

School of Music and Dance

Sabrina Madison-Cannon, Dean

MEETING MINUTES

February 10, 2021

Faculty in Attendance: Abbott, Baird, Boss, Brunkan, Cherry, Cordova-Arrington, Craig, Crumb, Denny, Ebert, Esquivel, Fine, Foley, Garner, Gearhart, Ghillebaert, Grose, Grossman, Hatakeyama, Henniger, Honka, Jantzi, Kim, Koenigsberg, Kruckenberg, Krueger, Kyr, Llinás, Madison-Cannon, McQuilkin, McWhorter, Mentzel, Moore, Nobile, Ortiz, Owen, Pack, Paul, Peña, Phillips, Pologe, Ponto, Riley, Rodgers, Rodgers, Scott, Silveira, Stolet, Straka, Strietelmeier, Vacchi, Van Dreel, Vanscheeuwijck, Viens, Wallmark, Wayte, Wheeler, Wiltshire, Wolf

Faculty Not in Attendance, but Excused: Bellona (teach), Dossin (teach), Jacobs (teach), Kennedy (appt), Shner (teach)

Staff in Attendance: Bates, Benefiel, Cagno, Cummings, Fyffe, Glenn, Gorman, Kenton, Klenke, Mason, Mikesell, Miller, Shaffer, Spicer, Stanny

Call to Order

Dean Sabrina Madison-Cannon welcomes SOMD faculty and staff to the remote zoom meeting and calls the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes from the January 13, 2021 meeting was presented by Madison-Cannon. Professor Henniger moves to approve the motion and Professor Foley seconded the motion; faculty voted via a zoom poll and the **minutes were approved as written with a vote of 53 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain**

Guest Presentation: Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment, and Outside Activities Policy

Dr. Emily Tanner-Smith, Associate Vice President for Research in the OVPRI and Dr. Carolyn Craig from Research Compliance Services (RCS) join us to share details on the university policy: <https://policies.uoregon.edu/vol-1-governance/ch-2-legal-affairs/conflict-interest-conflict-commitment-and-outside-activities>

Dr. Tanner-Smith shares that she is happy to join SOMD and she has a deep connection to the performing arts coming from a long line of professional musicians in her family and growing up in symphony halls. She can appreciate all the work being done in SOMD.

Tanner-Smith explains they are here to raise awareness of this UO policy. And also make introductions so you know who the people are behind the scenes and can feel comfortable reaching out. Contact their office at coi@uoregon.edu

Background

- In Spring 2019, UO updated its policy on conflicts of interest (COI), conflicts of commitment (COC), and outside activities
- Updated policy reflects extensive input from the University Senate and stakeholders across campus
- Goal of the updated policy is to better support the engagement of university employees in outside and entrepreneurial activities in a way that is consistent with state laws and regulations
- The policy applies to all university employees as public employees, including faculty, Officers of Administration, and classified staff

Overview of UO's Policy

- Encourages employees to engage in outside activities that advance the mission of the University
- Affirms academic and personal freedoms of those engaging in outside activities
- Protects employee by clarifying what they can/cannot do as UO employees in relation to the outside interest or activity
- Ultimately promotes good stewardship of public resources and public trust in the institution, the education it offers, and the science conducted by UO researchers

Conflict of interest

- Conflict of interest is defined as any action, decision, or recommendation by a person acting in their capacity as a University employee that would (for actual conflicts) or could (for potential conflicts) have a private financial impact on the person or their relative, or any business with which either is associated
 - In your UO capacity, are you in a position to authorize purchases from any business in which you or a relative have a financial interest?
 - Through your research or teaching roles, are you in a position to direct student labor or non-public information to any business in which you or a relative have a financial interest?
- Situations that may create the appearance of a conflict of interest can be damaging to the reputation of individuals and the institution, and should be disclosed/managed

Conflict of Commitment and Outside Activities

- Conflict of commitment is defined as a situation where an individual engages in outside activities, either paid or unpaid, that substantially interfere with the individual's duties to the University of Oregon
- In the context of this policy, a conflict of commitment (COC) is most readily identified when an outside activity takes a significant amount of time and/or occurs at times when the employee is expected to be performing their UO duties
- COCs can also emerge when an employee's outside activity otherwise competes with their UO duties.
Example: Researcher conducts research on the side for other institution

General Guidelines

- Employees are encouraged to engage in outside activities that comport with the mission of the University
- Employees generally may not:
 1. Make private commercial use of university resources without permission
 2. Use non-public information accessed as an employee to obtain private financial benefit
 3. Engage in activities that substantially interfere with an employee's duties to UO

Outside Activities Presumed NOT to Substantially Interfere with Duties

- All employees: on leave or university holidays (including winter and spring break)
- All hourly and part-time employees: activities performed outside of hourly or part-time employment
- Faculty: activities that do not exceed one day in each 7-day week (13 days/term), prorated by FTE; activities during summer, when you have no summer appointment; activities conducted during a sabbatical (if included in approved sabbatical plan)

Some outside activities are considered exempt and can be conducted without disclosure. Some examples:

- Flute instructor who occasionally plays their personally owned flute in a band in pubs on the weekend
- Grants administrator (OA) who does bookkeeping for their church (2 hours/week)
- Faculty delivers a colloquium at another university and gets paid an honorarium
- 9-month Faculty who teaches a college course for another US-based institution during the summer
- GE who edits manuscripts on the side

Other outside activities require disclosure and approval before an employee can engage in activity, given the risk that the activity might present a conflict of interest or commitment. Some examples where disclosure and prior approval is likely:

- Psychology professor who sees therapy clients at a mental health agency
- Full time outdoor program employee (OA) who owns small outdoor guide business through which they occasionally lead local trips
- Software developer (classified staff) who owns equity in UO start-up established to develop and sell transportation applications
- Marketing instructor who establishes an LLC through which they consult about advertising

Conflicts are not a bad thing! They often mean we are out in the community contributing.

A disclosure self-assessment tool is posted on the OVPRI website:

<https://research.uoregon.edu/manage/integrity-compliance/conflicts-interest-and-commitment>

Full presentation slides attached.

Motions from the Undergraduate Office

Associate Dean Mike Grose presents three new course proposals on behalf of the undergraduate committee which have also been approved by the graduate committee:

1. MUS 430/530 Tonal Analysis: Linear/Prolongational Analysis

Course Description: This course is designed to develop students' familiarity with linear/prolongational analysis and facility with graphing technique, help them to understand correlations between Roman numeral analysis, smaller elements of musical form and harmonic-contrapuntal structures, and make them more familiar with the analytical literature produced in this area.

2. MUS 431/531 Tonal Analysis: Form in Tonal Music

Course Description: This course explores the analysis of form in music from the Baroque, Classical, and Romantic eras. We will engage with some of the most important developments in formal analysis over the past twenty years, including (but not limited to) Sonata Theory, form- functional theory, processual approaches to form, and the relationship between formal types and linear structures.

3. MUS 432/532 Tonal Analysis: Analysis of Popular Music

Course Description: This course explores the analysis of popular music, with repertoire largely drawn from English-language rock, pop, R&B, and hip-hop from the 1960s to the present. We will begin with methodologies adapted from traditional music theory, including form, harmony, meter, and rhythm, and then move on to more repertoire-specific topics, such as timbre, texture, and lyrics. Though we will engage with professional scholarship as we explore these methods, the course's primary focus is on developing and expanding students' own analytical abilities; in other words, students will write more than they read.

Grose adds that Professor Rodgers can also address questions, but essentially these are updates for current courses. No questions or concerns are brought up from the faculty. Gross puts forward the motion from the undergrad committee and Henniger seconds. Voting and ballots were submitted via an anonymous zoom poll.

MUS 430/530: the motion carries with a vote of 53, 0 no, 1 abstain

MUS 431/531: the motion carries with a vote of 53, 0 no, 1 abstain

MUS 432/532: the motion carries with a vote of 53, 0 no, 1 abstain

Next, Grose presents a motion on behalf of the undergraduate committee which proposes changes to the **Popular Music Program**.

Summary of the proposed program changes, which have also been endorsed by NASM:

- MUS 463—Popular Music Studies will be made electable, not required, in the History & Culture menu of the concentration, and four elective credits will be removed from this menu
- MUS 263—US Popular Music 1800-1930 and MUS 358—Music in World Cultures will be required in the History & Culture menu
- If a student elects to use MUS 131—Music Theory I to satisfy the submenu requirement in the Musicianship menu, where one of three specific theory/musicianship courses must be completed, that student must also complete MUS 134—Aural Skills I

Grose opens the floor for questions.

Drew Nobile brings forth a concern that the updated curriculum is missing a literacy, aural skills, component. He adds that he and the Theory Area are in conversations with Professor Koenigsberg for additional revisions; there is a concern this proposal will be approved without addressing the additional revisions that are necessary and inquires why the proposal is being brought for vote before it's fully adjusted to meet the needs of the program and the students. He adds to clarify that he supports the Popular Music Program as a whole but has concerns regarding this current revision.

Grose states that the proposal is coming to approval at this stage because it was approved from NASM. And he agrees that there are ongoing conversations regarding the curriculum.

Madison-Cannon reminds us that approving these changes now should not prevent us from having ongoing conversations. An approval now does not preclude us from making changes later; this is the case for all of our curriculum. I encourage you to continue to constantly review our curriculum and seek areas for improvement. The risk in not approving this proposal now is that we go back to using the old curriculum that is not NASM approved. The expectation is that the conversation will continue.

Rob Kyr adds to the discussion that this is not what was discussed in the undergrad committee and was not brought up by Theory colleagues before being approved by the undergrad committee. He proposes we commit to having a conversation about this at our next undergrad committee meeting and invite those to the meeting that have concerns regarding this revision. From my understanding, different areas were in conversations and no reservations were brought up as they are now.

A question arises whether this motion is being voted on or if there is a motion to table. Kyr clarifies that he is only commenting and providing a suggestion on how to go forward with the process for continued engagement on this topic.

Sharon Paul seconds the concern that Nobile brought up that when students graduate, they need to have had a literacy component. She is fine with approving this for the sake of NASM but for long-term we need to ensure our students are graduating with the right competencies.

Gross puts forward the motion from the undergrad committee which was approved and seconded. Voting and ballots were submitted via an anonymous zoom poll.

Popular Music Program Changes: the motion carries with a vote of 34 yes, 8 no, 11 abstain

Last, Grose presents a motion on behalf of the undergraduate committee for program changes to the **B.M. in Jazz Studies**. The summary of changes is quite extensive, and Grose encourages faculty to review the NOM program change proposal details that were distributed via email, if they haven't already.

Madison-cannon asks if these changes are substantive enough to need a NASM review? Brad Foley: no.

Grose opens the floor for additional questions; there are none. The motion was put before the faculty; the motion was approved then seconded. Voting and ballots were submitted via an anonymous zoom poll.

Jazz Studies Program Changes: the motion carries with a vote of 48 yes, 1 no, 3 abstain

UO Senate Update

Madison-Cannon invites SOMD Senate representatives, Professor Jay Silveira and Professor Melissa Brunkan, to provide updates on what is going on within the UO Senate.

Silveira shares slides along with details on the UO Incidental Fees (I-Fees) and the ASUO proposal for a change in how student fees are allocated. Silveira received notification of the proposal and request for senator support from Quynh-Chi Tran, ASUO Academic Senate Seat 12 for Music, Art, and Public Policy on January 29, 2021.

Silveira explains that in the current I-Fees structure, \$1.7 million is allocated to athletics (students pay \$25.50/term). A lottery system is used to distribute student athletic tickets; if students are unsuccessful in the lottery to get a ticket, they have to purchase game tickets above what they already pay in I-Fees (\$10 for non-league \$20 for league).

ASUO Proposal: \$1.7 Million = 1.3% of Athletics budget; 10% of ASUO budget

- ASUO proposes reallocating funds to...
 - Supply EMU bathrooms with free menstrual products
 - Create a textbook subsidy
 - Fund a basic needs coordinator
 - Funding a student advocacy coordinator
 - Create an emergency housing subsidy for students who are facing homelessness

Implications

- Counterproposal (February 1, 2021) drafted by President Schill rejected by ASUO
- I-Fee is set by ASUO and not part of the Tuition and Fee Advisory Board (TFAB) process
- It is presented by ASUO to the UO Board of Trustees for approval
- If the UO Board of Trustees does not approve of ASUO's proposal, ASUO can appeal to Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC)
- Athletics will likely sell the tickets formerly allocated for students (at market value)
- "We do not want to use the money students paid this year for tickets ... we want to return that money to students since they did not receive the tickets they paid for... I am asking that you consider supporting this resolution and signing on as a cosponsor." (Annika Mayne, ASUO Finance Senate Seat 07, Athletics and Contracts Finance Committee Chair)

Counterproposal and other documents can be found here: <https://tinyurl.com/IFees>

Madison-Cannon asks if we have a sense of student interest on this on a broader scale? I want to be clear that we are getting a representation from all students and not a small subset.

Glenn asks if are they asking the school to support this?

Silveira responds that they are asking the two senators from SOMD (Silveira and Brunkan) to support this.

Glenn follows-up inquiring if they are asking other schools to support?

Madison-cannon adds, I think they are getting push back from OMB (Oregon Marching Band) students and they want to help educate SOMD students on the proposal.

Silveira says they are not well informed yet to vote on this and hopes to get more details during an upcoming meeting scheduled with the dean, SOMD senators, and Quynh-Chi Tran.

Next, Brunkan shares slides and an update regarding teaching evaluations and the revised system that intends to be a multi-source criteria-based teaching evaluation framework (below is taken from slides, which were presented by the Committee on Improvement of Evaluation of Teaching (CIET) to the University Senate)

History of the Work

- In May 2018 the Senate approved adopting the Continuous Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching System, which included a **centrally administered midway Student Experience Survey** (results only available to instructors) and **course-level Instructor Reflection survey** (results included in instructors' files), and **forming and charging a standing committee** with developing a new end-of-course Student Experience Survey.
- In April 2019 the Senate approved to **replace 'Course Evaluations' with the new 'Student Experience Surveys'** with learning-focused questions that are aligned with the teaching quality standards of professional, inclusive, and research-informed.
- In Fall 2019 the new Continuous Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching (CIET) System tools, including the **new midway Student Experience Survey, end-of-course Student Experience Survey and Instructor Reflection** were **deployed campus wide**.
- The 2018-19 and the 2019-20 Teaching Excellence and Evaluation Community Accelerating the Impact of Teaching (CAIT), with faculty representation from all schools and colleges, conducted **proof-of-concept testing and iteration of the Teaching Evaluation Criteria and new Teaching Evaluation Reports for tenure and promotion**.
- In September 2020 the Provost's Office created new reports which were accessed by academic unit managers (replaced the numerical mean student ratings previously provided by the Registrar's Office (P&T Reports)).
 - a) Teaching Overview Report and b) Teaching Detail Report

About the Proposed System: this **conceptual framework** codifies a **system of teaching evaluation** that includes **multiple sources of evidence** (from *students, peers and faculty* themselves) to evaluate faculty against **consistent standards** (*professional, inclusive, engaged and research-informed teaching*) using the Teaching Evaluation Criteria document.

Present Work of the CIET Committee

- Key goals are to **evaluate faculty based on known and shared criteria** rather than "I know good teaching when I see it" and reduce the known ways bias creeps into the system, especially in numerical rankings, which the new instruments no longer generate
- The new surveys ask **more specific teaching questions of students** (this is an intervention to reduce bias) and **ask aligned questions of faculty** in an instructor reflection

- The qualitative data from these surveys feeds into new reports organized by criteria to make it possible/practical to do a criteria-based review in which faculty teaching is compared to criteria rather than to other faculty through rankings and averages
- Student survey response rates are down, at least in part because we removed the grade hold linked to completing them.
- The CIET committee asks faculty to please consider allowing 10 minutes of class time for students to do the surveys.
- Working on central efforts to get response rates up again.
- Optional resources exist for units like a **peer review template, teaching statement template, and heads letter template**--all three aligned to the university-wide criteria
- The **teaching evaluation criteria document** itself, which units will want to ultimately make their own, **includes modifying the standards** as part of the policy change process.

Interim Head of Academic Music, Professor Boss, shares that he has met with Sierra Dawson (VP of Academic Affairs). We want the personnel reports to be around these four pillars of teaching. We're already starting to address these in our own department head letters for current promotion and tenure reviews underway.

Chat from Peña: I'm serving on the Continuous Improvement and Evaluation of Teaching Committee (CIET) and would be happy to answer any questions also. Thanks, Melissa B for the thorough overview.

Food Drive 2021

SOMD Events and Scheduling Coordinator, Brooke Cagno, shares information on the 2021 Food Drive currently underway. An email sent today from Wakako Stevens provides links and instructions on how to donate:

- For credit card donations, please donate through SOMD team fundraising page:
<https://fundraise.foodforlanecounty.org/fundraiser/3112051>
- You can also create a one-time, or 12-month recurring payroll deduction:
<https://forms.uoregon.edu/document/launch/governors-state-employees-food-drive>
 - Be sure to enter our department name in the appropriate field.

Cagno explains that we can also donate non-perishable food items to the Student Food Pantry; employees can give canned food every Wednesday in February from 11am to 1pm at the food pantry, which is hosted at Grace Lutheran Church at 18th and Hilyard.

Refer to the "Food Drive 2021" email (sent 2/1/2021) for more details on giving.

Updates and Announcements from the Dean's Office

Madison-Cannon shares that the BFA in Dance is on the agenda for HECC and should be approved soon.

Edmund A. Cykler Chair in Music has now reached the funding threshold. We have put together the selection criteria and process document, which will be distributed via email shortly along with nomination deadline. Thank you to the following committee members, including past and current chair holders, for agreeing to serve and review nominations:

- Brad Foley, Professor of Music, committee chair
- Idit Shner, Phillip H. Knight Chair in Music
- Sharon Paul, Robert M. Trotter Chair of Music
- Steve Owen, Professor of Jazz Studies, former Phillip H. Knight Chair in Music
- Keith Eggener, Marion D. Ross Distinguished Professor of Architectural History (College of Design)

COVID-19 In-Person Policy and Procedure Concerns from Students

We have been informed about concerns and confusion from students regarding how we are operating in-person. Before these issues bubble up to IMT or Provost. I'd like to propose that we shut down (pause) all in-person operations for a few days so we can re-evaluate our current processes and re-educate ourselves. Madison-Cannon is meeting with leadership tomorrow and will send out an email soon to start this discussion.

Steve Owen asks if there are any specific details on what type of concerns are being brought up.

Madison-Cannon shares a few examples of student concerns:

- Cleaning protocols not being done, or not observed being done.
- Protocol for in-person applied lessons are not being adhered to or are being interrupted differently. It's not just about playing time, it's about all in-person interactions (playing, discussion/feedback time, etc).

Dennis Llinás asks if students have brought up any specifics in terms of classes or people?

Madison-Cannon responds that in some cases they have and sometimes they haven't; students don't want to call anybody out and get anybody in trouble. Not adhering to protocol doesn't seem to be intentional, but students are very aware of the policies. There are specifics to different areas that may be unclear.

Karen Esquivel brings up that she may have been unintentionally violating the protocol and has been meeting in-person for 60 minutes. Clarification from Madison-cannon that yes, lessons can be 60 minutes, but 30-minutes is needed between lessons to "clear the space".

Chat from Tim Pack: Would it be possible to have an updated bullet list of protocols for having in-person classes?

Thor Mikesell explains that when this policy was initially created, we did so not knowing some of the additional classes that would end up being in person. We need to go back to IMT—and based on guidelines from the state, OSHA, and the Colorado study—get more specific and clear with our process. We are also going to be talking about tech courses for our music education majors. There are a lot of people involved (IMT, OtP, Safety & Risk Management, etc.)

Mikesell shares that the plan to collect this information is to meet with faculty 1:1. However he also offers to hold a faculty forum if it would be helpful to share information and answer questions to a broader audience.

Madison-Cannon suggests that we also hold a student forum to ensure we are all on the same page. Let's address this first, before complaints escalate, and we are shut down by the UO and we don't have control over the time we are not allowed to hold in-person lessons/classes. As you can see, I'm even quoting the wrong policy; let's take some time to pause, evaluate our policies, reeducate ourselves, and communicate with everyone to ensure our faculty, staff, and students are safe. Thank you for understanding.

Adjournment

Madison-Cannon thanks everyone for their time and joining the virtual meeting. The meeting was adjourned by Dean Madison-Cannon at 4:08 p.m.