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Scope of campus visit:

During the course of the campus visit meetings were scheduled with the department chair, the college dean, music staff (three full time and one part time), music faculty (three full time, one part time, and one FERP), and a one hour meeting with music students. Attendance at a memorial concert for Nathan Rubin, and visits to the University Singers, Symphonic Band, and Jazz Ensemble classes were also included. Documents reviewed prior to and after the campus visit included the self-study, university catalog, the department handbook, requirements for the Single Subject Matter Program in music, and additional information provided by the dean’s office staff.

Overview:

The Music Department at CSUEB enjoys a positive reputation across the Bay Area and the state of California. Ensembles frequently perform at state and regional conferences, as well as international tours. Graduates of the program staff many teaching positions in public schools as well as regional orchestras, major orchestras, and pit orchestras. Faculty members are recognized, not only in the region and state, but nationally and internationally for their expertise and quality.

There is definite tension between the desires of the music program and the ability of the administration to support the program in its current state and certainly according to the “Plan” outlined in the self-study document. The main issues are number of tenure-track faculty and administration of the music program; however, the dean has been forthcoming with lecturer dollars for needed courses and student enrollment has not appreciably declined. Additionally in 2005-06 over $300,000 has been allocated for the development of a state-of-the-art Media Center for Music Technology with a tenure-track hire to staff and develop the center and curriculum.

Several issues need resolution before additional resource decisions can be made:

- First, and most critical, is the fate of the current master’s program. The program was slotted to be phased out in 2004-05 academic year, but was reinstated in Fall, 2005. Staffing of the music program would be somewhat different with both baccalaureate and masters programs than with just a baccalaureate program.

- Secondly, the program needs to decide if it will write to the new standards for teacher credentialing for the Subject Matter Preparation Program in Music. With the CSET substituting for the traditional “Waiver” programs of the past, it may not be necessary to write a document to meet California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards, but rather to suggest a curriculum for students that intend
to enter the teaching profession that will aid them in passing the CSET exam in music. It is suggested that the music program check with other CSU campuses to determine an appropriate strategy.

- Thirdly, what is the role of music technology in both the undergraduate and graduate programs? Will this become a fifth area of concentration in the BA degree? Will aspects of technology be imbedded in the core courses as well as the areas of concentration? How will technology literacy/courses be used in graduate programs?

- Finally, the program is currently accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and is scheduled for an accreditation review as early as Spring, 2007. Although comments about accreditation are not a part of this review, suggestions about accreditation issues will be included throughout this document should the program decide to proceed with reaccreditation efforts.

It is also noted that while the music faculty are extremely active in external recruiting and performances, they, as a unit, have not participated in campus governance and politics in an equally commensurate way. The particularly deep cuts in both tenure-track positions and other resources may be directly attributable to the absence of a music presence in internal campus discussions, both formal and informal.

Following is an analysis of major areas of the music program.

**Curriculum**

**Undergraduate:**

The program offers a BA in music with 84 quarter units required. Students complete an additional 29 units for the Single Subject Matter Program in Music for entry into a Credential program. Elective courses are offered in jazz studies, music technology, and other areas. Each student must declare a major performance area (voice, instrument, or composition) and complete progressive study in this "major."

The program seems to offer four areas of concentration – music education, performance (voice, instrument, keyboard), jazz studies, and composition. The largest program is music education which enrolls 55-60% of undergraduate majors. It is recommended that the program require an area of concentration (12-15 units) to their major requirements, not only to better guide students to current elective courses, but also to ensure that these courses are well-enrolled and offered on a two-year cycle.

This reviewer agrees with the curricular modifications suggested in the Plan for revision of the theory/history sequence to offer two years of aural skills, six quarters of music theory, including 20th century techniques (deletion of one quarter), and expansion of the history sequence by one quarter. This is consistent with the academic core of music programs throughout the state and nation. The additional of a tutorial unit or element to
the first year theory sequence is also a way to keep students who have remedial needs in this area enrolled in the college level courses. Another approach would be to institute a music fundamentals or basic theory course as a general education option that would serve majors not ready for theory study, Liberal Studies students and music theatre students.

It is imperative to get all appropriate music courses, including ensemble classes, certified under new standards for general education courses. The program should ask for an exception to allow for more than one course required for the major to count for general education. Possible courses include ensembles, technology, and world music if added to the major as required for NASM reaccreditation.

Graduate:

The masters program (45 units) consists of a core of research, theory/composition, history/literature, and music education courses with a nine unit minimum concentration in one of four areas (1) Performance, (2) Composition-Theory, (3) Music Education, and (4) Music History and Literature. With duplicated enrollment of 18 students in Fall, 2004 and 16 students in Fall, 2005, the scope of the current program is too broad. With seven graduate history/literature and three theory courses currently in the catalog, the program is not appropriately scaled for current enrollment.

If the masters program is retained, the faculty should look at the one or two program concentrations that are most enrolled and scale the offerings accordingly. A survey of other masters programs in the region may reveal an area of emphasis that is unique to CSUEB and can be marketed appropriately.

Scope:

An important curricular necessity is an orchestral ensemble. The orchestra has traditionally been and continues to be the heart of a music curriculum. The absence of an orchestra ensemble (cut in 2004) is a major omission in the music curriculum of CSUEB and negatively affects student recruitment. Although the Director of Bands has scheduled orchestral reading sessions for wind and percussion performers as part of the band ensemble repertoire, it does not take the place of orchestral rehearsal and performance. It is suggested that the program add an orchestral ensemble to its regular offerings. Perhaps the most prudent way would be to offer a campus/community ensemble that meets once a week. The Director of Bands could cover this assignment if lecturer faculty could take other parts of his load. Otherwise a lecturer could cover this assignment only if s/he was given additional assigned time for student recruitment.

The choral area contained two ensembles, Chamber Singers and University Singers that both contained primarily music majors but were essentially the same size. A third group, University Chorus is primarily for non-music majors. If three ensembles are to be retained, it makes sense to have each group address a different demographic—majors, non-majors, community. If only two groups are retained for majors and non-majors, then
an annual opera workshop class and/or diction could be reinstated to address another area of vocal/choral need without additional staff.

Music technology is another important aspect of the curriculum. Current music curricula must contain literacy in technology including familiarity with notation programs, administration programs, websites, MIDI, and other issues. The proposed technology curriculum of ten courses somewhat addresses this issue with the five topics suggested at the 1000 level. The music faculty need to discuss this approach as opposed to imbedding technology throughout the curriculum – ie: notation programs in the theory sequence or administration programs in music education courses. Whatever is decided, the music technology courses that provide for technology literacy must be required for the major. A suggestion would be to have one or two quarters required for all majors. Otherwise, if the entire plan of five courses were implemented, additional faculty in technology or theory would be needed.

The proposed curriculum also develops courses in recording technology, a possible fifth concentration in the undergraduate curriculum. These courses should be at the upper division level with perhaps one prerequisite course at the 2000 level and have a capstone project required. Again, the program is encouraged to include music technology as a required concentration option in the degree program to ensure enrollment and rotation of courses.

This then begs the question of the degree type. With these suggested changes, including a required concentration, the degree will be closer in size and scope to a Bachelor of Music (BM) degree. Even with the current BA degree program, the number of units exceeds the scope of a traditional Bachelor of Arts degree. If the BM is approved, then the BA degree could be retooled for students that want to major in more than one area (ie: Music and Business), minor in another area, or wish to pursue a music degree with less performance requirements (ie: music recording technology).

It is also noted that if the program will apply for reaccreditation with NASM, world music, improvisation, and technology will be components that must be included in the curriculum. Since a world music course already exists, and music technology is being addressed, the improvisation element could be imbedded in current core and applied courses.

Students

The program has had consistent student enrollment over the past five years with a slight drop in the past two years despite the decrease of tenure-track lines. Enrollment data for Fall, 2005 was not available to see if this trend has continued. Undergraduate enrollment has gone from 146 in 1999 to 126 in 2004; graduate enrollment from 34 in 1999 to 29 in 2004.

During the campus visit about 25 students attended an afternoon session with the reviewer and presented both positive comments and concerns. Students stated they could
complete their degree program in four years. Students had consistent praise for the faculty, many stating that they had come to the campus to study with a specific faculty member.

Students voiced concerns about only one degree option. While additional courses are offered as electives, the reliability of these offerings is not always certain. Classes may be cancelled on short notice. A desire to have a guaranteed rotation of elective courses was expressed. The earlier recommendation for required concentrations would address this concern.

A concern of standards was another common concern. Students did not feel they were challenged in many of their courses; the theme of "the program can only take you so far," was a common refrain. In the vocal/choral area concerns about standards were most prevalent. A desire for additional courses, such as diction, was expressed. Students who were not interested in music education expressed a desire to have a course in music business, to help them with aspects of setting up a studio or business (n.b.- a course exists in the catalog, but may not be offered on a regular basis).

The freshmen clusters were also a point of concern particularly with scheduling between required music courses and the clusters.

When asked how many students chose CSUEB as their first choice, most students raised their hands. When asked if they would choose this campus again, only half of the students raised their hands.

Staff

Currently the staff consists of an Academic Support Coordinator I, who manages the departmental office, an Instructional Support Assistant III, who manages the Music Resource Center, an Equipment Technician I, and a .5 Performing Arts Technician that is shared with the theatre program. The self-study notes that the program lost two staff members – a bookkeeper and an equipment technician. Some of the functions of these lost positions are being addressed by a centralized dean’s office staff.

Overall, the staff seems appropriate for the size and scope of the music program, however, expectations of each position need to be aligned with the amount of time dedicated to each position. Otherwise a plan needs to be developed to attend to the following issues: the .5 position that supports all music performances in the Mainstage Theatre, along with other theatre and university events, may need to be expanded. Budget and bookkeeping are being coordinated by an expansion of the dean’s office staff but this plan has not been clearly articulated to current staff and students. A plan for technical coverage of the new Media Center for Music Technology through existing or an expanded college staff needs to be discussed with the dean.
Administration

Perhaps the most contentious issue, from the music faculty's viewpoint, is administration of the music program. In 2004-05, the music department was administratively combined with the theatre department and Tom Hird, theatre department chair, became chair of the combined department. In 2004-05 Tim Smith continued to serve unofficially as music coordinator maintaining many of the scheduling and budget duties of a chair. He resigned in Summer, 2005 and Frank LaRocca reluctantly assumed the appointment of Associate Chair of the combined department.

It is clear that the music program has not explored the possibilities, both curricularly and programmatically, that might accrue from a combined department. Team taught or cross listed courses in music theatre, voice, and movement might be attractive to potential students. Combining opera workshop with music theatre workshop on a rotation cycle would be an innovative and distinctive element of this combined department. Since both programs share a common performance space - the mainstage theatre, looking at issues from both disciplinary viewpoints in a collegial environment could help utilization of fiscal and staff resources.

It is suggested that the music and theatre programs explore cooperative curricular and facilities issue as part of a plan for the performing arts. Whether or not the music program continues to exist in a combined department, these conversations would help to strengthen both programs.

If the music program, however, is going to apply for reaccredidation to NASM, then it will be incumbent on the administration to find a musician for the head of the music program as required by NASM guidelines. If an appropriate candidate is not available in the current faculty, a search from outside should be undertaken.

Faculty

The full-time tenure-track faculty has been reduced from eleven in 1997 to a low of four in 2004-05. A new hire in music technology/theory began in Fall 2005, and a search is currently underway for a hire in choral/music ed/voice to begin in Fall, 2006 bringing the FT TT faculty to six in 2006-07. Three faculty are currently on FERP status, the first of those will end their FERP status by Fall, 2006, and a second by Fall, 2007.

Currently 53.5% of courses in the program are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty compared to 58.9% in the college. In 2002-03, the last year data are available, 65.72% of courses across the university were taught by FT T/TT faculty. It is expected that the percentage of courses taught by T/TT music faculty will improve with the additional hire in the choral/vocal area.

CSUEB is fortunate to be located in close proximity to excellent performing artists for applied faculty and most of the studio instruction is taught by lecturers. However, the nature of a music program requires extensive student recruitment and program
coordination and additional tenure-track lines are needed. Lecturer faculty can cover
applied studio instruction, but the academic core of theory and history courses, ensembles,
and a core faculty member for the recommended concentrations in jazz studies, and
technology must be covered by FT T/TT faculty.

With the ending of FERP status of two faculty by Fall, 2007, sufficient salary savings can
be put to a seventh tenure-track hire to begin, Fall, 2007.

If the faculty and administration decide to retain the master’s program, a position in
music history is necessary to teach music research and bibliography, graduate seminars in
music history, and undergraduate survey courses in music history and literature. If,
however, the decision is made to phase out the masters program, then the survey courses
could be taught by a faculty member as a secondary area and the hire can have a primary
emphasis in one of the areas cited as critical to the department: orchestral conducting,
strings, or voice.

The teaching areas of the next position would depend on the resolution of issues cited in
this report. One route would be to externally hire a department chair with a teaching
area in one of the critical areas. If the current administrative arrangement continues, then
this position should be dedicated to the most critical area(s) not addressed by the previous
search.

Overall, a core faculty of at least eight TT faculty members is required for the size and
scope of the current undergraduate music program. Nine are required if the master’s
program is retained.

Facilities:

No time for evaluation of facilities was available during the campus visit.

Assessment

The assessment plan presented as part of the self-study is very comprehensive, but may
not be practical, especially given the size of the current tenure-track faculty. Since so
many assessment activities are already built into the music curriculum, especially in
performance courses, it would be more prudent for the faculty to find two or three things
that it would like to measure and plan to track assessment data only for those elements.
The idea of a “barrier” exam for students entering upper division work in theory, piano
and performance is a good place to begin. A summative assessment embedded in the
final course in the music literature sequence that tests skills in analysis and literature may
also be appropriate. Oral and written skills can be assessed with other course embedded
activities.
Recommendations and Conclusions

Despite the concerns addressed in the self-study the music program is vital and enjoys a favorable reputation in the region and state. It is evident that the program needs to engage in comprehensive strategic planning that is based on reliable budget parameters. The critical issues of program scope and administration need to be addressed in order to make informed decisions on future tenure-track hires and overall resource allocation.

To summarize major recommendations included in subsections of this report:

1. Determine if the masters program is to be retained and, if so, the scope it will have.
2. Determine, in consultation with administration, the long term plan for administration of the music program.
3. Determine the curricular role of technology in both the undergraduate and graduate program. Additionally, will there be courses for non-majors, or a concentration in recording technology?
4. Determine if the program will apply for reaccredidation with the National Association of Schools of Music. If so, some curricular changes may be necessary.
5. Modify the theory/history sequence as proposed in the Plan. Consider adding a general education course in Basic Theory for non-majors, particularly Liberal Studies and Theatre, and majors who do not have the requisite skills to enter the major theory sequence.
6. Write proposals to have courses for non-majors, including ensemble courses, certified under the new standards for general education.
7. Consider adding an orchestral ensemble class as earlier as possible with preference given to a campus-community orchestra.
8. Determine, in consultation with the new TT hire in the choral/vocal area, the appropriate scope of choral ensembles, and the desire to incorporate opera workshop and diction classes into the curriculum.
9. Consider revising the current BA into two programs, a Bachelor of Music with required concentrations and revision of the current BA into a less performance-based program that can be combined with other majors and/or minors. If the current BA is retained, consider adding a required concentration to the major.
10. Determine, in consultation with administration, a faculty plan, based on answers to the issues above, for replacement of tenure-track faculty lines to a minimum of eight (nine if the graduate program is retained) including timelines for implementation.
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1. Summary of previous program review and plan.

Introduction

In Spring of 1997, the Music Department received a 10-year accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the longest period of accreditation possible. A report was submitted to the Committee on Program Review in March of 1999, as a part of the university's review process. That report contained, in large part, selected documents submitted as a part of the 1997 NASM process, following the policy established by the university that with programs and departments that are accredited by a national agency, the accreditation process and report to this agency supercedes the university's CAPR process.

In summarizing the 1997 NASM and 1999 CAPR reports, it is vital to place this information in context. A great deal has changed at CSUEB since 1997, and the resulting changes to the Music Department have also been drastic.

While some statistical information will be presented in this summation, within the context of describing the effects of these changes in statistics, greater detail will be presented in subsequent sections, in particular, Part 4 of the Self-Study. The information here serves as a presentation of the findings and plan in the 1997/1999 reports, as well as an overview of departmental history from Fall 1997 to Fall of 2004 (and in some cases, including through Fall 2005). This information should also serve as a prelude to the CAPR "Document #2: Plan."

Summative Overview

There has been some minimal progress in "areas of needed improvement" addressed by the 1997/1999 reports (one new Tenure-track hire currently on our faculty, one current tenure-track search, a new, well-funded Media Center for Music Technology and a designated faculty with expertise in this area), and our outstanding faculty are still offering a very high quality of music education, and despite all of the critical issues facing us the remaining large and small student performing ensembles are relatively healthy and continue their excellence in performance...all "areas of strength" identified in the 1997 NASM report.

However, it must be stated clearly, that a comparison of Fall 2004, to Fall of 1997 (the year after the Spring 1997 NASM Report), shows that the Music Department has, in fact, not only moved backwards in several vital areas identified as "areas of needed improvement", but several of the "strengths" identified in the report are now areas of needed improvement. This is due, in largest part, to forces outside of the control of the department.
Summary (continued)

Summation of specific areas addressed in the 1997 NASM/1999 CAPR reports

The Music Department is facing the most critical time in its history. This is due, in large part, to the following negative factors, some of which were affecting the department negatively, even prior to 1997, and others, which have happened since:

1. The trend, (not just on the departmental level, but university-wide) of replacing retiring Tenured Faculty with part-time lecturers.
   a) In Fall of 1997 there were 11 Full-Time tenured or tenure track faculty.  
      In the Fall of 2004 there were 4.
   b) Since the 1997 NASM report was filed, the highest Tenure-Track FTEF in Music was 10.33 (Fall-2000).  
      In Fall of 2004 that number was 5.6.
   c) A high of 18.47 Total FTEF was recorded in Fall 1998.  
      In Fall 2004 Total FTEF were 11.1.

2. The resignation of every tenure-track hire (three total) from 1997-2001, before the end of their probationary period.

3. Multiple changes in College-level administration at the Dean and Associate Dean levels, requiring continual "education" of new administrators as to the extremely unique nature and needs of the Music Department...a department whose curriculum, staffing, and budgetary needs differ widely from any other academic department on campus.

4. Regular cuts in the music budget for lecturers over several years and, in particular, the large cut to the music budget (39%) for the 2004-2005 academic year. The cut to the 2004-2005 budget resulted in the difficult-to-make-but-necessary decisions and changes listed below. The main criteria in making these decisions were, a) to preserve our major, subject matter preparation and teacher credential programs and, b) continue to offer the highest quality music education possible to majors and non-majors alike.
   a) the decision to phase out the Masters in Music program
   b) the elimination of the University Orchestra...the only major performing ensemble for our string majors, and a cornerstone of every viable music program.
   c) the restructuring of the Choral Program, and the elimination of 2 of the 4 Choral performing ensembles...the two that served our non-major population.
Summary (continued)

d) the restructuring of the Single Subject Matter Preparation Program in Music (subject matter competency course-sequence offered as a part of the State of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Accredited program, and required for entrance into the Single Subject Teacher Credential Program in Music), to offer the courses in a 2-year sequence, instead of every year.
e) the necessary establishment of a substantial fee ($225 per quarter) for applied instruction
f) the elimination of several well-enrolled and important "elective" courses (not required for graduation), including;
   - the three piano proficiency courses for keyboard majors
   - three courses in the jazz area; jazz theory, improvisation and arranging
   - the only computer music course in the curriculum
g) the elimination of second sections of Music Theory and additional sections of Sight Singing courses, causing a loss of the individual attention necessary for a strong foundation in these core music-academic classes.
h) the elimination of several sections of non-major courses (some of the highest FTES-producing courses in the department).
j) the restructuring of the University Bands Program, and the loss of a second section of Symphonic Band (and, by far, the largest performing ensemble in the Music Department).
j) the loss of the Opera Workshop program...the only non-choral singing experience for vocalists, and a cornerstone of every viable music program.

The news of these changes spread quickly among music educators and music professionals throughout the state ...and so did the rumors. These ran the gamut from, "CSUH eliminated the Music Program", to "there are no more Choirs at CSUH", to "the Music Education and Teacher Credential programs in Music were cut" to, "faculty member 'x' is retiring", or "faculty member 'y' is looking for another job." In many ways, this had as negative an effect on our program as any of the other single items listed above. The number of new-student applications for music majors, the number of new music students auditioning for scholarships, and the number of entering music majors all fell in Fall of 2005 from the previous several years. It is also most certain that our sister CSU's and other competing 2 and 4-year institutions took advantage of these rumors, and our real situation. It will take years to recover.

5. The change in the College-assigned Administrative Release Time in the Music Department from an historically .75 Chair position, to a 2004-2005 situation, created through a decision of the CLASS Dean to "administratively combine" the Music Department with the Theatre and Dance Department, appointing the Chair of Theatre-Dance Chair of Music as well. There was a .25 assignment given to the former Chair of Music, as a "Coordinator's" position, and a resultant increase in that person's teaching load.
Summary (continued)

It should be stated here (and will be stated elsewhere as well) that there are no other Music Departments in the CSU that are administered by a non-music person...including the smallest departments, with far fewer majors. While the administrative merge certainly helped the university budgetary problem, the appointment of a person to lead the Music Department, with no expertise in a subject matter, created a significant set of new concerns. In 2004-2005, the Music Department Coordinator continued to take on nearly all of the tasks assigned a regular chair, without the correlative release time.

With the resignation of the Coordinator from this position in Summer of 2005, the Dean created an "Associate Chair for Music" for the Music and Theatre-Dance departments, with a less unreasonable amount of assigned time. While this is a slight improvement of the situation in 2004-05, there is still no music expert in place as chief administrator for the Music Department.

6. The loss of Music Department staff, including a 1.0 Technician position (the only staff member with expertise in computer applications in music and recording engineering...two vital areas in our department), and a .75 Administrative Support Assistant/Bookkeeper (a position vital to the operation of a department with a very complex departmental budget and a large IRA budget).

7. The loss of a separately-housed Music Library/Media Center in the Main Library.

8. A major disruption of the Music office's ability to function properly, through the administrative decisions to change the configuration of office in Warren Hall, resulting in the CLASS Dean's need to find other office spaces, resulting in the Dean's decision to take over, a) the existing Music Office and Chair's Office complex, b) the Music Department Conference Room (which was also used regularly as a class room and rehearsal room, c) the Music Department Mail-Work room, d) the Music Department Computer Lab, e) a suite of three offices and an ante-room used by three part-time Music Faculty and one CSD full-time faculty member and, f) the large office of a music faculty member.

In exchange, the Music Department received a room for a new combination Classroom-Media Center for Music Technology, and two adjoining office spaces for a new Music Office and Conference-Work room. In a recent decision, the CLASS Dean has taken one of these two rooms away from eventual use by the Music Department, for a new centralized CLASS Financial Office.

In this larger office relocation process, the Music Office has been moved twice into temporary locations, and will hopefully, after over 7 months, be moved soon to its permanent location...a one-room office that will function as department office, conference room, mail room and work room.
Summative Conclusion

1. In the NASM reviewing Team's "Site Visit Report" for the 1997 NASM Report, the number one identified "Area of Improvement" was the need for additional tenure-track faculty. The report specifically noted the trend of the loss of full-time faculty, and a larger percentage of part-time faculty over the 10 year period from 1987-1997.

"...if the documented trend continues, with part-time instructors increasing as a percentage, ...an appropriate relationship between full-time faculty involved in the continuing business of the program...will not be maintained."

"The teaching loads for faculty appear to be such that faculty members are able to carry out duties effectively including instruction, advisement, professional growth, and service activities. However, the current trends noted above would put a strain on the fulfillment of non-teaching responsibilities."

With these concerns being raised in 1997, with a full-time tenure track faculty of 11, it is clear that with a full-time tenure-track faculty of 4 in Fall of 2004, to say that the Music Department's ability to provide both instruction and service to our on and off campus communities is in crisis would be a gross understatement.

2. Likewise, the 1997 "Site Visit Report" identified the need for additional office staff, particularly in the music office, as an area of needed improvement.

"The only area of improvement related to staffing revealed in the self-study is the size of support staff. Additional help is needed, especially in the Department office. The Department needs to continue working with the Dean to gradually increase the staff size."

Over the period of time from 1997-2005, the additional work for all of the department staff related in part, to, a) an increase in part-time faculty, b) an expansion of IRA and outreach activities, c) far fewer full-time faculty, d) three drastic administrative changes, e) ever-more complex budget issues, f) an increase in the use of technology, g) an increase in recital and concert performances as well as special events (just to list a few), has been enormous. With the loss of a 1.0 technician and .75 ASA/bookkeeper, this work is now being done by far fewer staff.

3. The "areas of strength" identified in the 1997 report that are no longer strengths include:
   "a stable [and capable] department leadership"
   "overall staff support"
   "Music/Media Library and Music Resource Center Staff Support", and
   "strong support of the Dean and Provost."
With three changes in department administration since 2001, including the change related to the "administrative merge" of Music with Theatre and Dance, the appointment of a non-expert in music as an administrator, and the reliance on the secondary positions of "Coordinator" and "Associate Chair" for the majority of the subject-specific decisions and work in the department, the department leadership is certainly not stable.

The Music Department staff (by Fall of 2004, down to just 3 full-time staff) is an amazing, talented, dedicated, loyal and hard working group of people. We are fortunate to have them, but the workload placed on the staff is, simply, unreasonable.

As stated in the Summary above, the Music Department has suffered the loss of a separately-housed Music/Media Library in the Main Library. This facility, previously staffed by a full-time Music Librarian, and a part-time Assistant Music Librarian, is now mostly staffed by non-expert personnel, but, fortunately, supervised by a Reference Librarian with a strong background in music. An extremely efficient and capable person staffs the Music Department's Music Resource Center. However, the scope of this position has changed drastically over the period from 1997. With several additional responsibilities (including a significantly larger responsibility for publicity for the department, as well as web design and maintenance for the Music Department web pages) all not related to the continued updating and maintenance of the significant holdings and materials in the MRC. An ever-changing student assistant staff of varying expertise, adds to the difficulties of supporting the needs of the department.

The support of the various Deans and Provosts since 1997 has been widely inconsistent, as evidenced by many of the statements in the summary above. While we are thrilled with the monetary investment and attention to our new Media Center for Music Technology, the new Tenure Track faculty member, and the current tenure track search, other areas, particularly the administrative decisions related to budget, replacement of full-time tenure track faculty, department administration and facilities have had a tremendously negative impact on the department, the faculty, the staff and the various constituencies we serve.

4. The "areas of strength" noted in the 1997 NASM Report that remain strengths are:

"a talented, dedicated and caring faculty", and
"strong commitment of service the surrounding community"

The talented and dedicated full-time tenured faculty is, of course, significantly smaller. The larger number of part-time faculty are also talented and dedicated...but as part-time faculty with busy professional lives away from CSUEB, their ability to devote additional time to the needs of the department is severely limited.

If anything, our commitment to serving the surrounding community, especially the music education community in the greater Bay Area has increased.
It is, we believe, more than impressive, that the Music Department has been able to maintain its health in light of all that has happened since the 1997 NASM/1999 CAPR reports were submitted. Our students are still receiving a quality music education. Our faculty are widely respected in their fields, and are constantly sought after by members of the music education community to function as mentors and leaders within their various specialized professions. The University's student performing ensembles continue to represent the Music Department and the University here on campus, throughout the state, nationally and internationally, with the highest caliber of music making. And Music Department Alumni performers, educators, composers and scholars continue to provide impressive and notable leadership in their fields.

2. Tenure Track requests, searches and history since 1997

The following statement comes from a December 1995 Music Department Planning Review Report,

"Every year the Department has requested tenure-track positions to replace regular faculty lost to retirement. Yet, over the past nine years (1988-89 through 1996-97), only one such appointment has been made. Over the next few years it will be essential to make tenure-track appointments in three areas if the Department is to meet its other goals and move successfully into the future: Orchestra/Instrumental Music Education, Choral Music/Music Education and Computer Music/Theory Composition."

Administrative changes in the Music Department over the past 5 years, and the recent relocation of the Music Department Office have resulted in a loss of some of the specific and itemized work product and paperwork related to past Tenure-Track Proposals and Requests. We are sorry all of this paperwork cannot be submitted. However, the following is a summary of activity in this area since 1997.

1. In Fall of 1997 the Department was authorized to do a search for a position in Orchestra/Music Education. A part-time lecturer conducted the University Orchestra, for several years prior to this search. That search was completed successfully, and a faculty member was in place in Fall of 1998. The faculty member began looking for other jobs as early as November of 1998, and left the university in Spring of 1999.

In order to give the Orchestral and Music Education Programs more support and attention, a regular faculty member (the Director of Bands) was additionally assigned to assume responsibility for these two programs in Fall of 1999.

2. In Fall of 1996 the Music Department was authorized to do a search for a position in Chorus/Choral Music Education, in support of the Director of Choral Activities faculty member. That search was completed successfully, and a faculty member was in place in Fall of 1997. After a series of average to weak evaluations during the first four years of this new faculty member's probationary period, he resigned in the Spring of 2001.
In Spring of 2001 the Chair of the department requested a full-time lectureship for Chorus/Choral Music Education to replace this loss. The request was denied, and the position was separated into parts, to be covered by part-time lecturers.

In Spring of 2002 the Director of Choral Activities retired, and a part-time faculty member assumed the enormous responsibilities of this position, in addition to those of the Chorus and Vocal-Choral Music Education.

In Spring of 2005 the Music Department was authorized to do a search for a Director of Choral Activities/Choral Music Education/Voice position. That search is under way, with a faculty appointment expected to start in Fall 2005.

3. In the Fall of 1999 the Music Department was authorized to do a search for Instrumental Music Education/Symphonic Band and/or Jazz Ensemble. This position was developed to support the faculty member in the Director of Bands position, who had, in Fall of 1999 assumed full responsibility of the University Orchestra and the Music Education program, in addition to the Director of Bands position. This search was completed successfully, and a new faculty member was in place in Fall of 2000.

In Spring of 2003 the faculty member in this position resigned to take a position at the prestigious University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music. The Director of Bands, who at this time was also serving in his second year as Chair of the Music Department, resumed responsibility for a portion of this position, and regular and part-time faculty were assigned other portions of the position.

4. The Music Department first requested a position in Computer Music/Theory/Composition in 1992, and for several years after...always unsuccessfully. In the Spring of 2001 the Music Department requested the position again. This request was accepted and approved by the Dean, but was never presented to the Provost. In the September of 2001 the new Chair of the Music Department requested that the Dean re-submit the position for reconsideration. The position was presented to the Provost, but subsequently denied by the President in November of 2001.

This position request was re-submitted in Spring of 2004, with significant changes, as a position in Music Technology/Theory/Composition. This position was approved, and a successful search during 2004-2005 resulted in the appointment in Fall 2005 of a new full-time tenure track faculty member in this area.

In the "Plan" portion of this CAPR Report, attention will be devoted to future tenure track proposals and requests. The Music Department, as evidenced by much of the information supplied in Part 1 of this Self-study, is in critical need of regular faculty members in several vital areas of our program. The recently approved new positions in the choral and music technology areas are greatly welcomed. However, the lack of a full time tenure track faculty member in several other areas, including Orchestra, Opera/Voice and Instrumental Music Education has put the department in a tenuous position.
With the impending full-retirement of 2 FERPers, and the retirement (perhaps within the next 5 years) of as many as two to three other full-time faculty members and a third FERPer, the need to replace these vital positions as well as others, will remain critical.

Please see the following pages for copies of the available tenure track requests and/or Position Announcements.

3. Music Department Outcomes Assessment

The Music Department Chair and Faculty began the Assessment process in Fall of 2000 with a great deal of anticipation as to how our program could be further improved. Due to the shrinking regular faculty and the drastic administrative changes in the department since then, continued work on Assessment has somewhat less consistent.

There have always been a number of "built-in" assessment tools in place throughout the curriculum in Music, both in the area of music academics and music performance. A sampling of these include:

- an entry-level audition for placement on a performance level,
- juries to evaluate performance on a quarterly/yearly basis,
- juries for evaluating readiness to advance through Applied levels 10-40,
- interviews as a part of the application process for Teacher Credential Candidates in Music,
- auditions for placement in various levels of performing ensembles,
- juries for junior and senior level recital performances,
- sequential music academic courses (particularly in Music Theory) that require passing evaluations for continuation to the next level,
- Graduate Advisory Exams in Music Theory and Music History
- Graduate juries for acceptance into the Performance area of emphasis
- Review of composition portfolios on both the undergraduate and graduate levels for acceptance into the programs of study in composition,
- A required exam in piano proficiency for all undergraduate music majors,
- Graduate Thesis evaluation,
- Traditional written and aural exams in music academic courses,
- Evaluation of written work related to research in the performance area,
- etc.

You will see, in the "Plan" portion of this report additional information concerning future assessment tools, including:

- required auditions for acceptance as a music major
- required Music Theory exams for the placement of all entering students (particularly entering freshman) in a regular theory track, or a supplemental theory tutorial track, and
a required Comprehensive Exam in Music Theory, Piano skills and Performance for the advancement from lower division to upper division

Discussions on the implementation of the above have already begun, and plans for an implementation timeline have also been drafted. We are anxious to renew our commitment to assessment in future years, and to help our students (and faculty) be more specifically aware of the requirements for meeting all of our curricular goals.

Please find, in the following pages:
- Music Department Mission Statement
- Learning Outcomes and Performance Indicators
- Undergraduate Program Goals
- Graduate Program Goals
- Undergraduate Assessment Plan
- Graduate Assessment Plan

4. Analysis of Academic Performance Review Statistics

Because the previous submission to CAPR was a document prepared in the Spring of 1997, and eight years of Academic Performance Review Statistics have been available since that time, the statistical information presented here will be in a slightly varied format, due to the longer time period. (The material available from Institutional Research is always presented in a 5-year time-frame format).

Each of the categories of statistics required in the CAPR document will be presented, and then commented on, directly following each category. A summation will appear at the end of this section as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics are, as you can see, "all over the map." There is a noticeable "spike" in 2002, due most likely to an especially healthy entering class. It is important to note the significantly lower numbers of graduating undergraduate students in the last 2 years.
### Number of Undergraduate and Graduate Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One can see a general trend of total majors rising very slightly to a peak in 2000, then a steady, if not drastic decline to Fall 2004. This is, in large part, due to the difficulty of a significantly smaller Full-Time faculty in continuing the normal heavy load of recruitment activity required to maintain a healthy department, especially in this current climate, where the "pool" of available, potential music majors is becoming smaller and smaller. More will be said about this in the summation at the end of this section.

### Number of Courses and Sections Taught

**NOTE:** The following numbers are for Fall Quarter only in each year, and include only a total number, not a breakdown of Lower Division, Upper Division and Graduate levels. It should also be noted that the way this information is presented in the various documents from the Office of Institutional Research varies from year to year...so only those statistics that are comparable are presented.

#### a) # of courses taught

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>92  (this statistic is obviously wrong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>82  (this statistic is obviously wrong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### a) # of sections taught

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>58/118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the top table (# of courses taught), taking away the 2 numbers that are obviously higher (and most likely mistakes), the number of courses taught is remarkably consistent. Unfortunately, while "number of sections" statistics were available for 2003 and 2004, "number of courses" statistics were not.

In the lower table (# of sections taught) the way statistics were labeled in the 1998-2002 and 2000-2004 reports must have changed, and a different system must have been used (the # of course sections would certainly not have doubled between 2000 and 2001). What is notable, however, is the trend of slight decreases in the sections taught from 2001-2003, (133, 118, 113), then the drastic reduction in numbers of sections in Fall 2004 (82). This is the direct result of the severe cuts to the budget for 2004-2005, as outlined in Part 1 of the Self Study.

### Average Section Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the low of 13.9 in 2000, the section size increases gradually through 2003, with a drastic increase in Fall 2004. Again, this is the direct result of the severe cuts to the budget for 2004-2005. With far fewer sections and larger enrollments in core classes for music majors, a larger section size is the expected result.

### FTES

Note: As above, the figures in the three categories below (FTES, FTEF, SFR) include only a total number, not a breakdown of Lower Division, Upper Division and Graduate levels, and are Fall Quarter statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>215.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>192.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>182.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>160.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>166.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>156.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>151.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is plain to see that Music Department FTES have been in a general decline over the past eight years, with a larger dip between 1999 and 2000, similar to the dip in the Average Section Size table. The decline is not only due to a smaller number of music
majors, but a smaller number of non-major courses offered, due to budget restraints, and the priority to keep the major intact.

**FTEF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As addressed in the summation of Part 1, the FTEF in Music has been in steady decline since 1998, with a drastic decline between Fall 2003 and Fall 2004...again, due to the severe budget cuts sustained by the department.

**SFR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the main criteria the Provost gave in November of 2001, for withdrawing support for the requested Tenure Track position in Computer Music/Theory/Composition, was the dismal Student Faculty ration in the Music Department, which the previous Fall had dipped below double-digits, to 9.7. The new Music Department Chair made a promise, at the time, to work hard to raise Music Department SFR's. A slow but steady rise in SFR's is noticeable from 2000-2003, with a large increase between 2003 and 2004. As with other statistical areas, this is due, in part, to the drastic reduction of sections in the department due to budget cuts, and the resultant larger enrollments in each section.

**Ethnicity of Majors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hisp.</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>A.In</th>
<th>Other Int.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ethnic diversity of the music major population has never been a reflection of the overall demographics of the university. This would be true of most college music department's music major populations. It is an unfortunate truth, especially in post-Proposition 13 California, that public school music programs (and arts programs, in general) in the areas that serve a large percentage of Black and Hispanic students, are not as strong as those in the communities that serve a large population of White and Asian students. The numbers above do not reflect the intentional recruiting (or non-recruiting) of any ethnic group of potential music majors. We would love to have our music major population more closely reflect that of the university.

**Summation of Statistics**

The non-inclusion of a breakdown, in several of the areas above, by Undergraduate, Lower Division, Upper Division or Graduate levels and by Regular Full-Time Faculty vs. part-time Lecturers is intentional. Because of the specific nature of faculty expertise in the Music Department, nearly every member of our faculty (both regular full-time faculty, and part-time lecturers) teaches across a wide spectrum of undergraduate courses, both lower and upper division. Because of the small number of Graduate Courses offered each quarter, a smaller number of faculty are involved...and these tend to be Regular Full-time faculty members, although not always.

In looking at the various tables above, there are only a few conclusions regarding "trends" that can be drawn:

1. The drastic changes in statistics between Fall 2003 and Fall 2004 with regard to FTEF, SFR's, Number of Sections Offered, Sections Taught and Average Section Size are all related to the results of the significant reduction in funding for the Music Department.

2. There is a relatively steady decline in the number of Music Majors and FTES since 1997. It is most certainly not a coincidence that this coincides with the steady decline in FTEF. In a department where it is vital that faculty invest significant time, energy and resources for recruiting, and where there are fewer and fewer full-time faculty to take on this fundamentally vital task, then the loss of majors is no surprise.

These two conclusions are closely related, and speak specifically to the number one concern for the future of the department: in order to not only stop this trend, but reverse it in order to have a healthy department, we will need more full-time faculty...a critical need.

5. A Comparison of CSU, East Bay's Music Course Offerings and Requirements, with corresponding sister CSU's and nationally recognized programs in the field of Music.
A comparison to Music Programs at sister CSU's

It is important to begin this section of the report with a clarification of the nature of our Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree in Music, especially in comparison to B.A.'s in Music at institutions that also offer the Bachelor of Music (B.M.) Degree. A survey of B.A. degrees at the many CSU's that offer B.M. degrees, would show that their BA degree is significantly smaller than CSU, East Bay's...closer to our Minor in Music.

A comparison of our B.A. in Music to other CSU's B.M. degrees would show that our degree is much closer in scope and size to their B.M. This varies, of course, with the size of the institution. The largest CSU's have several hundred music majors (CSU, Long Beach has nearly 900), and the smallest have significantly fewer than 100. It should be noted that for the size of our university's total enrollment, a music major population of 155 (Fall 2004) is comparatively large.

CSU, East Bay's required core curriculum in music academics compares very favorably with sister CSU's. Institutions that offer the B.M. will typically have more specialized courses for the various areas of emphasis within the major (performance, music education, etc.). CSU's with larger music major populations will also have a pool of students large enough to support the offering of more "elective" courses.

The most striking differences between the Music Department program at CSU East Bay and other CSU's are as follows:

1. There are very few (perhaps no other) CSU's that have no University Orchestra. While smaller CSU's may typically offer orchestra in the late-afternoon/evening, and the ensembles are College-Community Orchestras, often with a large percentage of participation of community members, they all support an orchestra...one of the cornerstones of a viable music program.

2. There are very few CSU's that do not offer Opera Workshop programs, again, one of the cornerstones of a viable music program. As with the orchestra programs, the smaller institutions typically offer Opera Workshop in the late-afternoon/evening, and the participants are a combination of college and community members.

3. Most CSU's offer a larger number and wider variety of courses related to Music Technology.

4. Most CSU's offer a significantly larger number and variety of courses for non-majors, and, in most cases, the enrollment for these courses far exceeds our typical enrollment.

Although the following areas are not directly related to course offerings and requirements, a comparison to other CSU's is certainly appropriate at this point in the report.
FAVORABLE COMPARISONS

1. The quality of our major performing ensembles (particularly in the jazz and wind band areas), is comparable to and/or stronger than many of our sister CSU’s with far larger music major populations.

2. The quality of our faculty compares very favorably with our sister CSU’s. In particular, because we draw our part-time faculty from the greater Bay Area, a world center for music performance, our applied music faculty are exceptional musicians.

3. The quality and size of certain individual programs with in the department, most notably our Composition Studio, is comparable to and/or stronger than many of our sister CSU’s with far larger music major populations.

UNFAVORABLE COMPARISONS

1. With regard to the balance of Full-time tenure track faculty and part-time lecturers, CSU, East Bay is at or near the bottom, statistically, in the CSU system.

2. The same can be said of the number of Full-time tenure track faculty compared to the number of music majors. There are several CSU’s with far fewer music majors, and more Full-time Tenure Track Faculty.

3. Finally, there is no other CSU (large or small), whose Music Department is administered by a non-music faculty member.

A comparison to Music Programs at nationally recognized programs

In addition to the areas of strength exhibited by the larger and better-staffed CSU’s discussed above, most nationally recognized institutions for the study of music have several other qualities in common with one another. These include:

1. A conservatory setting, where students are immersed in a music curriculum, and have little or no general education requirements. Often there is a School of Music, or a Conservatory of Music, which is a large and independent curricular and administrative entity.

2. A large number, and multiple levels of performing ensembles.

3. A large, yet "controlled" student population. Because these institutions have far more student applications than they can accept, they are able to select from the finest applicants, and accept an optimum number of music students in each of the various areas of emphasis.
4. A significantly larger percentage of graduate (and doctoral) students than a typical CSU.

5. A significantly larger set of course offerings for each of the various specialties.

7. The highest quality of instruction, facilities and equipment in every specialized area.

6. A very large staff to support instruction in every conceivable way, as well as dedicated staff in the areas of admissions, outreach and marketing.

With regards to positive comparisons between these nationally recognized programs and CSU, East Bay's Music Department, it would be accurate to offer the following:

1. The quality of instruction in Music Theory and Music History compares favorably.

2. The quality of artistry exhibited by many of our performing faculty compares favorably.

3. The quality of instruction offered in several of the studios in the Applied area (individual instruction) compares favorably.

4. The quality of musicianship, artistry and leadership among the conductors and directors of our performing ensembles compares favorably.

5. There are, at any given time, a handful of exemplary students at CSU, East Bay, who could just as well have been accepted to and be studying at any of the nation's most prestigious music institutions.

6. Achievements of the program

Given the information presented in Parts 1, 2 and 4 of the CAPR Report, it is a significant achievement that we still have a functioning music program at all. The fact that the program not only exists, but also in so many ways remains healthy, is absolutely remarkable. This is due, in large part, to the extreme dedication, hard work and efforts of a very small number of faculty and staff.

The following is by no means a complete list of the achievements of the program and the people involved, but a sample of the kinds of work being done by our faculty, students and staff.

1. The University Jazz Ensemble (the premiere performing ensemble in this large program), led by Director of Jazz Studies David Eshelman, is an award-winning ensemble with both national and international performance credits. In the past 5 years, these include appearances at state and national conferences (most notably the International Association of Jazz Educators National Conference), as well as
Document #2: PLAN

Overview
Because of the nature of the many and various areas of concern addressed in Part 1 of the Self-Study, and due to the large number proposed changes to the Music Department program and its curriculum contained in the following "Plan", this information will be presented (in this draft of the CAPR Report), in a more general outline format. The Music Department is anxious to receive the "Outside Reviewer's Report" and wishes to wait until after the report is read and digested, to further revise the plan, and in the final CAPR Report, to present it in the requested format.

I. Curriculum

A. Theory-Sight Singing and Piano Class Curriculum
   1. Revisions to include combining Sight Singing and Dictation into "Aural Skills". Assign a faculty member as "Coordinator" of this program
   2. Create a second year of required "Aural Skills"
   3. Theory course sequence will become 6 quarters, including 20th century theory
   4. Create a "Theory tutorial" that would be taught in parallel with Theory I (and possibly II and III), required for music majors who need remedial work on fundamentals of musical theory.
   5. Officially create drill and listening stations/software for use in the Media Center for Music Technology, for all of these courses.
   6. Require that Basic Piano course sequence be started in the Sophomore year, concurrent with Theory IV-VI

B. Literature and Analysis
   1. Increase from a 3 to a 4 unit class (70 minutes 3x’s per week)
   2. Add an additional fourth quarter in the sequence
      a) Form and Analysis in Fall
      b) Counterpoint in Winter
      c) Start Literature and Analysis sequence in Spring (L & A I), then continue the sequence (L & A II, III, IV) in the following F-W-S.

C. General Education Outcomes proposals for music classes
   1. Do for ALL music classes (except applied), including performing ensembles (not just non-major classes), so that non-majors could get GE credit for performing ensembles and music-academics they may take.

D. Technology related courses (see also the attached "Music Technology: New Course Proposals")
   1. develop new non-major offerings, particularly in the upper division area
   2. expand offerings for majors

E. Non-Major course offering expansion
   1. More involvement in Freshman Clusters
   2. Additional upper-division non-major courses
II. Faculty

A. Tenure Track requests (NOTE: The first two positions are in priority order. The order of the remaining requests would depend on faculty retirements, and an ongoing assessment of needs)

1. Choral/Choral Music Education/Voice (approved, and currently in search process, for a Fall '06 appointment)
2. Musicology/Ethnomusicology/Graduate Advisor (start Fall '07). This is a critical need, due to the department's only musicologist completing his FERP in Spring 2007)
3. Music Department Chair (or, if the current administrative merger of Music and Theatre-Dance continues, and Associate Chair for Music) with additional teaching duties.
4. Orchestra/Applied Strings. This is a critical need. The Music Department needs to get the orchestra back into the curriculum as soon as possible, and it is imperative that a full-time tenured faculty member be appointed to be a leader in this area.
5. Voice/Opera Workshop/other (Aural Skills?) This is a critical need. The Music Department needs to get the Opera Workshop program back into the curriculum as soon as possible, and it is imperative that a full-time tenured faculty member be appointed to be a leader in this area.
6. Theory-History-Technology (with secondary applied area?)
7. Instrumental Music Education
8. Recording Technology

B. Applied Lecturer Loads

1. Get additional funding for WTU for each Applied lecturer for official Studio Class times (additional 3-5 hours per quarter). Students would register for Applied lessons, and an attached "lab" for applied lessons, generating more FTES.
2. $ for faculty performances on and off campus (chamber ensembles)
3. $ to compensate lecturers time spent for recruiting events and activities
4. Consider a plan for future increase in applied lesson fees (track with other CSU's)
III. Department of Music Organization and Infrastructure
   A. Staffing
      1. Administrative, Technical and Instructional Support Staff
         a) A critical need for a Music Department Administrative
            Support Assistant/Bookkeeper
         b) A critical need for a staff position in support of Music
            Technology, Concert and Recital Recording and
            Maintenance of Audio Equipment
         c) Increased staff support help for the Music Office and the
            Music Resource Center

PLAN: Overview (continued)

B. Requests for new facilities and improvements to existing facilities
   1. Administrative
      a) An adequate space for the Music Department Office
      b) A separate office for the Chair or Associate Chair
      c) Replacement of the Music Department Conference and
         Mail-Work Rooms
   2. Classrooms (create more “smart” classrooms for Music)
   3. Additional Chamber Music and Large Ensemble Sectional
      Rooms
   4. Continue to upgrade the Media Center for Music Technology
   5. Departmental Support Areas to improve and/or restructure
      a) Instrument Storage and Technicians Room
      b) Recording Booth
      c) Wind Band and Jazz Band Library

IV. Performing Ensembles
V. A. “Premiere” Performing ensemble directors should receive 4-6 WTU’s (not 3
      WTU’s), in recognition of the significant extra time necessary for
      preparation, and time outside class related to active performing
      schedule, tours, conference and festival performances, etc. This is done
      at many CSU’s and at all UC’s. The second and third “tier” ensembles (a
      second section of Symphonic Band—if a 2 band model, the University
      Chorus, the 2nd and 3rd Jazz Bands, etc.) would stay at 3
      WTU’s…recognizing that these ensembles do far less performing and out-of-
      off-campus performances and events. The “premiere ensembles” would
      include;
         1. Symphonic Band (or Wind Ensemble, in the hopes that we would
            go back to the two-separate bands scenario)
         2. Jazz Ensemble (top of the three big bands only)
         3. University Singers (the premiere, auditioned large ensemble in
            the Choral area)
         4. Orchestra
B. Chamber Ensembles
1. Add back 2nd section of Jazz Combos (high enrollment)
2. Create a second section of Chamber Winds Ensemble (high enrollment)
3. Guitar/String/Harp ensemble
   a) how to deal with the situation of shared ensemble load, but widely disparate numbers in each area (large # of guitar students, extremely small number of string students and harp students.
4. Opera Workshop
   a) re-write as a chamber ensemble
   b) combine with a “Singing for the Stage”, or “Acting and Blocking for Singers” course that would be required when registering for Opera Workshop.
   c) Scheduling? Tu-Th. 2:00-2:50 Opera Workshop
      3:00-3:50 stage work class
5. New or Contemporary Music Ensemble and/or Electronic Music Ensemble.

C. Orchestra
1. Evening or day ensemble (?)
2. College-Community ensemble (?)
   a) if college-community, then priority given to students
3. Auditioned and selective. Strict standards for acceptance
4. Rehearses on campus
5. Conducted by a faculty appointee
6. Hurdles
   a) strings are the backbone of the orchestra
   b) must have a core of music major string players (4-6 vln/2-3 vla/2-3 vcl/1-2 bass; minimum)
   c) Required for Sting Players as major performing ensemble (Bassists who may not be ready to play in orchestra, could use Jazz Ensemble, but would be required to perform for a minimum of 2 years in orchestra)
   d) Not enough “orchestral winds” (Fl/Ob/Cl/Bsn/Horn) in department to support both the orchestra and the wind bands with a separate pool of players. Wind players would be required to perform in a wind band, and then selected for orchestra through audition.
   e) FTES—there would have to be a way for community members to be registered and count towards FTES. This was one of the issues with the loss of the college-community choral ensemble (“Oratorio Society”), due to small student enrollment, but large non-registered and non-FTES generating community members.
7. Time-line/steps in process/brainstorming ideas
a) Research; possible combine with existing community college/community orchestra (quality of ensemble/quality of conductor?)
b) proposals presented
c) marketing
d) Write T.T. position request for Orchestra Conductor/Applied Strings/non-Major courses (see above).
e) Invest scholarship $ in strings (2 scholarship quartets) and orchestral winds.
f) Establish a resident faculty string quartet (perhaps with a full scholarship student violinist as 2nd violin)

D. Oratorio Society
   1. Evening ensemble
   2. College-Community ensemble
   3. Conducted by a faculty appointee
   4. Hurdles
      a) FTES-there would have to be a way for community members to be registered and count towards FTES, as in orchestra, above

5. Time-line/steps in process/brainstorming ideas
   a) Research; possible combine with existing community choral ensemble (?)
   b) proposals submitted
   c) marketing

VI. Music Teacher Preparation Program
A. Revision of the Subject Matter Preparation Program to meet the new CTC Standards
   1. Needs to be completed and submitted no later than Fall 2006
B. Standardize the curriculum, and scope and sequence of instruction in the “Basic Instrument” courses
C. Consider offering two quarters of Basic Percussion, (like High Brass, Low Brass and High Strings and Low Strings)
   1. Non-Pitched percussion, and accessories
   2. Pitched percussion (timpani and mallets)
D. Re-visit every-other-year sequence
   1. Conducting classes WAY too big to offer every-other year, as most composition majors, and many other music majors want to take the classes, in addition to the music education students. Must (starting in 2006-2007) offer Basic Conducting (Fall), Choral Conducting (Winter), and Instrumental Conducting (Spring) every year. (NOTE: Graduate Conducting classes will rotate every-other year, as in past). Basic Conducting must hold to prerequisite of having completed Theory VI.
2. Offer a section of Computer Music for Music Educators every year, perhaps during early AM in “Year 2”, then possibly in the evening as an Extension course during “Year 1”, to attract area educators to campus.

E. TED courses for Teacher Credential Candidates
1. Size variance of class, depending on flow of 2-year Subject Matter Prep. Sequence
2. Supervision of Student-Intern Teacher; load size (same concern as #1)

VII. General topics
A. Entrance requirements/standards for ALL new music majors (implement for Fall 2007)
   1. Required audition as part of application process
      a) student’s select solos from a required list
      b) Set at least 3-4 “official” audition dates, including one in late-Spring/early-Summer (June-July)
      c) Entrance Auditions can also serve as scholarship auditions
   2. Use models in place at other CSU’s, and private colleges
      a) Long Beach
      b) Northridge
      c) UOP
      d) Others
   Clean up and revise printed materials
   3. Catalogue
   4. Undergraduate and Graduate Handbooks

B. Marketing and Recruiting
   1. MUST establish a strategy, process and procedure, including specific appointment of faculty member/staff to coordinate (assigned time?)
   2. MUST involve all lecturers on some level
   3. MUST have budget for creation (EVERY YEAR) of a poster (with tear-off cards) to send to schools
   4. Create Promotional CD/DVD, highlighting in sound and visuals every aspect of our program, and performing area, including faculty and performing ensembles.
   5. MUST have budget to purchase advertising in several Bay Area and state-wide journals of professional music organizations; CMEA Bay Section-Tempo magazine, CMEA state-level magazine, CBDA Bulletin (AND the All-State Band Concert Program), ACDA Bay Section, state and Western Division newsletters, CODA (orchestra), etc., etc.
   6. MUST have a budget to purchase and prepare a display that can be used at Regional and State-wide Conventions of professional organizations. Must have budget for registration fees, and for staffing the table (faculty and students) at conventions, etc.
Plan Summation

We certainly realize that the plan outlined above is extensive and specific in its scope. We feel, however, that most of the items proposed in each of the several areas can be accomplished in a 5-year span, given the support of the university. The following statements will serve both as a plan summation, and an overall summation of this CAPR Report.

The Music Department at CSU, East Bay can support many more music majors, even in its current state and with the existing performing ensembles. Focused recruiting for low-enrolled areas of the department (voice, strings, orchestral winds) is an absolute must.

The Music Department must be more active in developing and promoting courses for non-majors. These large 4-unit courses will continue to be the classes that drive the FTES and SFR's needed to support the one-on-one applied instruction, and smaller classes for many of the important core music classes.

The Music Department must continue to add to its Full-time Tenure Track faculty each year for the next several years, to fill areas of absolute critical need to support and expand our curriculum.

The Music Department must return to being a separately administered department, with a trained, experienced music-administrative expert as Chair.

The university and its administration must be open-minded in understanding the unique nature of Music, and the specific needs of a vibrant and successful program.

Music Department faculty and administrators must work to educate university administrators as to all of the above, and work together to get the music program back on stable ground, back on track and growing.
California State University, East Bay

Music Department Response to External Review Report (J. Klein)

The Music Department thanks Dr. James Klein for his time, efforts and energies in visiting the CSUEB campus, and in compiling the External Review Report. This Music Department Response to Dr. Klein's report will contain, 1) general comments on Dr. Klein's report, with an additional summation of our current situation, 2) a point-by-point commentary on several issues raised in the External Review Report, 3) an overview of our response and, 4) a revision of the "Plan" previously submitted. Quotes from Dr. Klein's report will be in italics.

1) General Comments on Dr. Klein's Report and a summation of our current situation.

We are grateful for the unique perspective provided by an outside reviewer, and applaud Dr. Klein for many of his insights into our situation. We also acknowledge several of his suggestions as being extremely helpful. As with any outside review and accompanying report, there are also areas of comment that show a misunderstanding of the current situation, or suggestions for action that, in our opinion, are not accurate or feasible.

Because Dr. Klein's Report refers both to his observations during his visit, and the original Music Department CAPR Report, we felt it was important to provide, here, a summary of our current situation, as a prelude to a more detailed response.

The CSU, East Bay University Mission Statement, under the heading "Vision" states that the University strives to be known for: Outstanding academic programs, recognized for their excellence. Curricula that foster active student participation through applied learning... and community service. High academic standards along with services and support that ensure each student the opportunity for success. An array of activities that promote students' enjoyment and well-being. Engagement in and essential contributions to the civic, cultural, and economic well-being of its region and communities.

It is the position of the Music Department that these and other visions stated in the Mission Statement are becoming increasingly problematic for the Music Department to achieve, despite an indisputably successful record of such achievement over the last two decades.

The three primary areas of concern are, 1) the small number of full time faculty, 2) department leadership and, 3) technical staff and clerical staff.
A comparison of faculty and staff rosters for 1984-1985 and 2004-2005 illustrates and places into perspective the drastic shift from full to part time faculty, and a loss of staff positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1984-1985 levels</th>
<th>2004-2005 levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech &amp; clerical Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music majors</td>
<td>~150</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The loss of 22 full time faculty positions over two decades has resulted in a very small number of full time faculty who can engage in the business of the department, including all departmental committee work, lecturer review, student recruitment, counseling of majors and minors, fund raising, scholarship auditions (five annually), faculty searches, community outreach, community service, thesis committees, applied juries, curriculum planning and development, and faculty recitals. With upcoming retirements in the near future only two or three full time faculty remaining will be tenured professors, eligible to serve on select departmental committees.

During this same time period, the growing success and reputation of the department has resulted in more opportunities for student and faculty achievement. A number of activities have been added or increased; a selected list of these include:

- University Bands Fall Tour (in addition to Band and Choral Spring Tours), the Musica Delle Donne series, Music Department/Yoshi’s fund raiser event, student composition recitals, composition scholarships, service scholarships, financial need awards, several assessment tools including quarterly applied juries for majors, student performer service facilitation, international Jazz Ensemble tours, departmental performing ensemble appearances at IAJE International Conferences, CMEA Bay Section conferences, CMEA State Conferences, and CBDA State Conferences, establishment of the Annual Faculty-Alumni Wind Orchestra event, Alumni Jazz Band, Invitational Band Festival, Jazz Festival, Instrumental Music Festival, All State Solo Recital Workshop, Choir Festival, the Choral program’s Renaissance Madrigal Feast, an Annual CSUEB (H) Composers Concert Glenn Glasgow Memorial Recital), site hosting of CMEA Band, Choir and Solo/Ensemble Festivals, guest conductorships for All State and other honor groups, festival adjudication, annual hosting of Trombone Day (coordinated and co-sponsored by Bay area music retail businesses), and hosting of special events such a Composers INC. concert, and presentation of many, many guest artists in recitals and masterclasses.

It should be noted that each of the remaining full time faculty has continued to maintain currency in their field, including composition of commissions, guest conducting, concert performing, guest soloing, adjudicating and recording.

Part time personnel are compensated for classroom teaching time only. Only with rare exception do they participate in the activities listed above.
Department leadership is the second major area of concern. Numerous efforts have been made to educate new departmental and school leadership who have little understanding of the intricacies of the music major, but with little success. Budget decisions are based on criteria applied to all departments across the board, not taking sufficient account of the distinctive curricular structure of any University music department. Recent steep cuts in lecturer budgets, and the resulting curriculum cuts have left current students, potential students and their teachers in a state of uncertainty regarding the University's commitment to the music major. As word of this has spread throughout the Bay Area music and education community, efforts at recruitment have been hampered.

The lack of music training on the part of the department chair, and the school dean and associate dean leaves a deficit of "university-level-music-program-knowledge." At the time of the "administrative merge," a Music Department "Coordinator" was appointed from the music faculty to assist the department chair. In the past five years Music Department leadership has quickly devolved from a nearly full-time department chair (27 WTUs for many years, prior to 2001), to a reduced administrative load for the Department Chair (18 WTU's or less from 2001-2004), to a department Coordinator (2004-2005, with 8 WTUs of release time to perform over 90% of the Chair's responsibilities, because they require music expertise), to the current "Associate Chair" for Music (12 WTUs, again to do a very large percentage of the duties traditionally expected of a full Music Department Chair).

With decreased release time and nearly undiminished administrative demands requiring music expertise, such as determining faculty loads, scheduling, personnel, counseling, budget, requirements, curriculum, performance and public relations the effect has been to create a severe leadership crisis for the department. This situation has also compromised our standing in the larger university and academic music community. NASM accreditation requires that a music expert serve as Chair, and the Music Department still retains accredited status from NASM. Whether or not the department seeks to renew that status, the NASM guidelines exist for a reason. No music department can operate up to the generally acknowledged standards in the field without a Chair possessing music expertise. CSUEB is currently the only Music Department in the entire CSU, regardless of size, without a musician as its Chair.

Thirdly, loss of full time staff has resulted in a general decline in the quality of support services including unreliable archival recording, a growing backlog of uncatalogued music acquisitions, ineffective clerical support work by student fill-ins and a significantly increased work-load and responsibilities for our remaining current full and part-time time staff. The recent forced office relocation and resultant loss of a number of Music Department facilities has resulted in the declining morale...not just of staff, but of faculty and students as well. The move to two different temporary locations resulted in the loss of important work product during the moves, decreased ability of office staff to work effectively, a lack of a professional appearance of our office space. There is still no location identified as a permanent Music Office.
2) A point-by-point commentary on several issues raised in the External Review Report

Overview:
The main issues are number of tenure-track faculty and administration of the music program;
We absolutely agree, adding Music Department staffing to this list.

... however, the dean has been forthcoming with lecturer dollars...
While it is true that the Dean did find additional dollars for some courses during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years, this comment must be seen in the context of the initial 39% cut to the lecturer budget from 2003-2004 to 2004-2005.

Additionally in 2005-06 over $300,000 has been allocated for the development of a state-of-the art Media Center for Music Technology...
This $300,000 figure is incorrect. It should read “over $120,000.”

Dr. Klein identified four areas of “critical need”...
- First, and most critical, is the fate of the current master’s program. The program was slotted to be phased out in 2004-05 academic year, but was reinstated in Fall, 2005. Staffing of the music program would be somewhat different with both baccalaureate and masters programs than with just a baccalaureate program.

The Music Department does not see the fate of the master’s program as the most critical issue facing the department. As stated at the bottom of page 1 of this response, “The three primary areas of concern are, 1) the small number of full time faculty, 2) departmental leadership and, 3) technical staff and clerical staff.”

Converting the statistics (shown in the “Number of Undergraduate and Graduate Majors” chart on page 13 of the music Department Self-Study,”) into “percentages of total music majors that are graduate students” shows the following:

Graduate Music Majors, as a percentage of total number of music majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>11.3 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even with the drop between the high of 28.8% in Fall 2002 and 18.8% in Fall 2004, the master’s program in music has maintained a healthy size, especially when seen in relation to undergraduate majors and percentage of total majors. The Music Department feels that it offers a unique and viable program for its specific service area (the greater east bay) and its various constituencies (working professionals) with the curriculum offered exclusively in late-afternoon and evening courses.

While a comparison (from the charts of statistics on page 13 of the Self Study) of numbers of Master’s students, and numbers of degrees awarded in the distant past may appear somewhat unusual, in the most recent 3-4 years, this number has been between 25-30% graduation rate. This figure should not be seen as unusual, especially for a program that is “non-residential”, where working professionals are attending classes in late-afternoons and evenings, and may, as a result of their professional obligations, take up to 3-4 years or more to complete the masters program.

Further, offering a masters degree has been shown as an important factor in the Music Department’s ability to attract and retain faculty.

It is the Music Department’s strong recommendation that the Master’s program be maintained.

• Secondly, the program needs to decide if it will write to the new standards for teacher credentialing for the Subject Matter Preparation Program in Music. With the CSET substituting for the traditional “Waiver” programs of the past, it may not be necessary to write a document to meet California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards, but rather to suggest a curriculum for students that intend to enter the teaching profession that will aid them in passing the CSET exam in music. It is suggested that the music program check with other CSU campuses to determine an appropriate strategy.

The insights shown in Dr. Klein’s offering of this recommendation are greatly appreciated. The Music Department completely agrees that, given the small number of remaining faculty resources (and in particular resources with the expertise and time to create the necessary paperwork for accreditation for the new CTC Standards) it would be best to continue to offer the current music education curriculum, not as an accredited waiver program, but as a subject matter preparation program for future credential candidates. It is vital to state that the current curriculum must stay in place, as it is designed, 1) first and foremost, to prepare students for subject matter competency and to not only be successful, but exemplary music educators and, 2) to give them the knowledge and skills necessary to pass the CSET exam so that they can be admitted into the Single Subject Teacher Credential Program in Music. These courses also provide a valuable assessment tool for the department.
• Thirdly, what is the role of music technology in both the undergraduate and graduate programs? Will this become a fifth area of concentration in the BA degree? Will aspects of technology be imbedded in the core courses as well as the areas of concentration? How will technology literacy/courses be used in graduate programs?

The Music Department is not at all satisfied with its past offerings in the area of Technology. As early as 1992 we requested a TT hire in the area of Music Technology—we did so again in 1996, 1998, 2000 and 2002. This is an area of very specialized expertise that also requires much in the way of organization, supervision, attention to security, equipment funding, and curricular development. Up to Fall 2004, with neither equipment, dedicated space or qualified faculty the Music Department fell behind sister institutions in the Bay Area.

We are extremely pleased, therefore, to have been authorized to search for a TT hire in Technology in 2004-05, resulting in the hiring of Asst. Prof. Rafael Hernandez. Furthermore, Dean Reimonenq backed this up with a dramatic commitment of funds for equipment and software and the assigning of a dedicated lab space.

As this is being written, the last of the equipment has arrived and the Department is poised to set up and inaugurate a Media Center for Music Technology that places Music on a par with its sister institutions. Three new course proposals have been submitted to augment Music 3082, our current rotating-topic computer music course. We are cooperating with Art for an evening Digital Audio course in the Fall and there will be offerings in Summer 2005, as well.

Technology is included in our undergraduate curriculum in a supplementary capacity. Principally, our software notation class supports students in Theory and History courses, Applied Composition and Music Education courses.

The Technology lab and curriculum is in its infancy, but some of the ideas being considered include requiring proficiency for all Music Majors, Music Education courses and, longer term, a “Music Industry” option within the major. Since our degree is an 84-unit BA, unless resources and planning for a move to a BM in the range of 125 units were forthcoming, a significant restructuring of course credit within the major would have to take place before Options of any kind could be incorporated into the major.

The Graduate program, particularly within the Composition emphasis, receives supplementary support from current course offerings. Regular offerings for graduate-level technology courses must await increased instructional support in the form of either another TT composer or a Lecturer position.
Finally, the program is currently accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and is scheduled for an accreditation review as early as Spring, 2007. Although comments about accreditation are not a part of this review, suggestions about accreditation issues will be included throughout this document should the program decide to proceed with reaccreditation efforts.

There is neither the manpower or resources within the Music Department to support the application of, or application process for renewing our NASM Accreditation at this time. The CSU East Bay Music Department is saddened by not being able to continue as an NASM Accredited institution. In addition, given the facts presented in the Self-Study (related to course offerings and, in particular the number of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty for the size of our department and the current administrative situation), it is unlikely that we could meet NASM standards at this time.

Dr. Klein mentions that, “suggestions about the accreditation process will be included throughout this document.” It is critically important that we address the most vital of these issues...the current administration of the Music Department by a non-musician. On page 6 of his External Review Report, under the larger section addressing the area of Administration, Dr. Klein states...

If the music program, however, is going to apply for reaccreditation to NASM, then it will be incumbent on the administration to find a musician for the head of the music program as required by NASM guidelines. If an appropriate candidate is not available in the current faculty, a search from outside should be undertaken.

It is the Music Department’s strong belief that regardless of our application for NASM reaccreditation, the return to an administrator who is a music expert is a critical need, for the many important reasons.

Music is a highly specialized academic area, both in terms of the general area of music, and, especially, in terms of the many, many sub-specialties within music. Each of these areas requires a faculty member with a specific expertise, as well as an administrator with, at the minimum, a general knowledge of each area.

In addition to the various music-academic and music-performance related areas, there are several other areas of expertise required of a music administrator that are unique to our discipline. Each of the following areas also require discipline specific knowledge:

A. Interacting, as a liaison and spokesperson for the department with a larger community of public and private schools and educators, music professionals and professional music organizations

B. Coordinating those involved in publicity and marketing for on and off campus performances and events

C. Recruitment, including tours with major performing ensembles
D. Working with on-campus personnel for music support of university events

E. Budget and Finances (including overseeing a large number of accounts in the areas of state supported budgets, IRA accounts and Trust Fund accounts)

F. Administering a very large adjunct lecturer-faculty, each with a very specific expertise

G. Dealing with a very complex set of faculty loads, related to a curriculum of classes in music where most music courses are not your typical 4 unit academic class. In addition, all of our undergraduate students and many of our graduate students are involved in one-on-one supervisory instruction.

And, finally, there is the issue of credibility. Given that no other respected Department of Music at a University in California (or the nation), and none of our sister CSU’s have a non-musician as administrator is quite damaging to the credibility of our department, college and university.

The topic of Music Department Administration will be addressed in greater detail under the heading of “Administration” later in this document.

It is also noted that while the music faculty are extremely active in external recruiting and performances, they, as a unit, have not participated in campus governance and politics in an equally commensurate way. The particularly deep cuts in both tenure-track positions and other resources may be directly attributable to the absence of a music presence in internal campus discussions, both formal and informal.

With an ever-shrinking full-time faculty over the past several years, the music department has been forced to invest its few remaining human resources in those things that would sustain the department...supporting the curriculum for the major, maintaining the high standards of excellence in performance, and recruiting.

It would be extremely disappointing to learn that significant losses in tenure-track positions and cuts in resources in the recent and distant past were the result of a lack of on-campus interaction with faculty and administration on the part of the Music Department. Support for the curriculum of a department should be based on the formal process already in place, not on a perception of political activity.
Following is an analysis of major areas of the music program.

Curriculum

Undergraduate:

The program seems to offer four areas of concentration - music education, performance (voice, instrument, keyboard), jazz studies, and composition. The largest program is music education which enrolls 55-60% of undergraduate majors. It is recommended that the program require an area of concentration (12-15 units) to their major requirements, not only to better guide students to current elective courses, but also to ensure that these courses are well-enrolled and offered on a two-year cycle.

While there are certainly informal areas of concentration within the BA in Music, to formalize these areas (we would advocate five areas; performance, music education, composition, jazz and music industry), as official options inside of the degree would require a significant curricular revision, or (as per Klein’s comments on Page 4, paragraph 3, and page 8 paragraph #9), might require proposing that we offer a Bachelor of Music degree (BM), with these options. This would be a huge step for the Music Department, and require significant support, staffing, administrative, and monetary resources currently not available.

This reviewer agrees with the curricular modifications suggested in the Plan for revision of the theory/history sequence to offer two years of aural skills, six quarters of music theory, including 20th century techniques (deletion of one quarter), and expansion of the history sequence by one quarter. This is consistent with the academic core of music programs throughout the state and nation. The additional of a tutorial unit or element to the first year theory sequence is also a way to keep students who have remedial needs in this area enrolled in the college level courses. Another approach would be to institute a music fundamentals or basic theory course as a general education option that would serve majors not ready for theory study, Liberal Studies students and music theatre students.

Yes. We agree, and hope to implement these curricular revisions as soon as possible.

It is imperative to get all appropriate music courses, including ensemble classes, certified under new standards for general education courses. The program should ask for an exception to allow for more than one course required for the major to count for general education. Possible courses include ensembles, technology, and world music if added to the major as required for NASM reaccreditation.

A major priority for the Music Department is to submit paperwork for GE credit for most all of our Lower and Upper Division courses. This process has already begun.
Graduate:

The masters program (45 units) consists of a core of research, theory/composition, history/literature, and music education courses with a nine unit minimum concentration in one of four areas (1) Performance, (2) Composition-Theory, (3) Music Education, and (4) Music History and Literature. With duplicated enrollment of 18 students in Fall, 2004 and 16 students in Fall, 2005, the scope of the current program is too broad. With seven graduate history/literature and three theory courses currently in the catalog, the program is not appropriately scaled for current enrollment.

If the masters program is retained, the faculty should look at the one or two program concentrations that are most enrolled and scale the offerings accordingly. A survey of other masters programs in the region may reveal an area of emphasis that is unique to CSUEB and can be marketed appropriately.

A number of the courses in the catalog are no longer offered. There is a core bibliography course, five courses in the Music history area, and one course in Theory-Analysis (which can be repeated once, with changing topics). These "academic" courses, along with applied lessons for performance majors, and four courses in the Music Education area constitute what we consider to be a bare minimum of offerings – not a "broad spectrum." Given that (with the exception of the bibliography course) the remaining courses are offered on a rotating basis (every two years), with no more than two "lecture courses" offered during any one quarter, we believe that the scale of offerings is appropriate for the size of our student population.

Scope:

An important curricular necessity is an orchestral ensemble. The orchestra has traditionally been and continues to be the heart of a music curriculum. The absence of an orchestra ensemble (cut in 2004) is a major omission in the music curriculum of CSUEB and negatively affects student recruitment. Although the Director of Bands has scheduled orchestral reading sessions for wind and percussion performers as part of the band ensemble repertoire, it does not take the place of orchestral rehearsal and performance. It is suggested that the program add an orchestral ensemble to its regular offerings. Perhaps the most prudent way would be to offer a campus/community ensemble that meets once a week. The Director of Bands could cover this assignment if lecturer faculty could take other parts of his load. Otherwise a lecturer could cover this assignment only if s/he was given additional assigned time for student recruitment.

Yes. The lack of an orchestra is a concern and we all agree that an orchestra is a vital and necessary part of a well-rounded music curriculum. However, it should be clearly stated that there are several other areas of concern that must take priority over re-establishment of the orchestra program. In addition, the department does not want to rush into or through this process, but carefully study the feasibility of various models, including those presented by Dr. Klein.
The choral area contained two ensembles, Chamber Singers and University Singers that both contained primarily music majors but were essentially the same size. A third group, University Chorus is primarily for non-music majors. If three ensembles are to be retained, it makes sense to have each group address a different demographic - majors, non-majors, community. If only two groups are retained for majors and non-majors, then an annual opera workshop class and/or diction could be reinstated to address another area of vocal/choral need without additional staff.

Dr. Klein's comments about the Choral program reflect a misunderstanding of the difference between the categories of “Major Performing Ensemble” (University Singers, in the Choral-Vocal area), and “Chamber Ensembles” (Chamber Singers in the Choral-Vocal area). All Chamber Ensembles in the Music Department are populated by students who are also enrolled in Major Performing Ensembles because participation in both categories of ensembles is required in the degree program.

With the addition of a new Tenure-Track Faculty member as Director of Choral Activities in Fall 2006, the ensemble and course offerings in the Choral-Vocal area will be evaluated. Opera Workshop has been revised to be offered as a Chamber Ensemble, and will be offered again, starting in Fall 2006.

Music technology is another important aspect of the curriculum. Current music curricula must contain literacy in technology including familiarity with notation programs, administration programs, websites, MIDI, and other issues. The proposed technology curriculum of ten courses somewhat addresses this issue with the five topics suggested at the 1000 level. The music faculty need to discuss this approach as opposed to imbedding technology throughout the curriculum - ie: notation programs in the theory sequence or administration programs in music education courses. Whatever is decided, the music technology courses that provide for technology literacy must be required for the major. A suggestion would be to have one or two quarters required for all majors. Otherwise, if the entire plan of five courses were implemented, additional faculty in technology or theory would be needed.

The proposed curriculum also develops courses in recording technology, a possible fifth concentration in the undergraduate curriculum. These courses should be at the upper division level with perhaps one prerequisite course at the 2000 level and have a capstone project required. Again, the program is encouraged to include music technology as a required concentration option in the degree program to ensure enrollment and rotation of courses.

The comments earlier in this response regarding Technology address these issues.
This then begs the question of the degree type. With these suggested changes, including a required concentration, the degree will be closer in size and scope to a Bachelor of Music (BM) degree. Even with the current BA degree program, the number of units exceeds the scope of a traditional Bachelor of Arts degree. If the BM is approved, then the BA degree could be retooled for students that want to major in more than one area (ie: Music and Business), minor in another area, or wish to pursue a music degree with less performance requirements (ie: music recording technology).

It is also noted that if the program will apply for reaccreditation with NASM, world music, improvisation, and technology will be components that must be included in the curriculum. Since a world music course already exists, and music technology is being addressed, the improvisation element could be imbedded in current core and applied courses.

Discussion of degree type and “options” or “concentrations” also occurs earlier in this document. The Music Department understands that the scope of its Bachelor or Arts in Music exceeds the traditional BA on campuses where the Bachelor of Music degree is also offered. Since we do not offer a BM, and the likelihood of implementing this degree is very small, the current curriculum we offer is the most reasonable compromise, in offering our students the education they need to succeed as performing and teaching musicians.

The Music Department will explore various ways that it might implement options or concentrations (Performance, Music Education, Composition, Jazz and Music Industry) within the context of the Bachelor of Arts degree.

**Students**

Students voiced concerns about only one degree option. While additional courses are offered as electives, the reliability of these offerings is not always certain. Classes may be cancelled on short notice. A desire to have a guaranteed rotation of elective courses was expressed. The earlier recommendation for required concentrations would address this concern.

The concerns about options were addressed previously in this response.

A concern of standards was another common concern. Students did not feel they were challenged in many of their courses; the theme of “the program can only take you so far,” was a common refrain. In the vocal/choral area concerns about standards were most prevalent. A desire for additional courses, such as diction, was expressed. Students who were not interested in music education expressed a desire to have a course in music business, to help them with aspects of setting up a studio or business (n.b. - a course exists in the catalog, but may not be offered on a regular basis).
All new students (including transfers) are evaluated for applied study level and preparation in music theory. But there are currently no auditions and examinations in place to evaluate students' performance and music-academic standards as part of the admissions process. We hope to implement these for students entering in Fall 2007. We have, for many years, worked with students who display an extremely wide range of abilities and aptitudes. With larger numbers of students participating in the instrumental area (wind bands and jazz bands), we are able to offer multiple levels of ensembles in these areas. With the small number of students with an emphasis in the vocal area, this is not possible. It should be mentioned that the only non-auditioned choral ensembles (University Chorus and University Oratorio Society) were cut as a part of the reductions for the 2004-2005 academic year. The University Chorus was added back into the curriculum for the 2005-2006 year.

Until numbers of vocal students grow, then there will be, as a matter of course, a more disparate range of abilities inside of the University Singers ensemble. In addition, without the requisite number of students in the vocal-choral area, it is not possible to meet the university's enrollment requirements in offering specialized courses in vocal pedagogy and vocal diction.

It bears repeating that a declining number of students in the areas of voice (and string-orchestra) is a direct result of the absence of tenure track faculty positions in these areas for the past several years.

The freshmen clusters were also a point of concern particularly with scheduling between required music courses and the clusters.

Because music is a course-intensive major with a minimum of 9 units of core music courses required each quarter of the freshman year, then freshman music students have extremely large loads, when combining their music courses with the required minimum of 9-10 units of GE cluster courses. Those freshmen that are required to do remedial work in English and/or Math are under even larger burdens.

Efforts have been made (unsuccessfully) to create clusters for Music Majors that include Theory I, II, III, as their discipline courses in the cluster. The Music Department hopes to continue to work with Sally Murphy to find a model that will satisfy both the department requirements and the university requirements.

When asked how many students chose CSUEB as their first choice, most students raised their hands. When asked if they would choose this campus again, only half of the students raised their hands.
We believe that this phenomenon is a direct result of the budget cuts, and the negative effect they, along with other administrative decisions, have had on our department. These are the same students that have lived through enormous changes in our department and have been directly affected by the cuts, through larger class sizes (due to elimination of sections and every-other-year course offerings), loss of ensembles (1 section of Symphonic Band, University Oratorio Society, University Chorus, University Orchestra, sections of chamber ensembles, etc.) and loss of courses (Vocal Diction, Vocal Pedagogy, Jazz Piano, Jazz Theory-Improvisation, etc.).

One can also view this as an example of the difficulty we are currently having in recruiting new students. As word of the budget cuts and administrative changes to our department has spread among high school and junior college music educators and their students, a large number of our potential new students no longer see CSUEB as a viable place for their continued study of music.

### Staff

Currently the staff consists of an Academic Support Coordinator I, who manages the departmental office, an Instructional Support Assistant III, who manages the Music Resource Center, an Equipment Technician I, and a .5 Performing Arts Technician that is shared with the theatre program. The self-study notes that the program lost two staff members—a bookkeeper and an equipment technician. Some of the functions of these lost positions are being addressed by a centralized dean’s office staff.

Overall, the staff seems appropriate for the size and scope of the music program; however, expectations of each position need to be aligned with the amount of time dedicated to each position. Otherwise a plan needs to be developed to attend to the following issues: the .5 position that supports all music performances in the Mainstage Theatre, along with other theatre and university events, may need to be expanded. Budget and bookkeeping are being coordinated by an expansion of the dean’s office staff but this plan has not been clearly articulated to current staff and students. A plan for technical coverage of the new Media Center for Music Technology through existing or an expanded college staff needs to be discussed with the dean.

We disagree completely with Dr. Klein’s assessment that staffing in the Music Department is adequate.

While there has not been a clearly articulated plan from the CLASS office, for what the Dean’s “centralized office staff” will look like, we have learned that the financial staff will not be reconciling the books of the various CLASS departments. This is one of, if not the most specialized tasks that a bookkeeper does, requiring not only expertise, but
significant time and energy. This is clearly not a solution to the Music Department Office staffing problems and concerns.

It must also be noted that the previous full-time Music Department Administrative Support Assistant-Bookkeeper (who was, arguably, the finest ASA-Bookkeeper in CLASS if not the University, and an expert in music) did much more than just bookkeeping in the department office. No amount of “alignment” will solve the current situation, where one person (the current Music Department ASC) is doing the work of (at least) two full time staff. The current ASC assumed all of the ASA-Bookkeeper duties from October-February, 2004-2005. From February – January, 2005-2006 the current ASC had to “clean-up” after an incompetent half-time student assistant who, without the necessary training to do a job requiring professional expertise, was completely inadequate (but the only person available) for the position. Since January 2006, the ASC has assumed, once again, all of the responsibilities of two full-time staff. This simply can not continue.

“...the .5 position that supports all music performances in the Mainstage Theatre, along with other theatre and university events, may need to be expanded...”

This position will absolutely require expansion if the needs of the Music Department (and Theatre-Dance Department) are going to be met adequately. The current .5 staff member (who was recruited from among the undergraduate student body), is splitting a total of 20 hours a week between both the Music and Theatre-Dance Departments, and attempting to do the work of two previous full-time staff – one in each department and each with a specific set of professional skills and areas of expertise. Many of the previous responsibilities of the Music Department staff person in the Computer-Recording-Technology related areas are being assumed by Music Department Faculty and Staff (in particular the new tenure-track faculty member in the area of Music Technology). While we are grateful to have a faculty member who is an expert in this area, it is, clearly, not a part of this faculty position, who has also assumed complete responsibility for the new Media Center for Music Technology.

Administration

Perhaps the most contentious issue, from the music faculty’s viewpoint, is administration of the music program. In 2004-05, the music department was administratively combined with the theatre department and Tom Hird, theatre department chair, became chair of the combined department. In 2004-05 Tim Smith continued to serve unofficially as music coordinator maintaining many of the scheduling and budget duties of a chair. He resigned in Summer, 2005 and Frank LaRocca reluctantly assumed the appointment of Associate Chair of the combined department.
It is clear that the music program has not explored the possibilities, both curricularly and programmatically, that might accrue from a combined department. Team-taught or cross-listed courses in music theatre, voice, and movement might be attractive to potential students. Combining opera workshop with music theatre workshop on a rotation cycle would be an innovative and distinctive element of this combined department. Since both programs share a common performance space - the mainstage theatre, looking at issues from both disciplinary viewpoints in a collegial environment could help utilization of fiscal and staff resources.

It is suggested that the music and theatre programs explore cooperative curricular and facilities issue as part of a plan for the performing arts. Whether or not the music program continues to exist in a combined department, these conversations would help to strengthen both programs.

We agree that there are advantages to exploring cooperation in certain areas of curriculum with Theatre-Dance. However, outside of these few classes (most mentioned by Dr. Klein in his report), there are few other areas of curriculum overlap from Music to Theatre-Dance. In addition, completely different areas of expertise are required to administer and teach in each of the areas of Music and Theatre-Dance.

Furthermore, there is not a single member of the Music Department Faculty or Staff that sees either the current administrative merge between Music and Theatre-Dance, or a possible departmental-curricular merge as beneficial to the health and future of the Music Department, its curriculum or its students.

The relatively new Music Theater Major (offered through the Theatre-Dance Department) was created with little to no consultation with the Music Department faculty or administration. Certainly we would like to see many of these students involved in taking classes in our department, as it would add a far greater strength and foundation to their training.

Had we been more involved in the creation of the Music Theatre Major, we would have suggested that the major would contain a Music Minor within the scope of its curriculum requirements. A model curriculum for the Music Theater major would look, then, like this:

Freshman: Music Theory I-II-III (including the tutorial class, if necessary)
Sight Singing I-II-III
University Chorus or University Singers
3 quarters of a Basic Voice Class Sequence (taught by music faculty)
Sophomore: Basic Piano I-II-III
University Chorus or University Singers
3 quarters of Applied Voice Lessons
1 music survey course (1000 or 2000 level)

Junior: Music 3002 (upper-division music appreciation class)
Continue to participate in performing ensembles, or take a
course in Computer Music, to satisfy the 8-unit upper-
division requirement, and/or
1 course (new) in the area of "History of Music for the Stage"

There have always been music majors involved in theatrical productions – both musicals
and stage plays. We certainly encourage our students (especially those with vocal
emphasis) to be involved. We would also welcome the opportunity to explore more
specific ways that Music Majors and Minors could formally participate in the Theatre-
Dance Department.

It should be noted that implementation of the above does not require any official merging
(administrative or curricular) of the Music Department with the Theatre-Dance
Department.

If the music program, however, is going to apply for reaccredidation to NASM, then it
will be incumbent on the administration to find a musician for the head of the music
program as required by NASM guidelines. If an appropriate candidate is not available
in the current faculty, a search from outside should be undertaken.

Certainly the size, scope and complexity of any university-level music department
(accredited or not) requires specialized faculty and administrative expertise only found in
well trained professional musician-educators.

The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) guidelines exist to identify those
characteristics that are expected of a fine music program...one that offers a curriculum
(as well as an expert administrator, to lead a specialized faculty to teach that curriculum
and a staff to support the faculty and students) that exists for the sole purpose of giving
future professionals in the area of music performance and music education and exemplary
training. Regardless of NASM accreditation, we believe that CSUEB administration
should be interested in supporting a respected curriculum and program in music.
including a music administrator to lead the program, and the 5-year plan identifies this as a “critical need.”

Faculty

The full-time tenure-track faculty has been reduced from eleven in 1997 to a low of four in 2004-05. A new hire in music technology/theory began in Fall 2005, and a search is currently underway for a hire in choral/music ed/voice to begin in Fall, 2006 bringing the FT TT faculty to six in 2006-07. Three faculty are currently on FERP status, the first of those will end their FERP status by Fall, 2006, and a second by Fall, 2007.

NOTE: In the time since receiving Dr. Klein’s report, the tenured faculty member who is Professor of Music and Instrumental Music Education/Director of Bands, (also responsible for teaching in the areas of chamber winds, conducting, and single subject teacher credential training and student-intern teacher observation, applied horn and brass pedagogy) has announced that he will be leaving CSUEB after the 2005-2006 academic year.

Currently 53.5% of courses in the program are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty compared to 58.9% in the college. In 2002-03, the last year data are available, 65.72% of courses across the university were taught by FT T/TT faculty. It is expected that the percentage of courses taught by T/TT music faculty will improve with the additional hire in the choral/vocal area.

The loss of the senior faculty member identified above will put these statistics below the 2004-2006 levels.

CSUEB is fortunate to be located in close proximity to excellent performing artists for applied faculty and most of the studio instruction is taught by lecturers. However, the nature of a music program requires extensive student recruitment and program coordination and additional tenure-track lines are needed. Lecturer faculty can cover applied studio instruction, but the academic core of theory and history courses, ensembles, and a core faculty member for the recommended concentrations in jazz studies, and technology must be covered by FT T/TT faculty.

We absolutely agree with Dr. Klein’s assessment. However, we would add that the large number of applied studio instructors who are lecturers makes it very difficult to effectively recruit, because as lecturers, they are not compensated for any additional work outside of instruction. We have already noted that it is difficult (if not impossible) to maintain the health of a major performing ensemble under the leadership (even expert leadership) of lecturers. The hiring of a tenure-track faculty for Director of Choral Activities/Choral-Vocal Music Education for Fall 2006 is a step in the right direction. With the loss of the Director of Bands/Instrumental Music Education faculty member,
this position becomes both a "critical need" and the Music Department's #1 priority for a search during 2006-2007 and an appointment in Fall 2007.

With the ending of FERP status of two faculty by Fall, 2007

and the loss of the Full Professorship....

... sufficient salary savings can be put to a seventh...

and eighth (and perhaps 9th)...

tenure-track hire to begin in Fall 2007.

If the faculty and administration decide to retain the master's program, a position in music history is necessary to teach music research and bibliography, graduate seminars in music history, and undergraduate survey courses in music history and literature...

Since the faculty has recommended strongly that the master's program be continued, then the position of musicologist-graduate coordinator (currently held by a faculty member whose FERP is ending in Spring 2007) is a "critical need" and a high priority.

... If, however, the decision is made to phase out the masters program, then the survey courses could be taught by a faculty member as a secondary area and the hire can have a primary emphasis in one of the areas cited as critical to the department: orchestral conducting, strings, or voice.

The teaching areas of the next position would depend on the resolution of issues cited in this report. One route would be to externally hire a department chair with a teaching area in one of the critical areas. If the current administrative arrangement continues, then this position should be dedicated to the most critical area(s) not addressed by the previous search.

We strongly believe that an additional critical need (second in priority, behind replacement of the Director of Bands-Instrumental Music Education position) is in the area of Music Department Administrator. We recommend that the position of Chair of the Department of Music be reinstated, with its previous release time of 27 WTU's, and that a search for this position lead to the hiring of a candidate with a secondary area of expertise in one of the specialty areas identified above as areas of need (particularly orchestral conducting and/or strings).
Overall, a core faculty of at least eight TT faculty members is required for the size and scope of the current undergraduate music program. Nine are required if the master's program is retained.

Given our needs, and in recognition of the fact that there are sister CSU’s with far fewer majors than CSUEB that have up to 10 full-time faculty, we believe that 10 positions (this number would include a Music Administrator) is the absolute minimum necessary to support a well-respected program.

Facilities:

No time for evaluation of facilities was available during the campus visit.

Had Dr. Klein visited the campus in 1996 as a part of the NASM external review committee, and then again in January 2006 as a part of the external review for this CAPR process, he would have been shocked at the loss of Music Department facilities and space.

Over the past 10 years, we have lost several rooms (the electronic music lab, two large classrooms, and several practice rooms) to various College of Business departments and the Communicative Sciences and Disorders Department. Summer of 2005, in the course of the university-level “trickle-down” office moves, (starting with the Provost re-organizing university administration spaces, requiring the CLASS Dean to vacate the Warren Hall spaces, and ending with CLASS Dean’s subsequent taking of Music Department spaces), we lost,

1) our Music Department Office,
2) our Chair-Coordinator’s office,
3) our Conference Room-Classroom,
4) our Mail Room-Lunch Room,
5) the Music Computer Lab,
6) a suite of 3 offices and an ante-room that housed music department lecturers and a full-time CSD faculty member, and
7) the office of a faculty member with over 30 years tenure in the department.

In exchange, we were given,

1) a temporary Music Department Office that is inadequate for our needs
2) a large room to use as a combination of classroom space and our new Media Music Center for Technology,
3) no new office space for displaced faculty, and
4) no new spaces to use for an Associate Chair-Coordinator’s Office, or Conference Room-Mail Room

The CLASS Dean’s initial plan to have two adjoining rooms be used for a Music Department Office space, and a combination Chair-Coordinator’s office, mini-Conference Room and Mail Room has, unfortunately, not come to pass. We are still in a temporary space (and will be through the rest of the 2005-2006 academic year), and the second room will be lost to house new CLASS financial staff. It is likely that the “temporary” location of the Music Department Office will not become the permanent location, and we will be moved again when the College of Business vacates the building and moves into their new facilities.

This situation has caused a general demoralization among all of our constituents (and certainly sends a clear and negative message to our potential students and faculty members), and has had a profoundly negative effect on the department...as much as any other significant “loss” (faculty, staff, budget, curriculum, administrative leadership) we have suffered in recent years.

In order to become a fully functioning department and serve the needs of our constituents, we must be re-housed in a new Music Departmental Office, and departmental spaces that include a separate Chair-Coordinator’s Office, and a separate Conference Room by fall of 2006.

Assessment

The assessment plan, presented as part of the self-study is very comprehensive, but may not be practical, especially given the size of the current tenure-track faculty. Since so many assessment activities are already built into the music curriculum, especially in performance courses, it would be more prudent for the faculty to find two or three things that it would like to measure and plan to track assessment data only for those elements. The idea of a “barrier” exam for students entering upper division work in theory, piano and performance is a good place to begin. A summative assessment embedded in the final course in the music literature sequence that tests skills in analysis and literature may also be appropriate. Oral and written skills can be assessed with other course embedded activities.

With the loss of full-time faculty, and the overburdened music department administration, we have not kept pace with Assessment in the way we wanted or hoped to. Dr. Klein’s comment that, “The assessment plan...may not be practical, especially given the size of the current tenure-track faculty...” is clearly an understatement. We will prioritize our assessment plan, starting with required audition-exam process as a part of the application process for entering students, and continuing with a competency exam (performance and academic) required of all lower-division students for continuation into upper-division study.
Recommendations and Conclusions

Despite the concerns addressed in the self-study the music program is vital and enjoys a favorable reputation in the region and state. It is evident that the program needs to engage in comprehensive strategic planning that is based on reliable budget parameters. The critical issues of program scope and administration need to be addressed in order to make informed decisions on future tenure-track hires and overall resource allocation.

To summarize major recommendations included in subsections of this report:

1. Determine if the masters program is to be retained and, if so, the scope it will have.
2. Determine, in consultation with administration, the long-term plan for administration of the music program.
3. Determine the curricular role of technology in both the undergraduate and graduate program. Additionally, will there be courses for non-majors, or a concentration in recording technology?
4. Determine if the program will apply for reaccredidation with the National Association of Schools of Music. If so, some curricular changes may be necessary.
5. Modify the theory/history sequence as proposed in the Plan. Consider adding a general education course in Basic Theory for non-majors, particularly Liberal Studies and Theatre, and majors who do not have the requisite skills to enter the major theory sequence.
6. Write proposals to have courses for non-majors, including ensemble courses, certified under the new standards for general education.
7. Consider adding an orchestral ensemble class as earlier as possible with preference given to a campus-community orchestra.
8. Determine, in consultation with the new TT hire in the choral/vocal area, the appropriate scope of choral ensembles, and the desire to incorporate opera workshop and diction classes into the curriculum.
9. Consider revising the current BA into two programs, a Bachelor of Music with required concentrations and revision of the current BA into a less performance-based program that can be combined with other majors and/or minors. If the current BA is retained, consider adding a required concentration to the major.
10. Determine, in consultation with administration, a faculty plan, based on answers to the issues above, for replacement of tenure-track faculty lines to a minimum of eight (nine if the graduate program is retained) including timelines for implementation.

Our response to Dr. Klein’s report has addressed items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (in part), 6, 7, 8 and 9. As for #10 above, following this response to Dr. Klein’s report is a revised version of the “DOCUMENT #2: PLAN” from the original Music Department CAPR report from 1/27/2006. It is our hope that, together with university administration, we can work towards a plan for rebuilding the Music Department.
Document #2: REVISED PLAN (3/27/06)

Overview

This revised plan reflects several changes and re-arrangements of priorities, based on recommendations from Dr. Klein’s External Review Report.

I. Curriculum
   A. Theory-Sight Singing and Piano Class Curriculum
      1. Revisions to include combining Sight Singing and Dictation into “Aural Skills”. Assign a faculty member as “Coordinator” of this program
      2. Create a second year of required “Aural Skills”
      3. Theory course sequence will become 6 quarters, including 20th century theory
      4. Create a “Theory tutorial” that would be taught in parallel with Theory I (and possibly II and III), required for music majors who need remedial work on fundamentals of musical theory.
      5. Officially create drill and listening stations/software for use in the Media Center for Music Technology, for all of these courses.
      6. Require that Basic Piano course sequence be started in the Sophomore year, concurrent with Theory IV-VI
   B. Literature and Analysis
      1. Add an additional fourth quarter in the sequence
         a) Form and Analysis in Fall
         b) Counterpoint in Winter
         c) Start Literature and Analysis sequence in Spring (L & A I), then continue the sequence (L & A II, III, IV) in the following F-W-S.
   C. General Education Outcomes proposals for music classes
      1. Do for ALL music classes (except applied), including performing ensembles (not just non-major classes), so that non-majors could get GE credit for performing ensembles and music-academics they may take.
   D. Technology related courses (see also the attached "Music Technology: New Course Proposals")
      1. Continue to develop new non-major offerings, particularly in the upper division area.
      2. Continue to expand offerings for majors
E. Non-Major course offering expansion
   1. More involvement in Freshman Clusters
   2. Additional lower and upper division non-major courses, 
      (including those fitting the needs of Musical Theatre Majors, and 
      in the areas of Technology and World Music)
F. Orchestra (see “Performing Ensembles” below)
G. Opera Workshop (See “Performing Ensembles” below)
H. Add and/or add back additional courses, anticipating growth in student 
   numbers.
   1. Vocal Pedagogy and Vocal Diction classes
   2. Singing for the Stage, officially attached to Opera Workshop. 
      (coordinate with Theatre)
   3. Music Business course(s) (to fit with the possible option in 
      Music Industry)
   4. Jazz Piano

II. Faculty
A. Tenure Track requests (NOTE: The first three positions are in priority 
   order, and are critical needs to fill by Fall 2007. The order of the 
   remaining requests would depend on faculty retirements, and an ongoing 
   assessment of needs)
   1. Director of Bands/Instrumental Music Education (start Fall ’07) 
      Our #1 priority, and a critical need due to the loss of the Full 
      Professor in this area, which is one of the most vital areas of the 
      department. We would request to search for this position in2006- 
      2007, with a Fall 2007 appointment.
   2. Music Department Chair or, if the current administrative merger 
      of Music and Theatre-Dance continues, and Associate Chair for 
      Music (start Fall ’07) with additional teaching duties in an area 
      of critical need, including, possibly, categories 4 and 5 below. 
      This is a critical need.
   3. Musicology/Ethnomusicology/Graduate Advisor (start Fall ‘07). 
      This is a critical need, due to the department's only musicologist 
      completing his FERP in Spring 2007.
   4. Orchestra/Applied Strings. The Music Department needs to get 
      the orchestra back into the curriculum as soon as possible, and it 
      is imperative that a full-time tenured faculty member be 
      appointed to be a leader in this area.
   5. Voice/Opera Workshop/Aural Skills. The Music Department will 
      put the Opera Workshop program back into the curriculum as 
      soon as possible, and it is imperative that a full-time tenured 
      faculty member be appointed to be a leader in this area.
   6. Theory-History-Technology (with secondary area of expertise in 
      an applied performance area)
7. Recording Technology

III. Department of Music Organization and Infrastructure

A. Staffing

1. Administrative, Technical and Instructional Support Staff
   a) A critical need for a Music Department Administrative Support Assistant/Bookkeeper
   b) A critical need for a staff position in support of Music Technology, Concert and Recital Recording and Maintenance of Audio Equipment
   c) Increased staff support help for the Music Office and the Music Resource Center

B. Requests for new facilities and improvements to existing facilities

1. Administrative
   a) An adequate space for the Music Department Office
   b) A separate office for the Chair or Associate Chair
   c) Replacement of the Music Department Conference and Mail-Work Rooms

2. Classrooms (create more “smart” classrooms for Music)

3. Additional Chamber Music and Large Ensemble Sectional Rooms

4. Continue to upgrade the Media Center for Music Technology

5. Departmental Support Areas to improve and/or restructure
   a) Instrument Storage and Technicians Room
   b) Recording Booth
   c) Wind Band and Jazz Band Library

IV. Performing Ensembles

A. “Premiere” Performing Ensemble directors should receive more than the current 3 WTU’s (a minimum of 4, and as many as 6 WTU’s in recognition of the significant extra time necessary for preparation, and time outside class related to active performing schedule, tours, conference and festival performances, recruiting, etc. This is done at many CSU’s and at all UC’s. The second and third “tier” ensembles (a second section of Symphonic Band-if a 2 band model, the University Chorus, the 2nd and 3rd Jazz Bands, etc.) would stay at 3 WTU’s, recognizing that these ensembles do far less performing and outside, off-campus performances and events. The “premiere ensembles” would include,

   Symphonic Band (or Wind Ensemble, in the hopes that we would go back to the two-separate bands scenario)
Jazz Ensemble (top of the three big bands only)
University Singers (the premiere, auditioned large ensemble in the Choral area)
Orchestra

B. Chamber Ensembles
1. Add back the 2nd section of Jazz Combos (high enrollment)
2. Create a second section of Chamber Winds Ensemble (high enrollment)
3. Guitar/String/Harp ensemble
   a) how to deal with the situation of shared ensemble load, but widely disparate numbers in each area (large # of guitar students, extremely small number of string students and harp students.
4. Opera Workshop
   a) re-write as a chamber ensemble
   b) combine with a “Singing for the Stage”, or “Acting and Blocking for Singers” course that would be required when registering for Opera Workshop.
   c) Scheduling: Tu-Th. 2:00-2:50 Opera Workshop
      3:00-3:50 stage work class
5. New or Contemporary Music Ensemble and/or Electronic Music Ensemble.

C. Orchestra
1. Evening ensemble
2. College-Community ensemble
   a) priority given to students
3. Auditioned and selective, with strict standards for acceptance
4. Would rehearse on campus
5. Conducted by a faculty appointee, approved by the department
6. Hurdles
   a) strings are the backbone of the orchestra
   b) must have a core of music major string players (4-6 vln/2-3 vla/2-3 vcl/1-2 bass; minimum). Talented non-majors and minors would be identified and encouraged to participate.
   c) Orchestra would be the required major performing ensemble for String Players (Bassists who may not be ready to play in orchestra, could use Jazz Ensemble, but would be required to perform for a minimum of 2 years in orchestra)
   d) Not enough “orchestral winds” (Fl/Ob/Ct/Bsn/Horn) in department to support both the orchestra and the wind bands with a separate pool of players. Wind players would be required to perform in a wind band, and then selected for orchestra through audition.
e) FTES—there would have to be a way for community members to be registered and count towards FTES. This was one of the issues with the loss of the college-community choral ensemble ("Oratorio Society"), due to small student enrollment, but large non-registered and non-FTES generating community members.

7. Time-line/steps in process/brainstorming ideas
   a) Research; possible combine with existing community college/community orchestra (quality of ensemble/quality of conductor?)
   b) proposals presented
   c) marketing
   d) Write T.T. position request for position of Orchestra Conductor/Applied Strings
   e) Invest scholarship $ in strings (2 scholarship quartets) and orchestral winds (2 woodwind quintets)
   f) Establish a resident faculty string quartet (perhaps with a full scholarship student violinist as 2nd violin and/or viola)

B. Oratorio Society. While it would be nice to reinstate this ensemble, which had a large community involvement component, it is not a priority at this time
1. Evening ensemble
2. College-Community ensemble
3. Conducted by a faculty appointee
4. Hurdles
   a) FTES—there would have to be a way for community members to be registered and count towards FTES, as in orchestra, above.
5. Time-line/steps in process/brainstorming ideas
   a) Research; possible combine with existing community choral ensemble
   b) proposals submitted
   c) marketing

V. Music Teacher Preparation Program
A. Regardless of CTC accreditation, it is vital to keep the current curriculum in tact, as it represents the course work necessary to promote competency in the field.
B. Standardize the curriculum, and scope and sequence of instruction in the "Basic Instrument" courses
C. Consider offering two quarters of Basic Percussion, (like High Brass, Low Brass and High Strings and Low Strings)
   1. Non-Pitched percussion, and accessories
   2. Pitched percussion (timpani and mallets)
D. Re-visit every-other-year sequence

1. Conducting classes are way too big to offer every-other year, as most composition majors, and many other music majors want to take the classes, in addition to the music education students. Must (starting in 2006-2007) offer Basic Conducting (Fall), Choral Conducting (Winter), and Instrumental Conducting (Spring) every year. (NOTE: Graduate Conducting classes will rotate every-other year, as in past). Basic Conducting must hold to prerequisite of having completed Theory VI.

2. Possibly offer a section of Computer Music for Music Educators every year, perhaps during early AM in “Year 2”, then possibly in the evening as an Extension course during “Year 1”, to attract area educators to campus.

E. TED courses for Teacher Credential Candidates

1. Size variance of class, depending on flow of 2-year Subject Matter Prep. Sequence

2. Supervision of Student-Intern Teacher; load size (same concern as #1)

3. Critical need for two separate faculty members to guide this program (one with expertise in Instrumental Music, and one with expertise in Choral-Vocal Music, to both lead the TED Methods and Materials Class for credential students, and to supervise credential students in their student-intern teaching positions.

VI. General topics

A. Entrance requirements/standards for ALL new music majors (implement for Fall 2007)

1. Required audition as part of application process
   a) student's select solos from a required list
   b) Set at least 3-4 “official” audition dates, including one in late-Spring/early-Summer (June-July)
   c) Entrance Auditions can also serve as scholarship auditions

2. Use models in place at other CSU’s, and private colleges
   a) Long Beach
   b) Northridge
   c) UOP
   d) Others

B. Clean up and revise printed materials

1. Catalogue
2. Undergraduate and Graduate Handbooks

C. Marketing and Recruiting

1. MUST establish a strategy, process and procedure, including specific appointment of faculty member/staff to coordinate
2. MUST involve all lecturers on some level
3. MUST have budget for creation (EVERY YEAR) of a poster (with tear-off cards) to send to schools
4. Create Promotional CD/DVD, highlighting in sound and visuals every aspect of our program, and performing area, including faculty and performing ensembles.

5. **Must have budget** to purchase advertising in several Bay Area and state-wide journals of professional music organizations; CMEA Bay Section-Tempo magazine, CMEA state-level magazine, CBDA Bulletin (AND the All-State Band Concert Program), ACDA Bay Section, state and Western Division newsletters, CODA (orchestra), etc.

6. **Must have a budget** to purchase and prepare a display that can be used at Regional and State-wide Conventions of professional organizations.

7. **Must have budget** for registration fees, and for staffing the table (faculty and students) at conventions.

**Plan Summation**

We certainly realize that the plan outlined above is extensive and specific in its scope. We feel, however, that most of the items proposed in each of the several areas can be accomplished in a 5-year span, given the support of the university.

The following statements will serve both as a plan summation, and an overall summation of this CAPR Report.

1) The Music Department must continue to add to its Full-time Tenure Track faculty each year for the next several years, to fill areas of absolute critical need to support and expand our curriculum.

2) The Music Department must return to being a separately administered department, with a trained, experienced music-administrative expert as Chair.

3) The university and its administration must be open-minded in understanding the unique nature of Music, and the specific needs of a vibrant and successful program. Music Department faculty and administrators must work to educate university administrators as to all of the above, and work together to get the music program back on stable ground, back on track and growing.

4) The Music Department must be more active in developing and promoting courses for non-majors. These large 4-unit courses will continue to be the classes that drive the FTES and SFR's needed to support the one-on-one applied instruction, and smaller classes for many of the important core music classes.

5) The Music Department at CSU, East Bay can support many more music majors, even in its current state and with the existing performing ensembles. Focused
recruiting for low-enrolled areas of the department (voice, strings, orchestral winds) is an absolute must...and, finally

6) The Music Department faculty and staff are working extremely hard, as we have done for decades, to offer the highest quality of education and pre-professional training to our students, who will leave us to eventually join the work force as the next generation's performing and teaching musicians. Thousands of Music Department Alumni have made us proud and brought us additional recognition as an institution that is widely respected for it's curriculum, the quality of its faculty and quality of its student performing ensembles.

In short, the Music Department has been the model of the vision outlined in the University's "Mission Statement"...an outstanding academic program, recognized for its excellence. A program with a curriculum that is a perfect example of active student participation through applied learning and community service. A department and faculty that hold to the highest academic standards, and provide services and support that ensure that each music student has an opportunity for success. We have fostered a wide array of activities that are directly related to the promotion of students' well-being and enjoyment. And, finally, a department that contributes enormously to the civic and cultural well being of our community and region.

CSU East Bay, as an institution, has gained enormous benefit from claiming ownership of its fine Music Department. We are, arguably, the most visible department on campus. Our faculty, our programs and our performing ensembles are well known throughout the state of California, and beyond.

Unfortunately, we are now, (and have been for the past 3-4 years) working in a university-level and college-level environment that is not conducive to, or supportive of the Music Department's contributions to the mission statement and vision of the university. The Music Department is at the most critical juncture in its history. Our faculty and students want to see the long tradition of excellence continue. We want to continue to be the model for the university's vision and mission.

Now the university must decide if it wants to continue this tradition: to continue enjoying the benefits provided to the university by an excellent and widely respected Music Department. If this tradition is to continue, then the University and the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences must work with us to support our efforts in this regard. Giving this report your most serious consideration is, we believe, the first step in this process.
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

FIVE-YEAR REVIEW DOCUMENTS

Submitted for consideration by the Committee on Program Review

January 27, 2006
Document #1: SELF-STUDY

1. Summary of previous program review and plan.

Introduction

In Spring of 1997, the Music Department received a 10-year accreditation from the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the longest period of accreditation possible. A report was submitted to the Committee on Program Review in March of 1999, as a part of the university's review process. That report contained, in large part, selected documents submitted as a part of the 1997 NASM process, following the policy established by the university that with programs and departments that are accredited by a national agency, the accreditation process and report to this agency supercedes the university's CAPR process.

In summarizing the 1997 NASM and 1999 CAPR reports, it is vital to place this information in context. A great deal has changed at CSUEB since 1997, and the resulting changes to the Music Department have also been drastic.

While some statistical information will be presented in this summation, within the context of describing the effects of these changes in statistics, greater detail will be presented in subsequent sections, in particular, Part 4 of the Self-Study. The information here serves as a presentation of the findings and plan in the 1997/1999 reports, as well as an overview of departmental history from Fall 1997 to Fall of 2004 (and in some cases, including through Fall 2005). This information should also serve as a prelude to the CAPR "Document #2: Plan."

Summative Overview

There has been some minimal progress in "areas of needed improvement" addressed by the 1997/1999 reports (one new Tenure-track hire currently on our faculty, one current tenure-track search, a new, well-funded Media Center for Music Technology and a designated faculty with expertise in this area), and our outstanding faculty are still offering a very high quality of music education, and despite all of the critical issues facing us the remaining large and small student performing ensembles are relatively healthy and continue their excellence in performance...all "areas of strength" identified in the 1997 NASM report.

However, it must be stated clearly, that a comparison of Fall 2004, to Fall of 1997 (the year after the Spring 1997 NASM Report), shows that the Music Department has, in fact, not only moved backwards in several vital areas identified as "areas of needed improvement", but several of the "strengths" identified in the report are now areas of needed improvement. This is due, in largest part, to forces outside of the control of the department.
Summary (continued)

Summation of specific areas addressed in the 1997 NASM/1999 CAPR reports

The Music Department is facing the most critical time in its history. This is due, in large part, to the following negative factors, some of which were affecting the department negatively, even prior to 1997, and others, which have happened since:

1. The trend, (not just on the departmental level, but university-wide) of replacing retiring Tenured Faculty with part-time lecturers.
   a) In Fall of 1997 there were 11 Full-Time tenured or tenure track faculty. In the Fall of 2004 there were 4.
   b) Since the 1997 NASM report was filed, the highest Tenure-Track FTEF in Music was 10.33 (Fall-2000). In Fall of 2004 that number was 5.6.
   c) A high of 18.47 Total FTEF was recorded in Fall 1998. In Fall 2004 Total FTEF were 11.1.

2. The resignation of every tenure-track hire (three total) from 1997-2001, before the end of their probationary period.

3. Multiple changes in College-level administration at the Dean and Associate Dean levels, requiring continual "education" of new administrators as to the extremely unique nature and needs of the Music Department...a department whose curriculum, staffing, and budgetary needs differ widely from any other academic department on campus.

4. Regular cuts in the music budget for lecturers over several years and, in particular, the large cut to the music budget (39%) for the 2004-2005 academic year. The cut to the 2004-2005 budget resulted in the difficult-to-make-but-necessary decisions and changes listed below. The main criteria in making these decisions were, a) to preserve our major, subject matter preparation and teacher credential programs and, b) continue to offer the highest quality music education possible to majors and non-majors alike.
   a) the decision to phase out the Masters in Music program
   b) the elimination of the University Orchestra...the only major performing ensemble for our string majors, and a cornerstone of every viable music program.
   c) the restructuring of the Choral Program, and the elimination of 2 of the 4 Choral performing ensembles...the two that served our non-major population.
Summary (continued)

d) the restructuring of the Single Subject Matter Preparation Program in Music (subject matter competency course-sequence offered as a part of the State of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Accredited program, and required for entrance into the Single Subject Teacher Credential Program in Music), to offer the courses in a 2-year sequence, instead of every year.

e) the necessary establishment of a substantial fee ($225 per quarter) for applied instruction

f) the elimination of several well-enrolled and important "elective" courses (not required for graduation), including;
- the three piano proficiency courses for keyboard majors
- three courses in the jazz area; jazz theory, improvisation and arranging
- the only computer music course in the curriculum

g) the elimination of second sections of Music Theory and additional sections of Sight Singing courses, causing a loss of the individual attention necessary for a strong foundation in these core music-academic classes.

h) the elimination of several sections of non-major courses (some of the highest FTES-producing courses in the department).

i) the restructuring of the University Bands Program, and the loss of a second section of Symphonic Band (and, by far, the largest performing ensemble in the Music Department).

j) the loss of the Opera Workshop program...the only non-choral singing experience for vocalists, and a cornerstone of every viable music program.

The news of these changes spread quickly among music educators and music professionals throughout the state ...and so did the rumors. These ran the gamut from, "CSUH eliminated the Music Program", to "there are no more Choirs at CSUH", to "the Music Education and Teacher Credential programs in Music were cut" to, "faculty member 'x' is retiring", or "faculty member 'y' is looking for another job." In many ways, this had as negative an effect on our program as any of the other single items listed above. The number of new-student applications for music majors, the number of new music students auditioning for scholarships, and the number of entering music majors all fell in Fall of 2005 from the previous several years. It is also most certain that our sister CSU's and other competing 2 and 4-year institutions took advantage of these rumors, and our real situation. It will take years to recover.

5. The change in the College-assigned Administrative Release Time in the Music Department from an historically .75 Chair position, to a 2004-2005 situation, created through a decision of the CLASS Dean to "administratively combine" the Music Department with the Theatre and Dance Department, appointing the Chair of Theatre-Dance Chair of Music as well. There was a .25 assignment given to the former Chair of Music, as a "Coordinator's" position, and a resultant increase in that person's teaching load.
Summary (continued)

It should be stated here (and will be stated elsewhere as well) that there are no other Music Departments in the CSU that are administered by a non-music person... including the smallest departments, with far fewer majors. While the administrative merge certainly helped the university budgetary problem, the appointment of a person to lead the Music Department, with no expertise in a subject matter, created a significant set of new concerns. In 2004-2005, the Music Department Coordinator continued to take on nearly all of the tasks assigned a regular chair, without the correlative release time.

With the resignation of the Coordinator from this position in Summer of 2005, the Dean created an "Associate Chair for Music" for the Music and Theatre-Dance departments, with a less unreasonable amount of assigned time. While this is a slight improvement of the situation in 2004-05, there is still no music expert in place as chief administrator for the Music Department.

6. The loss of Music Department staff, including a 1.0 Technician position (the only staff member with expertise in computer applications in music and recording engineering... two vital areas in our department), and a .75 Administrative Support Assistant/Bookkeeper (a position vital to the operation of a department with a very complex departmental budget and a large IRA budget).

7. The loss of a separately-housed Music Library/Media Center in the Main Library.

8. A major disruption of the Music office's ability to function properly, through the administrative decisions to change the configuration of office in Warren Hall, resulting in the CLASS Dean's need to find other office spaces, resulting in the Dean's decision to take over, a) the existing Music Office and Chair's Office complex, b) the Music Department Conference Room (which was also used regularly as a class room and rehearsal room, c) the Music Department Mail-Work room, d) the Music Department Computer Lab, e) a suite of three offices and an ante-room used by three part-time Music Faculty and one CSD full-time faculty member and, f) the large office of a music faculty member.

In exchange, the Music Department received a room for a new combination Classroom-Media Center for Music Technology, and two adjoining office spaces for a new Music Office and Conference-Work room. In a recent decision, the CLASS Dean has taken one of these two rooms away from eventual use by the Music Department, for a new centralized CLASS Financial Office.

In this larger office relocation process, the Music Office has been moved twice into temporary locations, and will hopefully, after over 7 months, be moved soon to its permanent location... a one-room office that will function as department office, conference room, mail room and work room.
Summative Conclusion

1. In the NASM reviewing Team's "Site Visit Report" for the 1997 NASM Report, the number one identified "Area of Improvement" was the need for additional tenure-track faculty. The report specifically noted the trend of the loss of full-time faculty, and a larger percentage of part-time faculty over the 10 year period from 1987-1997.

"...if the documented trend continues, with part-time instructors increasing as a percentage, ...an appropriate relationship between full-time faculty involved in the continuing business of the program...will not be maintained."

"The teaching loads for faculty appear to be such that faculty members are able to carry out duties effectively including instruction, advisement, professional growth, and service activities. However, the current trends noted above would put a strain on the fulfillment of non-teaching responsibilities."

With these concerns being raised in 1997, with a full-time tenure track faculty of 11, it is clear that with a full-time tenure-track faculty of 4 in Fall of 2004, to say that the Music Department's ability to provide both instruction and service to our on and off campus communities is in crisis would be a gross understatement.

2. Likewise, the 1997 "Site Visit Report" identified the need for additional office staff, particularly in the music office, as an area of needed improvement.

"The only area of improvement related to staffing revealed in the self-study is the size of support staff. Additional help is needed, especially in the Department office. The Department needs to continue working with the Dean to gradually increase the staff size."

Over the period of time from 1997-2005, the additional work for all of the department staff related in part, to, a) an increase in part-time faculty, b) an expansion of IRA and outreach activities, c) far fewer full-time faculty, d) three drastic administrative changes, e) ever-more complex budget issues, f) an increase in the use of technology, g) an increase in recital and concert performances as well as special events (just to list a few), has been enormous. With the loss of a 1.0 technician and .75 ASA/bookkeeper, this work is now being done by far fewer staff.

3. The "areas of strength" identified in the 1997 report that are no longer strengths include:

"a stable [and capable] department leadership"
"overall staff support"
"Music/Media Library and Music Resource Center Staff Support",
"strong support of the Dean and Provost."
With three changes in department administration since 2001, including the change related to the "administrative merge" of Music with Theatre and Dance, the appointment of a non-expert in music as an administrator, and the reliance on the secondary positions of "Coordinator" and "Associate Chair" for the majority of the subject-specific decisions and work in the department, the department leadership is certainly not stable.

The Music Department staff (by Fall of 2004, down to just 3 full-time staff) is an amazing, talented, dedicated, loyal and hard working group of people. We are fortunate to have them, but the workload placed on the staff is, simply, unreasonable.

As stated in the Summary above, the Music Department has suffered the loss of a separately-housed Music/Media Library in the Main Library. This facility, previously staffed by a full-time Music Librarian, and a part-time Assistant Music Librarian, is now mostly staffed by non-expert personnel, but, fortunately, supervised by a Reference Librarian with a strong background in music. An extremely efficient and capable person staffs the Music Department's Music Resource Center. However, the scope of this position has changed drastically over the period from 1997. With several additional responsibilities (including a significantly larger responsibility for publicity for the department, as well as web design and maintenance for the Music Department web pages) all not related to the continued updating and maintenance of the significant holdings and materials in the MRC. An ever-changing student assistant staff of varying expertise, adds to the difficulties of supporting the needs of the department.

The support of the various Deans and Provosts since 1997 has been widely inconsistent, as evidenced by many of the statements in the summary above. While we are thrilled with the monetary investment and attention to our new Media Center for Music Technology, the new Tenure Track faculty member, and the current tenure track search, other areas, particularly the administrative decisions related to budget, replacement of full-time tenure track faculty, department administration and facilities have had a tremendously negative impact on the department, the faculty, the staff and the various constituencies we serve.

4. The "areas of strength" noted in the 1997 NASM Report that remain strengths are:
   "a talented, dedicated and caring faculty", and
   "strong commitment of service the surrounding community"

The talented and dedicated full-time tenured faculty is, of course, significantly smaller. The larger number of part-time faculty are also talented and dedicated...but as part-time faculty with busy professional lives away from CSUEB, their ability to devote additional time to the needs of the department is severely limited.

If anything, our commitment to serving the surrounding community, especially the music education community in the greater Bay Area has increased.
It is, we believe, more than impressive, that the Music Department has been able to maintain its health in light of all that has happened since the 1997 NASM/1999 CAPR reports were submitted. Our students are still receiving a quality music education. Our faculty are widely respected in their fields, and are constantly sought after by members of the music education community to function as mentors and leaders within their various specialized professions. The University's student performing ensembles continue to represent the Music Department and the University here on campus, throughout the state, nationally and internationally, with the highest caliber of music making. And Music Department Alumni performers, educators, composers and scholars continue to provide impressive and notable leadership in their fields.

2. Tenure Track requests, searches and history since 1997

The following statement comes from a December 1995 Music Department Planning Review Report,

"Every year the Department has requested tenure-track positions to replace regular faculty lost to retirement. Yet, over the past nine years (1988-89 through 1996-97), only one such appointment has been made. Over the next few years it will be essential to make tenure-track appointments in three areas if the Department is to meet its other goals and move successfully into the future: Orchestra/Instrumental Music Education, Choral Music/Music Education and Computer Music/Theory Composition."

Administrative changes in the Music Department over the past 5 years, and the recent relocation of the Music Department Office have resulted in a loss of some of the specific and itemized work product and paperwork related to past Tenure-Track Proposals and Requests. We are sorry all of this paperwork cannot be submitted. However, the following is a summary of activity in this area since 1997.

1. In Fall of 1997 the Department was authorized to do a search for a position in Orchestra/Music Education. A part-time lecturer conducted the University Orchestra, for several years prior to this search. That search was completed successfully, and a faculty member was in place in Fall of 1998. The faculty member began looking for other jobs as early as November of 1998, and left the university in Spring of 1999.

In order to give the Orchestral and Music Education Programs more support and attention, a regular faculty member (the Director of Bands) was additionally assigned to assume responsibility for these two programs in Fall of 1999.

2. In Fall of 1996 the Music Department was authorized to do a search for a position in Chorus/Choral Music Education, in support of the Director of Choral Activities faculty member. That search was completed successfully, and a faculty member was in place in Fall of 1997. After a series of average to weak evaluations during the first four years of this new faculty member's probationary period, he resigned in the Spring of 2001.
In Spring of 2001 the Chair of the department requested a full-time lectureship for Chorus/Choral Music Education to replace this loss. The request was denied, and the position was separated into parts, to be covered by part-time lecturers.

In Spring of 2002 the Director of Choral Activities retired, and a part-time faculty member assumed the enormous responsibilities of this position, in addition to those of the Chorus and Vocal-Choral Music Education.

In Spring of 2005 the Music Department was authorized to do a search for a Director of Choral Activities/Choral Music Education/Voice position. That search is under way, with a faculty appointment expected to start in Fall 2005.

3. In the Fall of 1999 the Music Department was authorized to do a search for Instrumental Music Education/Symphonic Band and/or Jazz Ensemble. This position was developed to support the faculty member in the Director of Bands position, who had, in Fall of 1999 assumed full responsibility of the University Orchestra and the Music Education program, in addition to the Director of Bands position. This search was completed successfully, and a new faculty member was in place in Fall of 2000.

In Spring of 2003 the faculty member in this position resigned to take a position at the prestigious University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music. The Director of Bands, who at this time was also serving in his second year as Chair of the Music Department, resumed responsibility for a portion of this position, and regular and part-time faculty were assigned other portions of the position.

4. The Music Department first requested a position in Computer Music/Theory/Composition in 1992, and for several years after...always unsuccessfully. In the Spring of 2001 the Music Department requested the position again. This request was accepted and approved by the Dean, but was never presented to the Provost. In the September of 2001 the new Chair of the Music Department requested that the Dean re-submit the position for reconsideration. The position was presented to the Provost, but subsequently denied by the President in November of 2001.

This position request was re-submitted in Spring of 2004, with significant changes, as a position in Music Technology/Theory/Composition. This position was approved, and a successful search during 2004-2005 resulted in the appointment in Fall 2005 of a new full-time tenure track faculty member in this area.

In the "Plan" portion of this CAPR Report, attention will be devoted to future tenure track proposals and requests. The Music Department, as evidenced by much of the information supplied in Part 1 of this Self-study, is in critical need of regular faculty members in several vital areas of our program. The recently approved new positions in the choral and music technology areas are greatly welcomed. However, the lack of a full time tenure track faculty member in several other areas, including Orchestra, Opera/Voice and Instrumental Music Education has put the department in a tenuous position.
With the impending full-retirement of 2 FERPers, and the retirement (perhaps within the next 5 years) of as many as two to three other full-time faculty members and a third FERPer, the need to replace these vital positions as well as others, will remain critical.

Please see the following pages for copies of the available tenure track requests and/or Position Announcements.

3. Music Department Outcomes Assessment

The Music Department Chair and Faculty began the Assessment process in Fall of 2000 with a great deal of anticipation as to how our program could be further improved. Due to the shrinking regular faculty and the drastic administrative changes in the department since then, continued work on Assessment has somewhat less consistent.

There have always been a number of "built-in" assessment tools in place throughout the curriculum in Music, both in the area of music academics and music performance. A sampling of these include:

- an entry-level audition for placement on a performance level,
- juries to evaluate performance on a quarterly/yearly basis,
- juries for evaluating readiness to advance through Applied levels 10-40,
- interviews as a part of the application process for Teacher Credential Candidates in Music,
- auditions for placement in various levels of performing ensembles,
- juries for junior and senior level recital performances,
- sequential music academic courses (particularly in Music Theory) that require passing evaluations for continuation to the next level,
- Graduate Advisory Exams in Music Theory and Music History
- Graduate juries for acceptance into the Performance area of emphasis
- Review of composition portfolios on both the undergraduate and graduate levels for acceptance into the programs of study in composition,
- A required exam in piano proficiency for all undergraduate music majors,
- Graduate Thesis evaluation,
- Traditional written and aural exams in music academic courses,
- Evaluation of written work related to research in the performance area,
- etc.

You will see, in the "Plan" portion of this report additional information concerning future assessment tools, including:

- required auditions for acceptance as a music major
- required Music Theory exams for the placement of all entering students (particularly entering freshman) in a regular theory track, or a supplemental theory tutorial track, and
a required Comprehensive Exam in Music Theory, Piano skills and Performance for the advancement from lower division to upper division.

Discussions on the implementation of the above have already begun, and plans for an implementation timeline have also been drafted. We are anxious to renew our commitment to assessment in future years, and to help our students (and faculty) be more specifically aware of the requirements for meeting all of our curricular goals.

Please find, in the following pages:
- Music Department Mission Statement
- Learning Outcomes and Performance Indicators
- Undergraduate Program Goals
- Graduate Program Goals
- Undergraduate Assessment Plan
- Graduate Assessment Plan

4. Analysis of Academic Performance Review Statistics

Because the previous submission to CAPR was a document prepared in the Spring of 1997, and eight years of Academic Performance Review Statistics have been available since that time, the statistical information presented here will be in a slightly varied format, due to the longer time period. (The material available from Institutional Research is always presented in a 5-year time-frame format).

Each of the categories of statistics required in the CAPR document will be presented, and then commented on, directly following each category. A summation will appear at the end of this section as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These statistics are, as you can see, "all over the map." There is a noticeable "spike" in 2002, due most likely to an especially healthy entering class. It is important to note the significantly lower numbers of graduating undergraduate students in the last 2 years.
Number of Undergraduate and Graduate Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One can see a general trend of total majors rising very slightly to a peak in 2000, then a steady, if not drastic decline to Fall 2004. This is, in large part, due to the difficulty of a significantly smaller Full-Time faculty in continuing the normal heavy load of recruitment activity required to maintain a healthy department, especially in this current climate, where the "pool" of available, potential music majors is becoming smaller and smaller. More will be said about this in the summation at the end of this section.

Number of Courses and Sections Taught

NOTE: The following numbers are for Fall Quarter only in each year, and include only a total number, not a breakdown of Lower Division, Upper Division and Graduate levels. It should also be noted that the way this information is presented in the various documents from the Office of Institutional Research varies from year to year...so only those statistics that are comparable are presented.

a) # of courses taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>92 (this statistic is obviously wrong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>82 (this statistic is obviously wrong)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) # of sections taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>58/118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the top table (# of courses taught), taking away the 2 numbers that are obviously higher (and most likely mistakes), the number of courses taught is remarkably consistent. Unfortunately, while "number of sections" statistics were available for 2003 and 2004, "number of courses" statistics were not.

In the lower table (# of sections taught) the way statistics were labeled in the 1998-2002 and 2000-2004 reports must have changed, and a different system must have been used (the # of course sections would certainly not have doubled between 2000 and 2001). What is notable, however, is the trend of slight decreases in the sections taught from 2001-2003, (133, 118, 113), then the drastic reduction in numbers of sections in Fall 2004 (82). This is the direct result of the severe cuts to the budget for 2004-2005, as outlined in Part 1 of the Self Study.

### Average Section Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Section Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the low of 13.9 in 2000, the section size increases gradually through 2003, with a drastic increase in Fall 2004. Again, this is the direct result of the severe cuts to the budget for 2004-2005. With far fewer sections and larger enrollments in core classes for music majors, a larger section size is the expected result.

### FTES

Note: As above, the figures in the three categories below (FTES, FTEF, SFR) include only a total number, not a breakdown of Lower Division, Upper Division and Graduate levels, and are Fall Quarter statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>215.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>192.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>182.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>160.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>164.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>166.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>156.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>151.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is plain to see that Music Department FTES have been in a general decline over the past eight years, with a larger dip between 1999 and 2000, similar to the dip in the Average Section Size table. The decline is not only due to a smaller number of music
majors, but a smaller number of non-major courses offered, due to budget restraints, and the priority to keep the major intact.

### FTEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FTEF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As addressed in the summation of Part 1, the FTEF in Music has been in steady decline since 1998, with a drastic decline between Fall 2003 and Fall 2004... again, due to the severe budget cuts sustained by the department.

### SFR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>SFR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the main criteria the Provost gave in November of 2001, for withdrawing support for the requested Tenure Track position in Computer Music/Theory/Composition, was the dismal Student Faculty ratio in the Music Department, which the previous Fall had dipped below double-digits, to 9.7. The new Music Department Chair made a promise, at the time, to work hard to raise Music Department SFR's. A slow but steady rise in SFR's is noticeable from 2000-2003, with a large increase between 2003 and 2004. As with other statistical areas, this is due, in part, to the drastic reduction of sections in the department due to budget cuts, and the resultant larger enrollments in each section.

### Ethnicity of Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TOT.</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hisp.</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>A.In</th>
<th>Other Int.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ethnic diversity of the music major population has never been a reflection of the overall demographics of the university. This would be true of most college music department's music major populations. It is an unfortunate truth, especially in post-Proposition 13 California, that public school music programs (and arts programs, in general) in the areas that serve a large percentage of Black and Hispanic students, are not as strong as those in the communities that serve a large population of White and Asian students. The numbers above do not reflect the intentional recruiting (or non-recruiting) of any ethnic group of potential music majors. We would love to have our music major population more closely reflect that of the university.

**Summation of Statistics**

The non-inclusion of a breakdown, in several of the areas above, by Undergraduate, Lower Division, Upper Division or Graduate levels and by Regular Full-Time Faculty vs. part-time Lecturers is intentional. Because of the specific nature of faculty expertise in the Music Department, nearly every member of our faculty (both regular full-time faculty, and part-time lecturers) teaches across a wide spectrum of undergraduate courses, both lower and upper division. Because of the small number of Graduate Courses offered each quarter, a smaller number of faculty are involved...and these tend to be Regular Full-time faculty members, although not always.

In looking at the various tables above, there are only a few conclusions regarding "trends" that can be drawn:

1. The drastic changes in statistics between Fall 2003 and Fall 2004 with regard to FTEF, SFR's, Number of Sections Offered, Sections Taught and Average Section Size are all related to the results of the significant reduction in funding for the Music Department.

2. There is a relatively steady decline in the number of Music Majors and FTES since 1997. It is most certainly not a coincidence that this coincides with the steady decline in FTEF. In a department where it is vital that faculty invest significant time, energy and resources for recruiting, and where there are fewer and fewer full-time faculty to take on this fundamentally vital task, then the loss of majors is no surprise.

These two conclusions are closely related, and speak specifically to the number one concern for the future of the department: in order to not only stop this trend, but reverse it in order to have a healthy department, we will need more full-time faculty...a critical need.

5. A Comparison of CSU, East Bay's Music Course Offerings and Requirements, with corresponding sister CSU's and nationally recognized programs in the field of Music.
A comparison to Music Programs at sister CSU’s

It is important to begin this section of the report with a clarification of the nature of our Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree in Music, especially in comparison to B.A.'s in Music at institutions that also offer the Bachelor of Music (B.M.) Degree. A survey of B.A. degrees at the many CSU’s that offer B.M. degrees, would show that their BA degree is significantly smaller than CSU, East Bay's...closer to our Minor in Music.

A comparison of our B.A. in Music to other CSU's B.M. degrees would show that our degree is much closer in scope and size to their B.M. This varies, of course, with the size of the institution. The largest CSU's have several hundred music majors (CSU, Long Beach has nearly 900), and the smallest have significantly fewer than 100. It should be noted that for the size of our university's total enrollment, a music major population of 155 (Fall 2004) is comparatively large.

CSU, East Bay's required core curriculum in music academics compares very favorably with sister CSU’s. Institutions that offer the B.M. will typically have more specialized courses for the various areas of emphasis within the major (performance, music education, etc.). CSU's with larger music major populations will also have a pool of students large enough to support the offering of more "elective" courses.

The most striking differences between the Music Department program at CSU East Bay and other CSU's are as follows:

1. There are very few (perhaps no other) CSU's that have no University Orchestra. While smaller CSU's may typically offer orchestra in the late-afternoon/evening, and the ensembles are College-Community Orchestras, often with a large percentage of participation of community members, they all support an orchestra...one of the cornerstones of a viable music program.

2. There are very few CSU's that do not offer Opera Workshop programs, again, one of the cornerstones of a viable music program. As with the orchestra programs, the smaller institutions typically offer Opera Workshop in the late-afternoon/evening, and the participants are a combination of college and community members.

3. Most CSU's offer a larger number and wider variety of courses related to Music Technology.

4. Most CSU's offer a significantly larger number and variety of courses for non-majors, and, in most cases, the enrollment for these courses far exceeds our typical enrollment.

Although the following areas are not directly related to course offerings and requirements, a comparison to other CSU's is certainly appropriate at this point in the report.
FAVORABLE COMPARISONS

1. The quality of our major performing ensembles (particularly in the jazz and wind band areas), is comparable to and/or stronger than many of our sister CSU's with far larger music major populations.

2. The quality of our faculty compares very favorably with our sister CSU's. In particular, because we draw our part-time faculty from the greater Bay Area, a world center for music performance, our applied music faculty are exceptional musicians.

3. The quality and size of certain individual programs within the department, most notably our Composition Studio, is comparable to and/or stronger than many of our sister CSU's with far larger music major populations.

UNFAVORABLE COMPARISONS

1. With regard to the balance of Full-time tenure track faculty and part-time lecturers, CSU, East Bay is at or near the bottom, statistically, in the CSU system.

2. The same can be said of the number of Full-time tenure track faculty compared to the number of music majors. There are several CSU's with far fewer music majors, and more Full-time Tenure Track Faculty.

3. Finally, there is no other CSU (large or small), whose Music Department is administered by a non-music faculty member.

A comparison to Music Programs at nationally recognized programs

In addition to the areas of strength exhibited by the larger and better-staffed CSU's discussed above, most nationally recognized institutions for the study of music have several other qualities in common with one another. These include:

1. A conservatory setting, where students are immersed in a music curriculum, and have little or no general education requirements. Often there is a School of Music, or a Conservatory of Music, which is a large and independent curricular and administrative entity.

2. A large number, and multiple levels of performing ensembles.

3. A large, yet "controlled" student population. Because these institutions have far more student applications than they can accept, they are able to select from the finest applicants, and accept an optimum number of music students in each of the various areas of emphasis.
4. A significantly larger percentage of graduate (and doctoral) students than a typical CSU.

5. A significantly larger set of course offerings for each of the various specialties.

7. The highest quality of instruction, facilities and equipment in every specialized area.

6. A very large staff to support instruction in every conceivable way, as well as dedicated staff in the areas of admissions, outreach and marketing.

With regards to positive comparisons between these nationally recognized programs and CSU, East Bay's Music Department, it would be accurate to offer the following:

1. The quality of instruction in Music Theory and Music History compares favorably.

2. The quality of artistry exhibited by many of our performing faculty compares favorably.

3. The quality of instruction offered in several of the studios in the Applied area (individual instruction) compares favorably.

4. The quality of musicianship, artistry and leadership among the conductors and directors of our performing ensembles compares favorably.

5. There are, at any given time, a handful of exemplary students at CSU, East Bay, who could just as well have been accepted to and be studying at any of the nation's most prestigious music institutions.

6. Achievements of the program

Given the information presented in Parts 1, 2 and 4 of the CAPR Report, it is a significant achievement that we still have a functioning music program at all. The fact that the program not only exists, but also in so many ways remains healthy, is absolutely remarkable. This is due, in large part, to the extreme dedication, hard work and efforts of a very small number of faculty and staff.

The following is by no means a complete list of the achievements of the program and the people involved, but a sample of the kinds of work being done by our faculty, students and staff.

1. The University Jazz Ensemble (the premiere performing ensemble in this large program), led by Director of Jazz Studies David Eshelman, is an award-winning ensemble with both national and international performance credits. In the past 5 years, these include appearances at state and national conferences (most notably the International Association of Jazz Educators National Conference), as well as
performances at internationally renowned jazz festivals, including those in Montreaux and Umbria. The ensemble has released several professionally recorded CD's, including two since the 1997 NASM/CAPR report. Both CD's feature a number of compositions by Professor Eshelman, as well as CSUH student composers.

2. The University Wind Ensemble, under the direction of Director of Bands Timothy M. Smith, has performed numerous times at regional, state and division conferences, since the previous NASM/CAPR report, including performances at the College Band Directors National Association Western-Northwestern Division Conference, the California Music Educators Association State and Bay Section Conferences and the Western States Collegiate Wind Band Festival as a featured ensemble. Under Professor Smith's baton, over thirty works by CSU, East Bay (Hayward) faculty and student composers have been premiered.

3. Two music students: David Jerome and Steven DeRoches have been awarded Fulbright Scholarships in the past five years.

4. Adriana Rasch-Rivera and Margaret Kayward, graduate students of Dr. David Stein, were awarded CSU Graduate Research Awards.

5. Works by faculty composers Frank LaRocca, Rafael Hernandez, Jeffery Miller, and Allen Shearer have had regular performances throughout the Bay Area, nationally and internationally, including a choral work by Frank LaRocca that was presented at the World Choral Symposium in Japan this past summer.

6. Rafael Hernandez, the newest member of our faculty, was awarded a New Faculty Grant, and was instrumental in creating a vision for the new Media Center for Music Technology, and securing significant funding for this facility.

7. Kathryn Smith, Director of Choral Activities and Lecturer in Voice, is the past-President of the American Choral Directors Association California State Board. The University Chamber Singers, under her direction, presented the first-ever Madrigal Feast in December of 2004. The University Singers were special guest performers at the December 2005, Eric Whitaker International Choral Festival held in the east bay.

8. Graduate Student Composer, Justin Morrell was the only American finalist in the Thad Jones-Danish Radio Jazz Orchestra International Composition Contest. His award-winning work, Jazz Ensemble, was written for and premiered by the CSUEB Jazz Ensemble. Members of the University Wind Ensemble premiered Justin's Master's Thesis Composition for chamber winds, Wind Ensemble, at the Western States Collegiate Wind Band Festival.

9. While an undergraduate composition student, Robert Litton was commissioned by Director of Bands, Timothy Smith to compose a work for the opening of their Fall 2000 Tour concerts. The piece, One for All, was awarded the H. Robert Reynolds Composition Prize, and performed by the National Wind Ensemble, under the baton of Maestro
Reynolds, in Carnegie Hall. After completing his undergraduate and graduate degrees in Composition at CSUEB, Robert was accepted into the graduate program at the prestigious Film Scoring Program at the University of Southern California.

10. CSUEB faculty performers are among the most active in the Bay Area, and can be heard in every major performing ensemble, ranging from the San Francisco Symphony, Opera and Ballet Orchestras to the pit orchestras for the national productions of major works for musical theatre. Many of our faculty are heard on film scores, radio and television commercials and on recordings.

11. Recent staff achievements include the remarkable job Teresa Dulberg has done as our Music Department Web-master. Our Music Department Web Site is the envy of many of our sister institutions, and is praised as one of the most informative and user-friendly web sites visited by potential students and other members of our large musical community.

12. Music Department Administrative Support Coordinator, Mariko Abe and Technician, Frederic Palmer are also accomplished musicians. Fred, an early music specialist and performer on Baroque Oboe and Recorder, also leads the Mid-Peninsula Recorder Orchestra. Mariko Abe can be live and on recordings, making music with a number of ensembles, including the Bay Area Women's Philharmonic and the Stockton Symphony.

Given enough time and space, we could fill pages and pages with the accomplishments of our faculty, staff and students. This is an impressive and talented group of musicians and educators, and we are proud to have them represent CSU, East Bay and its Music Department through their many accomplishments.
Document #2: PLAN

Overview
Because of the nature of the many and various areas of concern addressed in Part 1 of the Self-Study, and due to the large number proposed changes to the Music Department program and its curriculum contained in the following "Plan", this information will be presented (in this draft of the CAPR Report), in a more general outline format. The Music Department is anxious to receive the "Outside Reviewer's Report" and wishes to wait until after the report is read and digested, to further revise the plan, and in the final CAPR Report, to present it in the requested format.

I. Curriculum
   A. Theory-Sight Singing and Piano Class Curriculum
      1. Revisions to include combining Sight Singing and Dictation into “Aural Skills”. Assign a faculty member as “Coordinator” of this program
      2. Create a second year of required “Aural Skills”
      3. Theory course sequence will become 6 quarters, including 20th century theory
      4. Create a “Theory tutorial" that would be taught in parallel with Theory I (and possibly II and III), required for music majors who need remedial work on fundamentals of musical theory.
      5. Officially create drill and listening stations/software for use in the Media Center for Music Technology, for all of these courses.
      6. Require that Basic Piano course sequence be started in the Sophomore year, concurrent with Theory IV-VI
   B. Literature and Analysis
      1. Increase from a 3 to a 4 unit class (70 minutes 3x's per week)
      2. Add an additional fourth quarter in the sequence
         a) Form and Analysis in Fall
         b) Counterpoint in Winter
         c) Start Literature and Analysis sequence in Spring (L & A I), then continue the sequence (L & A II, III, IV) in the following F-W-S.
   C. General Education Outcomes proposals for music classes
      1. Do for ALL music classes (except applied), including performing ensembles (not just non-major classes), so that non-majors could get GE credit for performing ensembles and music-academics they may take.
   D. Technology related courses (see also the attached "Music Technology: New Course Proposals")
      1. develop new non-major offerings, particularly in the upper division area
      2. expand offerings for majors
   E. Non-Major course offering expansion
      1. More involvement in Freshman Clusters
      2. Additional upper-division non-major courses
F. Orchestra (see “Performing Ensembles” below)
G. Opera Workshop (See “Performing Ensembles” below)
H. Add and/or add back additional courses
   1. Vocal Pedagogy and Vocal Diction classes
   2. Singing for the Stage (coordinate with Theatre?): officially attached to Opera Workshop?
   3. Music Business course(s)
   4. Jazz Piano

II. Faculty
A. Tenure Track requests (NOTE: The first two positions are in priority order. The order of the remaining requests would depend on faculty retirements, and an ongoing assessment of needs)
   1. Choral/Choral Music Education/Voice (approved, and currently in search process, for a Fall ’06 appointment)
   2. Musicology/Ethnomusicology/Graduate Advisor (start Fall 07). This is a critical need, due to the department’s only musicologist completing his FERP in Spring 2007)
   3. Music Department Chair (or, if the current administrative merger of Music and Theatre-Dance continues, and Associate Chair for Music) with additional teaching duties.
   4. Orchestra/Applied Strings. This is a critical need. The Music Department needs to get the orchestra back into the curriculum as soon as possible, and it is imperative that a full-time tenured faculty member be appointed to be a leader in this area. 
   5. Voice/Opera Workshop/other (Aural Skills?) This is a critical need. The Music Department needs to get the Opera Workshop program back into the curriculum as soon as possible, and it is imperative that a full-time tenured faculty member be appointed to be a leader in this area. 
   6. Theory-History-Technology (with secondary applied area?)
   7. Instrumental Music Education
   8. Recording Technology
B. Applied Lecturer Loads
   1. Get additional funding for WTU for each Applied lecturer for official Studio Class times (additional 3-5 hours per quarter). Students would register for Applied lessons, and an attached “lab” for applied lessons, generating more FTES.
   2. $ for faculty performances on and off campus (chamber ensembles)
   3. $ to compensate lecturers time spent for recruiting events and activities
   4. Consider a plan for future increase in applied lesson fees (track with other CSU’s)
III. Department of Music Organization and Infrastructure
   A. Staffing
      1. Administrative, Technical and Instructional Support Staff
         a) A critical need for a Music Department Administrative Support Assistant/Bookkeeper
         b) A critical need for a staff position in support of Music Technology, Concert and Recital Recording and Maintenance of Audio Equipment
         c) Increased staff support help for the Music Office and the Music Resource Center

PLAN: Overview (continued)

   B. Requests for new facilities and improvements to existing facilities
      1. Administrative
         a) An adequate space for the Music Department Office
         b) A separate office for the Chair or Associate Chair
         c) Replacement of the Music Department Conference and Mail-Work Rooms
      2. Classrooms (create more “smart” classrooms for Music)
      3. Additional Chamber Music and Large Ensemble Sectional Rooms
      4. Continue to upgrade the Media Center for Music Technology
      5. Departmental Support Areas to improve and/or restructure
         a) Instrument Storage and Technicians Room
         b) Recording Booth
         c) Wind Band and Jazz Band Library

IV. Performing Ensembles

V. A. “Premiere” Performing ensemble directors should receive 4-6 WTU’s (not 3 WTU’s), in recognition of the significant extra time necessary for preparation, and time outside class related to active performing schedule, tours, conference and festival performances, etc. This is done at many CSU's and at all UC's. The second and third “tier” ensembles (a second section of Symphonic Band—if a 2 band model, the University Chorus, the 2nd and 3rd Jazz Bands, etc.) would stay at 3 WTU’s…recognizing that these ensembles do far less performing and outside, off-campus performances and events. The “premier ensembles” would include;

   1. Symphonic Band (or Wind Ensemble, in the hopes that we would go back to the two-separate bands scenario)
   2. Jazz Ensemble (top of the three big bands only)
   3. University Singers (the premiere, auditioned large ensemble in the Choral area)
   4. Orchestra
B. Chamber Ensembles
1. Add back 2\textsuperscript{nd} section of Jazz Combos (high enrollment)
2. Create a second section of Chamber Winds Ensemble (high enrollment)
3. Guitar/String/Harp ensemble
   a) how to deal with the situation of shared ensemble load, but widely disparate numbers in each area (large # of guitar students, extremely small number of string students and harp students.
4. Opera Workshop
   a) re-write as a chamber ensemble
   b) combine with a “Singing for the Stage”, or “Acting and Blocking for Singers” course that would be required when registering for Opera Workshop.
   c) Scheduling? Tu-Th. 2:00-2:50 Opera Workshop
   3:00-3:50 stage work class
5. New or Contemporary Music Ensemble and/or Electronic Music Ensemble.

C. Orchestra
1. Evening or day ensemble (?)
2. College-Community ensemble (?)
   a) if college-community, then priority given to students
3. Auditioned and selective. Strict standards for acceptance
4. Rehearses on campus
5. Conducted by a faculty appointee
6. Hurdles
   a) strings are the backbone of the orchestra
   b) must have a core of music major string players (4-6 vln/2-3 vla/2-3 vcl/1-2 bass; \textit{minimum})
   c) Required for Sting Players as major performing ensemble (Bassists who may not be ready to play in orchestra, could use Jazz Ensemble, but would be required to perform for a minimum of 2 years in orchestra)
   d) Not enough “orchestral winds” (Fl/Ob/Cl/Bssn/Horn) in department to support both the orchestra and the wind bands with a separate pool of players. Wind players would be required to perform in a wind band, and then selected for orchestra through audition.
   e) FTES-there would have to be a way for community members to be registered and count towards FTES. This was one of the issues with the loss of the college-community choral ensemble (“Oratorio Society”), due to small student enrollment, but large non-registered and non-FTES generating community members.
7. Time-line/steps in process/brainstorming ideas
a) Research; possible combine with existing community college/community orchestra (quality of ensemble/quality of conductor?)
b) proposals presented
c) marketing
d) Write T.T. position request for Orchestra Conductor/Applied Strings/non-Major courses (see above).
e) Invest scholarship $ in strings (2 scholarship quartets) and orchestral winds.
f) Establish a resident faculty string quartet (perhaps with a full scholarship student violinist as 2nd violin)

D. Oratorio Society
1. Evening ensemble
2. College-Community ensemble
3. Conducted by a faculty appointee
4. Hurdles
   a) FTES-there would have to be a way for community members to be registered and count towards FTES, as in orchestra, above

5. Time-line/steps in process/brainstorming ideas
   a) Research; possible combine with existing community choral ensemble (?)
   b) proposals submitted
   c) marketing

VI. Music Teacher Preparation Program
A. Revision of the Subject Matter Preparation Program to meet the new CTC Standards
   1. Needs to be completed and submitted no later than Fall 2006
B. Standardize the curriculum, and scope and sequence of instruction in the “Basic Instrument” courses
C. Consider offering two quarters of Basic Percussion, (like High Brass, Low Brass and High Strings and Low Strings)
   1. Non-Pitched percussion, and accessories
   2. Pitched percussion (timpani and mallets)
D. Re-visit every-other-year sequence
   1. Conducting classes WAY too big to offer every-other year, as most composition majors, and many other music majors want to take the classes, in addition to the music education students. Must (starting in 2006-2007) offer Basic Conducting (Fall), Choral Conducting (Winter), and Instrumental Conducting (Spring) every year. (NOTE: Graduate Conducting classes will rotate every-other year, as in past). Basic Conducting must hold to prerequisite of having completed Theory VI.
2. Offer a section of Computer Music for Music Educators every year, perhaps during early AM in "Year 2", then possibly in the evening as an Extension course during "Year 1", to attract area educators to campus.

E. TED courses for Teacher Credential Candidates
   1. Size variance of class, depending on flow of 2-year Subject Matter Prep. Sequence
   2. Supervision of Student-Intern Teacher; load size (same concern as #1)

VII. General topics
   A. Entrance requirements/standards for ALL new music majors (implement for Fall 2007)
      1. Required audition as part of application process
         a) student's select solos from a required list
         b) Set at least 3-4 "official" audition dates, including one in late-Spring/early-Summer (June-July)
         c) Entrance Auditions can also serve as scholarship auditions
      2. Use models in place at other CSU's, and private colleges
         a) Long Beach
         b) Northridge
         c) UOP
         d) Others
         Clean up and revise printed materials
   3. Catalogue
   4. Undergraduate and Graduate Handbooks
   B. Marketing and Recruiting
      1. MUST establish a strategy, process and procedure, including specific appointment of faculty member/staff to coordinate (assigned time?)
      2. MUST involve all lecturers on some level
      3. MUST have budget for creation (EVERY YEAR) of a poster (with tear-off cards) to send to schools
      4. Create Promotional CD/DVD, highlighting in sound and visuals every aspect of our program, and performing area, including faculty and performing ensembles.
      5. Must have budget to purchase advertising in several Bay Area and state-wide journals of professional music organizations; CMEA Bay Section-Tempo magazine, CMEA state-level magazine, CBDA Bulletin (AND the All-State Band Concert Program), ACDA Bay Section, state and Western Division newsletters, CODA (orchestra), etc., etc.
      6. Must have a budget to purchase and prepare a display that can be used at Regional and State-wide Conventions of professional organizations. Must have budget for registration fees, and for staffing the table (faculty and students) at conventions, etc.
Plan Summation
We certainly realize that the plan outlined above is extensive and specific in its scope. We feel, however, that most of the items proposed in each of the several areas can be accomplished in a 5-year span, given the support of the university. The following statements will serve both as a plan summation, and an overall summation of this CAPR Report.

The Music Department at CSU, East Bay can support many more music majors, even in its current state and with the existing performing ensembles. Focused recruiting for low-enrolled areas of the department (voice, strings, orchestral winds) is an absolute must.

The Music Department must be more active in developing and promoting courses for non-majors. These large 4-unit courses will continue to be the classes that drive the FTES and SFR's needed to support the one-on-one applied instruction, and smaller classes for many of the important core music classes.

The Music Department must continue to add to its Full-time Tenure Track faculty each year for the next several years, to fill areas of absolute critical need to support and expand our curriculum.

The Music Department must return to being a separately administered department, with a trained, experienced music-administrative expert as Chair.

The university and its administration must be open-minded in understanding the unique nature of Music, and the specific needs of a vibrant and successful program.

Music Department faculty and administrators must work to educate university administrators as to all of the above, and work together to get the music program back on stable ground, back on track and growing.
External Review
CAPR - Music Program
Bachelor of Arts in Music, Master of Arts in Music
California State University, East Bay

Scope of campus visit:

During the course of the campus visit meetings were scheduled with the department chair, the college dean, music staff (three full time and one part time), music faculty (three full time, one part time, and one FERP), and a one hour meeting with music students. Attendance at a memorial concert for Nathan Rubin, and visits to the University Singers, Symphonic Band, and Jazz Ensemble classes were also included. Documents reviewed prior to and after the campus visit included the self-study, university catalog, the department handbook, requirements for the Single Subject Matter Program in music, and additional information provided by the dean’s office staff.

Overview:

The Music Department at CSUEB enjoys a positive reputation across the Bay Area and the state of California. Ensembles frequently perform at state and regional conferences, as well as international tours. Graduates of the program staff many teaching positions in public schools as well as regional orchestras, major orchestras, and pit orchestras. Faculty members are recognized, not only in the region and state, but nationally and internationally for their expertise and quality.

There is definite tension between the desires of the music program and the ability of the administration to support the program in its current state and certainly according to the “Plan” outlined in the self-study document. The main issues are number of tenure-track faculty and administration of the music program; however, the dean has been forthcoming with lecturer dollars for needed courses and student enrollment has not appreciably declined. Additionally in 2005-06 over $300,000 has been allocated for the development of a state-of-the art Media Center for Music Technology with a tenure-track hire to staff and develop the center and curriculum.

Several issues need resolution before additional resource decisions can be made:

- First, and most critical, is the fate of the current master’s program. The program was slotted to be phased out in 2004-05 academic year, but was reinstated in Fall, 2005. Staffing of the music program would be somewhat different with both baccalaureate and masters programs than with just a baccalaureate program.

- Secondly, the program needs to decide if it will write to the new standards for teacher credentialing for the Subject Matter Preparation Program in Music. With the CSET substituting for the traditional “Waiver” programs of the past, it may not be necessary to write a document to meet California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards, but rather to suggest a curriculum for students that intend...
to enter the teaching profession that will aid them in passing the CSET exam in music. It is suggested that the music program check with other CSU campuses to determine an appropriate strategy.

- Thirdly, what is the role of music technology in both the undergraduate and graduate programs? Will this become a fifth area of concentration in the BA degree? Will aspects of technology be imbedded in the core courses as well as the areas of concentration? How will technology literacy/courses be used in graduate programs?

- Finally, the program is currently accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and is scheduled for an accreditation review as early as Spring, 2007. Although comments about accreditation are not a part of this review, suggestions about accreditation issues will be included throughout this document should the program decide to proceed with reaccreditation efforts.

It is also noted that while the music faculty are extremely active in external recruiting and performances, they, as a unit, have not participated in campus governance and politics in an equally commensurate way. The particularly deep cuts in both tenure-track positions and other resources may be directly attributable to the absence of a music presence in internal campus discussions, both formal and informal.

Following is an analysis of major areas of the music program.

**Curriculum**

*Undergraduate:*

The program offers a BA in music with 84 quarter units required. Students complete an additional 29 units for the Single Subject Matter Program in Music for entry into a Credential program. Elective courses are offered in jazz studies, music technology, and other areas. Each student must declare a major performance area (voice, instrument, or composition) and complete progressive study in this “major.”

The program seems to offer four areas of concentration – music education, performance (voice, instrument, keyboard), jazz studies, and composition. The largest program is music education which enrolls 55-60% of undergraduate majors. It is recommended that the program require an area of concentration (12-15 units) to their major requirements, not only to better guide students to current elective courses, but also to ensure that these courses are well-enrolled and offered on a two-year cycle.

This reviewer agrees with the curricular modifications suggested in the Plan for revision of the theory/history sequence to offer two years of aural skills, six quarters of music theory, including 20th century techniques (deletion of one quarter), and expansion of the history sequence by one quarter. This is consistent with the academic core of music programs throughout the state and nation. The additional of a tutorial unit or element to
the first year theory sequence is also a way to keep students who have remedial needs in this area enrolled in the college level courses. Another approach would be to institute a music fundamentals or basic theory course as a general education option that would serve majors not ready for theory study, Liberal Studies students and music theatre students.

It is imperative to get all appropriate music courses, including ensemble classes, certified under new standards for general education courses. The program should ask for an exception to allow for more than one course required for the major to count for general education. Possible courses include ensembles, technology, and world music if added to the major as required for NASM reaccreditation.

Graduate:

The masters program (45 units) consists of a core of research, theory/composition, history/literature, and music education courses with a nine unit minimum concentration in one of four areas (1) Performance, (2) Composition-Theory, (3) Music Education, and (4) Music History and Literature. With duplicated enrollment of 18 students in Fall, 2004 and 16 students in Fall, 2005, the scope of the current program is too broad. With seven graduate history/literature and three theory courses currently in the catalog, the program is not appropriately scaled for current enrollment.

If the masters program is retained, the faculty should look at the one or two program concentrations that are most enrolled and scale the offerings accordingly. A survey of other masters programs in the region may reveal an area of emphasis that is unique to CSUEB and can be marketed appropriately.

Scope:

An important curricular necessity is an orchestral ensemble. The orchestra has traditionally been and continues to be the heart of a music curriculum. The absence of an orchestra ensemble (cut in 2004) is a major omission in the music curriculum of CSUEB and negatively affects student recruitment. Although the Director of Bands has scheduled orchestral reading sessions for wind and percussion performers as part of the band ensemble repertoire, it does not take the place of orchestral rehearsal and performance. It is suggested that the program add an orchestral ensemble to its regular offerings. Perhaps the most prudent way would be to offer a campus/community ensemble that meets once a week. The Director of Bands could cover this assignment if lecturer faculty could take other parts of his load. Otherwise a lecturer could cover this assignment only if s/he was given additional assigned time for student recruitment.

The choral area contained two ensembles, Chamber Singers and University Singers that both contained primarily music majors but were essentially the same size. A third group, University Chorus is primarily for non-music majors. If three ensembles are to be retained, it makes sense to have each group address a different demographic – majors, non-majors, community. If only two groups are retained for majors and non-majors, then
an annual opera workshop class and/or diction could be reinstated to address another area of vocal/choral need without additional staff.

Music technology is another important aspect of the curriculum. Current music curricula must contain literacy in technology including familiarity with notation programs, administration programs, websites, MIDI, and other issues. The proposed technology curriculum of ten courses somewhat addresses this issue with the five topics suggested at the 1000 level. The music faculty need to discuss this approach as opposed to imbedding technology throughout the curriculum – ie: notation programs in the theory sequence or administration programs in music education courses. Whatever is decided, the music technology courses that provide for technology literacy must be required for the major. A suggestion would be to have one or two quarters required for all majors. Otherwise, if the entire plan of five courses were implemented, additional faculty in technology or theory would be needed.

The proposed curriculum also develops courses in recording technology, a possible fifth concentration in the undergraduate curriculum. These courses should be at the upper division level with perhaps one prerequisite course at the 2000 level and have a capstone project required. Again, the program is encouraged to include music technology as a required concentration option in the degree program to ensure enrollment and rotation of courses.

This then begs the question of the degree type. With these suggested changes, including a required concentration, the degree will be closer in size and scope to a Bachelor of Music (BM) degree. Even with the current BA degree program, the number of units exceeds the scope of a traditional Bachelor of Arts degree. If the BM is approved, then the BA degree could be retooled for students that want to major in more than one area (ie: Music and Business), minor in another area, or wish to pursue a music degree with less performance requirements (ie: music recording technology).

It is also noted that if the program will apply for reaccredidation with NASM, world music, improvisation, and technology will be components that must be included in the curriculum. Since a world music course already exists, and music technology is being addressed, the improvisation element could be imbedded in current core and applied courses.

Students

The program has had consistent student enrollment over the past five years with a slight drop in the past two years despite the decrease of tenure-track lines. Enrollment data for Fall, 2005 was not available to see if this trend has continued. Undergraduate enrollment has gone from 146 in 1999 to 126 in 2004; graduate enrollment from 34 in 1999 to 29 in 2004.

During the campus visit about 25 students attended an afternoon session with the reviewer and presented both positive comments and concerns. Students stated they could
complete their degree program in four years. Students had consistent praise for the faculty, many stating that they had come to the campus to study with a specific faculty member.

Students voiced concerns about only one degree option. While additional courses are offered as electives, the reliability of these offerings is not always certain. Classes may be cancelled on short notice. A desire to have a guaranteed rotation of elective courses was expressed. The earlier recommendation for required concentrations would address this concern.

A concern of standards was another common concern. Students did not feel they were challenged in many of their courses; the theme of “the program can only take you so far,” was a common refrain. In the vocal/choral area concerns about standards were most prevalent. A desire for additional courses, such as diction, was expressed. Students who were not interested in music education expressed a desire to have a course in music business, to help them with aspects of setting up a studio or business (n.b.- a course exists in the catalog, but may not be offered on a regular basis).

The freshmen clusters were also a point of concern particularly with scheduling between required music courses and the clusters.

When asked how many students chose CSUEB as their first choice, most students raised their hands. When asked if they would choose this campus again, only half of the students raised their hands.

Staff

Currently the staff consists of an Academic Support Coordinator I, who manages the departmental office, an Instructional Support Assistant III, who manages the Music Resource Center, an Equipment Technician I, and a .5 Performing Arts Technician that is shared with the theatre program. The self-study notes that the program lost two staff members – a bookkeeper and an equipment technician. Some of the functions of these lost positions are being addressed by a centralized dean’s office staff.

Overall, the staff seems appropriate for the size and scope of the music program, however, expectations of each position need to be aligned with the amount of time dedicated to each position. Otherwise a plan needs to be developed to attend to the following issues: the .5 position that supports all music performances in the Mainstage Theatre, along with other theatre and university events, may need to be expanded. Budget and bookkeeping are being coordinated by an expansion of the dean’s office staff but this plan has not been clearly articulated to current staff and students. A plan for technical coverage of the new Media Center for Music Technology through existing or an expanded college staff needs to be discussed with the dean.
Administration

Perhaps the most contentious issue, from the music faculty's viewpoint, is administration of the music program. In 2004-05, the music department was administratively combined with the theatre department and Tom Hird, theatre department chair, became chair of the combined department. In 2004-05 Tim Smith continued to serve unofficially as music coordinator maintaining many of the scheduling and budget duties of a chair. He resigned in Summer, 2005 and Frank LaRocca reluctantly assumed the appointment of Associate Chair of the combined department.

It is clear that the music program has not explored the possibilities, both curricularly and programmatically, that might accrue from a combined department. Team taught or cross listed courses in music theatre, voice, and movement might be attractive to potential students. Combining opera workshop with music theatre workshop on a rotation cycle would be an innovative and distinctive element of this combined department. Since both programs share a common performance space - the mainstage theatre, looking at issues from both disciplinary viewpoints in a collegial environment could help utilization of fiscal and staff resources.

It is suggested that the music and theatre programs explore cooperative curricular and facilities issue as part of a plan for the performing arts. Whether or not the music program continues to exist in a combined department, these conversations would help to strengthen both programs.

If the music program, however, is going to apply for reaccredidation to NASM, then it will be incumbent on the administration to find a musician for the head of the music program as required by NASM guidelines. If an appropriate candidate is not available in the current faculty, a search from outside should be undertaken.

Faculty

The full-time tenure-track faculty has been reduced from eleven in 1997 to a low of four in 2004-05. A new hire in music technology/theory began in Fall 2005, and a search is currently underway for a hire in choral/music ed/voice to begin in Fall, 2006 bringing the FT TT faculty to six in 2006-07. Three faculty are currently on FERP status, the first of those will end their FERP status by Fall, 2006, and a second by Fall, 2007.

Currently 53.5% of courses in the program are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty compared to 58.9% in the college. In 2002-03, the last year data are available, 65.72% of courses across the university were taught by FT T/TT faculty. It is expected that the percentage of courses taught by T/TT music faculty will improve with the additional hire in the choral/vocal area.

CSUEB is fortunate to be located in close proximity to excellent performing artists for applied faculty and most of the studio instruction is taught by lecturers. However, the nature of a music program requires extensive student recruitment and program
coordination and additional tenure-track lines are needed. Lecturer faculty can cover applied studio instruction, but the academic core of theory and history courses, ensembles, and a core faculty member for the recommended concentrations in jazz studies, and technology must be covered by FT T/TT faculty.

With the ending of FERP status of two faculty by Fall, 2007, sufficient salary savings can be put to a seventh tenure-track hire to begin, Fall, 2007.

If the faculty and administration decide to retain the master's program, a position in music history is necessary to teach music research and bibliography, graduate seminars in music history, and undergraduate survey courses in music history and literature. If, however, the decision is made to phase out the masters program, then the survey courses could be taught by a faculty member as a secondary area and the hire can have a primary emphasis in one of the areas cited as critical to the department: orchestral conducting, strings, or voice.

The teaching areas of the next position would depend on the resolution of issues cited in this report. One route would be to externally hire a department chair with a teaching area in one of the critical areas. If the current administrative arrangement continues, then this position should be dedicated to the most critical area(s) not addressed by the previous search.

Overall, a core faculty of at least eight TT faculty members is required for the size and scope of the current undergraduate music program. Nine are required if the master's program is retained.

Facilities:

No time for evaluation of facilities was available during the campus visit.

Assessment

The assessment plan presented as part of the self-study is very comprehensive, but may not be practical, especially given the size of the current tenure-track faculty. Since so many assessment activities are already built into the music curriculum, especially in performance courses, it would be more prudent for the faculty to find two or three things that it would like to measure and plan to track assessment data only for those elements. The idea of a "barrier" exam for students entering upper division work in theory, piano and performance is a good place to begin. A summative assessment embedded in the final course in the music literature sequence that tests skills in analysis and literature may also be appropriate. Oral and written skills can be assessed with other course embedded activities.
Recommendations and Conclusions

Despite the concerns addressed in the self-study the music program is vital and enjoys a favorable reputation in the region and state. It is evident that the program needs to engage in comprehensive strategic planning that is based on reliable budget parameters. The critical issues of program scope and administration need to be addressed in order to make informed decisions on future tenure-track hires and overall resource allocation.

To summarize major recommendations included in subsections of this report:

1. Determine if the masters program is to be retained and, if so, the scope it will have.
2. Determine, in consultation with administration, the long term plan for administration of the music program.
3. Determine the curricular role of technology in both the undergraduate and graduate program. Additionally, will there be courses for non-majors, or a concentration in recording technology?
4. Determine if the program will apply for reaccredidation with the National Association of Schools of Music. If so, some curricular changes may be necessary.
5. Modify the theory/history sequence as proposed in the Plan. Consider adding a general education course in Basic Theory for non-majors, particularly Liberal Studies and Theatre, and majors who do not have the requisite skills to enter the major theory sequence.
6. Write proposals to have courses for non-majors, including ensemble courses, certified under the new standards for general education.
7. Consider adding an orchestral ensemble class as earlier as possible with preference given to a campus-community orchestra.
8. Determine, in consultation with the new TT hire in the choral/vocal area, the appropriate scope of choral ensembles, and the desire to incorporate opera workshop and diction classes into the curriculum.
9. Consider revising the current BA into two programs, a Bachelor of Music with required concentrations and revision of the current BA into a less performance-based program that can be combined with other majors and/or minors. If the current BA is retained, consider adding a required concentration to the major.
10. Determine, in consultation with administration, a faculty plan, based on answers to the issues above, for replacement of tenure-track faculty lines to a minimum of eight (nine if the graduate program is retained) including timelines for implementation.
California State University, East Bay

Music Department Response to External Review Report (J. Klein)

The Music Department thanks Dr. James Klein for his time, efforts and energies in visiting the CSUEB campus, and in compiling the External Review Report. This Music Department Response to Dr. Klein’s report will contain, 1) general comments on Dr. Klein’s report, with an additional summation of our current situation, 2) a point-by-point commentary on several issues raised in the External Review Report, 3) an overview of our response and, 4) a revision of the “Plan” previously submitted. Quotes from Dr. Klein’s report will be in *italics*.

1) General Comments on Dr. Klein’s Report and a summation of our current situation.

We are grateful for the unique perspective provided by an outside reviewer, and applaud Dr. Klein for many of his insights into our situation. We also acknowledge several of his suggestions as being extremely helpful. As with any outside review and accompanying report, there are also areas of comment that show a misunderstanding of the current situation, or suggestions for action that, in our opinion, are not accurate or feasible.

Because Dr. Klein’s Report refers both to his observations during his visit, and the original Music Department CAPR Report, we felt it was important to provide, here, a summary of our current situation, as a prelude to a more detailed response.

The CSU, East Bay University Mission Statement, under the heading "Vision" states that the University strives to be known for: Outstanding academic programs, recognized for their excellence. Curricula that foster active student participation through applied learning... and community service. High academic standards along with services and support that ensure each student the opportunity for success. An array of activities that promote students’ enjoyment and well-being. Engagement in and essential contributions to the civic, cultural, and economic well-being of its region and communities.

It is the position of the Music Department that these and other visions stated in the Mission Statement are becoming increasingly problematic for the Music Department to achieve, despite an indisputably successful record of such achievement over the last two decades.

The three primary areas of concern are, 1) the small number of full time faculty, 2) department leadership and, 3) technical staff and clerical staff.
A comparison of faculty and staff rosters for 1984-1985 and 2004-2005 illustrates and places into perspective the drastic shift from full to part time faculty, and a loss of staff positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1984-1985 levels</th>
<th>2004-2005 levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time faculty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech &amp; clerical Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music majors</td>
<td>~150</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The loss of 22 full time faculty positions over two decades has resulted in a very small number of full time faculty who can engage in the business of the department, including all departmental committee work, lecturer review, student recruitment, counseling of majors and minors, fund raising, scholarship auditions (five annually), faculty searches, community outreach, community service, thesis committees, applied juries, curriculum planning and development, and faculty recitals. With upcoming retirements in the near future only two or three full time faculty remaining will be tenured professors, eligible to serve on select departmental committees.

During this same time period, the growing success and reputation of the department has resulted in more opportunities for student and faculty achievement. A number of activities have been added or increased; a selected list of these include:

- University Bands Fall Tour (in addition to Band and Choral Spring Tours), the Musica Delle Donne series, Music Department/Yoshi’s fund raiser event, student composition recitals, composition scholarships, service scholarships, financial need awards, several assessment tools including quarterly applied juries for majors, student performer service facilitation, international Jazz Ensemble tours, departmental performing ensemble appearances at IAJE International Conferences, CMEA Bay Section conferences, CMEA State Conferences, and CBDA State Conferences, establishment of the Annual Faculty-Alumni Wind Orchestra event, Alumni Jazz Band, Invitational Band Festival, Jazz Festival, Instrumental Music Festival, All State Solo Recital Workshop, Choir Festival, the Choral program’s Renaissance Madrigal Feast, an Annual CSUEB (H) Composers Concert Glenn Glasow Memorial Recital), site hosting of CMEA Band, Choir and Solo/Ensemble Festivals, guest conductorships for All State and other honor groups, festival adjudication, annual hosting of Trombone Day (coordinated and co-sponsored by Bay area music retail businesses), and hosting of special events such a Composers INC. concert, and presentation of many, many guest artists in recitals and masterclasses.

It should be noted that each of the remaining full time faculty has continued to maintain currency in their field, including composition of commissions, guest conducting, concert performing, guest soloing, adjudicating and recording.

Part time personnel are compensated for classroom teaching time only. Only with rare exception do they participate in the activities listed above.
Department leadership is the second major area of concern. Numerous efforts have been made to educate new departmental and school leadership who have little understanding of the intricacies of the music major, but with little success. Budget decisions are based on criteria applied to all departments across the board, not taking sufficient account of the distinctive curricular structure of any University music department. Recent steep cuts in lecturer budgets, and the resulting curriculum cuts have left current students, potential students and their teachers in a state of uncertainty regarding the University's commitment to the music major. As word of this has spread throughout the Bay Area music and education community, efforts at recruitment have been hampered.

The lack of music training on the part of the department chair, and the school dean and associate dean leaves a deficit of "university-level-music-program-knowledge." At the time of the "administrative merge," a Music Department "Coordinator" was appointed from the music faculty to assist the department chair. In the past five years Music Department leadership has quickly devolved from a nearly full-time department chair (27 WTUs for many years, prior to 2001), to a reduced administrative load for the Department Chair (18 WTU's or less from 2001-2004), to a department Coordinator (2004-2005, with 8 WTUs of release time to perform over 90% of the Chair's responsibilities, because they require music expertise), to the current "Associate Chair" for Music (12 WTUs, again to do a very large percentage of the duties traditionally expected of a full Music Department Chair).

With decreased release time and nearly undiminished administrative demands requiring music expertise, such as determining faculty loads, scheduling, personnel, counseling, budget, requirements, curriculum, performance and public relations the effect has been to create a severe leadership crisis for the department. This situation has also compromised our standing in the larger university and academic music community. NASM accreditation requires that a music expert serve as Chair, and the Music Department still retains accredited status from NASM. Whether or not the department seeks to renew that status, the NASM guidelines exist for a reason. No music department can operate up to the generally acknowledged standards in the field without a Chair possessing music expertise. CSUEB is currently the only Music Department in the entire CSU, regardless of size, without a musician as its Chair.

Thirdly, loss of full time staff has resulted in a general decline in the quality of support services including unreliable archival recording, a growing backlog of uncatalogued music acquisitions, ineffective clerical support work by student fill-ins and a significantly increased work-load and responsibilities for our remaining current full and part-time time staff. The recent forced office relocation and resultant loss of a number of Music Department facilities has resulted in the declining morale...not just of staff, but of faculty and students as well. The move to two different temporary locations resulted in the loss of important work product during the moves, decreased ability of office staff to work effectively, a lack of a professional appearance of our office space. There is still no location identified as a permanent Music Office.
2) A point-by-point commentary on several issues raised in the External Review Report

Overview:
The main issues are number of tenure-track faculty and administration of the music program;
We absolutely agree, adding Music Department staffing to this list.

... however, the dean has been forthcoming with lecturer dollars...
While it is true that the Dean did find additional dollars for some courses during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 academic years, this comment must be seen in the context of the initial 39% cut to the lecturer budget from 2003-2004 to 2004-2005.

Additionally in 2005-06 over $300,000 has been allocated for the development of a state-of-the-art Media Center for Music Technology...
This $300,000 figure is incorrect. It should read “over $120,000.”

Dr. Klein identified four areas of “critical need”...

- First, and most critical, is the fate of the current master’s program. The program was slated to be phased out in 2004-05 academic year, but was reinstated in Fall, 2005. Staffing of the music program would be somewhat different with both baccalaureate and masters programs than with just a baccalaureate program.

The Music Department does not see the fate of the master’s program as the most critical issue facing the department. As stated at the bottom of page 1 of this response, “The three primary areas of concern are, 1) the small number of full time faculty, 2) departmental leadership and, 3) technical staff and clerical staff.”

Converting the statistics (shown in the “Number of Undergraduate and Graduate Majors” chart on page 13 of the music Department Self-Study,) into “percentages of total music majors that are graduate students” shows the following:

Graduate Music Majors, as a percentage of total number of music majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>11.3 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even with the drop between the high of 28.8% in Fall 2002 and 18.8% in Fall 2004, the master’s program in music has maintained a healthy size, especially when seen in relation to undergraduate majors and percentage of total majors. The Music Department feels that it offers a unique and viable program for its specific service area (the greater east bay) and its various constituencies (working professionals) with the curriculum offered exclusively in late-afternoon and evening courses.

While a comparison (from the charts of statistics on page 13 of the Self Study) of numbers of Master’s students, and numbers of degrees awarded in the distant past may appear somewhat unusual, in the most recent 3-4 years, this number has been between 25-30% graduation rate. This figure should not be seen as unusual, especially for a program that is “non-residential”, where working professionals are attending classes in late-afternoons and evenings, and may, as a result of their professional obligations, take up to 3-4 years or more to complete the masters program.

Further, offering a masters degree has been shown as an important factor in the Music Department’s ability to attract and retain faculty.

It is the Music Department’s strong recommendation that the Master’s program be maintained.

- Secondly, the program needs to decide if it will write to the new standards for teacher credentialing for the Subject Matter Preparation Program in Music. With the CSET substituting for the traditional “Waiver” programs of the past, it may not be necessary to write a document to meet California Commission on Teacher Credentialing standards, but rather to suggest a curriculum for students that intend to enter the teaching profession that will aid them in passing the CSET exam in music. It is suggested that the music program check with other CSU campuses to determine an appropriate strategy.

The insights shown in Dr. Klein’s offering of this recommendation are greatly appreciated. The Music Department completely agrees that, given the small number of remaining faculty resources (and in particular resources with the expertise and time to create the necessary paperwork for accreditation for the new CTC Standards) it would be best to continue to offer the current music education curriculum, not as an accredited waiver program, but as a subject matter preparation program for future credential candidates. It is vital to state that the current curriculum must stay in place, as it is designed, 1) first and foremost, to prepare students for subject matter competency and to not only be successful, but exemplary music educators and, 2) to give them the knowledge and skills necessary to pass the CSET exam so that they can be admitted into the Single Subject Teacher Credential Program in Music. These courses also provide a valuable assessment tool for the department.
• Thirdly, what is the role of music technology in both the undergraduate and graduate programs? Will this become a fifth area of concentration in the BA degree? Will aspects of technology be imbedded in the core courses as well as the areas of concentration? How will technology literacy/courses be used in graduate programs?

The Music Department is not at all satisfied with its past offerings in the area of Technology. As early as 1992 we requested a TT hire in the area of Music Technology—we did so again in 1996, 1998, 2000 and 2002. This is an area of very specialized expertise that also requires much in the way of organization, supervision, attention to security, equipment funding, and curricular development. Up to Fall 2004, with neither equipment, dedicated space or qualified faculty the Music Department fell behind sister institutions in the Bay Area.

We are extremely pleased, therefore, to have been authorized to search for a TT hire in Technology in 2004-05, resulting in the hiring of Asst. Prof. Rafael Hernandez. Furthermore, Dean Reimonenq backed this up with a dramatic commitment of funds for equipment and software and the assigning of a dedicated lab space.

As this is being written, the last of the equipment has arrived and the Department is poised to set up and inaugurate a Media Center for Music Technology that places Music on a par with its sister institutions. Three new course proposals have been submitted to augment Music 3082, our current rotating-topic computer music course. We are cooperating with Art for an evening Digital Audio course in the Fall and there will be offerings in Summer 2005, as well.

Technology is included in our undergraduate curriculum in a supplementary capacity. Principally, our software notation class supports students in Theory and History courses, Applied Composition and Music Education courses.

The Technology lab and curriculum is in its infancy, but some of the ideas being considered include requiring proficiency for all Music Majors, Music Education courses and, longer term, a "Music Industry" option within the major. Since our degree is an 84-unit BA, unless resources and planning for a move to a BM in the range of 125 units were forthcoming, a significant restructuring of course credit within the major would have to take place before Options of any kind could be incorporated into the major.

The Graduate program, particularly within the Composition emphasis, receives supplementary support from current course offerings. Regular offerings for graduate-level technology courses must await increased instructional support in the form of either another TT composer or a Lecturer position.
• Finally, the program is currently accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and is scheduled for an accreditation review as early as Spring, 2007. Although comments about accreditation are not a part of this review, suggestions about accreditation issues will be included throughout this document should the program decide to proceed with reaccreditation efforts.

There is neither the manpower or resources within the Music Department to support the application of, or application process for renewing our NASM Accreditation at this time. The CSU East Bay Music Department is saddened by not being able to continue as an NASM Accredited institution. In addition, given the facts presented in the Self-Study (related to course offerings and, in particular the number of full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty for the size of our department and the current administrative situation), it is unlikely that we could meet NASM standards at this time.

Dr. Klein mentions that, “suggestions about the accreditation process will be included throughout this document.” It is critically important that we address the most vital of these issues…the current administration of the Music Department by a non-musician. On page 6 of his External Review Report, under the larger section addressing the area of Administration, Dr. Klein states...

If the music program, however, is going to apply for reaccreditation to NASM, then it will be incumbent on the administration to find a musician for the head of the music program as required by NASM guidelines. If an appropriate candidate is not available in the current faculty, a search from outside should be undertaken.

It is the Music Department’s strong belief that regardless of our application for NASM reaccreditation, the return to an administrator who is a music expert is a critical need, for the many important reasons.

Music is a highly specialized academic area, both in terms of the general area of music, and, especially, in terms of the many, many sub-specialties within music. Each of these areas requires a faculty member with a specific expertise, as well as an administrator with, at the minimum, a general knowledge of each area.

In addition to the various music-academic and music-performance related areas, there are several other areas of expertise required of a music administrator that are unique to our discipline. Each of the following areas also require discipline specific knowledge:

A. Interacting, as a liaison and spokesperson for the department with a larger community of public and private schools and educators, music professionals and professional music organizations

B. Coordinating those involved in publicity and marketing for on and off campus performances and events

C. Recruitment, including tours with major performing ensembles
D. Working with on-campus personnel for music support of university events

E. Budget and Finances (including overseeing a large number of accounts in the areas of state supported budgets, IRA accounts and Trust Fund accounts)

F. Administering a very large adjunct lecturer-faculty, each with a very specific expertise

G. Dealing with a very complex set of faculty loads, related to a curriculum of classes in music where most music courses are not your typical 4 unit academic class. In addition, all of our undergraduate students and many of our graduate students are involved in one-on-one supervisory instruction.

And, finally, there is the issue of credibility. Given that no other respected Department of Music at a University in California (or the nation), and none of our sister CSU’s have a non-musician as administrator is quite damaging to the credibility of our department, college and university.

The topic of Music Department Administration will be addressed in greater detail under the heading of “Administration” later in this document.

---

*It is also noted that while the music faculty are extremely active in external recruiting and performances, they, as a unit, have not participated in campus governance and politics in an equally commensurate way. The particularly deep cuts in both tenure-track positions and other resources may be directly attributable to the absence of a music presence in internal campus discussions, both formal and informal.*

With an ever-shrinking full-time faculty over the past several years, the music department has been forced to invest its few remaining human resources in those things that would sustain the department...supporting the curriculum for the major, maintaining the high standards of excellence in performance, and recruiting.

It would be extremely disappointing to learn that significant losses in tenure-track positions and cuts in resources in the recent and distant past were the result of a lack of on-campus interaction with faculty and administration on the part of the Music Department. Support for the curriculum of a department should be based on the formal process already in place, not on a perception of political activity.
Following is an analysis of major areas of the music program.

**Curriculum**

*Undergraduate:*

The program seems to offer four areas of concentration—music education, performance (voice, instrument, keyboard), jazz studies, and composition. The largest program is music education which enrolls 55-60% of undergraduate majors. It is recommended that the program require an area of concentration (12-15 units) to their major requirements, not only to better guide students to current elective courses, but also to ensure that these courses are well-enrolled and offered on a two-year cycle.

While there are certainly informal areas of concentration within the BA in Music, to formalize these areas (we would advocate five areas; performance, music education, composition, jazz and music industry), as official options inside of the degree would require a significant curricular revision, or (as per Klein’s comments on Page 4, paragraph 3, and page 8 paragraph #9), might require proposing that we offer a Bachelor of Music degree (BM), with these options. This would be a huge step for the Music Department, and require significant support, staffing, administrative, and monetary resources currently not available.

This reviewer agrees with the curricular modifications suggested in the Plan for revision of the theory/history sequence to offer two years of aural skills, six quarters of music theory, including 20th century techniques (deletion of one quarter), and expansion of the history sequence by one quarter. This is consistent with the academic core of music programs throughout the state and nation. The additional of a tutorial unit or element to the first year theory sequence is also a way to keep students who have remedial needs in this area enrolled in the college level courses. Another approach would be to institute a music fundamentals or basic theory course as a general education option that would serve majors not ready for theory study, Liberal Studies students and music theatre students.

Yes. We agree, and hope to implement these curricular revisions as soon as possible.

It is imperative to get all appropriate music courses, including ensemble classes, certified under new standards for general education courses. The program should ask for an exception to allow for more than one course required for the major to count for general education. Possible courses include ensembles, technology, and world music if added to the major as required for NASM reaccredidation.

A major priority for the Music Department is to submit paperwork for GE credit for most all of our Lower and Upper Division courses. This process has already begun.
Graduate:

The masters program (45 units) consists of a core of research, theory/composition, history/literature, and music education courses with a nine unit minimum concentration in one of four areas (1) Performance, (2) Composition-Theory, (3) Music Education, and (4) Music History and Literature. With duplicated enrollment of 18 students in Fall, 2004 and 16 students in Fall, 2005, the scope of the current program is too broad. With seven graduate history/literature and three theory courses currently in the catalog, the program is not appropriately scaled for current enrollment.

If the masters program is retained, the faculty should look at the one or two program concentrations that are most enrolled and scale the offerings accordingly. A survey of other masters programs in the region may reveal an area of emphasis that is unique to CSUEB and can be marketed appropriately.

A number of the courses in the catalogue are no longer offered. There is a core bibliography course, five courses in the Music history area, and one course in Theory-Analysis (which can be repeated once, with changing topics). These “academic” courses, along with applied lessons for performance majors, and four courses in the Music Education area constitute what we consider to be a bare minimum of offerings – not a “broad spectrum.” Given that (with the exception of the bibliography course) the remaining courses are offered on a rotating basis (every two years), with no more than two “lecture courses” offered during any one quarter, we believe that the scale of offerings is appropriate for the size of our student population.

Scope:

An important curricular necessity is an orchestral ensemble. The orchestra has traditionally been and continues to be the heart of a music curriculum. The absence of an orchestra ensemble (cut in 2004) is a major omission in the music curriculum of CSUEB and negatively affects student recruitment. Although the Director of Bands has scheduled orchestral reading sessions for wind and percussion performers as part of the band ensemble repertoire, it does not take the place of orchestral rehearsal and performance. It is suggested that the program add an orchestral ensemble to its regular offerings. Perhaps the most prudent way would be to offer a campus/community ensemble that meets once a week. The Director of Bands could cover this assignment if lecturer faculty could take other parts of his load. Otherwise a lecturer could cover this assignment only if s/he was given additional assigned time for student recruitment.

Yes. The lack of an orchestra is a concern and we all agree that an orchestra is a vital and necessary part of a well-rounded music curriculum. However, it should be clearly stated that there are several other areas of concern that must take priority over re-establishment of the orchestra program. In addition, the department does not want to rush into or through this process, but carefully study the feasibility of various models, including those presented by Dr. Klein.
The choral area contained two ensembles, Chamber Singers and University Singers that both contained primarily music majors but were essentially the same size. A third group, University Chorus is primarily for non-music majors. If three ensembles are to be retained, it makes sense to have each group address a different demographic – majors, non-majors, community. If only two groups are retained for majors and non-majors, then an annual opera workshop class and/or diction could be reinstated to address another area of vocal/choral need without additional staff.

Dr. Klein’s comments about the Choral program reflect a misunderstanding of the difference between the categories of “Major Performing Ensemble” (University Singers, in the Choral-Vocal area), and “Chamber Ensembles” (Chamber Singers in the Choral-Vocal area). All Chamber Ensembles in the Music Department are populated by students who are also enrolled in Major Performing Ensembles because participation in both categories of ensembles is required in the degree program.

With the addition of a new Tenure-Track Faculty member as Director of Choral Activities in Fall 2006, the ensemble and course offerings in the Choral-Vocal area will be evaluated. Opera Workshop has been revised to be offered as a Chamber Ensemble, and will be offered again, starting in Fall 2006.

Music technology is another important aspect of the curriculum. Current music curricula must contain literacy in technology including familiarity with notation programs, administration programs, websites, MIDI, and other issues. The proposed technology curriculum of ten courses somewhat addresses this issue with the five topics suggested at the 1000 level. The music faculty need to discuss this approach as opposed to imbedding technology throughout the curriculum – ie: notation programs in the theory sequence or administration programs in music education courses. Whatever is decided, the music technology courses that provide for technology literacy must be required for the major. A suggestion would be to have one or two quarters required for all majors. Otherwise, if the entire plan of five courses were implemented, additional faculty in technology or theory would be needed.

The proposed curriculum also develops courses in recording technology, a possible fifth concentration in the undergraduate curriculum. These courses should be at the upper division level with perhaps one prerequisite course at the 2000 level and have a capstone project required. Again, the program is encouraged to include music technology as a required concentration option in the degree program to ensure enrollment and rotation of courses.

The comments earlier in this response regarding Technology address these issues.
This then begs the question of the degree type. With these suggested changes, including a required concentration, the degree will be closer in size and scope to a Bachelor of Music (BM) degree. Even with the current BA degree program, the number of units exceeds the scope of a traditional Bachelor of Arts degree. If the BM is approved, then the BA degree could be retooled for students that want to major in more than one area (ie: Music and Business), minor in another area, or wish to pursue a music degree with less performance requirements (ie: music recording technology).

It is also noted that if the program will apply for reaccredidation with NASM, world music, improvisation, and technology will be components that must be included in the curriculum. Since a world music course already exists, and music technology is being addressed, the improvisation element could be imbedded in current core and applied courses.

Discussion of degree type and “options” or “concentrations” also occurs earlier in this document. The Music Department understands that the scope of its Bachelor of Arts in Music exceeds the traditional BA on campuses where the Bachelor of Music degree is also offered. Since we do not offer a BM, and the likelihood of implementing this degree is very small, the current curriculum we offer is the most reasonable compromise, in offering our students the education they need to succeed as performing and teaching musicians.

The Music Department will explore various ways that it might implement options or concentrations (Performance, Music Education, Composition, Jazz and Music Industry) within the context of the Bachelor of Arts degree.

Students

Students voiced concerns about only one degree option. While additional courses are offered as electives, the reliability of these offerings is not always certain. Classes may be cancelled on short notice. A desire to have a guaranteed rotation of elective courses was expressed. The earlier recommendation for required concentrations would address this concern.

The concerns about options were addressed previously in this response.

A concern of standards was another common concern. Students did not feel they were challenged in many of their courses; the theme of “the program can only take you so far,” was a common refrain. In the vocal/choral area concerns about standards were most prevalent. A desire for additional courses, such as diction, was expressed. Students who were not interested in music education expressed a desire to have a course in music business, to help them with aspects of setting up a studio or business (n.b.: a course exists in the catalog, but may not be offered on a regular basis).
All new students (including transfers) are evaluated for applied study level and preparation in music theory. But there are currently no auditions and examinations in place to evaluate students' performance and music-academic standards as part of the admissions process. We hope to implement these for students entering in Fall 2007. We have, for many years, worked with students who display an extremely wide range of abilities and aptitudes. With larger numbers of students participating in the instrumental area (wind bands and jazz bands), we are able to offer multiple levels of ensembles in these areas. With the small number of students with an emphasis in the vocal area, this is not possible. It should be mentioned that the only non-auditioned choral ensembles (University Chorus and University Oratorio Society) were cut as a part of the reductions for the 2004-2005 academic year. The University Chorus was added back into the curriculum for the 2005-2006 year.

Until numbers of vocal students grow, then there will be, as a matter of course, a more disparate range of abilities inside of the University Singers ensemble. In addition, without the requisite number of students in the vocal-choral area, it is not possible to meet the university's enrollment requirements in offering specialized courses in vocal pedagogy and vocal diction.

It bears repeating that a declining number of students in the areas of voice (and string-orchestra) is a direct result of the absence of tenure track faculty positions in these areas for the past several years.

*The freshmen clusters were also a point of concern particularly with scheduling between required music courses and the clusters.*

Because music is a course-intensive major with a minimum of 9 units of core music courses required each quarter of the freshman year, then freshman music students have extremely large loads, when combining their music courses with the required minimum of 9-10 units of GE cluster courses. Those freshmen that are required to do remedial work in English and/or Math are under even larger burdens.

Efforts have been made (unsuccessfully) to create clusters for Music Majors that include Theory I, II, III, as their discipline courses in the cluster. The Music Department hopes to continue to work with Sally Murphy to find a model that will satisfy both the department requirements and the university requirements.

*When asked how many students chose CSUEB as their first choice, most students raised their hands. When asked if they would choose this campus again, only half of the students raised their hands.*
We believe that this phenomenon is a direct result of the budget cuts, and the negative effect they, along with other administrative decisions, have had on our department. These are the same students that have lived through enormous changes in our department and have been directly effected by the cuts, through larger class sizes (due to elimination of sections and every-other-year course offerings), loss of ensembles (1 section of Symphonic Band, University Oratorio Society, University Chorus, University Orchestra, sections of chamber ensembles, etc.) and loss of courses (Vocal Diction, Vocal Pedagogy, Jazz Piano, Jazz Theory-Improvisation, etc.).

One can also view this as an example of the difficulty we are currently having in recruiting new students. As word of the budget cuts and administrative changes to our department has spread among high school and junior college music educators and their students, a large number of our potential new students no longer see CSUEB as a viable place for their continued study of music.

**Staff**

Currently the staff consists of an Academic Support Coordinator I, who manages the departmental office, an Instructional Support Assistant III, who manages the Music Resource Center, an Equipment Technician I, and a .5 Performing Arts Technician that is shared with the theatre program. The self-study notes that the program lost two staff members — a bookkeeper and an equipment technician. Some of the functions of these lost positions are being addressed by a centralized dean’s office staff.

Overall, the staff seems appropriate for the size and scope of the music program; however, expectations of each position need to be aligned with the amount of time dedicated to each position. Otherwise a plan needs to be developed to attend to the following issues: the .5 position that supports all music performances in the Mainstage Theatre, along with other theatre and university events, may need to be expanded. Budget and bookkeeping are being coordinated by an expansion of the dean’s office staff but this plan has not been clearly articulated to current staff and students. A plan for technical coverage of the new Media Center for Music Technology through existing or an expanded college staff needs to be discussed with the dean.

We disagree completely with Dr. Klein’s assessment that staffing in the Music Department is adequate.

While there has not been a clearly articulated plan from the CLASS office, for what the Dean’s “centralized office staff” will look like, we have learned that the financial staff will not be reconciling the books of the various CLASS departments. This is one of, if not the most specialized tasks that a bookkeeper does, requiring not only expertise, but
significant time and energy. This is clearly not a solution to the Music Department Office staffing problems and concerns.

It must also be noted that the previous full-time Music Department Administrative Support Assistant-Bookkeeper (who was, arguably, the finest ASA-Bookkeeper in CLASS if not the University, and an expert in music) did much more than just bookkeeping in the department office. No amount of “alignment” will solve the current situation, where one person (the current Music Department ASC) is doing the work of (at least) two full time staff. The current ASC assumed all of the ASA-Bookkeeper duties from October-February, 2004-2005. From February – January, 2005-2006 the current ASC had to “clean-up” after an incompetent half-time student assistant who, without the necessary training to do a job requiring professional expertise, was completely inadequate (but the only person available) for the position. Since January 2006, the ASC has assumed, once again, all of the responsibilities of two full-time staff. This simply can not continue.

“...the .5 position that supports all music performances in the Mainstage Theatre, along with other theatre and university events, may need to be expanded...”

This position will absolutely require expansion if the needs of the Music Department (and Theatre-Dance Department) are going to be met adequately. The current .5 staff member (who was recruited from among the undergraduate student body), is splitting a total of 20 hours a week between both the Music and Theatre-Dance Departments, and attempting to do the work of two previous full-time staff – one in each department and each with a specific set of professional skills and areas of expertise. Many of the previous responsibilities of the Music Department staff person in the Computer-Recording-Technology related areas are being assumed by Music Department Faculty and Staff (in particular the new tenure-track faculty member in the area of Music Technology). While we are grateful to have a faculty member who is an expert in this area, it is, clearly, not a part of this faculty position, who has also assumed complete responsibility for the new Media Center for Music Technology.

Administration

Perhaps the most contentious issue, from the music faculty’s viewpoint, is administration of the music program. In 2004-05, the music department was administratively combined with the theatre department and Tom Hird, theatre department chair, became chair of the combined department. In 2004-05 Tim Smith continued to serve unofficially as music coordinator maintaining many of the scheduling and budget duties of a chair. He resigned in Summer, 2005 and Frank LaRocca reluctantly assumed the appointment of Associate Chair of the combined department.
It is clear that the music program has not explored the possibilities, both curricularly and programmatically, that might accrue from a combined department. Team-taught or cross-listed courses in music theatre, voice, and movement might be attractive to potential students. Combining opera workshop with music theatre workshop on a rotation cycle would be an innovative and distinctive element of this combined department. Since both programs share a common performance space - the mainstage theatre, looking at issues from both disciplinary viewpoints in a collegial environment could help utilization of fiscal and staff resources.

It is suggested that the music and theatre programs explore cooperative curricular and facilities issue as part of a plan for the performing arts. Whether or not the music program continues to exist in a combined department, these conversations would help to strengthen both programs.

We agree that there are advantages to exploring cooperation in certain areas of curriculum with Theatre-Dance. However, outside of these few classes (most mentioned by Dr. Klein in his report), there are few other areas of curriculum overlap from Music to Theatre-Dance. In addition, completely different areas of expertise are required to administer and teach in each of the areas of Music and Theatre-Dance.

Furthermore, there is not a single member of the Music Department Faculty or Staff that sees either the current administrative merge between Music and Theatre-Dance, or a possible departmental-curricular merge as beneficial to the health and future of the Music Department, its curriculum or its students.

The relatively new Music Theater Major (offered through the Theatre-Dance Department) was created with little to no consultation with the Music Department faculty or administration. Certainly we would like to see many of these students involved in taking classes in our department, as it would add a far greater strength and foundation to their training.

Had we been more involved in the creation of the Music Theatre Major, we would have suggested that the major would contain a Music Minor within the scope of its curriculum requirements. A model curriculum for the Music Theater major would look, then, like this:

Freshman:  Music Theory I-II-III (including the tutorial class, if necessary)
           Sight Singing I-II-III
           University Chorus or University Singers
           3 quarters of a Basic Voice Class Sequence (taught by music faculty)
Sophomore:  Basic Piano I-II-III
   University Chorus or University Singers
   3 quarters of Applied Voice Lessons
   1 music survey course (1000 or 2000 level)

Junior:  Music 3002 (upper-division music appreciation class)
   Continue to participate in performing ensembles, or take a
   course in Computer Music, to satisfy the 8-unit upper-
   division requirement., and/or
   1 course (new) in the area of “History of Music for the Stage”

There have always been music majors involved in theatrical productions – both musicals
and stage plays. We certainly encourage our students (especially those with vocal
emphasis) to be involved. We would also welcome the opportunity to explore more
specific ways that Music Majors and Minors could formally participate in the Theatre-
Dance Department.

It should be noted that implementation of the above does not require any official merging
(administrative or curricular) of the Music Department with the Theatre-Dance
Department.

If the music program, however, is going to apply for reaccredidation to NASM, then it
will be incumbent on the administration to find a musician for the head of the music
program as required by NASM guidelines. If an appropriate candidate is not available
in the current faculty, a search from outside should be undertaken.

Certainly the size, scope and complexity of any university-level music department
(accredited or not) requires specialized faculty and administrative expertise only found in
well trained professional musician-educators.

The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) guidelines exist to identify those
characteristics that are expected of a fine music program…one that offers a curriculum
(as well as an expert administrator, to lead a specialized faculty to teach that curriculum
and a staff to support the faculty and students) that exists for the sole purpose of giving
future professionals in the area of music performance and music education and exemplary
training. Regardless of NASM accreditation, we believe that CSUEB administration
should be interested in supporting a respected curriculum and program in music.
including a music administrator to lead the program, and the 5-year plan identifies this as a "critical need."

Faculty

The full-time tenure-track faculty has been reduced from eleven in 1997 to a low of four in 2004-05. A new hire in music technology/theory began in Fall 2005, and a search is currently underway for a hire in choral/music ed/voice to begin in Fall, 2006 bringing the FT TT faculty to six in 2006-07. Three faculty are currently on FERP status, the first of those will end their FERP status by Fall, 2006, and a second by Fall, 2007.

NOTE: In the time since receiving Dr. Klein’s report, the tenured faculty member who is Professor of Music and Instrumental Music Education/Director of Bands, (also responsible for teaching in the areas of chamber winds, conducting, and single subject teacher credential training and student-intern teacher observation, applied horn and brass pedagogy) has announced that he will be leaving CSUEB after the 2005-2006 academic year.

Currently 53.5% of courses in the program are taught by tenured/tenure track faculty compared to 58.9% in the college. In 2002-03, the last year data are available, 65.72% of courses across the university were taught by FT T/TT faculty. It is expected that the percentage of courses taught by T/TT music faculty will improve with the additional hire in the choral/vocal area.

The loss of the senior faculty member identified above will put these statistics below the 2004-2006 levels.

CSUEB is fortunate to be located in close proximity to excellent performing artists for applied faculty and most of the studio instruction is taught by lecturers. However, the nature of a music program requires extensive student recruitment and program coordination and additional tenure-track lines are needed. Lecturer faculty can cover applied studio instruction, but the academic core of theory and history courses, ensembles, and a core faculty member for the recommended concentrations in jazz studies, and technology must be covered by FT T/TT faculty.

We absolutely agree with Dr. Klein’s assessment. However, we would add that the large number of applied studio instructors who are lecturers makes it very difficult to effectively recruit, because as lecturers, they are not compensated for any additional work outside of instruction. We have already noted that it is difficult (if not impossible) to maintain the health of a major performing ensemble under the leadership (even expert leadership) of lecturers. The hiring of a tenure-track faculty for Director of Choral Activities/Choral-Vocal Music Education for Fall 2006 is a step in the right direction. With the loss of the Director of Bands/Instrumental Music Education faculty member,
this position becomes both a “critical need” and the Music Department’s #1 priority for a search during 2006-2007 and an appointment in Fall 2007.

With the ending of FERP status of two faculty by Fall, 2007

and the loss of the Full Professorship....

...sufficient salary savings can be put to a seventh...

and eighth (and perhaps 9th)...

tenure-track hire to begin in Fall 2007.

If the faculty and administration decide to retain the master’s program, a position in music history is necessary to teach music research and bibliography, graduate seminars in music history, and undergraduate survey courses in music history and literature...

Since the faculty has recommended strongly that the master’s program be continued, then the position of musicologist-graduate coordinator (currently held by a faculty member whose FERP is ending in Spring 2007) is a “critical need” and a high priority.

...If, however, the decision is made to phase out the masters program, then the survey courses could be taught by a faculty member as a secondary area and the hire can have a primary emphasis in one of the areas cited as critical to the department: orchestral conducting, strings, or voice.

The teaching areas of the next position would depend on the resolution of issues cited in this report. One route would be to externally hire a department chair with a teaching area in one of the critical areas. If the current administrative arrangement continues, then this position should be dedicated to the most critical area(s) not addressed by the previous search.

We strongly believe that an additional critical need (second in priority, behind replacement of the Director of Bands-Instrumental Music Education position) is in the area of Music Department Administrator. We recommend that the position of Chair of the Department of Music be reinstated, with its previous release time of 27 WTU’s, and that a search for this position lead to the hiring of a candidate with a secondary area of expertise in one of the specialty areas identified above as areas of need (particularly orchestral conducting and/or strings).
Overall, a core faculty of at least eight TT faculty members is required for the size and scope of the current undergraduate music program. Nine are required if the master’s program is retained.

Given our needs, and in recognition of the fact that there are sister CSU’s with far fewer majors than CSUEB that have up to 10 full-time faculty, we believe that 10 positions (this number would include a Music Administrator) is the absolute minimum necessary to support a well-respected program.

Facilities:

No time for evaluation of facilities was available during the campus visit.

Had Dr. Klein visited the campus in 1996 as a part of the NASM external review committee, and then again in January 2006 as a part of the external review for this CAPR process, he would have been shocked at the loss of Music Department facilities and space.

Over the past 10 years, we have lost several rooms (the electronic music lab, two large classrooms, and several practice rooms) to various College of Business departments and the Communicative Sciences and Disorders Department. Summer of 2005, in the course of the university-level “trickle-down” office moves, (starting with the Provost re-organizing university administration spaces, requiring the CLASS Dean to vacate the Warren Hall spaces, and ending with CLASS Dean’s subsequent taking of Music Department spaces), we lost,

1) our Music Department Office,
2) our Chair-Coordinator’s office,
3) our Conference Room-Classroom,
4) our Mail Room-Lunch Room,
5) the Music Computer Lab,
6) a suite of 3 offices and an ante-room that housed music department lecturers and a full-time CSD faculty member, and
7) the office of a faculty member with over 30 years tenure in the department.

In exchange, we were given,

1) a temporary Music Department Office that is inadequate for our needs
2) a large room to use as a combination of classroom space and our new Media Music Center for Technology,
3) no new office space for displaced faculty, and
4) no new spaces to use for an Associate Chair-Coordinator’s Office, or Conference Room-Mail Room

The CLASS Dean’s initial plan to have two adjoining rooms be used for a Music Department Office space, and a combination Chair-Coordinator’s office, mini-Conference Room and Mail Room has, unfortunately, not come to pass. We are still in a temporary space (and will be through the rest of the 2005-2006 academic year), and the second room will be lost to house new CLASS financial staff. It is likely that the “temporary” location of the Music Department Office will not become the permanent location, and we will be moved again when the College of Business vacates the building and moves into their new facilities.

This situation has caused a general demoralization among all of our constituents (and certainly sends a clear and negative message to our potential students and faculty members), and has had a profoundly negative effect on the department...as much as any other significant “loss” (faculty, staff, budget, curriculum, administrative leadership) we have suffered in recent years.

In order to become a fully functioning department and serve the needs of our constituents, we must be re-housed in a new Music Departmental Office, and departmental spaces that include a separate Chair-Coordinator’s Office, and a separate Conference Room by fall of 2006.

Assessment

The assessment plan, presented as part of the self-study is very comprehensive, but may not be practical, especially given the size of the current tenure-track faculty. Since so many assessment activities are already built into the music curriculum, especially in performance courses, it would be more prudent for the faculty to find two or three things that it would like to measure and plan to track assessment data only for those elements. The idea of a “barrier” exam for students entering upper division work in theory, piano and performance is a good place to begin. A summative assessment embedded in the final course in the music literature sequence that tests skills in analysis and literature may also be appropriate. Oral and written skills can be assessed with other course embedded activities.

With the loss of full-time faculty, and the overburdened music department administration, we have not kept pace with Assessment in the way we wanted or hoped to. Dr. Klein’s comment that, “The assessment plan...may not be practical, especially given the size of the current tenure-track faculty...” is clearly an understatement. We will prioritize our assessment plan, starting with required audition-exam process as a part of the application process for entering students, and continuing with a competency exam (performance and academic) required of all lower-division students for continuation into upper-division study.
Recommendations and Conclusions

Despite the concerns addressed in the self-study the music program is vital and enjoys a favorable reputation in the region and state. It is evident that the program needs to engage in comprehensive strategic planning that is based on reliable budget parameters. The critical issues of program scope and administration need to be addressed in order to make informed decisions on future tenure-track hires and overall resource allocation.

To summarize major recommendations included in subsections of this report:

1. Determine if the masters program is to be retained and, if so, the scope it will have.
2. Determine, in consultation with administration, the long-term plan for administration of the music program.
3. Determine the curricular role of technology in both the undergraduate and graduate program. Additionally, will there be courses for non-majors, or a concentration in recording technology?
4. Determine if the program will apply for reaccredidation with the National Association of Schools of Music. If so, some curricular changes may be necessary.
5. Modify the theory/history sequence as proposed in the Plan. Consider adding a general education course in Basic Theory for non-majors, particularly Liberal Studies and Theatre, and majors who do not have the requisite skills to enter the major theory sequence.
6. Write proposals to have courses for non-majors, including ensemble courses, certified under the new standards for general education.
7. Consider adding an orchestral ensemble class as earlier as possible with preference given to a campus-community orchestra.
8. Determine, in consultation with the new TT hire in the choral/vocal area, the appropriate scope of choral ensembles, and the desire to incorporate opera workshop and diction classes into the curriculum.
9. Consider revising the current BA into two programs, a Bachelor of Music with required concentrations and revision of the current BA into a less performance-based program that can be combined with other majors and/or minors. If the current BA is retained, consider adding a required concentration to the major.
10. Determine, in consultation with administration, a faculty plan, based on answers to the issues above, for replacement of tenure-track faculty lines to a minimum of eight (nine if the graduate program is retained) including timelines for implementation.

Our response to Dr. Klein’s report has addressed items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (in part), 6, 7, 8, and 9. As for #10 above, following this response to Dr. Klein’s report is a revised version of the “DOCUMENT #2: PLAN” from the original Music Department CAPR report from 1/27/2006. It is our hope that, together with university administration, we can work towards a plan for rebuilding the Music Department.
Document #2: REVISED PLAN (3/27/06)

Overview

This revised plan reflects several changes and re-arrangements of priorities, based on recommendations from Dr. Klein's External Review Report.

I. Curriculum
   A. Theory-Sight Singing and Piano Class Curriculum
      1. Revisions to include combining Sight Singing and Dictation into “Aural Skills”. Assign a faculty member as “Coordinator” of this program
      2. Create a second year of required “Aural Skills”
      3. Theory course sequence will become 6 quarters, including 20<sup>th</sup> century theory
      4. Create a “Theory tutorial” that would be taught in parallel with Theory I (and possibly II and III), required for music majors who need remedial work on fundamentals of musical theory.
      5. Officially create drill and listening stations/software for use in the Media Center for Music Technology, for all of these courses.
      6. Require that Basic Piano course sequence be started in the Sophomore year, concurrent with Theory IV-VI
   B. Literature and Analysis
      1. Add an additional fourth quarter in the sequence
         a) Form and Analysis in Fall
         b) Counterpoint in Winter
         c) Start Literature and Analysis sequence in Spring (L & A I), then continue the sequence (L & A II, III, IV) in the following F-W-S.
   C. General Education Outcomes proposals for music classes
      1. Do for ALL music classes (except applied), including performing ensembles (not just non-major classes), so that non-majors could get GE credit for performing ensembles and music-academics they may take.
   D. Technology related courses (see also the attached "Music Technology: New Course Proposals")
      1. Continue to develop new non-major offerings, particularly in the upper division area.
      2. Continue to expand offerings for majors
E. Non-Major course offering expansion
   1. More involvement in Freshman Clusters
   2. Additional lower and upper division non-major courses, (including those fitting the needs of Musical Theatre Majors, and in the areas of Technology and World Music)

F. Orchestra (see “Performing Ensembles” below)
G. Opera Workshop (See “Performing Ensembles” below)
H. Add and/or add back additional courses, anticipating growth in student numbers.
   1. Vocal Pedagogy and Vocal Diction classes
   2. Singing for the Stage, officially attached to Opera Workshop. (coordinate with Theatre)
   3. Music Business course(s) (to fit with the possible option in Music Industry)
   4. Jazz Piano

II. Faculty
A. Tenure Track requests (NOTE: The first three positions are in priority order, and are critical needs to fill by Fall 2007. The order of the remaining requests would depend on faculty retirements, and an ongoing assessment of needs)
   1. Director of Bands/Instrumental Music Education (start Fall ’07)
      Our #1 priority, and a critical need due to the loss of the Full Professor in this area, which is one of the most vital areas of the department. We would request to search for this position in 2006-2007, with a Fall 2007 appointment.
   2. Music Department Chair or, if the current administrative merger of Music and Theatre-Dance continues, and Associate Chair for Music (start Fall ’07) with additional teaching duties in an area of critical need, including, possibly, categories 4 and 5 below. This is a critical need.
   3. Musicology/Ethnomusicology/Graduate Advisor (start Fall ’07).
      This is a critical need, due to the department's only musicologist completing his FERP in Spring 2007.
   4. Orchestra/Applied Strings. The Music Department needs to get the orchestra back into the curriculum as soon as possible, and it is imperative that a full-time tenured faculty member be appointed to be a leader in this area.
   5. Voice/Opera Workshop/Aural Skills. The Music Department will put the Opera Workshop program back into the curriculum as soon as possible, and it is imperative that a full-time tenured faculty member be appointed to be a leader in this area.
   6. Theory-History-Technology (with secondary area of expertise in an applied performance area)
7. Recording Technology

III. Department of Music Organization and Infrastructure

A. Staffing
1. Administrative, Technical and Instructional Support Staff
   a) A critical need for a Music Department Administrative Support Assistant/Bookkeeper
   b) A critical need for a staff position in support of Music Technology, Concert and Recital Recording and Maintenance of Audio Equipment
   c) Increased staff support help for the Music Office and the Music Resource Center

B. Requests for new facilities and improvements to existing facilities
1. Administrative
   a) An adequate space for the Music Department Office
   b) A separate office for the Chair or Associate Chair
   c) Replacement of the Music Department Conference and Mail-Work Rooms

2. Classrooms (create more “smart” classrooms for Music)
3. Additional Chamber Music and Large Ensemble Sectional Rooms
4. Continue to upgrade the Media Center for Music Technology
5. Departmental Support Areas to improve and/or restructure
   a) Instrument Storage and Technicians Room
   b) Recording Booth
   c) Wind Band and Jazz Band Library

IV. Performing Ensembles

A. “Premiere” Performing Ensemble directors should receive more than the current 3 WTU’s (a minimum of 4, and as many as 6 WTU’s in recognition of the significant extra time necessary for preparation, and time outside class related to active performing schedule, tours, conference and festival performances, recruiting, etc. This is done at many CSU’s and at all UC’s. The second and third “tier” ensembles (a second section of Symphonic Band—if a 2 band model, the University Chorus, the 2nd and 3rd Jazz Bands, etc.) would stay at 3 WTU’s, recognizing that these ensembles do far less performing and outside, off-campus performances and events.

The "premiere ensembles" would include,

Symphonic Band (or Wind Ensemble, in the hopes that we would go back to the two-separate bands scenario)
Jazz Ensemble (top of the three big bands only)
University Singers (the premiere, auditioned large ensemble in the Choral area)
Orchestra

B. Chamber Ensembles
1. Add back the 2nd section of Jazz Combos (high enrollment)
2. Create a second section of Chamber Winds Ensemble (high enrollment)
3. Guitar/String/Harp ensemble
   a) how to deal with the situation of shared ensemble load, but widely disparate numbers in each area (large # of guitar students, extremely small number of string students and harp students).
4. Opera Workshop
   a) re-write as a chamber ensemble
   b) combine with a “Singing for the Stage”, or “Acting and Blocking for Singers” course that would be required when registering for Opera Workshop.
   c) Scheduling: Tu-Th. 2:00-2:50 Opera Workshop
      3:00-3:50 stage work class
5. New or Contemporary Music Ensemble and/or Electronic Music Ensemble.

C. Orchestra
1. Evening ensemble
2. College-Community ensemble
   a) priority given to students
3. Auditioned and selective, with strict standards for acceptance
4. Would rehearse on campus
5. Conducted by a faculty appointee, approved by the department
6. Hurdles
   a) strings are the backbone of the orchestra
   b) must have a core of music major string players (4-6 vln/2-3 vla/2-3 vcl/1-2 bass; minimum). Talented non-majors and minors would be identified and encouraged to participate.
   c) Orchestra would be the required major performing ensemble for String Players (Bassists who may not be ready to play in orchestra, could use Jazz Ensemble, but would be required to perform for a minimum of 2 years in orchestra)
   d) Not enough “orchestral winds” (Fl/Ob/Cl/Bssn/Horn) in department to support both the orchestra and the wind bands with a separate pool of players. Wind players would be required to perform in a wind band, and then selected for orchestra through audition.
e) FTES—there would have to be a way for community members to be registered and count towards FTES. This was one of the issues with the loss of the college-community choral ensemble (“Oratorio Society”), due to small student enrollment, but large non-registered and non-FTES generating community members.

7. Time-line/ steps in process/ brainstorming ideas
   a) Research; possible combine with existing community college/community orchestra (quality of ensemble/quality of conductor?)
   b) proposals presented
   c) marketing
   d) Write T.T. position request for position of Orchestra Conductor/Applied Strings
   e) Invest scholarship $ in strings (2 scholarship quartets) and orchestral winds (2 woodwind quintets)
   f) Establish a resident faculty string quartet (perhaps with a full scholarship student violinist as 2nd violin and/or viola)

B. Oratorio Society. While it would be nice to reinstate this ensemble, which had a large community involvement component, it is not a priority at this time
   1. Evening ensemble
   2. College-Community ensemble
   3. Conducted by a faculty appointee
   4. Hurdles
      a) FTES—there would have to be a way for community members to be registered and count towards FTES, as in orchestra, above.

5. Time-line/ steps in process/ brainstorming ideas
   a) Research; possible combine with existing community choral ensemble
   b) proposals submitted
   c) marketing

V. Music Teacher Preparation Program
   A. Regardless of CTC accreditation, it is vital to keep the current curriculum in tact, as it represents the course work necessary to promote competency in the field.
   B. Standardize the curriculum, and scope and sequence of instruction in the “Basic Instrument” courses
   C. Consider offering two quarters of Basic Percussion, (like High Brass, Low Brass and High Strings and Low Strings)
      1. Non-Pitched percussion, and accessories
      2. Pitched percussion (timpani and mallets)
D. Re-visit every-other-year sequence
   1. Conducting classes are way too big to offer every-other year, as most composition majors, and many other music majors want to take the classes, in addition to the music education students. Must (starting in 2006-2007) offer Basic Conducting (Fall), Choral Conducting (Winter), and Instrumental Conducting (Spring) every year. (NOTE: Graduate Conducting classes will rotate every-other year, as in past). Basic Conducting must hold to prerequisite of having completed Theory VI.
   2. Possibly offer a section of Computer Music for Music Educators every year, perhaps during early AM in “Year 2”, then possibly in the evening as an Extension course during “Year 1”, to attract area educators to campus.

E. TED courses for Teacher Credential Candidates
   1. Size variance of class, depending on flow of 2-year Subject Matter Prep. Sequence
   2. Supervision of Student-Intern Teacher; load size (same concern as #1)
   3. Critical need for two separate faculty members to guide this program (one with expertise in Instrumental Music, and one with expertise in Choral-Vocal Music, to both lead the TED Methods and Materials Class for credential students, and to supervise credential students in their student-intern teaching positions.

VI. General topics
   A. Entrance requirements/standards for ALL new music majors (implement for Fall 2007)
      1. Required audition as part of application process
         a) student’s select solos from a required list
         b) Set at least 3-4 “official” audition dates, including one in late-Spring/early-Summer (June-July)
         c) Entrance Auditions can also serve as scholarship auditions
      2. Use models in place at other CSU’s, and private colleges
         a) Long Beach
         b) Northridge
         c) UOP
         d) Others
   B. Clean up and revise printed materials
      1. Catalogue
      2. Undergraduate and Graduate Handbooks
   C. Marketing and Recruiting
      1. MUST establish a strategy, process and procedure, including specific appointment of faculty member/staff to coordinate
      2. MUST involve all lecturers on some level
      3. MUST have budget for creation (EVERY YEAR) of a poster (with tear-off cards) to send to schools
4. Create Promotional CD/DVD, highlighting in sound and visuals every aspect of our program, and performing area, including faculty and performing ensembles.

5. Must have budget to purchase advertising in several Bay Area and state-wide journals of professional music organizations; CMEA Bay Section-Tempo magazine, CMEA state-level magazine, CBDA Bulletin (AND the All-State Band Concert Program), ACDA Bay Section, state and Western Division newsletters, CODA (orchestra), etc.

6. Must have a budget to purchase and prepare a display that can be used at Regional and State-wide Conventions of professional organizations.

7. Must have budget for registration fees, and for staffing the table (faculty and students) at conventions.

Plan Summation

We certainly realize that the plan outlined above is extensive and specific in its scope. We feel, however, that most of the items proposed in each of the several areas can be accomplished in a 5-year span, given the support of the university.

The following statements will serve both as a plan summation, and an overall summation of this CAPR Report.

1) The Music Department must continue to add to its Full-time Tenure Track faculty each year for the next several years, to fill areas of absolute critical need to support and expand our curriculum.

2) The Music Department must return to being a separately administered department, with a trained, experienced music-administrative expert as Chair

3) The university and its administration must be open-minded in understanding the unique nature of Music, and the specific needs of a vibrant and successful program. Music Department faculty and administrators must work to educate university administrators as to all of the above, and work together to get the music program back on stable ground, back on track and growing.

4) The Music Department must be more active in developing and promoting courses for non-majors. These large 4-unit courses will continue to be the classes that drive the FTES and SFR's needed to support the one-on-one applied instruction, and smaller classes for many of the important core music classes.

5) The Music Department at CSU, East Bay can support many more music majors, even in its current state and with the existing performing ensembles. Focused
recruiting for low-enrolled areas of the department (voice, strings, orchestral winds) is an absolute must... and, finally

6) The Music Department faculty and staff are working extremely hard, as we have done for decades, to offer the highest quality of education and pre-professional training to our students, who will leave us to eventually join the work force as the next generation’s performing and teaching musicians. Thousands of Music Department Alumni have made us proud and brought us additional recognition as an institution that is widely respected for it’s curriculum, the quality of its faculty and quality of its student performing ensembles.

In short, the Music Department has been the model of the vision outlined in the University’s “Mission Statement”... an outstanding academic program, recognized for its excellence. A program with a curriculum that is a perfect example of active student participation through applied learning and community service. A department and faculty that hold to the highest academic standards, and provide services and support that ensure that each music student has an opportunity for success. We have fostered a wide array of activities that are directly related to the promotion of students’ well-being and enjoyment. And, finally, a department that contributes enormously to the civic and cultural well being of our community and region.

CSU East Bay, as an institution, has gained enormous benefit from claiming ownership of its fine Music Department. We are, arguably, the most visible department on campus. Our faculty, our programs and our performing ensembles are well known throughout the state of California, and beyond.

Unfortunately, we are now, (and have been for the past 3-4 years) working in a university-level and college-level environment that is not conducive to, or supportive of the Music Department’s contributions to the mission statement and vision of the university. The Music Department is at the most critical juncture in its history. Our faculty and students want to see the long tradition of excellence continue. We want to continue to be the model for the university’s vision and mission.

Now the university must decide if it wants to continue this tradition: to continue enjoying the benefits provided to the university by an excellent and widely respected Music Department. If this tradition is to continue, then the University and the College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences must work with us to support our efforts in this regard. Giving this report your most serious consideration is, we believe, the first step in this process.
**OVERVIEW OF STUDY**

Program Review Process: CSUEB will demonstrate

- In the five-year reviews of 21 of 52 graduate and undergraduate programs, that we have collected, analyzed and used the results to improve student learning; and
- That we have analyzed the student learning outcomes in all degree programs for the extent that multicultural issues are addressed.

The Academic Senate considered recommendations to improve the process for the 5-year Review that includes linking the review process to assessment of student learning and to resource allocations.

**DEMONSTRATION OF ACADEMIC QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Demonstration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How are learning outcomes used by the programs under review?</td>
<td>Gateway courses study program, modify curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What kinds of learning assessment beyond course grades are programs collecting regularly?</td>
<td>Outcomes for gateway courses and exit survey for BS, Gateway courses and MS exit exam for most MS options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What evidence is there that programs have engaged in discussions about learning results?</td>
<td>Curriculum revisions are based on committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do program reviews address faculty’s engagement with General Education Outcomes?</td>
<td>Unknown but there are QR outcomes for GE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How is the academic quality of programs offered on the Concord Campus addressed in program reviews?</td>
<td>Not available at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The mission promises “multicultural learning experience”. How is that addressed in program reviews?</td>
<td>Addressed in examples and problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How are advising and retention issues addressed in the program reviews?</td>
<td>MCS Student Center, faculty advising in class, large department events (awards dinner), workshops for students, and student lab, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How are campus climate issues addressed in the program reviews?</td>
<td>Faculty VERY cooperative and work together well. Use committee structure for most activities. Students see #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How are the results from 5-year reviews communicated to and coordinated among all constituents?</td>
<td>Chair reports that: We did not say in review, but copies of all documents were offered to all faculty and all TAs by email; hard copies were (and are) available in the Dept Office, and were left by faculty mailboxes for a week or so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How does the leadership demonstrate its commitment to the 5 year review process?</td>
<td>Outstanding, well documented review. Asked reviewer to concentrate on issues important to their programs. Faculty interfaced with outside reviewer as is clear in his report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How is the 5-year review process communicated and coordinated to all constituents?</td>
<td>All faculty committees were consulted; all other faculty were invited to submit input. Students were consulted by email, in class, and (a few) in person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How are issues of work-load addressed in program reviews?</td>
<td>Use committee structure to balance demands on faculty. Still heavy for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How are faculty and programs rewarded for attention to teaching and learning assessment/improvement?</td>
<td>Chair reports that: That's a good question. For many faculty, excellent teaching reviews are worth striving for. But adequate studn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How is student learning reflected in faculty recruitment, retention, and promotion?</td>
<td>Recruitment is based on the needs of the curriculum and the self study that the department engages in regularly apart from five-year review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STRATEGIC PLANNING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Describe the level of clarity and coherence of academic planning provided for in the program reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>How do program reviews contribute to departmental and university planning efforts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>How were the results from previous reviews used, especially in addressing student learning issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Describe the quality of the data analysis, and dissemination of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Describe the effectiveness of the institutional portfolio in the review process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>What is the resource commitment to Five-Year Review process?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCORD CAMPUS**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>How is the academic quality of programs at the Concord Campus compare to the Hayward Campus?</td>
<td>No programs offered on Concord campus (although a few courses are offered there).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan should...</td>
<td>Definitions of terms</td>
<td>Rubric:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. state the department or program mission in terms of educational purpose or goals</td>
<td>These are broad statements of purpose in philosophical terms often describing values and aspirations.</td>
<td>4 = very clearly stated 3 = stated with some clarity 2 = stated, but generally lacking clarity 1 = not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. relate the department or program's mission/goals to the University mission.</td>
<td>These statements explain how the program's goals support the University's mission.</td>
<td>4 = relationship(s) very clearly stated 3 = relationship(s) stated with some clarity 2 = relationship(s) stated, but generally lacking clarity 1 = relationship(s) not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. describe program in content-centered terms.</td>
<td>These statements describe essential educational content covered in order to achieve the program mission/goals. They identify in content-centered terms (e.g., concepts, theories, paradigms, etc.) the knowledge and skills the program aims to convey.</td>
<td>4 = content very clearly stated 3 = content described stated with some clarity 2 = content described, but generally lacking clarity 1 = content not described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. state intended student-centered objectives at the program level in measurable or observable terms.</td>
<td>Student-centered objectives describe intended student learning outcomes in terms of what students will be able to do and/or what changes in knowledge, attitudes or behavior will occur as a result of the program.</td>
<td>4 = has student-centered objectives consistently stated in measurable or observable terms 3 = has student-centered objectives but only some are stated in measurable or observable terms 2 = has student-centered objectives but none are stated in measurable or observable terms 1 = offers no student-centered objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. link program level student-centered objectives to specific course level student-centered objectives in measurable or observable terms.</td>
<td>These are lists, tables, or other schema showing intended student learning outcomes within courses or sequences of courses as they relate to overall program student learning objectives (e.g., showing hierarchical programmatic connections and/or explaining how courses fit together within degree programs and other course sequences such as options, minors, credentials, or concentrations, etc.)</td>
<td>4 = linkage(s) very clearly described 3 = linkage(s) described with some clarity 2 = linkage(s) described, but lacking clarity 1 = linkage(s) are not described</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CAL STATE HAYWARD WASC PLANNING PROCESS**

1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>describe assessment methods for student-centered objectives (D) <strong>at the program level.</strong></td>
<td>This section identifies and describes specific strategies and methods the faculty will use to determine whether students have achieved the program’s intended student-learning outcomes (as listed in E).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Method(s):</strong> 5 = method(s) very clearly described, appear appropriate, and are consistently linked to specific objectives 4 = method(s) very clearly described, appear appropriate, but inconsistently linked to specific objectives 3 = method(s) as described are clearly inappropriate 2 = method(s) named but are insufficiently described to ascertain appropriateness and/or linkage to objectives 1 = no methods are described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>describe assessment methods for student-centered objectives <strong>at the course level.</strong></td>
<td>This section uses course syllabi to illustrate specific strategies and methods the faculty use to determine whether students have achieved the intended student-learning outcomes within the courses that constitute the program.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assessment document and self study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Method(s):</strong> 5 = method(s) very clearly described, appear appropriate, and are consistently linked to specific objectives 4 = method(s) very clearly described, appear appropriate, but inconsistently linked to specific objectives 3 = method(s) as described are clearly inappropriate 2 = method(s) named but are insufficiently described to ascertain appropriateness and/or linkage to objectives 1 = no methods are described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>present results of assessment activities as summaries of actual student learning outcomes data that have been collected by the unit.</td>
<td>This section summarizes the results (using narrative, qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods) from surveys, exams, or other direct measures of program or student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>CAPR report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Method(s):</strong> Y = yes, actual results from assessment activities are presented in the documentation N = none are presented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>describe and present results of other measures relating to program quality or effectiveness.</td>
<td>These typically include surveys, exit interviews, focus groups and other non-instructional assessment measures.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Method(s):</strong> 4 = such description is explicitly offered 3 = such description is at least implied 2 = description not apparent, but it is possible that the document intended to do this 1 = no such description offered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>offer well-reasoned conclusions concerning what action should be taken given the results of H and I above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>describe how conclusions drawn from assessment data are or will be used in academic planning processes for the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>describe an overall plan or process for program evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>discuss student learning outcomes in the context of other planning or operational goals (e.g. resource, staffing, logistical, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>show credible results of assessment activities in terms of their representation of student learning outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section should present a logical analysis of the results (H and I) as they relate to intended and unintended program outcomes.

This section should describe how the results of assessment activities will be or have been used to inform its curricular, instructional, and/or strategic planning and implementation activities (e.g., program or course modifications, faculty development, advisement, or need for additional assessment data.)

This goes beyond F and G above to describe an overall plan for action in terms of how the unit will determine whether the program is meeting its goals and objectives (e.g. process, personnel, methods, timelines, etc.).

These descriptions relate to additional activities or resources needed in order for programs or courses to achieve stated goals.

This is a composite judgment based on whether the measures appear valid (measure what they purport to measure), and reliable (measure it consistently) and whether the analyses of the data were done correctly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 = conclusions are clearly supported by the data</th>
<th>3 = conclusions are only partially supported by the data</th>
<th>2 = conclusions are not supported by the data</th>
<th>1 = no conclusions are offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 = such description is explicitly offered</th>
<th>3 = such description is at least implied</th>
<th>2 = description not apparent, but it is possible that the document intended to do this</th>
<th>1 = no such description offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 = such description is explicitly offered</th>
<th>3 = such description is at least implied</th>
<th>2 = description not apparent, but it is possible that the document intended to do this</th>
<th>1 = no such description offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 = totally credible</th>
<th>3 = mostly credible</th>
<th>2 = somewhat credible</th>
<th>1 = not very credible or none offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Review Outcome Team Recommends Assessment Plan Rubric</td>
<td>Revised CAPR May 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesis: Overall quality of plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Synthesis</td>
<td>O. show how the unit’s use of student learning outcomes data is an effective part of that program’s curriculum and course development and revision activities</td>
<td>This section should present a well-developed and coherent assessment plan that includes continuous and well-integrated linkage among assessment, planning, and implementation activities.</td>
<td>4 = definitely&lt;br&gt;3 = probably&lt;br&gt;2 = possibly, but uncertain&lt;br&gt;1 = definitely not</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total</td>
<td>P. Sum of scores out of possible 58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Average</td>
<td>49/58 = .84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAPR Evaluation Response Form
Program __Mathematics______ Date: 4/20/006

1. Self-Study
   1.1. Previous Review and Plan
   In the last review (2000), the Department plans for Mathematics were: (i) revision of the courses for prospective elementary teachers, (ii) review of Math 3000, Introduction to Abstract Mathematics and Proofs, (iii) review of the calculus/analysis sequences, (iv) consideration of a C.S. option in the math major (v) review of remedial courses, (vi) review of courses used by Engineering students (vii) development of capstone courses, and (viii) addition of a course in mathematical modeling. All of these plans have been addressed. (i) The courses for elementary mathematics education (Math 4021-4024) were thoroughly revised and are now Math 2011/4012/4013/4014. (ii) Based on the conviction of our faculty that students needed additional preparation for upper division, theoretical mathematics courses, the Department voted to add Math 3000, Introduction to Abstract Mathematics and Proofs, to the list of required courses for all mathematics majors. (iii) The faculty are exploring the possibility of requiring an additional course in vector calculus of all mathematics majors. (iv) Given the trend in computer science enrollments in recent years, there has been no significant demand for a computer science option in the mathematics major, and no such option has been seriously considered. (v) The Department has reviewed, on an ongoing basis, the remedial courses in mathematics, in light of the changes in the Entry Level Mathematics Exam and the Chancellor's Executive Order to limit remediation to one year. (vi) After initial trials of having Engineering students take Math 3841, Linear Programming, a mutual decision was made by Math/CS and Engineering that Industrial Engineering students would be better served by a separate course, ENGR 3841, Operations Research I. (vii) Mathematics majors in the Mathematics Teaching option are required to take a capstone course, Math 4901 (Senior Seminar.) (viii) In its searches for new mathematics faculty, the Department concentrated on those applicants who could develop and teach a course in mathematical modeling, successfully hiring so that a new course in Mathematical Modeling Math 3865) was offered Fall 2005.

1.2. Tenure-track Position Applications
Are copies attached?
   X Yes
   ____ No

Is progress in achieving these appointments discussed?
   ___ Not at All
   ___ Partially (Question: ____________________________)
   ____ Adequately
   ____ Exemplary (Comment: _________________________)

1.3. Outcomes Assessment (See Attached Rubric)
   ____ Not at All
   X Partially (Question: Data from gateway courses given.)
   ___ Adequately
   ___ Exemplary (Comment: __________________________)

Gateway courses reflect the challenging nature of mathematics – no automatic good grades in any course. The relatively low pass rate in Math 2304 (roughly 2/3 of those who begin manage to end the course with a C or better; more than 10% usually withdraw) reflects also the many non-math majors who must take this course. Of the upper division courses, analysis (Math 3300) is difficult
for many students. But on the whole, upper division math students do succeed in the courses that they take. No pass rates for MS exams were given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gateway Course</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Exc</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Withdraw</th>
<th>Number Succeed</th>
<th>PerCent Succeed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2304</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3100</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3122</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4901</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Math 3000 course was added to the curriculum in Fall 2000 to meet a need for math majors to succeed in upper division courses requiring proofs. The Department is glad to see the high rate of success in 3000, plus strong rates in the other upper division courses.

The Math 4901 course is the capstone course for students in the Teaching Option. It is also encouraging to note that over 93% of the students who started this course finished it successfully.

1.4. Program Statistics

Are copies of IR&A-supplied tables attached?

- Yes with much detail added
- No

Is the impact on program quality of enrollment trends discussed?

- Not at All
- Partially (Question: Programs have maintained 35 limit where possible.)
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: )

Is the impact on program quality of trends in student-faculty ratio (SFR) discussed?

- Not at All
- Partially (Question: )
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: )

Is the impact on program quality of trends in percentage of courses taught by regular faculty discussed?

- Not at All
- Partially (Question: )
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: )

Discussion via email: from Chair Reiter:

The Department certainly does discuss the percentage of courses taught by regular faculty.

In CS, it has changed dramatically because of the sharp decline in the number of lecturers.

In math, it doesn't change very much -- essentially all remedial classes are taught by TAs (actually, that % has gone up as we have more grad students to draw on), most service
courses (1110, 1130, 1810, 1820) are taught by lecturers, and almost all course for majors are taught be TT faculty (with the exception of a few evening and summer sections).

I don't have graphs of the trends in percentages, but do keep close watch on overall trends. No figures that the University keeps are very good at capturing what is going on.

Is the impact on program quality of trends in number of majors discussed?
   __ Not at All
   __ Partially (Question: ________________________________)
   X __ Adequately
   __ Exemplary (Comment: ________________________________)

(1) Students do succeed as mathematics majors. They find the courses challenging, but they are able to finish the courses and the degrees.

(2) Students are generally happy with the level of instruction in math courses. A wide variety is cited as examples of excellence in exit surveys. Few complaints are registered - none about instructors in upper-division courses.

(3) The major is relatively small (at least compared to Computer Science). Not all required courses are offered each quarter, and often not in both day/evening sections. Students do find it hard to schedule their classes, given these limited offerings. It should be noted though, that with the increase in enrollment at the 3000-4000 level, more sections are now offered.

(4) Since 2000, the CSUEB math major program has grown 71%. This is the 3rd highest percentage increase in the whole system, except for Long Beach and San Bernardino.

(5) Compared to the relative size of the other universities, CSUEB currently has a large number of math majors -- more than either San Francisco State or San Jose State.

(6) The options - pure, applied, teaching - are standard. Many schools, especially those of a comparable size, do not offer all three of these options. Other schools may also offer a statistics option; at CSUEB, that would be done with a major in the Statistics department

Other statistical trends and impact on program quality discussed, if any: SEE ABOVE

(Comment/Question: __ teaching issues discussed also CS impact on mathematics ________________________________

   __ Exemplary (Comment: ________________________________)

1.5. Comparative Review
   __ Not at All
   __ Partially (Question: ________________________________)
   __ Adequately
   X __ Exemplary (Comment: careful comparison to other programs in the CSU in mathematics ___________________________________________)

   ________________________________
   ________________________________
1.6. Other Program Achievements
   __ Not at All
   ___ Partially (Question: ____________________________)
   X__ Adequately
   ___ Exemplary

1.7. Extra Units Justification, if required: NA
   ___ Partially (Question: ____________________________)
   ___ Adequately

2. Five-Year Plan
2.1. Curriculum
   Are envisioned changes for the next five years discussed, and do they address
   recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, including what has been learned
   from the outcomes assessment process?
   __ Not at All
   ___ Partially (Question: ____________________________)
   X__ Adequately
   ___ Exemplary (Comment: __________________________)

   Curriculum goals and plans:
   - To continually update curriculum (particularly in applied mathematics).
   - To update and revise the program for future high school teachers to create a program that meets
     the new State standards. This will require not only a change in the courses in the program, but
     course modifications, particularly in Math 3215 Geometry, Math 3121 Abstract Algebra and Math
     4901 Senior Seminar). Effective Fall, 2003, the course Math 3000 was added as a requirement in
     the major.
   - Mathematics
     - meet new CTC requirements for mathematics majors who intend to teach
     - add new position of CTC Coordinator to Department Administrative assignments
     - analyze applied math courses; possibly add new topics in applied math
   - New courses: Math 911 Algebra Lab, Math 3000 Introduction to Abstract Mathematics and
     Proofs, Math 3865 Mathematical Modeling, Math 4245 Intro. Knot Theory, Math 6210 Convex
     Polytopes and Combinatorial Geometry, Math 6235 Knot Theory, Math 6865 Mathematical
     Modeling

2.2. Students
   Are envisioned changes for the next five years discussed, and do they address
   recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, including what has been learned
   from the outcomes assessment process?

   Number of majors:
   __ Not at All
   ___ Partially (Question: ____________________________)
   X__ Adequately
   ___ Exemplary (Comment: __________________________)

   Student enrollment: In mathematics, we have experienced a healthy increase in the number of
   majors in recent years. The number of undergraduate mathematics majors increased from 64 to 104
   in the period from Fall 2000 to Fall 2004, while the number of mathematics graduate students more
than doubled during this period (28 in 2000; 66 in 2004). Student enrollment in mathematics classes is strong, particularly at the upper division level. These upper division courses attract not only mathematics majors, but also statistics and computer science majors, as well as students preparing to pursue teaching credentials in mathematics. The following table shows the dramatic rise in upper division and graduate mathematics enrollment since Fall 2000.

Table 1: Head count in upper division and graduate mathematics courses (excluding cross-listed computer science and statistics courses and mathematics education courses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 2000, enrollments in pre-calculus and general education mathematics courses have remained almost constant. However, the number of students taking calculus courses has begun to decline, due primarily to the large decrease in the number of computer science majors. Among our mathematics courses, the greatest decline has been experienced in the courses for future elementary school teachers. These enrollment drops are primarily due to two factors: (1) Teacher education programs no longer require completion of a number systems course as a condition for admission, and (2) Completion of a Liberal Studies major (including its required mathematics sequence) is no longer accepted as proof of subject matter competence for admission to a multiple subjects teaching credential. (Now all candidates must pass an examination, the CSET.) Enrollments in our biggest service courses, Math 1810 and 1820—courses for majors in Business Administration and Economics—have been generally stable since 2000. However, beginning in Fall 2006, the College of Business and Economics will no longer require Math 1820 for most students. We expect future enrollments in Math 1820 to be only a small fraction of the current enrollments.

Total enrollments:

- Not at All
- Partially (Question: _________________________)
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________)

Student characteristics:

- Not at All
- Partially (Question: _________________________)
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________)

Student career opportunities:

- Not at All
- Partially (Question: _________________________)
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________)

Program-level student learning outcomes:

- Not at All
- Partially (Question: _________________________)
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________)

(1) Students do succeed as mathematics majors. They find the courses challenging, but they are able to finish the courses and the degrees.
(2) Students are generally happy with the level of instruction in math courses. A wide variety is cited as examples of excellence in exit surveys. Few complaints are registered – none about instructors in upper-division courses.

(3) The major is relatively small (at least compared to Computer Science). Not all required courses are offered each quarter, and often not in both day/evening sections. Students do find it hard to schedule their classes, given these limited offerings. It should be noted though, that with the increase in enrollment at the 3000-4000 level, more sections are now offered.

**Student attendance and participation in conferences, etc.:** Science Festival (2001, 2003, 2005) 10+ students volunteer at each festival, Regional MAA meetings (every year) About 20 students go each year; usually there is at least one student poster presentation. Undergraduate Mathematics Research Conference at Sonoma State (2005, several students attended, Genevieve Granier gave a talk. Tri-Valley Math Conference – 3(? 2) of our grad students attended this conference in Pleasanton, Sept. 2005. This was an articulation conference between HS, Community College and CSU.

**Other Student Achievements:** Ph.D. programs: In the past five years, we have had students go on to PhD programs in mathematics at various schools (Leif Jordan at UCSC, Murray Stokeley accepted at U. Colorado, Arlo Caine is at U of Arizona, Jonathan Wong at Oregon State U., Kurt Luoto at U Washington, Theodora Dordea at Berkeley, Aaron Fisher, UC Davis, Jaideep Mulherkar, Davis, others).

Teacher Credentialing: And, during the period from F '00 through the present, 183 people were certified as having satisfied the requirements of CSUEB's Subject Matter Preparation Program in Mathematics. Of these, 61 received their degrees from CSUEB and 85 others completed some of their required math courses at CSUEB.

Other programs: An increasing number of our students are attending Summer Institutes in Mathematics. In the Summer of 2004, we had two students attend the Park City Mathematics Institute in Utah. This Winter one of our students will attend the prestigious “Budapest Semester in Mathematics.”

Outreach plans:

___ Not at All
___ Partially (Question: ______________________________________)
___ Adequately
_X_ Exemplary (Comment: ______________________________________)

**ACCLAIM:** Alameda County Collaborative for Learning and Instruction in Mathematics (ACCLAIM). A partnership with California State University East Bay Mathematics Department, providing summer institutes with school year follow-up, K-12, focused on mathematics content for teachers, lesson design, and assessment. Faculty member Tom Roby is PI and director of ACCLAIM professional development institutes, overseeing a budget of over $4 million (including stipends) in FY 2001-04.

Retention strategy:

___ Not at All
 ___ Partially (Question: ________________________________)
 ___ Adequately
_X_ Exemplary (Comment: ________________________________)
Note workshops under resources and student activities.

**Special events on campus:** Mathematics Awareness Week - "Mathematics and the Cosmos", 2005 (talks, games, events), Hosts for the Northern California, Nevada and Hawaii section of the Mathematical Association of America section meeting in Spring 2004. Approximately 200 professors and students from a wide geographical area participated. Friday Colloquium talks 4-6 times per quarter – well attended by faculty and students. Annual Department party – attracts over 70 students and faculty members each June.

Class scheduling:
- Not at All
- Partially (Question: ____________________________)
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________)

Resources to Support Student Learning:
- Not at All
- Partially (Question: ____________________________)
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________)


### 2.3. Faculty

Are envisioned changes for the next five years discussed, and do they address recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, including what has been learned from the outcomes assessment process?
- Not at All
- Partially (Question: ____________________________)
- Adequately
- Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________)

**Faculty:** At this time, the depth and breadth of the mathematics faculty is strong. However, there will be retirements and other changes; it is necessary to maintain their strength as a resource.

Since 2000, the Department has hired four new tenure-track faculty members in Mathematics: Drs. Jennifer Courter, Rudy Horne, Sarah Frey, and Shirley Yap. Drs. Courter and Horne have been enticed elsewhere. The reasons for these losses do not appear to have been related to dissatisfaction with our department or with the university. Rather, there were issues such as the high cost of housing in the Bay Area and the availability of desirable post-doctoral appointments elsewhere. In our recent hiring, the Department has tried to ensure that all candidates know both the advantages and disadvantages of living in the Bay Area. We are very pleased with our most recent hires, both of whom are quite involved with the activities of our department. A greater level of interest among our mathematics students is readily apparent since the arrival of these new faculty members. Many publications noted for tenure-track faculty.

**Lecturers:** The pool of mathematics lecturers is quite stable. Drs. Carter and Simutis have taught for us for a long time. New lecturers who also hold a Ph.D. have been available to teach when
needed (as in the summer) – for example, Drs. Olkin and Kovaleva. Other lecturers with a long history of success in lower division service courses and mathematics education courses include Fujimura, Becker, Benjamin, Conlan, and Slivinsky. At the current time, we are not adding to our pool of mathematics lecturers. This is good for current stability, but possibly bad if we lose lecturers or experience enrollment increases in the future. Many publications noted for some lecturers as well as tenure-track faculty

**MAA Northern California Section Award:** Award for “Distinguished College or University Teaching of Mathematics” to faculty member Russ Merris, 2004

Are anticipated new tenure-track applications discussed and justified:

- [ ] Not at All
- [ ] Partially (Question: ____________________________________________________________________________)
- [x] Adequately
- [ ] Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________________________________________________________)

2.4. **Other Resources**

Are envisioned changes for the next five years discussed, and do they address recommendations and concerns identified in the Self-Study, including what has been learned from the outcomes assessment process?

**Staff:**

- [ ] Not at All
- [ ] Partially (Question: ____________________________________________________________________________)
- [x] Adequately
- [ ] Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________________________________________________________)

**Equipment:**

- [ ] Not at All
- [ ] Partially (Question: ____________________________________________________________________________)
- [x] Adequately
- [ ] Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________________________________________________________)

**Library:**

- [ ] Not at All
- [ ] Partially (Question: ____________________________________________________________________________)
- [x] Adequately
- [ ] Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________________________________________________________)

**Other resources:** The department faculty offices are scattered all over campus. Faculty involved in student research need lab space for their work. It is unclear where faculty in Warren Hall will be relocated after the retrofit work begins.

It is very important to maintain and update the library collection and reference materials (books, periodicals, MathSciNet, etc).

**Travel:**

- [ ] Not at All
- [ ] Partially (Question: ____________________________________________________________________________)
- [x] Adequately
3. **Outside Reviewer’s Report**

Not at All

Partially (Question: ____________________________)

X Adequately

Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________)

MCS is a large department, one of the largest faculties at CSUEB. On the other hand, the size is not necessarily a disadvantage. The math and CS disciplines have much affinity for each other. In the CSUEB case, MCS seems to operate as a single faculty and everyone seems to get along. I did not detect any sentiment in favor of dividing MCS into separate math and CS departments. It is beyond my brief to get involved in organizational issues; I simply observe that to the extent anyone desires to separate the departments, the proponent ought to specify a serious problem for which the separation would be a solution.

The outside review focused mainly on Computer Science and its possible accreditation. The following comments had to do with the department rather than Computer Science. The mathematics programs

The MCS faculty members are spread over several buildings that are widely dispersed across the CSUEB campus. Some faculty are located in the upper floors of a tall building that is slated for substantial demolition to reduce the risk of earthquake damage; apparently the administration has not yet planned for new space for these soon-to-be-homeless faculty members. The geographic dispersion obviously undermines faculty accessibility to students, and also inhibits collaborative efforts among faculty members. The impending demolition provides an excellent opportunity to focus on trying to better consolidate the MCS faculty.

In conclusion, I want to reiterate that I really enjoyed the chance to visit CSUEB. It was a great pleasure meeting with you, the faculty, the Dean, and the students. I hope that you and the others found the visit equally enjoyable, and a productive contribution to your program assessment.

4. **Program Response to Outside Reviewer’s Report**

Not at All

Partially (Question: ____________________________)

X Adequately

Exemplary (Comment: ____________________________)

5. **Additional CAPR Response Comments, Concerns, or Questions:**
CAPR FORMAT FOR RESPONSE TO FIVE-YEAR PROGRAM REVIEWS

Approved on November 1, 2001
(approved by CAPR on this date but not on a CAPR document for ExCom approval)

Date: TBD

To: Academic Senate

From: CAPR

Re: Five-Year Review for Mathematics

Action Requested:

Background
  • Overview description of the program
  • Overview of the documents submitted to CAPR

Five-Year Program Review/Self-Study (dates)
  • Summary of specific areas of the Self-Study
  • Summary of supporting data

Outside Reviewer’s Comments & The Department’s Response

Program’s Five-Year Strategic Plan (dates)

CAPR Analysis Of The Program’s Five-Year Review
  a. Program
  b. Resources

CAPR Recommendation For Continuation Of The Program

Date Of The Program’s Next Five-Year Review
# California State University, East Bay
## APR Summary Data-Mathematics
### Fall 2000 - 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Fall Quarter</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Total Number of Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. FTES Generated</td>
<td></td>
<td>654.3</td>
<td>663.9</td>
<td>627.1</td>
<td>605.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| College Years |  | 99-00 | 00-01 | 01-02 | 02-03 | 03-04 |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| B. Degrees Awarded |  | 1. Undergraduate | 19 | 15 | 13 | 11 | 26 |
|  | 2. Graduate | 10 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 13 |
|  | 3. Total | 29 | 25 | 16 | 18 | 39 |

| Fall Quarter |  | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| C. Faculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenured/Track Headcount |  | 28 | 30 | 33 | 30 | 29 |
|  | 2. Part-Time | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
|  | 3. Total Tenure Track | 29 | 32 | 34 | 32 | 31 |
| Lecturer Headcount |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Full-Time |  | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Part-Time |  | 22 | 28 | 43 | 41 | 27 |
| 6. Total Non-Tenure Track |  | 23 | 31 | 46 | 44 | 31 |
| 7. Grand Total All Faculty |  | 52 | 63 | 80 | 76 | 62 |
| Instructional FTE Faculty |  | 8. Tenured/Track | 9.2 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 7.5 | 8.8 |
| 9. Lecturer |  | 17.9 | 17.4 | 17.9 | 17.1 | 15.2 |
| 10. Total Instructional FTEF |  | 27.1 | 26.2 | 24.4 | 24.6 | 24.0 |
| Lecturer Teaching |  | 11. % Lecturer/Total Instructional FT | 66.2% | 66.2% | 73.2% | 69.4% | 63.2% |
|  | 12. FTES Taught by Lecturer | 498.4 | 521.6 | 509.7 | 457.3 | 411.9 |
|  | 13. % FTES Lecture/FTES Generated | 76.2% | 78.6% | 81.3% | 75.5% | 69.8% |

| D. Student Faculty Ratios |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Tenured/Track |  | 17.0 | 16.1 | 17.9 | 19.7 | 20.2 |
| 2. Lecturer |  | 27.8 | 30.0 | 28.5 | 26.8 | 27.2 |
| 3. SFR By Level (All Faculty) |  | 24.2 | 25.3 | 25.7 | 24.6 | 24.6 |
| 4. Lower Division |  | 27.2 | 27.5 | 27.8 | 25.7 | 26.7 |
| 5. Upper Division |  | 16.4 | 20.6 | 22.2 | 23.3 | 19.4 |
| 6. Graduate |  | 5.6 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 10.6 | 10.4 |
| 7. Number of Sections Offered |  | 95 | 90 | 88 | 90 | 84 |
| 8. Average Section Size |  | 26 | 28 | 27 | 26 | 27 |