

Section 3. Proposal Guidelines for the Establishment of a College or School or Reorganization Within a College or School

a. Abstract

A one-page summary of the essential information from each of the sections below. Please submit this abstract both as an introduction to the proposal and as a separate document; proposals will not be considered complete without the abstract.

For the past few years, a group of arts chairs and faculty members have been working on an idea to create a School of the Arts, modeled after other universities that have benefited from a more unified structure for their arts programs. Since spring 2019 we have put in especially concerted efforts, and, over the last year, we formed two working groups (Appendix 1) to tackle the various elements that such a merger would entail. Arts chairs and any faculty who were interested in participating in this work have been part of this process. The current proposal outlines the results of the work, culminating in the articulation of our ideas, and the benefits we see to moving the arts departments into a School.

As we have devised it, the current arts departments—Art and Art History, Theatre and Dance, and Music-- will shift to programs, and maintain their current groupings. For instance, Art Education will remain with Art and Art History and Music Education and Lane Series will remain with Music. Film and Television Studies and Creative Writing will remain in English and will be affiliated programs/faculty with the School. There are no curricular changes that are part of this move; all majors and minors will stay intact. Faculty appointments will also move from departments to the School. As such, faculty positions, ranks, or tenure will move to the School and are otherwise unchanged. There will be no changes to operating or gift funds allocated to these areas as the move to the School occurs. The changes are in the move to a different, more cohesive administrative structure.

This new entity aims to better support the excellence of our arts faculty and curricula, expand interdisciplinary courses and research opportunities for our students, stay more current with trends in the arts that are crossing disciplinary barriers, elevate and better promote the value of the arts as part of a liberal arts education, and communicate more effectively the importance of the arts for the enrichment of and engagement with diverse communities at UVM and beyond. The commitment of the CAS administration and UVM upper administration to support these endeavors has already borne fruit—we hired three Harris fellows, two lecturers, and moved to lecturers to the TT track in support of our move to a School model. The administration has also committed to a substantial initial investment to support our work as a School. We are excited to come together and the faculty and chairs have worked hard collaboratively to build what we believe will be a strong unit for ourselves within the College.

b. Description

ii. For reorganization proposals, please provide a detailed description of the proposed academic structure, including graphic representations of the old and the new structure

For new College or School proposals, please provide a detailed description of the proposed College or School. The description should clearly demonstrate how the proposed unit meets the definition of College or School, including having a defined mission in instruction, research and scholarship, and service.

The School of the Arts will be composed of the faculty and staff in Theatre and Dance, Art and Art History, and Music, and will have affiliated faculty in Film and Television Studies and Creative Writing. It will be within the College of Arts and Sciences. The structure of the School reflects the need to promote the disciplinary diversity of these areas and ensure these areas' autonomy and visibility. This model is, therefore, preferable to melding all of the arts into one large department. The School brings us together in critical decision making, planning, and strategic initiatives, but also maintains our disciplinary identities.

As per the University manual, the School will be led by a Director to be appointed by the Dean, following the procedures normally followed for the appointments of department chairs. The Director will report to the Dean. Given the size and complexity of the School, an Associate Director will be appointed to help manage the operations of the School, including facilities and programming. Consistent with other usages in the University, the internal units within the School will be called programs, and will be led by program directors, whose responsibility is to oversee the curriculum of their respective majors and minors. They will work closely with the Director and Associate Director to meet the objectives of the School. (See Appendix 2.A. for detailed job descriptions and 2.B. for the organizational chart).

In terms of service, we recognize that a balance must be struck between faculty concern over potential additional service and the need for responsible shared governance. Thereby, we have conceived of a plan to have a cross-School committee formed of program directors and additional faculty from each discipline so as to have equal representation. In conjunction with the executive team (program directors, associate director and director), two faculty members from each program, and one member from each of the affiliate programs, would serve on the School of the Arts Steering committee and help shape the following areas: 1. Inclusion and Belonging (classroom climate, hiring, faculty support and mentorship curricular and programming initiatives to increase awareness and address historical and systematic issues around inclusion and equity) 2. Budget/Facilities/Equipment committee; 3. Curriculum and Events (cross-School curricular initiatives and events planning; in consultation with Inclusion and Belonging committee). We would have another executive committee with the program directors, associate director and director to work on other aspects of decision making and planning for the School. Beyond these two committees, we would leave at the discretion of each division what unit-specific committees will remain necessary for their program's work. Working together in these committees is a critical piece of finding our connections, building our community, and identifying our needs. The Director will be tasked with the advocacy and implementation of the shared vision, ideas, and requests across the School as well as for the individual programs and faculty members.

The working group drafted a mission statement, which was sent to faculty for feedback. The following statement reflects that input.

Mission Statement: UVM School of the Arts

The UVM School of the Arts is a welcoming community of students, faculty, and staff members in the areas of Music, Theatre, Dance, Art, and Art History, and affiliated programs in Film and Television Studies and Creative Writing, dedicated to creating a vibrant hub for learning, discovery, collaboration, inclusivity, innovation in creative practice, and above all to giving voices to future artists, historians and theoreticians of the arts, and arts educators.

We train and mentor our students to prepare them for real world challenges as makers, cultural producers and consumers, and informed global citizens.

We integrate a diversity of artistic practices and creative voices into the academic mission of the University through mobilization of resources, faculty and student support, collaborations with other disciplines, programs and academic units, and through partnerships and outreach to our community and beyond.

At the UVM School of the Arts, we believe in the power of the arts and of an arts education. We believe in the student's potential and support their artistic values.

The goals for this proposal include the following:

- To bring together the arts units at UVM in a cohesive way, while also respecting and supporting our differences
- To streamline efforts in raising awareness for arts related events on campus
- To foster an artistic community that brings UVM arts faculty and students together in shared interests
 - To align with UVM's land grant mission in serving and engaging the local community
- To advance fundraising for arts units in the College of Arts and Sciences

In creating a UVM School of the Arts we aim for the following outcomes:

- Recruitment of more students interested in the arts
- Deeper community engagement in arts related events: concerts, performances, screenings, showings, exhibitions, and lectures
- Expanded collaborations with community arts partners in Vermont and beyond
- Increased opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration for arts faculty and students
- Better visibility for the arts on campus, in CAS, and among students and the community, including a clearer picture of what we do in our respective areas of research, teaching, exhibition, performance, and scholarship.
- Strengthened existing learning areas, certificates, majors and minors
- Advance fundraising efforts for all arts units and programs in the School of the Arts.
- Improved marketing efforts and coordination of arts related events on campus
- Better meet the needs for Catamount Core arts requirements for students across the university.
- Increase support for students in realizing the many career paths possible in the arts through skills training, collaborative work in and out of the classroom, local and national internships and other professional opportunities.
 - As faculty and staff, we will work together to improve conditions for faculty and staff professional development.
 - Seek out shared and mutually beneficial opportunities to develop and implement innovative pedagogy and curricula.
 - Encourage and support usage of presentation and exhibition spaces across campus. (For example, supporting an art installation in the Southwick Courtyard, a musical performance on the Cohen steps, etc.)

iii. Where appropriate, describe any history that would be relevant to the current proposal.

The current departments of Art and Art History, Theatre and Dance and Music have evolved over time. (See the histories of these departments in Appendix 3.) Dance was established as a new academic program and was initially a program in Music; it moved from Music to Theatre quite recently, forming the Department of Theatre and Dance. Art History was folded in with Studio Art and Art Education decades ago. Film and Television Studies is housed in English but their work obviously intersects with the other arts disciplines, and most recently, a faculty member was jointly hired by FTS and Art and Art History. New facilities, an emergence of new ideas among the faculty, trends across the country towards a School of the arts model, and the directions artistic practice has taken in recent decades, catalyzed the move to a School.

The Dean of CAS had chairs meet in smaller disciplinary groups beginning in 2015. At the time, the chairs and program directors were Tom Toner (Music), Tom Brennan (Art and Art History)/Kelley Di Dio (spring 2016 Acting Chair), Sarah Nielsen (FTS), Dance (Paul Besaw), and Gregory Ramos (Theatre). Through these conversations, and through our collaboration on a presentation to the Board (which also included Major Jackson, Steve Budington and Jane Kent), we saw the value of working more closely together. The chairs continued to meet as a cohort as an Associate Dean to the Arts was appointed (Kelley Di Dio), and as leadership changed to new chairs and program directors, Paul Besaw, Patti Riley, and then David Neiweem in Music, Jane Kent and then Pamela Fraser in Art and Art History, Deb Ellis and then Hyon Joo Yoo in FTS, and Paul Besaw in Theatre and Dance, once Dance moved and Gregory Ramos left UVM.

The idea of a School of the Arts was borne from those initial discussions in 2015, but grew over time, as new people came on board and there was a growing consensus that this move would be advantageous. In the summer of 2019, we formed a specific working group to meet regularly and research the idea more seriously. We surveyed nationally Schools of the arts to understand better how they are organized, what programs are included in them, and what pros and cons they identified as a result of being in a School. We interviewed 28 chairs or directors of Schools and collected that information. In further discussions, we identified what our challenges and opportunities would be in forming a School at UVM. In October 2019, we brought our ideas to faculty in a proposal after which department faculty meetings with representatives from the committee. We continued to meet as a group every two weeks through the fall semester. In the spring, we held two forums to discuss where we were in our thinking and get further feedback from arts faculty. These meetings were scheduled for March 6 and March 18, 2020 (the second forum was cancelled because of Covid). We had another faculty forum on October 9, 2020. Working with that feedback, we continued to meet and work through ideas on a regular basis.

At the end of last fall (2020), after several additional meetings of a large group of interested faculty, we organized into two working groups (see Appendix 1). These groups were the result of an open call for participation from arts faculty and chairs. The administrative structure working group included: Jane Kent (Art & Art History), Steve Budington (Art & Art History), Yutaka Kono (Music), Kelley Di Dio (Associate Dean, Art & Art History), Deb Ellis (Film & Television Studies; later replaced by Hyon Joo Yoo, Film & Television Studies), Pamela Fraser (Art & Art History), Patti Riley (Music; later replaced by David Neiweem, Music), Paul Besaw, Theatre & Dance, and for one semester Katie Gough (Theatre & Dance). The curricular working group included Paula Higa (Theatre & Dance), Mildred Beltré (Art & Art History), Madsen Minax (Art & Art History), Jenn Karson (Art & Art History), Steve Kostell (CDAE), Kelley Di Dio (Associate Dean, Art & Art History), and faculty from creative writing, languages, and other interested faculty. The group discussed potential multi-disciplinary large lecture courses and proposed one, Looking and Listening, which will be taught in fall 2022, and Deb Ellis and Steve Kostell proposed another, Media and Activism, which will be taught in spring 2023. (See Appendix 4.)

The work of the groups advanced to such an extent that when called by the Dean to have a vote about our participation in the School (in response to the Dean's December 2, 2020 memo in which the School was identified as a point of reorganization in the College). We sent a general outline (Appendix 5.B.) of how we thought the School could be organized and what outcomes we saw as the result of the reorganization into a School. The vote was called in March and responses were sent to the Dean by March 15, 2021. Each department voted positively for the School, but each brought up issues that needed to be addressed by the administrative working group as well as the Dean and Provost's offices (these responses are in Appendix 5 C.). We met regularly since then to work through those issues.

We have communicated regularly with the arts faculty and staff to make our work transparent. (Copies of those communications are in Appendix 5.D.) The Dean has also included updates of the School in CAS chairs and faculty meetings to let people know the work was ongoing and then to inform them of the positive vote of the faculty in the arts.

The names for the internal units have shifted from maintaining the term 'department' to 'program/faculty in' as a result of research done about uses at other Schools of the Arts, discussions among the group members and the administration. We asked the faculty to determine whether our internal units should be named 'programs,' in accordance with other programs with majors in CAS, or just be called "Music/Faculty in Music/Head of Music." Faculty were sent information and a ballot to vote on their preference on September 9, 2021 (see Appendix 6). The result of that vote was 24 votes in total; 19 for program and 5 for the discipline names.

We also sent out the mission statement the administrative working group drafted to faculty for their feedback. This occurred on September 10, 2021. All feedback was incorporated.

We sent the draft of this proposal to the faculty for review on September 22, held a public forum on September 29, and received email feedback until October 10.

c. Goals & Rationale

i. Describe the rationale behind this proposal including reasons why other options are not appropriate.

Maintaining our current structure means maintaining the silos of our departments and ignoring contemporary, deeply cross-disciplinary practices in the arts. A new cohesive structure will better support collaborative work for the benefit of our scholarship (Provost's Academic Success Goals 2.1 and 2.2) and the preparation of our students for the competitive job market in the arts (Provost's Academic Success Goal 1.1 and 1.3) .

Our new facilities in Cohen and the Recital Hall provide new production, performance and exhibition capabilities. The School will encourage new and creative ways to utilize these spaces for the benefit of scholarship, students, and the community.

Our new faculty members' work extends beyond the current departments and participates in the current move in the creative arts towards performance and other artistic collaborations that blur the traditional lines of our media and areas of specialization.

We need the School to work together and maximize the benefits of these new facilities, provide support and resources for cross-disciplinary work (Provost's Academic Success Goals 2.1 and 2.2); and create a more vibrant, diverse and supportive community for our faculty staff and students (Provost's Academic Success Goals 1.5).

ii. Identify the specific goals of the proposed new academic structure

Moving into one large department rather than a School would potentially undermine the visibility of our programs and impact enrollments, as their independent identities would be swept into one oversized department of the arts with one chair (see Appendix 7). This would be totally out-of-scale compared to our current departments and inconsistent with what other universities have done with their arts programs. By having programs for each area within the School, the independent identity is maintained. Furthermore, the autonomy of the areas over their curriculum and spending is important to the function and health of these areas. Evolving the current departments into programs that are part of a School ensures autonomy in these areas but provides a better infrastructure to meet our objectives.

To reiterate, we will maintain local-level control of our curricula and local-level service needs within the programs in the School. We plan on supporting large-lecture multi-disciplinary courses in the future, but it will be continue to be up to the individual programs how their curricula and major/minors are constructed. The aim of the School is not to "take over" or homogenize the arts, but to better support the individual programs while also better supporting the overall mission of the School to create new opportunities for greater visibility, strength, and excellence for our students and professors in our research in and beyond the traditional boundaries.

As we outlined in our mission statement, our goals are

- To bring together the arts units at UVM in a cohesive way, while also respecting and supporting our differences
- To streamline efforts in raising awareness for arts related events on campus
- To foster an artistic community that brings UVM arts faculty and students together in shared interests (Provost's Academic Success Goals 1.1, 2.1, 2.2)
- To align with UVM's land grant mission in serving and engaging the local community (President's Amplifying our Impact)
- To advance fundraising for arts units in the College of Arts and Sciences (Provost's Academic Success Goal 2.1).

While some collaboration has happened sporadically over the years, we mostly remain siloed in our departments. We see the move to a School, with a new leadership structure, committees within the School that will bring faculty together across media, and disciplines as a means by which we can foster the creative work of our faculty and students and build a stronger, more inclusive community.

Furthermore, a move to a School model much more closely aligns with the evolutions in our scholarship and creative work that de-discipline the arts. Moving together will provide a much more current education for our students and enrich our faculty's work through their deeper connections across media, while still supporting the work artists do that is not multi-disciplinary or collaborative in nature.

iii. Describe how the goals align with the university's mission, and how the new administrative model will help to achieve the stated goals

The shift in the administrative structure will allow program directors the time and space to address the day-to-day issues in their areas as well as more time for planning, curricular changes, and attention to area needs by moving the responsibilities of personnel, student issues, and staff supervision to the director. The director will be dedicated to those aspects previously assigned to chairs, but also have a commitment to doing more dedicated fundraising and stewardship, planning and programming for School-wide events, work with local community partners, advocate for the arts with the upper administration and help communicate the impact of administrative decisions and projects to the School faculty, and ensure that faculty are well supported in their scholarship and teaching. The Director will furthermore provide a cohesive vision for the arts ensuring that the goals of the School for collaboration and innovation are met.

This structure recognizes that arts leaderships' jobs are varied and complicated because of the unique nature of the arts—with facility and equipment needs, programming of performances and exhibitions that are enormously time consuming, SCH limitations because of class sizes and limited faculty resources, among other issues. The director's advantage of seeing the needs and particulars of the different areas within the School in a more cohesive way will allow for better advocacy, fundraising, and planning. The new structure will allow us to meet our goals and advance the excellence of the arts at UVM.

iv. Where appropriate, offer examples of institutions with similar organizational structures and outline relevance of these examples to the goals and/or rationale for the structural changes

In the summer of 2019, a group of arts chairs, the FTS director (Gregory Ramos, Paul Besaw, Jane Kent, Deb Ellis) and Kelley Di Dio (AD for the Arts) surveyed existing Schools of the arts at universities across the US. We compiled a list of Schools and then set up times to interview the leaders of them. We found a good deal of variation in their sizes, structure, financial resources, student numbers and number of programs (and also variations in University organization, re: whether the Schools were within or outside of Colleges). The report we compiled is in Appendix 5.A.. Since we began this work, other universities have been undergoing similar reorganizations into Schools of the arts.

Colleges and Universities with similar structures to what we are proposing (Schools or College of Arts within a larger College and/or University) are very common. They include: University of Hartford, Boston University, Syracuse University, UConn, University of Maine, Bard, Northern Vermont, UT Austin, UNC, Columbia, College of Charleston, University of New Orleans, University of Nevada, Virginia Commonwealth University, Purchase College, Emerson, St. Cloud State University, Samford University, SMU, University of North Alabama, Northern Kentucky University, Western Connecticut State University, Endicott College, University of Toledo, Azusa Pacific University, Seton Hall University, University of Central Missouri, University of Louisiana-Monroe, University of Lynchburg, Ohio Northern University, Purdue University, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Rider University, East Tennessee State University, Loyola University, Arizona State University, Boston University, University of Southern Mississippi, University of South Florida, George Washington University, Ball State, University of Kansas, Georgia State University, Carnegie Mellon University, University of Houston, Rutgers University and Princeton University.

Ultimately, we created a model that uses some common elements we found (like an AD/Director as the head of the School, who reports to the Dean of the College; separate units within the School for the different areas), and responds to the actual facilities we have (we will not be in one building of the arts, but maintain our existing arts

spaces across campus, primarily in Williams, RTT, Cohen, and the Southwick/Music Complex, as well as with our existing areas of expertise, faculty numbers, student enrollments, and financial resources.

d. Impact

i. Explain how the proposed reorganization or establishment of a School or college will impact students, faculty, staff and other programs or units at UVM

The School of the Arts will provide greater visibility via marketing, directed coordinated efforts with admissions, and stronger community partnerships to attract prospective students. Expanded community partnerships and work with faculty across the arts, along with the internship office in CAS, the UVM Alumni Association, the Foundation, and the Career Center, will engender more internship and professional development opportunities for arts students, such as the Arts in Action program in New York City and other similar opportunities. We will also develop professional development workshops and student/alumni panels to further the preparation of our students for the job market and/or grad school. Most significantly, perhaps, is the work we will do to further our students' development and understanding of arts collaboration, public engagement, and cross-disciplinary learning through our shared curriculum and creative projects.

The School is focused on supporting the cutting-edge cross-disciplinary work of our arts faculty while also supporting their independent work by increasing research opportunities, internal and external awards, and better coordinated facility and resource support. Better coordinated fundraising and stewardship as well as greater advocacy with external and internal granting bodies will provide the means to do this, as will the dedicated support of the Director and Associate Director. In addition, the decreased service burden of those who serve as program directors, as opposed to the enormous jobs that arts chairs currently manage, will allow those faculty leaders more time and energy to direct to their creative projects. The outcomes will be better faculty morale and more substantive faculty support for their teaching and research endeavors.

We recognize the incredible work of the staff in the arts, both administrative and technical, who make the work of the faculty and its leadership possible and support the success of our students. All current staff appointments will be maintained as they are, while also identifying and implementing new ways to coordinate and make more efficient the handling of various administrative processes. Technical staff, like the administrative staff, will report to the Director. The Director will provide support and create clear parameters to help support the work they do for faculty across the arts. Already, many of our technical staff work across areas in the arts, but there have been scheduling and communication issues that have arisen because of a lack of centralized coordination. This will be addressed with the School model.

e. Budget

i. Include data that is relevant to the financial sustainability of the proposed new or reorganized administrative structure.

All operating budgets will shift to the School structure but remain allocated as they are to the areas within the School. Gift funds will also remain with the areas in which they are currently. Therefore, there is no change in these resources for the areas. (Current operating and gift funds are listed in Appendix 8.) The Dean and the Provost's Office are co-funding a one-time start up fund of \$50,000 for the School. Fundraising efforts will help form a pool from which future projects and programming can be funded.

In the administrative leadership, there will be some gains in SCHs and modest savings in stipends as current course releases and stipends allocated for chairs will be reduced. The Director will be compensated in line with our extra-large departments. The Associate Director will be compensated in line with chairs of medium-sized departments. The program directors for Theatre and Dance, Music, and Art and Art History will be compensated comparably to our large programs in the College that have majors (e.g., FTS, GRS, Neuroscience). The change current stipends and course releases to this structure is effectively cost neutral, yielding a modest annual savings of up to \$7000 savings and a gain of 2 more courses (as course releases are reduced). This structure, with the additional layer of the Associate Director, recognizes the larger array of responsibilities and ambitions of the leadership of the School and the effort needed to get the School off and running, as well as the size of the School in terms of FTE, majors, SCH,

and operating budgets (see Appendix 7). The Associate Director role will be assessed in two years to see if it is still necessary after the School has gotten its footing.

f. Evaluation

i. Please outline how you will evaluate the School's success, including benchmarks related to the goals outlined above.

The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences has set out the following areas for evaluation of the success of the School:

Scholarly metrics: increase in productivity as defined by the units, increased applications for external and internal grants and awards

Student credit hour/major/minor increases (See Appendix 7 for major enrollments, SCHS and FTE for FY 20 and FY 21.)

Increase in philanthropic support: donor support for arts initiatives, research funding, scholarships, facility upgrades, etc.

Increase in public engagement: more collaboration with greater Burlington and Vermont arts organizations, more community-engaged events and learning opportunities

g. Summary of Communications with academic units likely to be involved in or affected by the proposal.

i. Summarize all communications with the academic units involved in or affected by the proposal, including all written communications (e.g., emails, memos) in an appendix to the request.

The administrative structure working group has been in consistent communication with all of arts faculty in CAS since 2018, when the idea was moved beyond a concept to creating a plan. These departments include Theatre and Dance, Art and Art History, and Music, but also the program in Film and Television Studies housed in English. We also communicated with Creative Writing faculty about our project to see if they were interested in being affiliated in some way. They continued to be a part of the large-lecture course planning group, but not the administrative structure group due in part to reductions in their faculty. They have agreed to join the School as affiliated faculty like FTS. We look forward to working with them on programming and other initiatives. The School will be the home base for the fine and performing arts and arts education.

The communication strategy has been to update faculty regularly via email and chairs have had it as a regular part of faculty meeting discussions, especially over the last year, as well. (See Appendix 5 A-D)

We have sent regular updates to faculty, especially since the March 2021 vote was cast and responses were sent to the Dean. The working group, which was formed by the chairs and any interested faculty who responded to the open call, has worked hard to find answers to the questions posed or address concerns voiced in those responses. We asked the arts chairs to communicate that progress to their faculty members, but also sent a memo in May and in August giving more detailed updates. Faculty members were able to provide feedback to their chairs or working group members along the way, but also in the forums we held in spring 2020 and again this fall, as well as in CAS faculty meetings. We have communicated concerns or other issues to the Dean and his team, who has worked with his business team, as well as HR and the Provost's office to get answers or advice as needed. We have engaged with the faculty every step of the way as we worked on this project together.

h. Schedule

Outline the proposed implementation schedule

Assuming support from CAS faculty and the Senate, we plan to have the proposal to the Board of Trustees at their February meeting. This would have the School in place for fall 2022. The merging into a School requires no physical relocation of faculty or staff. The administrative structure would go into effect on July 1, 2022 and faculty and staff positions would transition to the School at that time.

Appendices:

1. Working group membership
2. A. Position descriptions for Director, Associate Director, and Program Directors
2. B. Organizational chart
3. History of the Departments and Programs of Music, Theatre, Dance, Art and Art History
4. Large Lecture Arts Courses
- 5.A. 2019 Report with Initial School Proposal
- 5.B. Memo outlining School concept as of March 2021, with call for vote
5. C. Responses to Vote
- 5.D. Other Communications with Arts Faculty Regarding the School 2019-2021
- 5 E. Notes from arts faculty forum held on September 29, 2021.
6. Vote results for internal unit names
7. School of Arts Comparables
8. Current operating/gift funds in the arts