August. For state voting each region has only one voting representative in each of the three divisions: band, choir, and orchestra. Each of the three representatives will vote on general membership items. For proposals specific to a division, only the division representative from the region will vote.**

Also, during your region meeting please feel free to open the floor for discussion of any topic that might seem of importance to your colleagues. **You may then forward to me any new proposals that emerge and we will include them on the agenda for discussion at the spring region meetings.** Note that **three years must elapse** before any prior item that did not pass into rule may receive new consideration.

- **Discussion Items** have been submitted since the prior year's spring meetings. A Discussion Item will be considered for vote at the summer meeting only after that item is presented and voted upon at the spring region meetings. A Discussion Item that receives a favorable vote at the summer meeting will become an Action Item the following year and receive a vote at the spring region meetings and the summer MAC meeting.
- **Action Items** originated as Discussion Items and received a favorable vote by the MAC for further consideration. Action Items that receive a favorable vote at the summer MAC meeting will go before the UIL Standing Committee on Music and Technical Advisory Committee to receive further consideration.

**NOTE:** Any proposal from last year's MAC agenda that does not appear below is likely due to one of the following: 1) The item received a favorable vote from the MAC process and was advanced to UIL for consideration. (Any proposal that was advanced to UIL for consideration either went into rule or was not adopted by UIL); or 2) The item did not receive a favorable vote from the MAC at the summer meeting. We receive a high volume of communication in the state office; therefore, if it appears that any agenda item has been omitted please contact us.

## ALL DIVISIONS

ACTION ITEM (for vote): Submitted by Region 20 General Membership.

**UIL consider creating clear qualifications, selection, and application process for membership on the PML and Sight-Reading Committees.** *Rationale:* Currently there are no clear or published qualifications for these committees, nor are vacancies announced and applications solicited. Given that these committees make far-reaching curricular decisions that affect music teaching throughout the state, there needs to be a more transparent and articulated process.

## VOCAL DIVISION

ACTION ITEM (for vote): Submitted by Region 20 Vocal Division.

**UIL consider creating an ad hoc committee specifically to consider diversity, inclusion, and equity within the Choir PML for Concert-Sight Reading (Mixed, Tenor-Bass, and Treble).** *Rationale:* There are huge swaths of work by well-established composers that are unrepresented, resulting in populations being disenfranchised and disengaged from a lack of representation in their curricular materials. A single Choice piece is not sufficient opportunity to represent the multitude of perspectives available in excellent choral literature from around the world. The PML should serve as a resource for excellent literature of all styles, and not limit the ability of directors to pick music that represents their diverse student population.

Because this lack of representation is the result of institutional neglect and oversight, there needs to be institutional action to actively and deliberately address this issue. If relying upon the submission process were adequate to resolve the issue, it would no longer be an issue.

For example, in the PML, there are the following numbers:

Zero Rosephany Powell

Zero William Dawson

One Brazeal Dennard (Tenor-Bass, Level 4)

One Jester Hairston (Tenor-Bass, Level 4)

Zero Stacey Gibbs

Zero Jeffery Ames (Mixed, Level 5)

13 Titles by Moses Hogan (Level 2 - 1, level 3 - 3, level 4 - 2, level 5 - 7)

The lack of literature is of particular interest for the lower levels. The beginning groups are the ones who could benefit most from representation, as they are often yet to fully engage in the art form; varsity singers have already bought into the program and invested themselves. Providing a more representative list could serve to also possibly raise the participation level at UIL events because directors could program representational literature in their curricular study.

ACTION ITEM (for vote): Submitted by Region 33 Vocal Division.

**UIL consider eliminating the requirement for a varsity mixed choir to be entered by all 5A/6A schools for Concert and Sight-Reading Evaluation.** *RATIONALE:* Out of consideration for the diversity and struggles inherent in the urban school environment, the Region 33 Vocal Division respectfully requests that UIL allow 5A/6A schools to have the option of taking a Treble Choir as the Varsity group (first group), and eliminating the requirement for a varsity mixed choir. This will make the 5A/6A requirements consistent with the requirements for all other classifications.

## **ORCHESTRA DIVISION**

No proposals

## **BAND DIVISION**

ACTION ITEM (for vote): Submitted by the Region 4 Band Division.

**Adjust the band sight-reading levels as described below.** *RATIONALE:* Current rules require all non-varsity bands (including sub non-varsity bands) read two levels below their conference. This proposal would give the sub-non-varsity bands a graduated scale of music. As it stands, some sub-non-varsity bands are having to sight read music that is harder than their concert selections. For instance, a 5A SNV band could play a grade 1 piece on stage but would be required to sight read at level 3.

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Level</u>
6A V	6
6A NV	4
6A Sub NV A	3
6A Sub NV B	2
6A Sub NV C	1
All bands below this in 6A would read level 1	
5A V	5
5A NV	3
5A Sub NV A	2
5A Sub NV B	1
All bands below this in 5A would read level 1	
4A V	4
4A NV	2
4A Sub NV A	1
All bands below this in 4A would read level 1	

3A V 3

3A NV 1

All bands below this in 3A would read level 1

2A V 2

2A NV 1

All bands below this in 2A would read level 1

1A V 1

All bands below this in 1A would read level 1

DISCUSSION ITEM (for vote): *Submitted by the Region 13 Band Division.*

**Create a Division 1 and Division 2 for 6A State Marching Band Championships.**

*RATIONALE:* 6A has the most disparity of enrollment between the largest school and the smallest school. This disparity creates a competitive advantage for larger schools in the following ways: 1) The larger schools have more students to draw from; 2) The larger schools can be more discerning with who they select for marching spots, while the smaller 6A schools have to march a higher percentage of students just to keep the playing field level and appear larger. This causes the larger schools to have a more elite group and a skill set that is higher due to the ability to pick and choose from a larger pool of performers.