AIMÉE DORR  
PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  

Re: Approval of Herb Alpert School of Music at UC Los Angeles  

Dear Aimée:  

In accordance with the Universitywide Review Processes For Academic Programs, Units, and Research Units (the “Compendium”), and on the recommendation of CCGA, the Academic Council has approved UC Los Angeles’ proposal to establish the Herb Alpert School of Music and associated departmental and program transfer actions needed to form the School on that campus.  

I am enclosing CCGA’s report on its review of the new School, and respectfully request that your office complete the process of obtaining the President’s approval.  

Sincerely,  

J. Daniel Hare, Chair  
Academic Council  

Cc: Academic Council  
Senate Director Baxter  
Senate Executive Directors
December 6, 2015

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR DAN HARE

Dear Dan:

At its December 2 meeting, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) voted unanimously to approve UCLA’s proposal to establish the Herb Alpert School of Music. Three established departments (Ethnomusicology, Music, and Musicology) will be transferred from their existing academic units to constitute the School, and it will have its own Dean and supporting staff. The UCLA Chancellor’s Office has committed around $1.5M in General Funds to create the Dean’s Office and has agreed to retire the Ostin Music Center debt of $11 million by having annual payments made by the office of the Vice Chancellor/Chief Financial Officer.

The proposal was transmitted to CCGA during the summer of 2015, and assigned to the CCGA lead reviewer at the committee’s first meeting of the 2015-2016 Academic Year, on October 7, 2015. As per established policy, the proposers solicited two internal (UC) reviews, and the CCGA lead reviewer at least two external (non-UC) reviews. A total of two internal and three external reviews were returned, all from reviewers with considerable academic standing and administrative experience in the field. The proposed school was strongly endorsed by four of the five reviewers, with some concerns raised regarding the unorthodox structure of the school (combining performance and scholarship), challenges related to sharing of resources between the three departments, the future of the Jazz studies program, future access to Humanities Division fellowship resources for Musicology, and the desirability for accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

The leaders of the proposed school, i.e., Executive Director Judi Smith and three Co-Directors (the Department Chairs), were provided the reviews and subsequently returned a response, as well as introducing a number of measures to address reviewer concerns and to foster collaboration among the Departments. They, and several of the reviewers, noted that the proposed school is committed to and poised to benefit from its unique structure that combines its strengths in performance and scholarship; acknowledged the inherent challenges in sharing resources, but responded with a comprehensive plan and some immediate measures that are a promising demonstration of their ability to do so; outlined plans to convert the current Jazz Studies concentration to a major in Ethnomusicology, and to hire two additional Jazz Studies faculty; noted the Humanities Dean is willing to continue providing support to Musicology in the near term and that the Herb Alpert gift had already helped in maintaining the Department’s current level of support; and stated that it would be prudent to consider the possibility of accreditation once a dean is on board to provide leadership, should that be an appropriate path forward. New measures introduced include the creation of new courses, new fund raising programs, major renovations in the Schoenberg Music Building, and substantive decisions to reallocate the funding among the three departments. The proposers also reiterated a commitment to esteeming all musical traditions and maintaining a balanced emphasis on scholarship and practice. CCGA discussed reviewer concerns, and the program response, and was satisfied that all concerns had been addressed appropriately.
A unique aspect of the proposal was that the School has existed “virtually” since 2007 without a full, independent administrative structure. (The virtual School of Music was organized as a programmatic enterprise, and it has been led by a Director appointed by the Dean of the School of the Arts and Architecture.) CCGA understands that this unusual arrangement was the result of a confluence of factors – the availability of the donor’s generous gift and the fiscal crisis that UCLA experienced at the time of the donation. During the review process, the proposers acknowledged that forming a virtual school first, before setting up the real school, may not have been the “best arrangement.” It was an expedient one, given the circumstances. CCGA is therefore of the view that this unique “virtual school” arrangement should be understood as a one-off exception and should be avoided in the future.

Overall, CCGA sees the setting up of a school as a welcome development and recommends its approval. The proposal is well-crafted and comprehensive. It sets out guiding principles that commit faculty and students to esteem all musical traditions and maintain a balanced emphasis on scholarship and practice, and lays out a path forward for continued growth and further development of UCLA’s already highly-regarded music programs. In order to address the fact that the School has been set up “virtually” since 2007, though the Departments of Music, Ethnomusicology and Musicology continued to exist and were evaluated under different administrative units (School of Arts and Architecture, and Division of Humanities/College of Letters and Science), CCGA strongly recommends that an academic review of the three departments in the new School be undertaken by the fourth year of its formal establishment.

For your information, I have included the CCGA lead reviewer’s final report as an enclosure. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Valerie Leppert, Ph.D.
Chair, CCGA

Enclosures (1)

cc: Dan Chalfant, Academic Council Vice Chair
    CCGA Members
    Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR DAN HARE

Dear Dan:

At its December 2 meeting, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) voted unanimously to approve UCLA’s proposal to transfer three departments to the Herb Alpert School of Music: Musicology from the Division of Humanities/College of Letters and Science, and Music and Ethnomusicology from the School of the Arts and Architecture. The transfers are a necessary step in the establishment of the new Herb Alpert School of Music, the creation of which CCGA also voted to approve at its December meeting. The proposed transfer will also redefine the School of the Arts and Architecture by focusing on four complementary departments (Art; Architecture and Urban Design; Design/Media Arts; and World Arts and Cultures/Dance).

According to the “Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units,” campus decisions on transfer of graduate degree programs across academic units are in most cases final. There are two cases in which they may be subject to system-level review: 1) if the Divisional Senate is not appropriately involved in the campus process; or 2) if any systemwide implications are not satisfactorily addressed. CCGA is satisfied that the UCLA Academic Senate and its Graduate Council were fully involved in the review of the transfer proposal. There are no outstanding issues related to systemwide implications that are not satisfactorily addressed. CCGA recommends the approval of the transfer action as a concomitant procedural step to facilitate the establishment of the Herb Alpert School of Music.

Sincerely,
Valerie Leppert, Ph.D.
Chair, CCGA

cc: Dan Chalfant, Academic Council Vice Chair
    CCGA Members
    Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director
The Proposal

UCLA proposes to create the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music (HASOM) with the transfer of three established departments (Ethnomusicology, Music, and Musicology). The first of its kind in the UC system, the proposed School aims to maintain a balanced emphasis on scholarship and practice.

The proposal, if approved, means that the new Herb Alpert School of Music formally comes into being in 2016, with its own Dean and supporting staff. UCLA Chancellor’s Office has committed ~$1.5M in General Funds to create a Dean’s Office for the new School and has agreed to retire the Ostin Music Center debt of $11 million by having annual payments made by the office of the Vice Chancellor/Chief Financial Officer.

Existing Status

In 2007, the UC Regents and the UC President approved the use of the name “Herb Alpert School of Music” when accepting a $30 million gift from the Herb Alpert Foundation. The gift obligated UCLA to establish a new unit to enhance interactions among UCLA’s three music-related departments. The School therefore has existed “virtually” since then. The present proposal is about the creation of an independent administrative structure (a Dean’s Office) and the transfer of the aforementioned departments from the School of the Arts and Architecture (Ethnomusicology and Music) and the Division of Humanities in the College of Letters and Science (Musicology) to the newly created School.

Redefinition of School of the Arts and Architecture Review

CCGA discussed the concomitant proposal to redefine the School of the Arts and Architecture (san Ethnomusicology and Music) in its November meeting and did not see a need to further review the action other than formally voting on it. According to “Compendium: Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units,” campus decisions on transfer of graduate degree programs across academic units are in most cases final. There are two cases in which they may be subject to system-level review: 1) if the Divisional Senate is not appropriately involved in the campus process; or 2) if any systemwide implications are not satisfactorily addressed. CCGA is satisfied that UCLA Academic Senate and its Graduate Council are fully involved in the review of the redefinition proposal. There are no outstanding issues related to systemwide implications that are not satisfactorily addressed.

CCGA decided to vote in its December meeting on the redefinition action as a concomitant procedural step to establishing HASOM.

The Reviewing Process

As outlined in the University of California Compendium on Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, & Research Units (2014), establishing a school requires the
submission of a pre-proposal and a full proposal. UCLA’s Pre-proposal to establish a music school was drafted during the spring of 2014, in consultation with the faculty, Academic Senate leadership, and staff of UCLA’s Office of Academic Planning and Budget, among others. It was submitted to UC Provost and the Chair of UC Academic Council in July 1, 2014.

Faculty of the three affected Departments voted in December, 2014 (see below). The current proposal was completed in December 30, 2014 and was sent to the UC Provost and Chair of UC Academic Council. CCGA received the proposal in the summer of 2015.

Kwai Ng was assigned CCGA Lead Reviewer at the Committee’s October meeting. Names of possible reviewers were offered by the proposers, and by the Lead Reviewer himself. Three internal (UC) reviewers were identified and contacted by UCLA in October. Two returned their reviews. Three external (non-UC) reviewers were identified and contacted by the Lead Reviewer at around the same time. All three returned their reviews. The five reviewers who returned reviews waived confidentiality: David Brodbeck (UC Irvine), D. Kern Holoman (UC Davis), Jeffrey Magee (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), Daniel Melamed (Indiana), Lester Monts (Michigan). The reviews were returned by November 30.

The reviewers have considerable academic standing and administrative experience. One is a renowned music scholar who understands the UC system well (Brodbeck). One is a former UC Dean and Chair (Holoman). Two are current department chair/director of a major school of music in the country (Magee, Melamed). Another is a former senior vice provost at another major state university (Monts (and also a former UC Dean)). Together the reviewers have provided very detailed and thoughtful recommendations that cover all major facets of the proposed program.

Votes of the Faculties of the Three Departments in 2014
As mentioned, faculty (both ladder and non-ladder) voted on the plan in December 2014. The majority of the ladder faculty in Ethnomusicology (11/15 at 73%) and Music (14/19 at 74%) voted “Yes” on the proposition to establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music, while half (5/10 at 50%) of the ladder faculty in Musicology voted “Yes”. In Music, none of the ladder faculty voted against the proposition, while a minority of ladder faculty in Ethnomusicology (3/15 at 20%) and Musicology (3/10 at 30%) voted against the proposition.

A higher percentage of non-ladder than ladder faculty abstained or did not vote: Ethnomusicology (16/29 at 55% vs. 1/15 at 7%, respectively), Music (16/42 at 39% vs. 5/19 at 23%, respectively), Musicology (3/6 at 50% vs. 2/10 at 20%, respectively).

The minority voting “No” in Ethnomusicology appeared concerned that the new School would over time resemble a traditional music conservatory, where western classical music was given precedence over a broad spectrum of world music, and scholars of ethnomusicology (and musicology) played a subservient role to those training musicians. The minority voting “No” in Musicology appeared concerned about transferring from the Division of Humanities in the College of Letters and Science—where the Department has been well supported for the past 25 years—to a new School that may not value their scholarship as much and may not be able to provide them with the same levels of support.
The leaders of the virtual school, i.e., Executive Director Judi Smith and three Co-Directors (the department chairs), have since then introduced a number of measures to address those concerns and to foster collaboration among the Departments.

Key Questions

(1) Nontraditional Format
The proposed new HASOM is unconventional compared to other established schools of music. Most schools of music emphasize performance training. But HASOM aims for what the proposers describe as “a balanced emphasis” on music scholarship and music practice (i.e., performance, composition, education).

One reviewer (Melamed) questioned if the new school is committed to put in more resources to music practice. The proposers responded that all three departments, including Music, currently compete quite successfully with peer institutions for their students. It responded that it is committed to its “balanced emphasis” approach. It writes:

“HASOM is not a conventional school of music; nonetheless, all three departments currently compete quite successfully with peer institutions for their students.”

“It is an academic approach that fulfills the campus’ commitment to music performance and music scholarship, and one we are particularly well suited to pursue. The School’s goal and mission statement were vetted and embraced by our faculty, UCLA’s Academic Senate, and our Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost.”

The other four reviewers hold different views. They argue that the oversupply of graduates specialized in performance studies means that it would be ill advised for HASOM to follow the traditional conservatory model (Holoman, Brodbeck). In the words of Brodbeck: “By cutting against the grain of standard school of music in this way, the UCLA Herb Alpert School would be in a position to market itself as a truly innovative alternative to what is on offer at other top schools across the nation.”

(2) Resource Sharing
All three departments acknowledged in their comments in the proposal that working together as a cooperative whole presented serious challenges. In particular, resource sharing is a concern. This concern is also raised by one reviewer (Melamed), who writes that the three departments seem more interested in maintaining status quo than in taking up opportunities offered by the new arrangement. The same reviewer points out that “the proposed school will not be comprehensive, and does not appear poised to offer much as an integrated unit than it does as three independent departments.”

In response, the proposers outline the following features built in the new HASOM:

- faculties will establish school bylaws, elect members to a Faculty Executive Committee that will oversee the School’s curriculum and new educational collaborations
- form a unified Student Council, establish a Board of Visitors, and search for a founding dean.
- HASOM’s Cabinet, comprising the Executive Director (or Dean) and three Co-Directors (the three departmental chairs), is at the core of the School’s administration.
- The Cabinet vets all budget issues.
- HASOM, with its new development staff, is seeking funding to support the teaching of performing ensembles and individual lessons.
- Rather than competing for resources, School leaders are collaborating with our new Development Office to set priorities for fundraising. In this way, the School will be able to finance improvements in music performance programs without sacrificing funds earmarked for scholarly pursuits.

(3) Other Issues Raised in the Review Process

i) Future of Jazz Studies Program
Currently undergraduate students in Jazz Studies graduate in Ethnomusicology with a concentration in Jazz Studies. Executive Director Judith Smith appointed a faculty workgroup to provide recommendations about the advisability of Jazz Studies becoming a separate major in the Department of Ethnomusicology. The committee’s report, just submitted, recommends the creation of a Jazz Studies Major in Ethnomusicology, and the department’s hiring plan calls for hiring two ladder faculty with expertise in Jazz Studies; these positions were approved by the EVC/Provost in November and a search will be conducted in 2016-17.

ii) Resources for Musicology in the Future
Musicology is concerned about its eventual loss of access to fellowships designated for Humanities Division. The Humanities Dean is willing to provide continued generous financial support of the Department of Musicology (grants, computing support, graduate fellowships) in the short term. The Department has also been in conversation with the Graduate Division to seek multi-pronged assurances of continued support in this area. It is also important to note, first, that during the recent financial crisis, when support for the department’s graduate students from the Division dipped, it was the Herb Alpert School of Music (in its virtual stage) that helped the department to maintain its level of support.

iii) Accreditation
One reviewer (Monts) recommends HASOM to seek affiliation with National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), currently with a membership of more than 650 music schools, departments, and conservatories. The proposers responded that they have discussed accreditation but thought it would be prudent to wait until the School was approved and had a founding dean, who would provide leadership in initiating the accreditation process should it be appropriate.

iv) Music Theory and Education
Another reviewer (Magee) suggests that fostering innovative developments in music theory and music education could both reinforce HASOM’s existing strengths and galvanize the integration of performance and scholarship around a common cause. The proposers responded that while the suggestion is intriguing, it would require a major shift of resources and departmental priorities. An initiative of this sort might also involve an expansion of faculty FTE resources for the Music Department, which is not contemplated at this time. But it added that the Music Department’s latest three-year hiring plan prioritized searches for two composition/theory faculty positions to bring that
division up to its previous FTE strength. The addition of these two faculty members is expected to strengthen the theory area as a whole.

Conclusion

The proposed HASOM is strongly endorsed by four of the five reviewers. One external reviewer (Melamed) questioned if the new structure would be impactful in changing the status quo. To this end, the proposers have produced detailed responses on what they have done since the votes were taken last December. The new initiatives include the creation of new courses, new fund raising programs, major renovations in the Schoenberg Music Building, and substantive decisions to reallocate the funding among the three Departments, among others. The proposers also reiterated, their “Guiding Principles” about (1) esteeming all musical traditions and (2) maintaining a balanced emphasis on scholarship and practice are not hollow words. It will be up to the faculty and its newly formed Faculty Executive Committee (which oversees curriculum and new educational collaborations) to uphold this bold commitment.

It is obvious that the proposers have put a lot of thought into this complex proposal. In view of the unconventional structure of HASOM as a school of music and the fact that it has been existed “virtually” since 2007, I strongly recommend a review of the program by UCLA Graduate and Undergraduate Council within a time frame substantially shorter than the normal eight-year cycle.

I recommend approving the proposal to establish HASOM at this time.

CCGA Lead Reviewer: Kwai Ng