Contributions to Music Education Vol. 45 (2020), pp. 47-66.

MARIE MCCARTHY
University of Michigan

SPECIAL SEGMENT ON VISION 2020
AND THE FUTURE OF MUSIC EDUCATION

The Housewright Declaration: A Lens for Viewing Music Education in the Early Twenty-First Century

In this article the twelve statements in the Housewright Declaration (2000) are examined in the context of trends and developments in the music education profession since the Declaration was published. A brief context for the time period is provided, focusing on three influential trends—nationalism, justice and equity, and new forms of communication enabled by advancements in technology. Discussion of the Declaration statements is organized around two overarching themes—inclusion and widening horizons. The theme of inclusion addresses students, teachers, curricular content, dimensions of music making, and music education for all persons across the lifespan. The theme of widening horizons includes a broader definition of music making, incorporation of new technologies into school practice and professional forums, collaborations and partnerships, and an expanded role for the music educator. I identify barriers that may have impeded the full realization of the Declaration, and offer ways in which the ideals of the Declaration can be further advanced: embracing heterogeneity, facing up to racism, acknowledging the power of tradition, and connecting the 'houses' of music education.

Keywords: music education, twenty-first century, Housewright Declaration, inclusion, widening horizons

Introduction

There are moments in the history of music education that bring into focus the profession's values, and aspirations for the future. The Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education held in Tallahassee on September 23-26, 1999, and its "summation of the agreements" (Hinckley, 2000b) in the Housewright

Declaration, represent one such moment. It was not the first time that leaders of the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) paused to reflect and to issue a declaration in response to changes in society. Between 1942 and 1946, MENC organized an extensive, nationwide examination of the music curriculum that engaged "nearly 2,000 members and friends of the MENC" on curriculum committees and many hundreds more who participated in open sessions of the committees. Findings and recommendations of the project were published in a series of four documents followed by a summative report in the *Music Education Source Book* (Morgan, 1947). The overall theme that emerged was one of "widening horizons for music education," described by MENC Past President Lilla Belle Pitts as "inspiring prospects for the realization of well-founded hopes" (Pitts, 1947, p. x). Propelled by hope for a peaceful future in the aftermath of war, MENC adopted "A Declaration of Faith, Purpose and Action" (Morgan, 1947, pp. xi-xiii).

Twenty years later, in the midst of turbulent times, MENC co-sponsored a gathering of scholars from diverse disciplines for the Tanglewood Symposium held in Tanglewood, MA from July 23 to August 2, 1967. The goal was to evaluate the role of music in contemporary American society and to make recommendations for the music profession going forward. The Tanglewood Declaration that issued from the Symposium proceedings provided not only a philosophical guide for reform in music education but also a foundation and inspiration for curricular and policy initiatives (Choate, 1968). Reform movements such as Widening Horizons and Tanglewood motivated leaders who organized the Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education. Clifford Madsen noted that "society, technology, and music will always be in constant flux, necessitating continuous attention from concerned professionals" (Madsen, 2000, p. ix). In her introduction to *Vision 2020*, MENC President June Hinckley recalled the "Tanglewood Symposium and the guidance for music educators that it provided through those difficult times" (Hinckley, 2000a, p. 1). And so, inspired by past leaders and their decision to pause and reflect, the Housewright Symposium was convened at the dawn of a new century. The philosophical assumptions that had provided a beacon for music education during the twentieth century were unraveling in light of new understandings of the meaning and function of music across cultures and across the lifespan. The timing of the Housewright Symposium coincided with the turn of a millennium—a time filled with hope, noble ideals, innovative thinking, and such qualities that tend to characterize new beginnings.

The purpose of this article is to examine the Housewright Declaration as a document of its time, and to offer an interpretation of the extent to which

developments since 2000 advanced the twelve statements set forth therein (see Branscome, 2016, for an earlier interpretation). Before engaging with the statements in the Declaration, I provide a brief context for the time period between 2000 and 2020. Using the statements of the Declaration, I identify developments that indicate progress as well as barriers that may have impeded its full realization. It is a humbling and daunting task to evaluate the effect of national trends on the course of music education in the first two decades of the 21st century. Without the advantage of chronological distance, it is difficult to draw conclusions about what has occurred while patterns continue to emerge. The Housewright Symposium leaders were acutely aware of the rate and intensity of social, cultural and technological change. June Hinckley noted that "[t]he conditions of change are so rapid that by 2020 things we have yet to imagine will be commonplace" (2000a, p. 3). Her words ring true.

Three of the trends that dominated the period and impacted the course of music education are nationalism, issues of justice and equity, and new forms of communication enabled by advancements in technology. A rise of nationalism was triggered by the devastating and irreversible moment that shook American life at the core—September 11, 2001. In its aftermath, a rise of nationalistic sentiment and patriotic fervor was reflected in the pages of music education journals (for example, the November 2001 issue of the *Music Educators Journal*, Fall 2002 issue of the *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, and several issues of *Teaching Music* and the *Music Educators Journal* in subsequent years) and national initiatives (MENC's National Anthem Project: Restoring America's Voice, 2005-07).

Issues related to justice and equity and the humane treatment of all people, regardless of social class, race, nationality, ethnicity, ability, gender, or sexual orientation, were foremost in the public forum and pervasive in the discourse of music educators at all levels of practice and inquiry. The nature and speed of communication and the use of social media in the professional domain represent a third area to impact the course of music education in the time period. With the founding of Facebook in 2004, Twitter in 2006, and Instagram in 2010, music educators had new platforms to share professional concerns, solutions and innovations. Many more trends influenced the course of music education—unprecedented findings in neuroscience and consciousness studies to inform teaching and learning, the corporatization of education, the further incorporation of standards and measurement into educational progress and administration, and the expansion of research paradigms and methodologies. Each reader will bring their own perspective to the first two decades of the century. I offer one lens into the relationship between the points of agreements set out in the Housewright

Declaration and issues that dominated music education during the first two decades of the century.

The Housewright Declaration

The Housewright Declaration appeared at the conclusion of *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the Future of Music Education*. It was preceded by reports from the Chairs of six Commissions that focused on the following themes: Why do humans value music? Why study music? How can the skills and knowledge called for in the National Standards best be taught? How can all people continue to be involved in meaningful music participation? How will societal and technological changes affect the teaching of music? What should be the relationship between schools and other sources of music learning? After a short preamble to the Declaration, the writers presented twelve points of agreement, as follows:

1. All persons, regardless of age, cultural heritage, ability, venue, or financial circumstance deserve to participate fully in the best music experiences possible.

2. The integrity of music study must be preserved. Music educators must lead the development of meaningful music instruction and experience.

3. Time must be allowed for formal music study at all levels of instruction such that a comprehensive, sequential and standards-based program of music instruction is made available.

4. All music has a place in the curriculum. Not only does the Western art tradition need to be preserved and disseminated, music educators also need to be aware of other music that people experience and be able to integrate it into classroom music instruction.

5. Music educators need to be proficient and knowledgeable concerning technological changes and advancements and be prepared to use all appropriate tools in advancing music study while recognizing the importance of people coming together to make and share music.

6. Music educators should involve the music industry, other agencies, individuals, and music institutions in improving the quality and quantity of music instruction. This should start within each local community by defining the appropriate role of these resources in teaching and learning.

7. The currently defined role of the music educator will expand as settings for music instruction proliferate. Professional music educators must provide a leadership role in coordinating music activities beyond the school setting to insure formal and informal curriculum integration.

8. Recruiting prospective music teachers is a responsibility of many, including music educators. Potential teachers need to be drawn from diverse backgrounds, identified early, led to develop both teaching and musical abilities, and sustained through ongoing professional development. Also, alternative licensing should be explored in order to expand the number and variety of teachers available to those seeking music instruction.

9. Continuing research addressing all aspects of music activity needs to be supported including intellectual, emotional, and physical responses to music. Ancillary, social results of music study also need exploration as well as specific studies to increase meaningful music listening.

10. Music making is an essential way in which learners come to know and understand music and music traditions. Music making should be broadly interpreted to be performing, composing, improvising, listening, and interpreting music notation.

11. Music educators must join with others in providing opportunities for meaningful music instruction available for all people beginning at the earliest possible age and continuing throughout life.

12. Music educators must identify the barriers that impede the full actualization of any of the above and work to overcome them.

For the purpose of this discussion, I organized ten of the twelve points of agreement into two overarching themes—inclusion (1, 4, 9, 11) and widening horizons (3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10). Statement 12 on the identification of barriers impeding implementation is discussed later in the context of four themes. Statement 2 on preserving "the integrity of music study" and the provision of "meaningful music instruction" can be regarded as foundational to other statements. It has echoes in the initial statement of the Tanglewood Declaration: "Music serves best when its integrity as an art is maintained." There is an additional focus on music instruction, "meaningful music instruction." Since meaning is embedded in value, it is curious that findings of the Commission chaired by Bennett Reimer, "Why do humans value music?", were not reflected in statement 2, although they were integrated into the preamble to the statements (Hinckley, 2000a, p. 219).

The dialogue from the Commission continued when Reimer's contribution formed the basis for a "symposium" feature in the Spring 2002 issue of the *Philosophy of Music Education Review*. In the collection of essays, Reimer reflected on his *Vision 2020* assignment, and Anthony Palmer, Thomas Regelski, and Wayne Bowman offered critiques on the question of why humans value music. Furthering the dialogue, in the third edition of *A Philosophy of Music Education*, Reimer (2003) stated that "the primary mission of music education is to make musical values widely and deeply available" (p. ix). Elliott (1995) identified self-growth, self-knowledge, and enjoyment, as the "the central values of music making as a human pursuit" (p. 120). These two core philosophical texts, in addition to articles in *Action, Criticism, and Theory*, and in the *Philosophy of Music Education Review* in subsequent years interrogated musical values and valuing from a host of perspectives—race to vernacular music, democracy to dis-ability, diversity to ethics.

Inclusion and the Way Forward

The theme of inclusion finds a prominent place in the Declaration (statements 1, 4, 9 and 11). The provision of the "best music experiences possible" (statement 1) was set as a goal for all persons, regardless of their circumstances and sociopolitical identities. Efforts to advance this goal have dominated professional activity since 2000, reflected in music education literature, conference themes, and in the creation of special interest groups. The inclusion of students whose access to or full participation in music instruction has been limited in any way received increasing attention—students with special needs, students with non-conforming gender and sexual identities, students in underserved communities, students who are underrepresented in traditional school music programs, and students who are diverse language learners, among others.

Issues around inclusion in the context of mainstreaming and special needs appeared regularly in practice-based (e.g. Special Issue of *Music Educators Journal*, January 2001) and research-based journals (e.g., Jellison & Draper, 2015). The range of topics addressed within special needs education expanded and became more specialized. Instructional strategies for teaching students with particular disabilities were offered in a variety of forums; the use of technology to enable learning increased in coverage; the social and psychological implications of special needs on identity formation expanded; and, the topic of special needs frequently appeared with related areas of music therapy, health and well-being.

The inclusion of students with non-conforming gender identities was slow to enter the mainstream discourse of music education. The publication of Louis Bergonzi's article on sexual orientation and music education in 2009 in the most

widely-disseminated journal in the profession, the *Music Educators Journal*, proved to be a landmark moment for highlighting LGBTQ students and teachers in the consciousness of the profession. A series of symposia titled LGBTQ Studies and Music Education began in 2010 and continues, with the group's fourth symposium in 2020. Select papers from the symposia appeared in journals and nurtured the development of a body of scholarly literature and empirical studies (e.g., DeNardo et al., Spring 2011 issue of the *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*).

The inclusion of students from all socio-economic strata and racial and ethnic groups has finally found its rightful place among professional concerns related to justice and equity. The June 2012 issue of the *Music Educators Journal* posed the question on its cover: "Music for All….?" insinuating unfinished work and an ongoing journey toward equal representation of students in all music programs. The 2015 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), a reauthorization of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), confirmed the nation's commitment to "equal opportunity for all students" and to advancing equity for "America's disadvantaged and high-need students" (https://www.ed.gov/ESSA). A series of articles identifying the profile of students who enroll in music classes provides a valuable picture of the demographic and social backgrounds of participants and reveals underrepresented groups (Elpus & Abril, 2011, 2019; Elpus & Grise, 2019). Based on an informal perusal of the literature published since 2000, certain student populations deserve more attention, especially diverse language learners and students with refugee status.

Like no other time in the history of the profession, issues of social justice and equity appeared regularly in the pages of music education books and journals, and in conference forums. From the International Conference on Music Education, Equity, and Social Justice held at Teachers College, Columbia University in 2006 to journal articles (e.g., Allsup & Shieh, 2012; Richerme, 2016; Salvador & Kelly-McHale, 2017) and *The Oxford Handbook of Social Justice in Music Education* (Benedict et al., 2015), the two decades have been marked by a voluminous body of literature on equity and social justice, matched with ongoing development of El Sistema or El Sistema-inspired music education programs.

The thinking behind statement 1, that "all persons … deserve to participate fully in the best music experiences possible" was timely when looking to the future from the vantage point of 1999. The profession advanced the ideal of music education for all students, with much work ahead in each area of diversity. Scholars also confronted the pedagogical challenges of teaching culturally diverse students and offering practical applications (Fitzpatrick-Harnish, 2015; Lind & McKoy, 2016). Who are the teachers to teach "all" students" and how are they prepared? How

might their preparation need to differ from that of traditional teacher education programs which assumed a homogeneous demographic in the student population? Of all areas of research and dialogue in the first two decades, music teacher education at pre-service and in-service levels has shown unprecedented growth. Beginning in 2005, the Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE) initiated a biennial symposium to advance music teacher education. It serves as an important forum for identifying issues and facilitating reform in teacher education. To what degree has the need to recruit prospective music teachers "drawn from diverse backgrounds" been met?

One of the most complex challenges is the recruitment and retention of racially and ethnically and socially diverse music teacher education students. The question is embedded in issues related to access to early music education, inequality of educational opportunity, social capital, social imagination, and many other considerations at the intersection of race, ethnicity, social class, schooling, college preparation, and proficiency in traditional forms of music making. The authors of statement 8 viewed the responsibility of recruiting diverse music teachers as "belonging to many, including music educators." Intentional collaborations with P-12 music teachers that focus on nurturing early on the interest of diverse music students in a teaching career may be one key to diversifying the demographic of music teachers.

In addition to inclusion related to students and teachers, statement 4 of the Declaration advocated for the inclusion of "all music" in the curriculum, and increased awareness of "other music that people experience." The statement resonates strongly with a similar one in the Tanglewood Declaration: "Music of all periods, styles, forms, and cultures belongs in the curriculum." Over three decades on, I observe a subtle yet important difference between the focus of each. Music is presented in this statement as something that people do rather than as object or work, reflecting a social-cultural view of music that was beginning to take root in music education by the end of the 20th century (e.g., Elliott, 1995; Regelski, 1998; Small, 1998).

The movement to incorporate diverse musics into the curriculum had already gained considerable ground in the final decades of the 20th century (e.g. Anderson & Shehan Campbell, 1989; Shehan Campbell, 1996; publications of World Music Press, 1985-). The momentum was sustained into the new century, with increased attention to the contexts of music makers and music cultures, strengthened by further collaborations with ethnomusicologists, and the inclusion of new music cultures in publications and curricular materials (e.g. *Global Music Serie*s, 2004-). In the context of American music, Jazz Appreciation Month was launched at the Museum of American History in 2001,

> *to recognize and celebrate the extraordinary heritage and history of jazz for the entire month of April … [and] to stimulate and encourage people of all ages to participate in jazz – to study the music, attend concerts, listen to jazz on radio and recordings, read books about jazz, and more.* (https://americanhistory.si.edu/smithsonian-jazz/jazz-appreciation-month)

In subsequent years, topics addressing jazz education appeared regularly in practitioner and research journals alike. Jazz Appreciation Month was featured in the *Music Educators Journal* and later in *Teaching Music*. On a slightly later trajectory, popular music came into its own in US music education, evident in the publication of *Bridging the Gap* (Rodriguez, 2004), a collection of essays that originated in the Northwestern University Music Education Leadership Seminar in 2002, and the founding of Modern Band—Little Kids Rock in 2002, the Association for Popular Music Education in 2010, and the *Journal of Popular Music Education* in 2017.

Inclusivity was also extended to research that addressed "all aspects of music activity including intellectual, emotional, and physical responses to music" (statement 9). It is curious that the "social results of music study" were viewed as "ancillary" at a time when a social philosophy of music was steadily gaining ground in the profession. Beginning in 1995, sociology of music education symposia began to take place, developing into the International Society for the Sociology of Music Education with biennial symposia and related book and article publications (e.g., Froehlich, 2007; Wright, 2010). Investigations of the social results of music study have dominated music research and theory since the Declaration was published. An overview of topics in the *Journal of Research in Music Education* and the *Bulletin of the Council of Research in Music Education* indicated an ongoing record of studies that used social-psychological theories to investigate topics related to music teaching and learning such as motivation, self-concept, bullying, social identity and sociocultural preference for music.

A further dimension of inclusion was evident in statement 11 of the Declaration which sought to make "meaningful music instruction" available for all people across the lifespan. The agenda of lifelong music education was already under way in the 1990s, broadening the definition of "music education" to include adults and in the process locating lifelong engagement with music as a desired goal of P-12 music education. It gained a strong foothold in the profession after 2000. Similar to other NAfME Special Research Interest Groups (SRIG), the Adult and Community Music Education SRIG began to co-sponsor a series of Music and Lifelong Learning symposia in 2005. The *International Journal of Community Music* issued its first volume in 2008, and promoted research on music education

in diverse community contexts. A decade later, *The Oxford Handbook of Community Music* (Bartleet & Higgins, 2018) provided evidence of the scope and significance of this relatively new area of scholarship and practice.

To conclude discussion of the theme of inclusion, I refer to one of five values presented in the current NAfME Strategic Plan (2016-2021): "Inclusion and Equity: Building strength and promoting diversity in a profession representing the wide spectrum of people and cultures, abilities, economic backgrounds, and gender identities" (https://nafme.org/about/mission-and-goals). What was imagined by the authors of the Declaration in 1999-2000 in terms of inclusion and equity and justice, has indeed found a central place in the profession at all levels in the interim years. It is unfinished work and the goal now is to continue to enact the Declaration ideals in the spaces of all music classrooms.

Widening Horizons with New Frameworks

Whereas statements around inclusion focused primarily on the human dimensions of music education—who is learning, who is teaching, who is represented in school music—widening horizons, (a metaphor often drawn on to describe trends in music education (McCarthy, 2007; Morgan, 1947)), addressed the expansion of goals related to curriculum, advocacy, policy, and networks. A core concern of music educators that has dominated formal curriculum and policy documents across the decades is included in statement 3 of the Declaration—that "time must be allowed for formal music study at all levels of instruction such that a comprehensive, sequential and standards-based program of music instruction is made available."

The most tangible evidence in advancing the goal of standards-based music instruction and accompanying benchmarks was the production of the *National Core Arts Standards* released in June 2014, twenty years after the introduction of the *National Standards for Arts Education*. In this later cycle, student assessment and teacher evaluation were considered simultaneously and advanced through the work of the NAfME Teacher Evaluation Task Force—for example, the Teacher Evaluation and Music Assessment Preconference in Nashville in 2013, and the publication of a *Workbook for Building and Evaluating Effective Music Education* (2013, 2016), aimed "to create a basic set of criteria by which administrators can judge music teachers' job performance fairly and appropriately" (Randall, 2013, p. 36). In reviewing music teacher education since *Vision 2020*, Thornton (2019) addresses the impact of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (2002-2015) on music teachers working in "test-focused schools" and on teacher preparation programs "through the implementation of edTPA and other forms of measurement intended to demonstrate growth and define success" (p. 4). Music education assessment

was a topic of international interest, evident in a series of symposia beginning in 2007, with its most recent held at the University of Florida in 2019. Assessment in this forum has been addressed broadly, reflecting the scope of music activities in the *National Core Standards*.

Already in the 1994 listing of national standards, music educators envisioned a broader range of musical activities in all classrooms across K-12. The formal introduction of creative music making—composing and improvising—marked the beginning of a gradual transformation of classroom practices. In keeping with the central place given to creative music, the writers of the Declaration emphasized that "music making should be broadly interpreted to be performing, composing, improvising, listening, and interpreting music notation" (statement 10). Such change takes time, demanding as it does appropriate teacher education, the production of curricular materials, and a body of research to inform best practices. Based on a review of related literature, the profession has made significant progress in advancing research on creative music making (e.g., Hickey & Webster, 2001; Webster, 2016), creating curriculum materials for best practice (e.g., Hickey, 2012; Higgins & Campbell, 2010; Kaschub & Smith, 2016), and investigating aspects of the music creative process—for example, acquiring improvisation skill, collaborative composition, improvisers' strategies, composing with iPads, and jazz improvisation.

Along with a broadening of the music curriculum was the unprecedented expansion of technological tools to facilitate music teaching and learning. The Declaration writers were clear that music educators need to be informed and proficient concerning "technological changes and advancements and be prepared to use all appropriate tools in advancing music study" (statement 5). Advancements in technology have transformed the spaces of music, learning and communication. Uses of technology have been applied across a range of learning contexts, from performance to composition, special needs' learners to self-evaluation, practicing to music reading, access to unfamiliar music cultures to cross-cultural communication, recording to multimedia productions, and the list goes on. TI:ME - Technology in Music Education, founded in 1995, has provided leadership in music teacher education, advocated and modeled innovative pedagogies, and connected music teachers "with other like-minded K-12 educators, collegiate educators, and industry professionals to get the best possible experience in making music for your students" (https://www.joinit.org/o/time). In the area of professional development, innovations in distance education and the proliferation of online degree programs have transformed spaces of learning. The popularization of social media and online forums (Bauer, 2008) afforded teachers multiple ways to communicate easily and directly with colleagues near and far. For some, this has opened up a new

world of professional networks where concerns and curiosities and successes can be shared, support garnered, and pedagogical understanding deepened.

Another set of widening horizons is found in the necessity for music teachers to involve "the music industry, other agencies, individuals, and music institutions in improving the quality and quantity of music instruction" (statement 6). Since the mid nineteenth century when the music industry gained a strong foothold in music education, its presence has increased manifold. In recent decades, partnerships were extended beyond instrument makers and publishers to corporations and agencies that support advocacy programs. This deepening presence and influence of the corporate world in the advancement of music education was accompanied by an ongoing critique, especially in the writings of Julia Koza who analyzed implications of partnerships between MENC and major corporations (Koza, 2002, 2006).

An additional recommendation in the same statement 6 was that partnerships should start "within each local community by defining the appropriate role of these resources in teaching and learning." A focus on the local was in-keeping with the principles of a major MENC grassroots advocacy program in the 1990s, *Music Makes a Difference*. With momentum for establishing local networks and partnerships already in place, this statement was timely. The incorporation of multiple partners to enrich the curriculum has implications for the teacher's role and responsibilities.

When writers of the Declaration looked into the new century ahead, patterns of development pointed in the direction of a more expansive role for the music educator. Professional music educators, they wrote, "must provide a leadership role in coordinating music activities beyond the school setting to insure formal and informal curriculum integration" (statement 7). The focus here seems to have been on making authentic connections with other learning content and contexts and the use of community musical resources. In sum, several of the statements sought to expand the horizons of music education—the scope of curriculum activities and the ways in which teaching and learning is assessed, technologies engaged in the process of education and professional development, partnerships to advance the cause of music education, all with implications for the role of the teacher and teacher education.

The Housewright Declaration: Challenges Revealed

In the Introduction to *Vision 2020*, June Hinckley asked: "Will our dreams for music education all come true? Perhaps they will not" (Hinckley, 2000a, p. 3). A definitive answer is not possible but it is reasonable to conclude that the values of inclusion and expansion through widening horizons (although the writers did not use these words as such) inherent in the statements did indeed permeate developments in music education since *Vision 2020* was published. Leaders were wise to include a final statement in the Declaration, in which they asked music educators to "identify the barriers that impede the full actualization" of any of the statements and to work to overcome them (statement 12).

The many statements in the Declaration that focused on inclusion and widening horizons represent noble ideals and timely goals for music education. With easy access to information, sophisticated techniques for amassing and analyzing big data, and a quest for achieving certainty and finding solutions, one might anticipate that barriers would crumble to make the road clear for their implementation. However, functioning within hegemonic structures and centuries-old traditions and values, music educators encountered challenges when it came to enacting many of the ideals set forth in the Declaration. I identify four such challenges, and offer ways to further advance the goals set forth in the Declaration—embracing heterogeneity, facing up to racism, acknowledging the power of tradition, and connecting the 'houses' of music education.

Embracing Heterogeneity

The orderly worlds of education—from classroom to curriculum to policy—do not lend themselves easily to heterogeneity. Those worlds flourish around uniformity, standardization, equilibrium, and homogeneity, and to some degree those qualities are required in order for schools to function effectively. A tension arises when a new social order demands that human diversity and complexity are not only recognized but honored and enacted at all levels of education. Such is one strand of the narrative of music education in the later decades of the 20th and early decades of the 21st century. It was an un-settling time, and writers of the Declaration sensed the need to diversify, to aspire to inclusive practices in music education, and to expand definitions and roles and values beyond the status quo that was in need of re-vision(ing).

Already many scholars in music education had arrived at that place and were pushing the boundaries for change, for example those who called 'may day' in 1993 (see Gates in this issue). They embraced the complexity of human music making and human learning and highlighted the need for radical change and for

using multiple lenses to access meaning. More recently, Myers (2017) offers a compelling argument for embracing complexity and heterogeneity in the context of research in music education, moving from:

> An emphasis on method, findings, and documentation to one of struggling with the complexities and ambiguities—the mysteries of the "messy lowlands" – of the intricate and intrinsic relationships among being human and this most profound expression of the human spirit within which we live and do our work. (p. 23)

In a similar vein, developing a polyphonic vision of qualitative research, Allsup (2017) argues for recognition of complexity at the epistemic level when looking at problems of access, power, and justice. For over twenty years, Jorgensen has advanced a dialectical approach to music education (Jorgensen, 1997, 2001) while Allsup (2016) moves professional thinking toward an open philosophy of music education, with less certainty and greater fluidity around the edges of pedagogy, more "this and that" rather than the binary oppositions that underpin some pedagogical approaches. At the philosophical and theoretical levels, scholars point the way to patterns of thinking, forms of research discourse, and habits of practice that seek to supplant homogeneous approaches and reductionist solutions. Perhaps the greatest challenge of all is to uproot the systemic racism that is a legacy of centuries of hatred, hegemony, oppression, and injustice.

Facing Up to Racism

The ideals of inclusion permeating the Housewright Declaration were admirable and timely. The motto of 'music for every child' adopted by the Music Supervisors National Conference goes back to the early 20th century. Every child? Given the segregated nature of music education at the time, it's unlikely that the motto was inclusive of black students. By the year 2000 the goal of 'music for every child' had expanded to students of all backgrounds, even if access to music programs for all was not realized. At that historical moment, over a century and a half since school music was introduced into public schools, many hurdles remained. The legacies of racism remained hidden in the spaces of schools and colleges, and in the infrastructures of music education, and were in large part unexamined. In this century, voices for change resounded in music education literature (e.g., Bradley, 2007; Gustafson, 2009; Hess, 2015), and the discourse intensified after a pivotal moment in May 2016.

In light of allegations of racist comments, Michael Butera resigned as CEO of NAfME, generating a set of heated exchanges in the music education commu-

nity (Bates, 2019). When historians in the future interpret this incident, they will likely see it as a turning point for the organization that represents music education in the U.S., for its members and for the profession at large. Moments like this provide opportunities for all persons to face up to racism, to name it, to do something about it through all available channels—for example, the P-12 curriculum, teacher education, the the recruitment and election of leaders, and research forums.

Acknowledging the Power of Tradition

Another barrier that tended to impede advancement of the Declaration's goals (and in ways analogous to barriers related to racism) was lack of acknowledgment of the power of tradition in the school and academy. School music has from the beginning been tied to particular Western musical practices and their accompanying value systems. Attempts to root other musical practices in the academy and to broaden the scope of the music curriculum can be met with fear of loss and extinction. Historically, music educators have expressed dissatisfaction with the status quo and urged the profession to consider the roots of practice. Strong voices for change permeated this time period. Colwell (2005) made a strong case for the importance of "critical friends" to the profession, an idea that is relevant in this context. For example, as part of the MENC Centennial Series in the *Music Educators Journal*, Kratus (2007) viewed music education to be at "a tipping point," with urgent need to balance the preservation of tradition with embracing the changes in musical practices beyond school. His forthright challenge resonated with music teachers who wrote letters that were published in a subsequent issue of the journal (Disharoon et al., 2008).

Originating in the forum of the College Music Society, Sarath et al. (2016) issued a manifesto for change through redefining music studies in higher education, with implications for transforming teacher preparation programs. The agency that tradition affords is important to sustain music programs; at the same time, the effects of the power of any one tradition need to be acknowledged and evaluated. Underpinning the Housewright Declaration is the message to allow multiple traditions to grow and to celebrate diverse musical values and practices in school culture.

Connecting the 'Houses' of Music Education

The landscapes of music education, including all its infrastructures, form a rich and diverse ecology. As public school music developed over the decades, it tended to construct their own 'houses' and to build autonomy within them while disconnecting from its community roots (Kaplan, 1966). Statements in the Dec-

laration (6 and 7, in particular) called for deeper and more sustainable connections with the local community and with related agencies and institutions.

At the same time, scholars sought to re-define the term 'music education' and broaden its scope to include all contexts of music transmission. At yet another level, special interest groups continue to grow and flourish, each with its own 'house' and meetings and publications. They play a key role in advancing the profession and encompass teaching and learning in a variety of settings and institutions. While more and more specialized groups function within the ecology of music education, a primary challenge is to connect the 'houses' of practice and scholarship that they represent and to enrich one another's growing bodies of knowledge and wisdom.

In a practical field such as music education, theory and practice can move on parallel planes, as evidenced in the divergence of MENC/NAfME conferences between 2010 and 2020, with research and teacher education conferences held separately from practitioner conferences. More intentional planning and sustained interactions between the 'houses' of P-12 education, teacher education, and research activity will help present a more unified front to society. And connecting the houses of music education does not stop with re-arranging the profession internally. It also looks to like-minded partners who play a role in engaging all people in music across the lifespan. One of the values listed in the NAfME Strategic Plan (2016-2021) is "community", aimed at collaborating "with our family of associations, members, and partners to carry out our mission." And in this time period like no other, international networks have expanded and communication has increased. More scholars are collaborating on research projects across national borders, meeting international colleagues in conference settings, and engaging students with their peers in other countries. Global engagement is likely to find new meaning and importance in music education beyond 2020.

The Housewright Declaration: Hope Renewed

The Housewright Symposium and its *Vision 2020* proceedings, including the Housewright Declaration, afforded an important view of music education at the turn of the 21st century. In the Declaration there is evidence of forward thinking which I interpreted in this article under two principal themes—inclusion and expansion in the form of widening horizons. June Hinckley, leading the initiative, and her colleagues were aware that the Declaration was bold and ambitious. As they projected, there were systemic challenges to its "full realization." In a sense, the story of the first decades of the century was about facing those challenges.

On the road toward democracy, there are barriers to overcome, mountains to climb, diversions to take, and the dark waters of history's legacy to cross; on the same journey is found the light of hope, the panorama from the mountain top, the promise of peace on the horizon, and the joyful sounds of diverse peoples quickening the step toward that end. Looking ahead to a future moment on the journey—the bi-centenary of public school music in 2038—let us imagine landscapes that have benefitted from the generosity and wisdom of leaders who convened in Tallahassee in 1999 to create a more just and humane life through music education.

References

Allsup, R. E. (2016). *Remixing the classroom: Toward an open philosophy of music education.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Allsup, R. E. (2017). Ifs, ands, and buts: A polyphonic vision of qualitative research in music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 214*, 7-18.

Allsup, R. E., & Shieh, E. (2012). Social justice and music education: The call for a public pedagogy. *Music Educators Journal, 98*(4), 47–51.

Anderson, W. M., & Shehan Campbell, P. (1989). *Multicultural perspectives in music education*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

Bartleet, B.-L., & Higgins, L. (2018). *The Oxford handbook of community music*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bates, V. C. (2019). Standing at the intersection of race and class in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 18*(1), 117–60.

Bauer, W. I. (2008). A content analysis of the MENC discussion forums. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 175*, 75-84.

Benedict, C., Schmidt, P., Spruce, G., & Woodford, P. (Eds.). (2015). *The Oxford handbook of social justice in music education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bergonzi, L. (2009). Sexual orientation and music education: Continuing a tradition. *Music Educators Journal, 96*(2), 21-25.

Bradley, D. (2007). The sounds of silence: Talking race in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 6*(4), 132-162.

Branscome, E. (2016). Vision 2020 and beyond: Imminent deadlines of the *Housewright Declaration. Contributions to Music Education, 41*, 71-91.

Choate, R.A. (Ed.). (1968). *Music in American society: Documentary report of the Tanglewood Symposium*. Washington, D.C.: Music Educators National Conference.

Colwell, R. J. (2005). Can we be friends? *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 166*, 75-91.

DeNardo, G. F., et al. (2011). Establishing identity: LGBT Studies and Music Education – Select conference proceedings. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 188*, 9-64.

Disharoon, R. A., Hupp, T., Egger, T., & Blostein, M. D. (2008). Music education at the tipping point? *Music Educators Journal, 94*(3), 7-8.

Elliott, D. J. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Elpus, K., & Abril, C. R. (2011). High school music ensemble students in the United States: A demographic profile. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 59*(2), 128-145.

Elpus, K., & Abril, C. R. (2019). Who enrolls in high school music? A national profile of U.S. students, 2009–2013. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 67*(3), 323-338.

Elpus. K., & Grise, A. (2019). Music booster groups: Alleviating or exacerbating funding inequality in American public school music education? *Journal of Research in Music Education, 67*(1), 6-22.

Fitzpatrick-Harnish, K. (2015). *Urban music education: A practical guide for teacher*s. New York: Oxford University Press.

Froehlich, H. C. (2007). *Sociology for music teachers: Perspectives for practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Gustafson, R. I. (2009). *Race and curriculum: Music in childhood education*. Palgrave, NY: Macmillan.

Hess, J. (2015). Upping the "anti-": The value of an anti-racist theoretical framework in music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education, 14*(1), 66–92.

Hickey, M. (2012). *Music outside the lines: Ideas for composing in K-12 music classrooms*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hickey, M., & Webster, P. (2001). Creative thinking in music. Special Focus: Composition and improvisation. *Music Educators Journal, 88*(1), 19-23.

Higgins, L., & Campbell, P. S. (2010). *Free to be musical: Group improvisation in music*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Education.

Hinckley, J. (2000a). Introduction. In C. K. Madsen (Ed.), *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the future of music education* (pp. 1-3). Reston, VA: The National Association for Music Education.

Hinckley, J. (2000b). Why Vision 2020? *Music Educators Journal, 86*(5), 21-24, 66.

Jellison, J. A., & Draper, E. A. (2015). Music research in inclusive school settings: 1975 to 2013 *Journal of Research in Music Education, 62*(4), 325-331.

Jorgensen, E. R. (1997). *In search of music education*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Jorgensen, E. R. (2001). A dialectical view of theory and practice. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 49*(4), 343-359.

Kaplan, M. (1966). *Foundations and frontiers of music education*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kaschub, M., & Smith, J. (2016). *Experiencing music composition in grades 3-5*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Koza, J. E. (2002). Realm without angels: MENC's partnerships with Disney and other major corporations. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 10*(2), 72-79.

Koza, J. E. (2006). "Save the music"? Toward culturally relevant, joyful, and sustainable school music. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 14*(1), 23-38.

Kratus, J. (2007). Music education at the tipping point. *Music Educators Journal, 94*(2), 42-48.

Lind, V. R., & McKoy, C. L. (2016). *Culturally responsive teaching in music education: From understanding to application*. New York: Routledge.

Madsen, C. K. (2000). Preface. In C. K. Madsen (Ed.), *Vision 2020: The Housewright Symposium on the future of music education* (pp. ix-x). Reston, VA: The National Association for Music Education.

McCarthy, M. (2007). Widening horizons with a global lens: MENC responds to the new world order, 1982-2007. *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education, 28*(2), 140-154.

Morgan, H. N. (Ed.). (1947). *Music education source book*. Chicago, IL: Music Educators National Conference.

Myers. D. E. (2017). Asking powerful questions: Toward a scholarship of value and impact. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 213*, 7-25.

Pitts, L. B. (1947). Ever-widening horizons of music education. In H. N. Morgan (Ed.), *Music education source book* (pp. ix-x). Chicago, IL: Music Educators National Conference.

Randall, M. (2013). Tuning up the standards for teaching, student assessments, and evaluations of music educators. *Teaching Music, 21*(1), 36-40.

Regelski, T. A. (1998). The Aristotelian bases of praxis for music and music education as praxis. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 6*(1), 22-59.

Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education: Advancing the vision.* (3d ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Richerme, L. K. (2016). To name or not to name? Social justice, poststructuralism, and music teacher education. *Philosophy of Music Education Review, 24*(1), 84-102.

Rodriguez, C. X. (2004). *Bridging the pap: Popular music and music education*. Reston, VA: MENC: The National Association for Music Education.

Salvador, K., & Kelly-McHale, J. (2017). Music teacher educator perspectives on social justice. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 65*(1), 6-24.

Sarath, E. W., Myers, D. M., & Campbell, P. S. (2016). *Redefining music studies in an age of change: Creativity, diversity, and integration*. New York: Routledge.

Shehan Campbell, P. (1996). *Music in cultural context: Eight views on world music education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Thornton, L. (2019). Vision 2020 and beyond. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 29*(1), 3-6.

Webster, P. R. (2016). Creative thinking in music, twenty-five years on. *Music Educators Journal, 102*(3), 26-32.

Wright, R. (Ed.). (2010). *Sociology and music education*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Co.