

Ratification Group Conference Call

Monday, November 4, 2019

1:30 - 2:30 PM ET

In Attendance:

Toni Paz, Leader

Hilary Dow Ward

Quanice Floyd

Stanford Thompson

MINUTES

1. Welcome
2. Outlining Values for Members
 - a. Toni - First Paragraph Outlines Types of Members
 - i. Core Members
 - ii. Auxiliary Members
 - iii. Founding Members
 - b. Toni - Goals of Membership and some of the outstanding questions we have for the group to answer:
 - i. What are distinguishing factors between Core Members and Auxiliary Members?
 - ii. What are the distinguishing factors of Founding Members?
 - iii. We want members to share our values (individually and organizationally) - do we care if it is on the mission, vision, and values level? What level do we care or do we care at all?
 - iv. Do we want members to show proof of their values? Are we going to require something or will there be a sort of vetting process?
 - v. Should we have founding members? Should they have different benefits?
 - vi. What behaviors do we want to encourage from our members?
 - vii. Do we believe that there is a minimum amount that all organizations should pay for dues?
 - viii. Do we believe that dues should be based on a sliding scale, according to budget? Is there a ceiling? How will this work for smaller programs?
 - c. Toni - Reviewing Page 2 of NIMAN Values Draft3
 - i. What are the key values NIMAN's core members share?
 1. A commitment to training musicians from underrepresented ethnicities
 2. A commitment to removing barriers to access for musicians from underrepresented ethnicities
 3. A focus on training musicians from underrepresented ethnicities for conservatory-level auditions -OR-

4. A focus on training musicians from underrepresented ethnicities, whether it's conservatory level or not.
 5. Trade or other organizations that support musicians from underrepresented ethnicities
 6. Organizations or individuals that include diversity & inclusion or equity in the field of classical music
 7. A demonstrated commitment to cultural equity¹ (as defined by Americans for the Arts May 2018)
- d. Stan - To me, this looks pretty good, and with the added questions, there are some things for us to grapple with in Cincinnati. What, from this, are your recommendations from your working grouping and what are the questions that you think that we should tackle?
 - e. Toni - There is a sample list of values that comes from El Sistema. We could use any amount of them, but I think we agree that these are our values. All of us in our group agree that there needs to be skin in the game. Do we care at what level how much skin in the game/organizational commitment they have and use. We didn't care as much if it's mission, vision, or value. Whether it's a flagship program or a current project. How important are those key values to those who are interested. If there are dedicated resources, that indicates skin in the game.
 - f. Stan - I think once we start defining what level these things are at we also have to have a mechanism to evaluate it and a set of consequences. Unless you create you create a situation where each individual member or organization self-identifies with these values. NIMAN doesn't actually intervene, but we go on the honor system. It could get messy, otherwise.
 - g. Hilary - We also talked about single memberships. If there's a private teacher who wants to commit and contribute, that would look very different from a summer program or a conservatory.
 - h. Toni - I think the values that those people would fall under is covered by the last two bullets.
 - i. Organizations or individuals that include diversity & inclusion or equity in the field of classical music
 - ii. A demonstrated commitment to cultural equity
 - i. Toni - Those are values that you would self-declare. If it's an organization that has mission, vision, and values - that we can check. If they have a strategic plan or a flagship program, we can check that. If there needs to be some checks and balances, with these bullets, there are things we can check and we can ask for it. If it's a personal commitment, that we cannot check. If it's an individual, we would have to have a document to verify. At some point we would have a document for them to sign and show a personal commitment to it. At a certain point, we can ask for some verification, organizationally, but we have to decide on how strict we're going to be on organizations that are declaring, and whether anybody who meets any of this criteria becomes a core member. If they don't meet any of the criteria, do they become a friend. Let's say it's an

¹ ***CULTURAL EQUITY:** defined by Americans for the Arts on May 23, 2016 as "...embodying the values, policies, and practices that ensure that all people – including but not limited to those who have been historically underrepresented based on race/ethnicity, age, ability, sexual orientation, gender, socioeconomic status, geography, citizenship status, or religion – are represented in the development of arts policy..."critical to the long-term viability of the arts sector".

orchestra whose mission is just to perform music. There's no program, no goal, no objective - but they think this is important. That's an auxiliary member.

- j. Hilary - So regardless of the size of the resources or organization, it would matter according to their mission statement?
- k. Toni - I think that's the question. If that's the criteria, that would make anyone else a friend. LGBTQ community example - if you are a member of that community, then you identify as LGBTQ. If you're straight, you identify as an ally. So like that, if you do not work in this space, have a program in this space - you would identify as an auxiliary member.
- l. Stan - I would say that is a construct that in Cincinnati we will talk more about. I wouldn't say that we need to clearly define that now. What I'm hearing is there needs to be a clear delineation of levels and benefits. Let's say, for example, we had a regrating program that could provide organizations with the funds to launch or grow their diversity initiative, perhaps there is something more robust to help us make the decision of who is worthy to get that money versus we don't have to go through that amount of work to have them sign up to be a member.
- m. Toni - if you're chasing funding for a program you don't have, versus looking for money to fund a program that you're already committed to - I think there needs to be a commitment for it. We don't necessarily want people who would say "if we get the money, we'll do it". It doesn't succeed if you're chasing the money for it. If the core member has skin in the game, the core members would be eligible for funding as a partner, whereas a friend who wants to start a program - that's an entirely different category, and we would be comparing apples to apples and oranges to oranges. If we're going gung-ho for advocacy, we want more bodies in the room. If we're focusing on programs, then we really want the people in the room to be those who are in this space working every day as our core members. We want those people as our board members.
- n. Stan - I think it will be important for us to have enough definition around this because we want to get to a point where NIMAN can become a service organization for all sorts of people. This might include all sorts of people who might want to teach and mentor. It might be people who want to donate money. Students. It could be other musicians who might not be musicians of color who, you mentioned, Toni, might want to be an ally. We know that organizations are going to be in the best position to leverage the resources that they already have. We want them to leverage those resources in a more coordinated way that will have a positive effect on the trajectory of musicians of color. When I think about core/auxiliary, is it organizations that have the resources that have the leverage now versus organizations that don't have those resources. Example: The Atlanta Symphony has the TDP and is prepared to leverage their resources right now. Other symphonies may not have any kind of program, and really could only leverage their resources to help those wanting to join their own symphony. Does that make them an auxiliary member, that they don't really have something concrete?
- o. Toni - it would allow the orchestra to sign up as auxiliary members, but allow the musicians to sign up as individual core members. They would be the advocates leading the charge. That's what that wiggle room leaves - commitment to cultural equity. I think we need to be straightforward with the commitments, like training musicians from underrepresented communities, but we do want wiggle room. I think the cultural equity is the wiggle room. I think people who include DEI as important to them - that's also wiggle room.

- p. Hilary - I'm thinking about how scenarios apply to people at different levels of membership. How a teacher who wants to do that individually, and how to people like that become members, and how is it that they contribute. I'm trying to think of how people working at different levels in DEI can contribute. A teacher in an elementary school who believes deeply - they should have an entry point. A private teacher should have an entry point. Church musicians and programs - let's face it, in big communities, children don't always learn music at school, but at church. They should have an entry point. Youth Orchestras, other ensembles, and moving into universities and college, pre-professional programs. These are the people that we want to have some sort of membership, and how do the values apply to each one of those points.
 - q. Toni - We could, if we want everyone to be welcome, on the membership application form, we could have one side for individuals and one side for organizations. You select the box that applies to you so that people know that even if they aren't working for a large organization that if they have a commitment to cultural diversity, they are welcome. We would make it clear that we're not looking for their personal mission and vision. For individuals, we're looking for a personal commitment to cultural diversity.
 - i. **Action item: Clarify language for specific individuals.**
 - r. Toni - I'm not sure that I've answered Stan's question about it on an organizational level. In the example Stan gave, you said that TDP would have the resources, but it's really the Atlanta Symphony that has the resources. The values that we have defined here, we don't define for them if it's TDP or the ASO that is the member. We're just saying that the organization has to have a commitment. We want NIMAN to have flexibility in the application process. So does the program apply or the organization apply?
 - s. Stan - The legal entity should be the one that applies.
 - t. Toni - Okay, but that could be a mess, too. The Woodruff Arts Center would be the legal entity.
 - u. Hilary - In our case, that would be Sewanee University of the South and for BUTI, that's Boston University.
 - v. Stan - It's okay to ask who is the legal entity, but put in who is the head of the program. Designation is the program that is functioning underneath that organization. I think there's a way to have a checked box. You would put Boston University, you would put BUTI, and you would put the person running that program.
 - w. Toni - What other questions do we have about key values and commitment level? Do we need to present the organizational commitment level?
 - x. Hilary - What if there was a check the box - I agree to abide by this or do you have them input in a box what their commitment is?
 - y. Toni - In regards to the organizational commitment level? If we're going to have a reporting mechanism, we would have to have a place, a drop down spot for that where they can upload a copy of the mission/vision statement or strategic plan.
 - z. Hilary - Or a website link where it's listed.
3. Membership Form
- a. Proposed: The Ratification Committee may recommend members sign a form committing to the following objectives in the spirit of creating a level playing field for all musicians:
 - i. To embrace with conviction that overcoming inherent bias and unconscious racism is essential for musicians from underrepresented ethnicities to be given equitable opportunities to thrive throughout their pathway to success.

- ii. To regard the advancement of a musician from an underrepresented ethnicity as a success -- regardless of which summer program, university or studio that individual decides to attend.
 - iii. To be open to sharing best practices, sharing information, capacity building ideas and other opportunities may lead to furthering equitable practices.
 - iv. Providing a supportive network for pre-collegiate environment for families, and helping those families to see and value the process of becoming a professional musician.
 - b. Toni - Is there anything left off or that we need to add? Instruments/geographical issue - those things I didn't feel I had written down enough or that they floated to the top enough to put them in here.
 - c. Hilary - Those are important aspects, but I think they may fill in somewhere else.
 - d. Toni - I still have some editing to do with this, but could I bring the documents as they are?
 - e. Hilary - This seems to be a good representation.
 - i. **Action Item: Go over this document with the two members that could not be in this meeting and add points from those conversations to these minutes.**
4. Establishing Dues and Dues Structure
- a. Hilary - We need to propose cost. I sent the example of Chamber Music America, and I'm not suggesting we completely copy that, but I don't think we need to reinvent the wheel in terms of how those membership points can be outlined. I think it would be good to put a dollar amount to individual cost versus a summer program or college program.
 - b. Toni - I think that's fair. I think without knowing exactly what the programs will be, it might be a little out of context, but we need to provide a range. If we're going to have a conference every year, and that conference cost comes with a membership, that's going to have a different price than memberships have a discounted rate for the conference.
 - c. Hilary - It may need to be outlined. If your institution is getting a membership that would help your admissions department, that cost is going to be different from a program that meets 5 weeks a year.
 - d. Stan - Why don't we ask people what would they pay? An outline for how we discuss this in Cincinnati, but we want a robust database of musicians, that there are some signature programs that not one organization can do by themselves, but that this organization can help do together. What would people pay for the experience, and so then as we get the numbers, we can put that out there.
 - e. Toni - Why don't we give a minimum and a maximum so that we don't get back numbers that we don't like.
 - f. Hilary - Toni and I discussed this last week, and we did come up with a good range. Between \$100-1,000 for an individual, and if it's an institution, it's more. If it were \$1,000, for our summer festival, that's an amount I could pay. And if it's less than that, I would wonder what I was paying for at that price.
 - g. Toni - There's a perceived value in the price we're offering. If we're too low, you ask what it's worth, or too high and no one can afford it. We want a ceiling.
 - h. Quance - I also think it's important to know what the benefits are when comparing benefits and value. What type of membership would I be getting and is it worth it? Am I getting that back somehow through my membership.

- i. Toni - Maybe the conversation we have about benefits should come after programs. That way we have an idea of what the service and value is of this membership. That way if we propose \$1,000, people say we're getting x,y, and z, and that's valuable.
 - j. Stan - If we do have a robust database, maybe it's not a membership due, but if you're going to have access, it would need to be expensive. We're talking about passing over some really detailed information that would save admissions departments tens of thousands of dollars in travel costs and finding people.
 - k. Toni - In that case, membership would include discounted subscription to the database.
 - l. Quance - Also thinking about what it takes to build that database and maintain it. The money that goes into that over time.
 - m. Hilary - Institutions should have to pay a lot because it's changing the way their admissions process is run in regards to this type of student.
 - n. Toni - we don't want the dues for that database that isn't created to hinder the progress of the membership.
 - o. Hilary - A clarinet teacher wouldn't necessarily need this information. But it would be useful information to other organizations.
 - p. Toni - I hadn't counted on adding in a fee structure for the database. We were just thinking about the membership. But you would have to be a member to even have access to even think about the database.
 - q. Stan - There's a different committee that would suggest a cost for the database. I think it's fine to say here are the membership levels, and the prices. To get access to other things, you might incur another cost.
 - r. Hilary - It's like a country club - you have your main membership, and then to get access to other things, you have to pay separately for those things. The access to the database needs to be a separate entity. There are going to be people that don't need access to this database other than them putting their students into it.
 - s. Toni - Are we okay presenting a range or is that too broad a conversation?
 - t. Stan - I think it depends what you all want to suggest. I would say to go with your gut on what you want to suggest as best practice.
 - u. Hilary - I think, from the summer program aspect - it cost about \$4,000 to go to Midwest in Chicago. I would rather pay in this way than have to go to Chicago in the winter. When we paid for all the levels of registration - if you said for a summer music festival, you have to pay \$1,000 and for additional access, you have to pay an additional \$1,500, I think that's reasonable. We can't pay \$10,000, but I think other schools can and should. They're recruiting for for years of access for year long programs.
 - v. Toni - The subscription seems to be based on number of weeks, and number of users, I would imagine. But subscription costs should not tied to membership. This is revenue regardless of how people intend to use the services or not.
 - i. **Action item: finish editing and send draft 4 and go over the revised documents with Quance and Garrett**
5. Founding Members
- a. Toni - We haven't talked about founding members in this group. If we want to get some traction, I think we should establish what the membership costs should be and then discounting it deeply. Maybe offering a discount for people if they come in within the first 60 or 30 days?
 - b. Hilary - You could do a pledge - we're going to commit for 3 years with this program: I think that is reasonable. I've had to do that with other types of organizations contractually.

- c. Toni: Would we need to consider incentives to drive initial support - like first year is 50% off membership,, second year is 25%, third year is full price?
- d. Stan - I think we would shoot ourselves in the foot financially. I think we should establish a price and go. If an organization needs to submit either a waiver or a payment plan...I'm just not understanding why we would do that.
- e. Hilary - Incentive to join.
- f. Stan - There will be a window of time where every organizations that signs up would have the option of being a charter member. Perhaps they could receive a 10% discount. If you discount it so much at the beginning, you don't end up earning enough money and you're limping financially out of the gate.
- g. Toni - I like that a founding member would be a 3 year pledge. We'll make a recommendation that there's a 3 year commitment to be a charter or founding member, and we like the idea of using this document as a starting point to distribute at the convening. I'm assuming that I will be leading the discussion?
 - i. **Action item: Toni will make some notes on the fee structure and fill everyone in.**