



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW  
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	Choose an item. CLASS
Department	Music
Program Unit	Music
Reporting for Academic Year	Choose an item. 2015-2016
Department Chair	Buddy James
Date Submitted	6/30/2016

**1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)**

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

Our most recent 5-year Program Review outlined a set of planned program changes, with the goal of implementing those changes by our next accreditation cycle in 2019-2020. Those changes were presented in the areas of curriculum, faculty, and resources. Curricular changes pertained to addition and modification of degrees, as well as exploration of online/self-support offerings, and course offerings (restoration of audio production courses, increased diversity of ensembles, pursuit of state certification for the music education program). Since that time, between CSU policy changes and faculty changes, our goals have shifted somewhat to reflect different curricular priorities

**B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress**

We were scheduled for our next 5-year Program Review this year, so we are on the edge of an entirely new focus and set of goals. Many of our previous goals have been met. We have restored some of our audio production courses (although not the entire sequence), we continue to diversify our student body and our ensemble offerings, and we have achieved state certification for the music education program. We have spent the year focusing on Semester Conversion and what it means to the music department. The Department has decided on conversion rather than transformation, and will continue to examine the curriculum with regard to meeting student needs in a changing arts and cultural environment.

**C. Program Changes and Needs**

Our department has diverse and extremely specialized offerings, and our largest challenges are as follows:

1. Attracting qualified and excellent faculty.
2. Staffing issues

### 3. Attracting students.

1. In the past 3 years we have lost 2 full-time faculty members. Our tenured composer ended his FERP and we find ourselves without tenure-track composer for the first time in the history of our department. This year is the third, and final, year of our faculty member specializing in Jazz Studies. He is vacating his position to return to the east coast. In both cases we are fulfilling our needs with lecturers, but we certainly are hindered by not having those positions in our department.

We also struggle with finding, and keeping, excellent lecturers to teach our private students. Some lecturers teach the equivalent of 1 unit, or less, which makes it challenging to make coming to campus a worthwhile trip. More students (#3) would certainly help with this.

2. 10 years ago, with a similar sized student body, we had 3 ½ full-time staff positions. Now we have 2 10-12 positions, a full-time administrative assistant and a ½ time bookkeeper. As outside pressures continue to grow it becomes a greater and greater challenge to adequately meet our staffing needs.

3. Music is unique among academic departments in that we rely heavily on recruiting for our livelihood. We are in direct competition with schools all over the state, and country, for music students. Only athletics are similar to music with regard to recruiting. In order to attract students we must excel in the following areas: 1. Curriculum 2. Quality of Faculty 3. Scholarships 4. Facilities. As a department we will proceed into Semester Conversion and into our next five-year review concentrating on these areas.

## **2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)**

### **A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

1. Quickly identify rhythms and pitches and maintain pitch accuracy for application in performance or composition.
2. Bring an enriched tone production with improved technical skills to the performance of their primary instrument.
3. Apply critical and creative thinking and analytical reasoning to address complex challenges in music theory and history.
4. Demonstrate the ability to work collaboratively and respectfully with other musicians in a performance context.
5. Integrate musical ideas, theory, and practice, and communicate them to others clearly and persuasively in classroom and performance settings.

### **B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

This year we selected SLO #3: Apply critical and creative thinking and analytical reasoning to address complex challenges in music theory and history.

### **C. Summary of Assessment Process**

The undergraduate program in music at Cal State East Bay is designed to help students develop and practice the complex set of skills musicians and music educators need to perform and teach music in professional contexts. Our program divides this skill set into six different areas, namely skills in:

- basic musicianship (SLO 1);
- performance on one's primary instrument (SLO 2);
- creative and critical thinking (SLO 3);
- analytical reasoning (SLO 3);
- collaboration (SLO 4); and
- communication (SLO 5).

Our CLASS FACT project for AY2015-2016 assessed SLO #3, using as a basis for analysis two courses required of music majors: Music Theory IV (MUS2033, Fall 2015) and Music Literature & Analysis II (MUS3156, Winter 2016). Creative thinking was assessed in the theory course with assignments that asked students to compose music using techniques and style characteristics examined in class. Critical thinking was assessed in the history course with a formal research paper project. Analytical reasoning was assessed in both courses.

In the theory course, students studied examples of concert music from the past one hundred years and then, through in-class discussion and homework assignments, identified specific techniques and stylistic characteristics used to compose the music. Students were then asked to compose short pieces using the techniques and characteristics they had identified. This approach was inherently both analytical and creative in that students needed to explicitly understand how various musical examples work and then

demonstrate what they learned by composing. Students also discussed the nature of musical innovation and creativity. A broader goal of these efforts was to encourage students to use critical thinking to evaluate music they perform or compose outside of these courses.

In the history course, students were asked to write a 4-6-page research-based paper focused on a composition, composer, or event of their choice from music history. Though the total page number was low, the instructor's expectations were high, and included the need for students to use a minimum number of relevant sources, two-thirds of which had to be academic sources; to organize the paper around a guiding research question and thesis; and to include at least one section of focused analysis of either a historical text or score. Students were told to expect this Winter Quarter project from the Fall Quarter, the beginning of the year-long course. And the project assigned for the end of that first quarter—involving textual and score analysis—was meant to serve as a “ramping” exercise to prepare students for the following quarter's project.

#### **D. Summary of Assessment Results**

Assigning a research project in the Winter Quarter of this course is part of the instructor's broader goal to get upper-division music majors in the program to apply analytical and critical thinking skills to a musical-historical subject of their choice and to express their findings through writing. The hope is to use this project as the basis of an annual assessment of these skills. In keeping the project small (4-6-pages) and including a “ramp” activity in the Fall Quarter, the instructor was responding to the findings of the AY2014-2015 CLASS FACT Assessment report, which raised concerns about the significant number of music majors who “lacked the practical skills and cultural understanding needed to engage in a large-scale project involving musical analysis and historical research,” and recommended that these skills be introduced at an earlier stage in the course (if not also at an earlier stage of each student's time in the department). Out of 33 students enrolled in MUS3156, all of them received a passing grade (“C” grade or higher) with this activity (8 “A” grades, 17 “B” grades, and 8 “C” grades).

Of the 25 students in Theory IV (Fall Quarter), 22 passed the class. Two failed, and one withdrew before the end of the quarter.

### 3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

Institutional Research, Analysis and Decision Support (IRAD) produces program statistics annually in standard format. These statistics (available on their page [here](#)) will be attached to the Annual Report of the Program Unit. This statistical document is expected to be approximately one page long and will contain the same data as required for the five-year review including student demographics of majors, student level of majors (e.g. Juniors, Seniors), faculty and academic allocation, and course data.

The Annual Report may include one or two pages of supplemental information, as appendices, in the form of graphical presentation (e.g., line graphs), tables, and pertinent discussion which summarize the data of the last several (3-5) years to make changes and trends more apparent.

#### a) Student demographics of majors

Overall Gender Distribution as of Fall, 2015:

BA: Male = 55, Female= 45

MA: Female = 8, Male = 18

	BA = 100	MA = 26
Black, Non-Hispanic	6	2
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Asian	8	1
Pacific Islander	0	1
Hispanic	20	4
White	19	10
Multiple Ethnicity	5	1
Race/Ethnicity Unknown	3	0
Non-resident Alien	39	7

#### b) Degrees conferred by the program (Recent as of Fall 2015)

BA= 24

MA= 10

#### c) SFR (total SCU)

	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015
Tenured and Tenure Track	808	810	1208	1057	482
Lecturer	1629	1932	1710	2145	2940
Lower Division	1438	1407	1496	2031	2238
Upper Division	758	1088	1150	1062	1016
Graduate	241	247	272	109	168
Total	2437	2742	2918	3202	3422

d) Course History Data

	<b>Summer</b>				<b>Fall</b>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
Number Sections	2.0	1.0	2.0	0	152	141	124	131	143
Enrollment	113	101	208	0	1065	1055	1025	1154	1250
Average Section Size	112	101	104	0	19.9	21.9	21.2	26.5	27.3

	<b>Winter</b>					<b>Spring</b>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>
Number Sections	152	135	132	131	122	152	135	128	132	127
Enrollment	1111	1012	967	1112	1038	1134	898	958	1053	1112
Average Section Size	20.5	19.8	23.5	24.3	28.2	23.9	17.9	22	23.4	23.2