

School of Music and Dance

Sabrina Madison-Cannon, Dean

MEETING MINUTES

April 14, 2021

Faculty in Attendance: Abbott, Baird, Boss, Brunkan, Cherry, Cheung, Cordova-Arrington, Crumb, Dossin, Esquivel, Fine, Garner, Gearhart, Ghillebaert, Grose, Grossman, Hatakeyama, Henniger, Honka, Kim, Koenigsberg, Kruckenberg, Kyr, Llinás, McQuilkin, McWhorter, Moore, Nobile, Ortiz, Owen, Pack, Paul, Peña, Phillips, Pologe, Ponto, L. Rodgers, S. Rodgers, Scott, Shner, Silveira, Stolet, Straka, Strietelmeier, Vacchi, Van Dreel, Viens, Wayte, Wheeler

Faculty Not in Attendance, but Excused: Denny (teach), Ebert (teach), Foley (teach), Iddrisu (teach), Jacobs (teach), Jantzi (appointment), Krueger (teach), Mentzel (conference), Vanscheeuwijck (conference), Wallmark (teach), Wolf (teach)

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

Call to Order

Dean Sabrina Madison-Cannon is absent and Associate Dean Mike Grose is presiding over today's meeting on her behalf. Grose welcomes SOMD faculty and staff to the remote zoom meeting and calls the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes from the March 10, 2021 meeting was presented by Grose. Professor Henniger moves to approve the motion which is seconded by Professor Peña; the faculty voted, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Guest Presentation: Imagining the Future of Online Courses at UO

Dr. Carol Gering, Associate Vice Provost for UO Online, joins the SOMD meeting to provide an update on evolving prioritization of online courses and invite dialogue.

The last time Gering came to SOMD, it was shortly after she arrived at UO; they were initially looking at bottlenecks for undergrad courses and what courses could be moved online to help students work towards degree completion. UO Online is still working on that initiative.

Then the pandemic hit. And they shifted gears to look at our high enrollment courses. Making sure we had high-quality courses move online. There are 105 new online courses, some of the highest online courses. These will help us get the most bang for our buck.

As we think about returning to normal, the shift in thinking is what should be next. What does normal look like after the pandemic? Gering can't answer that alone so she's here to talk with us. What works for SOMD? What's the right percentage/the right mix of online courses? Across UO, she is suggesting 25% of courses being offered online. What makes sense for SOMD?

Gering invites those that have taught online to share the value of online courses from their experience.

Professor Crumb shares that he was teaching a lot of studio composition online. For performance areas where we have lessons with individual studios, is it possible for students to be given an option in the future? The idea generally would be to be in-person, but would it be possible for online to be optional sometimes?

Gering responds that it's a great question, but one she doesn't have the answer to. Forgive me, I'm not completely up to speed on this type of course.

Crumb replies that for composition, he teaches from the piano and can do so regardless of if the student is in the room or not.

Instructor Pack adds to the discussion by sharing that he has been enjoying using the resources in the library, the green screen, and the learning glass. He still records in-person class, he has a hybrid course. Some students are taking the in-person class remotely. He hopes that when we go back to in-person there will still be an opportunity to use this service.

Professor Boss notes that Pack brings up a good point about hybrid classes. He is seeing that students can zoom in from another place, or the reverse of it, we can bring in guests to our class without the travel/hotel costs. In the future, would we be able to adapt more hybrid options and more hi-flex classrooms?

Gering explains the distinction between hi-flex and hybrid. Hi-flex, you have two audiences at the same time; students in-person and students watching remotely, but the class takes place at the same time. With a hybrid class, all students meet in a class (in-person) at the same time, then some of the content is delivered remotely.

For fall, there will be a push to have as many in-person student experiences as possible. Students have expressed zoom fatigue and the need to have a social connection. After fall, there will be an opportunity to explore modalities and more options than what we have done in the past.

Instructor Wayte shares that he participated in the online course initiate program this year, one class in the winter was completely online with pre-recorded content. He likes the live zoom sessions; he has more interaction via zoom than in live in-person class. He gets questions and comments in the chat; students are speaking up more, and student responses have increased. He has mixed feelings about going back to the class. Will I still get this level of engagement? They are much more willing to raise their hand and put something in the chat vs raising their hand and speaking up in person. How do I preserve that?

Gering agrees that introverted students can be more comfortable putting something in the chat vs speaking up, or in an asynchronous environment they have time to digest the information before the zoom class and time to formulate a response; these different types of environments can be beneficial for some students.

She adds that online classes still have a place, after fall. Not as an emergency response, but for strategic reasons.

Professor Pologe shares that for music performance studios, one-on-one lessons with students in our studios need to be in person and in a highly acoustic space to be able to learn correctly. Guest performers, lectures, and masterclasses (guests are remote students are in-person) are wonderful options. And less expensive options allowing us to give students the opportunity for more guests/masterclasses.

Gering agrees that is a great approach to thinking about what's strategic, rationale, the right use of technology.

Professor Fine adds that another benefit and strategic use of technology is that we were able to listen to music and live narrate (talk in chat), without talking over the music. She can envision the hybrid model with perhaps less time in class with partial zoom participation for listening. Fine is also mindful of zoom burnout so she hopes were not going that way fully.

Professor Kruckenberg addresses an important concern about “what is the sweet spot of the percentage of classes?” Gering said 25%, and Kruckenberg hopes the university is thinking of this by unit. As Pologe said, performance classes can be challenging to deliver remotely so it shouldn’t be then that academic classes must make up the additional 25%.

Gering thanks Kruckenberg for bringing that up. The 25% is just a number in terms of planning and hiring course designers. It’s in no way a requirement/mandate. The level of online courses will be determined at a unit level.

One of the most important things for an online class is that the student feels like they have a real teacher/person to interact with.

Carol shares her email address and invites faculty to contact her to continue the conversation: cgering2@uoregon.edu

Motion from the Undergraduate Office

Grose presents a motion on behalf of the Undergraduate Committee which proposes a revision to the BA Music History & Literature program.

The motion was put before the faculty and was seconded by Kruckenberg. Grose asks for questions or discussion.

Professor Paul brings up a concern regarding the change in ensemble requirement. I completely support the idea that students should be able to take a wide range of ensembles. But by taking away the large ensemble requirement, they lose the opportunity for foundational support in the courses there studying.

There is no additional discussion. Grose calls the question. Voting and ballots were submitted via an anonymous zoom poll, voting results also include absentee vote submissions.

BA Music History program revision: the motion carries with a vote of 30 yes; 8 no; 8 abstain.

Motion from the Dean’s Office

Grose presents a motion on behalf of the Dean’s Office for revisions to the SOMD Professional Development Policy. The proposed revision changes the submission date from once a year, October 1, to twice a year. The proposed new submission dates would be June 1 for requests from July through December and December 1 for requests from January through June. The rationale for the change is to allow faculty/staff to submit requests and receive approval for summer/fall activities earlier and before activity taking place vs submitting after the fact.

Boss inquires why June 1 was selected and instead of a later date, something like July 1.

Benefiel explains that June 1 was selected since faculty are still on contract. Requests can be reviewed and approved before faculty leave for summer. We want to be considerate of faculty time and don’t want to have a deadline that requires faculty to submit anything while they are off contract.

The motion was put before the faculty and was seconded by Jay Silveira. Grose asks for questions or discussions; none.

Voting and ballots were submitted via an anonymous zoom poll, voting results also include absentee vote submissions.

SOMD Professional Development Policy Revision: the motion carries with a vote of 36 yes, 2 no, 9 abstain.

Grose asks if there are any additional questions or announcements for the good of the order; there are none.

Adjournment

Grose thanks everyone for their time and for joining the virtual meeting. Grose asks if there is a motion to adjourn the meeting; Pologe moves and Shner seconds. The meeting was adjourned by Grose at 4:43 p.m.