

To: Interim Dean, Kathleen Rountree, College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences

From: Rafael Hernandez, Chair, Department of Music

Subject: Department of Music Annual Report

I. Self-study

a. Progress with Departmental Planning and Review

In AY 2009-2010, the Department of Music underwent its 10-year accreditation review by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and a notice of action by the NASM accreditation board was sent to the Department in October 2010 (AY 2010-2011). In January 2011, the CAPR-required 5-year review document was submitted to CAPR along with the accreditation documents according to the methods and procedures outlined in 08-09 CAPR 23 Revised.

b. Program assessment processes

In an effort to make more clear to students, faculty, and staff the most critical aspect of our assessment, the student's Applied Level Rating, a new set of Applied Music courses has been created so that the a student can register for and clearly understand what their current Applied Level is and how many quarters they have left in that level in order to jury (e.g. be assessed) in order to move upwards a level or re-jury. The old system of Applied Level ratings was confusing in that there was simply a lower division and upper division course number, each with two possible levels (10 and 20 for lower division, 30 and 40 for upper). The student or faculty member would talk with the Department Administrative Support Coordinator (ASC) in order to find out their level (as it wasn't clear just by the course number) and either party would often forget as the year went on, thereby having to check with the ASC again. The new system allows for the student and faculty member to more clearly know simply by looking at the student's transcript. The level is built into the course number (e.g. Level 20 Applied Flute) and the student counts the number of quarters enrolled. In the student's third quarter, they jury in front of a faculty panel to be assessed. If the jury is passed, they are cleared to register for the next level (e.g. Level 30 Applied Flute). If not, they receive a failing grade for the quarter's study and then make the grade up via academic renewal (and jury again at the end of that quarter). This newer, stronger and clearer approach to Applied Level assessment will hopefully make more transparent the structure of Applied Level assessment throughout the course of the degree and provide clear instruction as to the frequency and consequences of assessment.

c. Fulfilling programmatic needs

Related to the Applied Level rating above is the proposal of the Bachelor of Music degree proposal that the Department is ready to put forward for inclusion in the Campus Master Plan. This degree proposal is discussed at length in the Department's accreditation documents as a cost-neutral degree that would take existing resources and re-allocate them in order to serve the needs of students wanting professional study in music while still serving those wanting a more liberal arts focus in music.

II. Assessment report

Summary of assessment results

Degree Recital (# of Students)

SLOs assessed:

1. Improved rhythm and pitch identification skills and pitch accuracy for application in performance and composition
2. Development of enriched tone production in tandem with improved technical skills in performance
5. improved listening skills and levels of interaction in ensemble performance

	Pass	Fail
Junior	14	2
Senior	21	1
Graduate	5	0

Graduate Comprehensive Examination (# of Students)

SLOs assessed:

3. Enhanced awareness and knowledge of theoretical structures and compositional techniques
4. an awareness of historical context and references as well as an increased awareness and knowledge of the literature;

	Pass	Fail
Graduate	5	0

a. Reflection upon progress made

As is common in the discipline of Music, the Department directly assesses students every year in their Applied area through faculty jury. The means for assessing these juries vary greatly from instrument to instrument. For instance, assessment of diction as related to the development of enriched tone production is relevant for vocalists but not for instrumentalists. So, the Department still struggles with a means to keep the unique affordance of each applied area in tact while culling all applied assessment data together in a way that will be meaningful to those outside of the discipline. Additionally, there is still much more improvement that can be made in assessing SLOs #3 and #4 (see Graduate Comprehensive Examination above), especially at the undergraduate level.

b. Summary of changes, activities and results of SLO

The most significant changes to assessments of SLOs was mentioned in section #1 with the creation of explicit Applied Music courses that feature the level number in the course title. In addition to this, the Department is making a much more concerted effort at collecting all assessment data, admittedly now quite fragmented, and recording it in a single place for better institutional accountancy and transparency.

III. Research data

Save for student demographics (which aren't current), the webpage at <http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/index.html> is woefully inadequate at providing data requested.

a. Student demographics (recent of 2009-2010)

B.A. Music	Female	Male
Race/ethnicity unknown	8	21
Black, non-Hispanic	9	13
Asian or Pacific Islander	10	5
Hispanic	8	12
White	20	32
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	1
Nonresident alien	4	3
Multiple ethnicity	1	1
B.A. Music Total	60	88

M.A. Music	Female	Male
Race/ethnicity unknown	2	2
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2	0
Hispanic	0	1
White	4	12
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Nonresident alien	2	0
Multiple ethnicity	0	0
M.A. Music Total	10	15

b. Student level

The Department requests further clarification on what data is required here.

c. Faculty and academic allocation

	Headcount	FTEF	WTU
Tenured/Track	8	6.25	225.90
Lecturer	22	5.53	248.88

d. Course data

The Department requests further clarification on what data is required here. Meanwhile, SFR and FTES data is provided below (recent as of Fall 2008 according to the Planning and Institutional Research link in the section introduction).

	FTES	FTEF	SFR
Lecturer	106.67	5.84	18.25
Tenured/Track	69.40	6.97	9.95
Lower Division	94.33	4.83	19.54
Upper Division	71.60	6.54	10.95
Undergraduate	165.93	11.37	14.60
Graduate	10.13	1.45	6.99