

School of Music and Dance

Sabrina Madison-Cannon, Dean

MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 2021

Faculty in Attendance: Abbott, Baird, Boss, Brunkan, Cheung, Cordova-Arrington, Crumb, Ebert, Esquivel, Fine, Garner, Gearhart, Ghillebaert, Grose, Hatakeyama, Honka, Jantzi, Kim, Kruckenberg, Kyr, Llinás, Madison-Cannon, McQuilkin, Mentzel, Mockli, Moore, Nobile, Ortiz, Pack, Paul, Peña, Phillips, Pologe, Ponto, Roberts, L. Rodgers, S. Rodgers, Scott, Shner, Silveira, Stolet, Straka, Strietelmeier, Vacchi, Van Dreel, Vanscheeuwijck, Viens, Wachter, Wheeler

Faculty Not in Attendance, but Excused: Denny (teach), Dossin (recording), Grossman, Owen (teach), Wallmark (teach), Wolf (teach)

Staff in Attendance: Bates, Benefiel, Bostwick, Cagno, Cummings, Glenn, Gorman, Hinojosa, Kenton, Klenke, Mason, Mikesell, Shaffer, Spicer, Stevens, Walton

Call to Order

Dean Sabrina Madison-Cannon welcomes SOMD faculty and staff to the remote zoom meeting and calls the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes from the April 14, 2021 meeting was presented by Madison-Cannon. Associate Dean Grose moves to approve the motion which is seconded by Professor Mentzel. Madison-Cannon asks if there is any discussion, questions, or modifications; none. Faculty voted via a zoom poll and the **minutes were approved as written with a 39 yes, 1 abstain**

Motions from the Dean's Office

Madison-Cannon presents a motion on behalf of the Dean's Office to propose adoption of revisions to the SOMD Mission and Vision statements. She shares that the statements were edited and vetted in several different ways, including input from FAC and the Implementation Committee.

The motion was seconded by Professor Van Dreel. Madison-Cannon asks if there is any discussion, questions, or modifications. She also suggests we look at the broader spirit of the statements and not spend our time wordsmithing small edits.

Madison-Cannon screens shares the proposed statements, which are copied below:

Mission

The University of Oregon School of Music and Dance has a threefold mission:

- To identify and attract a diverse pool of the highest level of dedicated and striving musicians, dancers, and scholars and assist them in reaching their full potential;
- To enrich students' lives with the arts of music and dance, offering a dynamic curriculum for those seeking a robust liberal arts education;
- To serve as an educational and cultural resource for the University of Oregon, the local community, and the state of Oregon.

Vision

1. Our teaching is engaged, inclusive, and research-led. We look to cultivate a synergy between academic and creative pursuits.
2. We welcome risk-takers. We strive to experiment and invest in new creations while critically examining existing work.
3. We look for opportunities to share music-dance knowledge and value all lived experience, all forms of education, and all fields of study that inform our artistic pursuits. We work to build and maintain a supportive environment so that our musicians and dancers feel safe to explore and flourish.
4. The community is our classroom. Our area is full of off-campus arts organizations, performance venues, and creative opportunities, connecting student artists with the skills and information they need to effect positive change within their communities and move the fields of music and dance forward.

A question come up requesting clarification if the mission statement includes music performance when referring to a liberal arts education. Members of the FAC and Implementation Committee clarify yes that is the intent behind both the mission and vision statements.

Madison-Cannon takes a moment to pause for any last questions or discussions. There are none so she calls the question. Voting and ballots were submitted via an anonymous zoom poll:

SOMD Mission statement revision: the motion carries with a vote of 44 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain

SOMD Vision statement revision: the motion carries with a vote of 44 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain

Next, Madison-Cannon presents a motion on behalf of the Dean's Office to propose adoption of the new department head appointment process. The motion is seconded by Professor Shner. Madison-Cannon asks if there are any questions or comments.

Professor Boss poses a practical question regarding the implementation timeline; is the timeline noted in the new policy what we'll do for the initial appointment (call for nominations in fall 2021) so interim heads will serve a second year?

Madison-Cannon proposes that if the new appointment process is approved, that we expedite the process for this year to a spring term nomination/appointment process. After this initial year, we'll use the timeline noted in the policy. For this year, I propose for the Dean's Office to send a call for nominations after this meeting, then onboard our new music department heads this year/spring so they are able to attend the OtP new unit head training in June.

Madison-Cannon says the second option would be to stay in the interim structure and start the formal dept head process in fall 2021.

Professor Peña asks if current interim heads can be nominated/in the pool for department heads if we fast tracked the nomination process?

Madison-Cannon responds yes. First, let's vote on the process. Then secondly, we can discuss any concerns to expedite the process to this term.

Van Dreel draws attention to many comments in the chat in support of expediting the nomination process.

Professor Nobile points out that we had talked about the vote for the “secret ballot” to not be a vote for one person, but rather a “strongly favor”, “favor”, “does not favor”.

Boss confirms that the balloting would be an advisory vote, and faculty would not be picking one person but instead would share their support for each candidate.

Madison-Cannon asks for any final questions or discussions. There are none so she calls the question. Voting and ballots were submitted via an anonymous zoom poll:

New Department Head Appointment Process: the motion carries with a vote of 43 yes, 1 no, 2 abstain

Internal Governance Policy Revision Discussion

Madison-Cannon moves to the revised SOMD internal governance policy document for group discussion. She begins again, with a request to not wordsmith, but instead for us to focus on the big picture and commenting on potential edits or updates.

Professor Stolet brings up a concern regarding faculty reviews and that two different review groups review for pay raises (FAC) and major reviews (personnel committee). There could be disagreement between an FAC review for a merit review and Personnel Committee for a major review.

Madison-cannon clarifies that FAC would be evaluating faculty differently (one-year annual review) than what the scope of the review would be that the Personnel Committee would be doing. They (personnel) are looking at a larger timeframe, usually six or three years. She asks for clarification and if the concern is that the Personnel Committee says this person is stellar than the FAC is looking at a one-year snapshot and doesn't give them as high of merit than the other committee? They are looking at different things and a different scope.

Professor Boss adds to the discussion about FAC doing annual reviews. There are some members of our committee, Implementation Committee, who were concerned that there would not be input from every area on FAC for annual reviews.

Madison-Cannon points out that this been discussed and taken into consideration; a note has been included in the policy to add ad-hoc members from non-represented areas to the FAC for the purpose of merit raises.

Professor Crumb brings up the point on university personnel committees that for reviews from their unit, members are asked to recuse themselves and leave the room during the discussion.

Discussion if ad-hoc area representatives on FAC would have advisory role or would vote on merit reviews. The idea is for them to be advisory/content specialists as needed.

Boss adds that the Undergraduate Committee membership make-up is moving to a department representative make-up vs area make-up which could be a concern.

Madison-cannon screens share Undergraduate Committee from governance policy draft.

Van Dreel says the department rep vs area rep make-up was discussed in FAC; focusing on department reps first, and in the off chance an area wasn't on the committee, but their experience was needed the FAC committee would seek out the area/faculty that could give experience/opinion on what is being considered.

Associate Dean Grose confirms that the department vs area structure was discussed. Since we are moving into a department structure within the school, it made sense to have the committee make-up move in that direction too.

Madison-Cannon reminds us the role committee members have: committee members are responsible for disseminating information discussed by the committee through department and area channels and also bring back any questions/concerns from their department or areas within their department to the committee.

Professor Gearhart shares that they also at looked at the membership make-up of the Recruitment Committee. Currently it is heavy on staff members and light on performance faculty members. He suggests adding two more members for a total of three music performance faculty on the committee.

Instructor Esquivel adds that this comment was left on the OneDrive doc from the Implementation Committee

Gearhart also notes that the Recruitment Committee may be changing with the onboarding of a new Assistant Dean of Admissions.

In terms of next steps and faculty input on the governance policy, Madison-Cannon asks Akiko Hatakeyama and Sarah Ebert what the best way is to share comments. They respond that OneDrive is.

Next Steps for governance policy review:

- Faculty will receive draft document to review and comment on via OneDrive; comments due May 17
- FAC and implementation committee will review, revise, and create a final draft
- Final draft will be sent to faculty as a NOM on May 26; summer session policy will also be sent at this time
- Faculty vote to adopt new governance policy at June meeting.

Updates and Announcements from the Dean's Office

Madison-Cannon shares an update about the communications office/staff and addresses some questions that she's been receiving regarding where communications requests should be sent.

General communications requests go to Josh Gren, OBF interim director of communications. He's been our air traffic control for our needs. Josh will either take care of the request or funnel to our other support staff like Alyssa Hinojosa, our temp communications staff, or our communications student worker. Barbara Harris, OBF education & operations coordinator, has also been a tremendous support and helping with SOMD communications needs. Steve Fyffe is working on Ledger Lines right now. He may be reaching out to you with requests for the next issue. If you have any ideas, please send them to him.

Reminder: Professional development requests are due June 1.

Madison-Cannon asks if there is anything else for the good of the order.

Adjournment

Madison-Cannon thanks everyone for their time and joining the virtual meeting. The meeting was adjourned early at 3:54 p.m.

Minutes submitted by
Tiffany Benefiel, Dean's Office
May 14, 2021