ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT

College	Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences
Department	Music
Program	B.A. and M.A.
Reporting for Academic Year	2016-2017
Last 5-Year Review	2010-2011
Next 5-Year Review	2019-2020
Department Chair	Buddy James
Date Submitted	October 20, 2017

I. **SELF-STUDY** *(suggested length of 1-3 pages)*

A. **Five-Year Review Planning Goals**

Present your planning goals from your last 5-year plan.

Our most recent 5-year Program Review took place in 2010-2011, and our last accreditation review was 2009-2010. We outlined a set of planned program changes in the areas of curriculum, faculty, and resources, with the goal of implementing those changes by our next accreditation cycle in 2019-2020, but in AY17-18 we find ourselves facing a significantly different landscape regarding planning goals. The planning goals from 2010-2011 included the following:

1. Curriculum & Student Learning
   a. Bachelor of Music degree proposal
   b. Bachelor of Arts in Music degree revision
   c. Master of Music Education degree proposal
   d. Increase the number of majors to a maximum of 350 total music students
   e. Explore a "blended" option for Music Education students wishing to complete their studies in music and earn a teaching credential within 4 years.
   f. Restoration of the audio production offerings and development of some degree options, possibly in collaboration with another Department
   g. Create online and self-support offerings to help boost SCU generation and "soft" revenue.
   h. Cultural diversity of non-major performance offerings

2. Faculty
   a. The Department of Music will request the following tenure-track lines:
      i. Interactive Sound and Music Composition
      ii. History / Ethnomusicology

Draft 05-04-2017

          iii. Jazz

          iv. Orchestra Director

          v. Voice / Opera Workshop

3. Resources

    a. The Department of Music will demand a restoration of a 12/12 timebase for the Music Resource Center staff and Music Technician Staff.

    b. The Department of Music will demand audio production technical staff in order to alleviate the burden of work currently placed on the Department Chair (whose expertise is in audio production) and two other staff who help (but then, by doing so, are working out of classification).

4. General

    a. Create an East Bay Arts & Media Preparatory Division for self-support musical offerings that the community can engage in.

B. **Progress Toward Five-Year Review Planning Goals**

Report on your progress toward achievement of the 5-Year Plan. Include discussion of problems reaching each goal, revised goals, and any new initiatives taken with respect to each goal.

1. Curriculum & Student Learning

    a. Bachelor of Music degree proposal: The department abandoned the Bachelor of Music degree proposal after conceiving it, having been advised that it would be too costly and would not likely be approved at the state level. The Department of Music is still interested in pursuing this degree if it were to be a viable option.

    b. Bachelor of Arts in Music degree revision: We have made revisions to the B.A. in Music degree, but the revisions proposed in the earlier report were significant and contingent upon starting a Bachelor of Music degree. The B.A. remains largely intact since we were unable to propose a B.M.

    c. Master of Music Education degree proposal: We have made little progress on a Master of Music Education degree, beyond discussions. The department remains committed to this idea, and is in the process of exploring how we might make this a reality. In the years since we have identified the desire to create this degree, a summers only M.MusEd degree has been started at San Jose State University.

    d. Increase the number of majors to a maximum of 350 total music students: Our numbers have decreased significantly since our last five-year review. We believe that we would be unable to sustain a department of 350 total music students with each receiving applied music lessons, and we find ourselves searching for ways to increase the number of majors to a healthy number, closer to 150 from the current 90.

    e. Explore a "blended" option for Music Education students wishing to complete their studies in music and earn a teaching credential within 4 years: We have not made progress on this goal due to the demands of the credentialing process in California, but we have

made progress in the area of Music Education. Beginning with semesters we will be offering a Certificate in Music Education. The Certificate in Music Education will give our current students something to show for the work they have done in completing the Single Subject Matter Preparation Program in Music, and offer educational opportunities to non-degree seeking students. We believe this will serve many people who already have degrees in music and need further training before pursuing a teaching credential.

f. Restoration of the audio production offerings and development of some degree options, possibly in collaboration with another Department: The Department of Music has been awarded a tenure-track search for this academic year and is searching for a musicianship/composition/technology faculty member. This new faculty member will be integral in forwarding this goal, as our only faculty member with expertise in this area has left the department for an administrative position.

g. Create online and self-support offerings to help boost SCU generation and "soft" revenue: We have put courses online, such as our MUS 1006 History of Rock and Roll, which has helped to greatly boost SCU generation. We have yet to fully explore self-support offerings, and are now looking into self-support summer offerings. These include the summers only Masters of Music Education as well as non-curricular workshops, such as piano pedagogy.

h. Cultural diversity of non-major performance offerings: The department has a vibrant West African Drumming Ensemble and has had a Latin Jazz Combo in its offerings in recent years. There is still a great need for more work in the area of developing other types of ensembles (Mariachi Band, Gospel Choir, etc. . .)

2. Faculty

    a. The Department of Music will request the following tenure-track lines:

        i. Interactive Sound and Music Composition: We have been given a search for a new musicianship/composition/technology faculty member.

        ii. History / Ethnomusicology: We have not requested a new faculty member in this area, as our needs are currently being met.

        iii. Jazz: We held a successful search, but the faculty member has since left CSUEB. Jazz studies courses are currently being coordinated by a nationally recognized lecturer. The Department of Music will regularly reevaluate this situation, and may consider asking for a new search in the future.

        iv. Orchestra Director: Our string program is not strong enough to warrant a search for an Orchestra Director at this time.

        v. Voice / Opera Workshop: We have not requested a tenure-track line in Voice/Opera Workshop, but this would be the most likely applied area for a future tenure-track request should the numbers of music majors increase. We are able to meet the needs of our current students.

3. Resources

a. The Department of Music will demand a restoration of a 12/12 timebase for the Music Resource Center staff and Music Technician Staff: We have been unsuccessful in our quest for a restoration of a 12/12 timebase for our staff.

b. The Department of Music will demand some sort audio production technical staff in order to alleviate the burden of work currently placed on the Department Chair (whose expertise is in audio production) and two other staff who help (but then, by doing so, are working out of classification): Our current Music Equipment Technician has been extremely helpful in working with audio production technical details, but he is most likely working out of classification. Our audio production technical needs are currently being met through student workers.

4. General

a. Create an East Bay Arts & Media Preparatory Division for self-support musical offerings that the community can engage in: We have made no strides, beyond conversation, towards this goal. This is a reachable goal for the near future.

C. Program Changes and Needs

Report on changes and emerging needs not already discussed above. Include any changes related to SB1440, significant events which have occurred or are imminent, program demand projections, notable changes in resources, retirements/new hires, curricular changes, honors received, etc., and their implications for attaining program goals. Organize your discussion using the following subheadings.

Overview: The Department of Music finds itself in a very different place than it was at the time of the last five-year review. The Department has gotten dramatically smaller and our curriculum offerings have remained the same. These challenges are more fully explained below:

Curriculum: The curriculum of the Department of Music has remained virtually unchanged for decades. Small changes have been made based on suggestions from the National Association of Schools of Music, and many new courses have been proposed and implemented. The heart of the degree, however, has not evolved. Our shrinking number of students is likely influenced by a greater variety of curriculum offerings at nearby CSUs. The Department of Music must consider a revamping of its Bachelor of Arts degree so that it better serves the students who come to CSUEB. The department is looking to bring in a consultant to help us analyze current and potential offerings.

Students: The number of music majors in both the B.A. and M.A has declined sharply (over 40%) in the last 10 years. The number of students who are expressing interest in studying music at CSUEB, as evidenced through CSU Mentor, has also declined but at a much less

drastic rate. A revitalized curriculum is being considered that will better appeal to the needs of students who are expressing interest in studying at CSUEB.

Faculty: We currently have five tenure-track faculty, three 1.0 lecturers and a search underway. We have the number of faculty we need to adequately serve the current number of students. It is likely that we will need to consider new tenure-track line requests in the future in order to address potential curriculum changes.

Staff: Our staff is entirely new since our last five-year review. Two staff members with over 30 years experience each have retired, and we have filled those positions. Our Music Tech position has changed three times, and the current staff member is capable, enthusiastic, and appears to be an excellent long term fit for our program.

Resources: *(facilities, space, equipment, etc.)* The Department of Music facilities are old and dated. We have a small recital hall with very nice acoustics that is suitable for vocal and chamber music, but our University Theatre has very poor acoustics and is the only space on campus large enough for our larger instrumental ensembles. The Theatre, a space designed primarily for theatre and dance productions that has also been serving as a concert hall, is housed in the Department of Theatre and Dance so, in addition to having an inadequate acoustic for our ensembles, offers the Department of Music a limited schedule for performances and other use.

We have recently purchased new pianos, new computers, and new A/V equipment that was sorely needed. We still need new or refurbished pianos, and piano maintenance is a very challenging and underfunded part of our department's needs. We also need to replenish the instruments used in our music education training courses, as they are extremely old and in dire need of replacement.

Assessment: We spent time recently rethinking and rewriting our PLO's so that we can better assess whether our program is accomplishing the desired outcomes.

Other: *(e.g., major program modifications)*

II.   **<u>SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT</u>**   *(suggested length of 1-2 pages)*

A. **Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)**
List all your PLO in this box. Indicate for each PLO its alignment with one or more institutional learning outcomes (ILO). For example: "PLO 1. Apply advanced computer science theory to computation problems (ILO 2 & 6)."

1. Quickly identify rhythms and pitches and maintain pitch accuracy for application in performance or composition. (ILO 6)

2. Bring an enriched tone production with improved technical skills to the performance of their primary instrument. (ILO 6)

3. Apply critical and creative thinking and analytical reasoning to address complex challenges in music theory and history. (ILO 1, 2, 3, 4)

4. Work collaboratively and respectfully with other musicians in a performance context. (ILO 1, 2, 3, 6)

5. Integrate musical ideas, theory, and practice, and communicate them to others clearly and persuasively in classroom and performance settings. (ILO 1, 2, 4, 6)

B. **Program Learning Outcome(S) Assessed**
List the PLO(s) assessed. Provide a brief background on your program's history of assessing the PLO(s) (e.g., annually, first time, part of other assessments, etc.)

4. Work collaboratively and respectfully with other musicians in a performance context. This is our first time assessing this PLO.

C. **Summary of Assessment Process**
Summarize your assessment process briefly using the following sub-headings.

Instrument(s): We found this PLO to be difficult to assess with a typical assessment instrument. It is difficult to quantify the outcome, and we made our assessment tool an individual self-reflection survey that was used in conjunction with a public performance of our major performing ensembles in Spring Quarter, 2017. We chose this quarter because it had the most opportunities for students to collaborate with other ensembles from both on an off-campus.

Sampling Procedure: Students from our two largest major performing ensembles were asked to comment on their immediately concluded performances with a questionnaire, which also provided an opportunity for self-reflection.

Sample Characteristics: Assessment characteristics included attitudes toward performance, note accuracy, tone, ability to listen, method of performance, and attitude toward collaborators and collaborations.

Data Collection: Students were given the assessment immediately following the final performance of the AY16-17. Students were asked to reflect on a question and answer with one of the following possible choices: Significantly improves; Improves; No impact; Hinders; Significantly hinders. The students were also asked to add their own thoughts regarding collaboration.

Data Analysis: Nearly 2/3 of all music majors took part in this assessment. The data was analyzed separately by ensemble (two different ensembles) and together as a group. The results from each ensemble were very similar, whether coming from an instrumentalist or a vocalist.

D. **Summary of Assessment Results**
   Summarize your assessment results briefly using the following sub-headings.

   Main Findings: PLO 4 is our most easily predictable and observable PLO, even though it is difficult to quantify, and the results were largely as we had predicted and hoped. 87% of the students found that performing with others enabled them to perform better, while only 3% said that it did not enhance their performance. Music is a flagship of collaborative learning, so this is the expected outcome. Note accuracy was improved for nearly the same amount of students (87%), but 6% of the students' performances suffered as a result of collaborative concerts. We were not able to determine the reason for this from the comments, but it is likely that it had to do with lack of preparation on the part of the individual student. Tone improved for nearly all performers, and in no case was tone hindered in the collaborative setting. The ability to listen was significantly improved for nearly half of the students, most likely due to heightened awareness of performance. Finally, most students enjoyed performing more in a collaborative setting and it changed how they performed in concert.

   All of these outcomes were expected, and consistent with our ultimate goals of engagement and developing awareness of our students in performance settings.

   Recommendations for Program Improvement: These findings do not suggest to us the need to change our program. If anything, perhaps we could explore offering more collaborative opportunities for our students. It is easy for a student in a large ensemble to feel as if his or her contribution is minimized due to the numbers of students performing. The results of this assessment may help us to convince more students of the deep educational value of performing in a large ensemble, particularly when it comes to developing their individual performance skills.

Next Step(s) for Closing the Loop: This particular assessment of collaboration focused on large ensembles. The next time that we study this PLO it would benefit us to study collaboration in small ensembles. Small ensembles, such as duos, trios, quartets, etc…, tend to encourage students to contribute in a more deliberate way, because the individual contributions have a much greater impact on the final outcome.

E. **Assessment Plans for Next Year**

Summarize your assessment plans for the next year, including the PLO(s) you plan to assess, any revisions to the program assessment plan presented in your last five-year plan self-study, and any other relevant information.

This academic year we intend to assess PLO 5. Integrate musical ideas, theory, and practice, and communicate them to others clearly and persuasively in classroom and performance settings. The challenge of this assessment is to accurately compare data in both classroom and performance settings.

III.   **DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS**
Each program should provide a one-page discussion of the program data available through CAPR. This discussion should include an analysis of trends and areas of concern. Programs should also include in this discussion requests for additional resources including space and tenure-track hires. Resource requests must be supported by reference to CAPR data only. Requests for tenure-track hires should indicate the area and rank that the program is requesting to hire. If a program is not requesting resources in that year, indicate that no resources are requested.

A. **Discussion of Trends & Reflections**
    Notable Trends:
    Summarize and discuss any notable trends occurring in your program over the past 3-5 years based on program statistics (1-2 paragraphs). You may include 1-2 pages of supplemental information as appendices to this report (e.g., graphs and tables).

    The most notable trend in the Department of Music over the last five years is drop in enrollment count for music majors. Enrollment of music majors in Department of Music offerings hit a low of 437 in Fall 2016, compared to 599 in Fall 2012. There was a dip in enrollment in Fall 2013 with a small recovery in 2014 and 2015. Since 2012, when over 50% of the students enrolled in Department of Music classes were music majors, music majors have made up less than 50% of music classes, and majors made up only 45.7% of the Department of Music's enrollment in Fall 2016. There were 87 major FTES in Fall 2012, but that has dropped steadily to 54 FTES in Fall 2016. The Department of Music is now generating more GE FTES than before, but the instructional SFR has dropped from 18.3 to 12.4. Overall SFR has remained about the same, rising from 15.1 to 15.4.

    The Department of Music had slightly fewer faculty members and slightly fewer FTEF in Fall 2016 than it did in Fall 2012. Tenure-track faculty, however, have increased from 32.2% to 42.6% of the teaching FTEF. The department remains consistent with three full-time lecturers and approximately 20 part-time lectures.

    Reflections on Trends and Program Statistics:
    Provide your reflections on the trends discussed above and statistics and supplemental information presented in this report.

    The most troubling reflection from these statistics is the decline in music major enrollment. The department continues to offer GE courses that help with SFR and generate SCUs, but our music major courses are suffering due to low enrollment in the major. This information tells us that we must make some sort of significant change order to attract more students. We are not offering the type and/or quality of program options that are desirable to CSUEB students.

    There are many reasons for the decline of music majors that are not observable in the statistical charts produced by APR. The department has enough faculty members to effectively run our programs as they currently exist. We are also offering general education courses that bring students who might wish to become music majors into the Department of Music. The decline

of music majors appears to be related to program offerings and scholarship funding, as our department is in direct competition with other music departments around the area and state.

The most pressing issue for the Department of Music is finding a way to get more students to enroll in Music major courses. We are reflecting on our program entrance procedures, which include an audition, and the types of programs is that we offer.

B. **Request for Resources**   *(suggested length of 1 page)*

1. Request for Tenure-Track Hires

The Department of Music is not currently requesting tenure-track hires.

2. Request for Other Resources

Future changes in programs may result in the need for a variety of new resources. Our current resource needs appear in three areas: musical equipment, staff, and performance space.

1. We require further funding for the upkeep and maintenance of all musical equipment, particularly our piano fleet. Attracting new students is directly related to our ability to provide them with quality equipment to complete their degree requirements. We have received generous funds in the recent past to purchase new equipment, but we need more new equipment as well as a way to maintain the costly equipment that we currently have. This is a serious consideration for both attracting new students and in training the students that we have.

2. We request funds to reinstatement our staff to a 12/12 work year. Our faculty and students are performing their increasing duties with less support than the department has historically had. Faculty are spending a greater amount of time on tasks that have traditionally been performed by staff, taking away their time for recruiting, maintaining, and innovating programs.

3. The Department of Music encourages the campus to consider the funding and building of a new state-of-the-art venue that has a dynamic performance space for music events, and can also serve as a hub for creativity, innovation, multimedia, and global connectivity. Our location in the East Bay uniquely situates us to become a center for arts and creativity on a global scale, and new facilities would make that possible.