January 8, 2015

To: Joel Aberbach, Academic Senate Chair  
Alex Blui, Graduate Council Chair  
Linda Bourque, Rules and Jurisdiction Chair  
Jim Gober, Undergraduate Council Chair  
David Sears, Planning and Budget Council Chair

From: Judith L. Smith, Emerita Professor and Dean/Vice Provost

Re: Proposal to Establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and the Proposal to Redefine the School of the Arts and Architecture

On behalf of the two faculty workgroups, I am attaching two proposals, one to Establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and the other to Redefine the School of the Arts and Architecture. The proposals originate from UCLA’s Reconstitution Pre-proposal submitted by Chancellor Gene Block to the Office of the UC President on July 1, 2014. My role, on recall, has been to facilitate the writing of the Pre-proposal and the two proposals.

Whereas the Pre-proposal presented two complementary actions in one document, I was advised by the Academic Senate leadership to create two proposals because the establishment of a school would require a separate series of reviews. As advised, I worked over the past six months (July-December 2014) with two faculty workgroups to write the proposals and to facilitate the vetting of and voting on the proposals.

My role as a facilitator has required collaborations with members of the Chancellor’s Office and SOAA Dean’s Office, leaders of the Academic Senate, as well as the affected faculty and staff. UCLA has not established a new school since the Professional Schools Restructuring Initiative (PSRI) in 1994. At that time, I was Vice Chair of UCLA’s Academic Senate and several issues raised twenty years ago are still bothersome. As a result, I requested and obtained several helpful rulings from Rules and Jurisdiction, and I am grateful for Linda Bourque’s assistance.

I am also grateful for the opportunity to meet with three committees of the Academic Senate to summarize and answer questions regarding the factual information presented the Pre-proposal. I met with the Committee on Planning and Budget (October 3, 2014), Graduate Council (October 17, 2014), and Undergraduate Council (October 24, 2014). Later, each Committee responded to me with recommendations. I would like to address a few issues raised in the committees’ memos; my comments have been reviewed by the faculty workgroups.

Memo from Graduate Council (Oct 27, 2014)

1. Council asked that the rationale and benefits for changing the existing structure be more fully addressed in the Proposal. Section 2 of the music school proposal is devoted to a thorough discussion of how UCLA’s proposed School of Music meets the needs of UCLA, the UC system, and beyond. In the “Official Responses” posted in the two proposals, each of the seven departments lists...
the major “benefits” of the proposed actions and predicts “advances” for the newly established or refocused school. Lastly, a succinct list of the major benefits is presented in the Executive Summary and in the last section of each proposal.

2. Council stated that it hoped interactions among the faculties in the three music-related departments would improve as a product of the new School of Music. This is a widely shared hope. During the past six months, I have witnessed progress and expect that with inspired leadership the three departments will join forces to develop an ambitious agenda for the new School and provide a transformative model for other 21st century music schools.

Memo from Undergraduate Council (Nov 21, 2014)

1. Council commented on several issues related to the Regulations for the proposed School of Music. After reading the memo, I immediately sent an email seeking clarification and suggesting a meeting. Since I did not receive a response, I repeat my queries here.

From its Nov 21 memo, I understood Council expected that the School Bylaws and Regulations would be ratified before the Proposal to Establish a School of Music was submitted in January (2015). It is my understanding, however, that the “school faculty” cannot ratify them until Chancellor Block sends his official recommendations to the UC President and The UC Regents. This will not occur until UCLA’s Academic Senate has concluded its Appendix V review and the Legislative Assembly votes on the proposals.

Both proposals include preliminary drafts of the Bylaws and Regulations produced by the faculty workgroups during the summer and fall of 2014. When the “affected” faculty voted this December, they did not vote to ratify these Bylaws or the Regulations for either school, as faculty members eligible to vote on an Appendix V action include temporary faculty (adjuncts and lecturers) who are not typically eligible to vote on the Bylaws or Regulations.

This may be another issue for Rules and Jurisdiction, to wit: When is the faculty of a new school or restructured school formally constituted and thereby authorized to ratify documents such as the Bylaws and Regulations?

The workgroups and I have planned to appoint faculty committees to finalize the Bylaws and Regulations during the winter and spring (2015). When the faculty for each school is formally constituted, they will vote on the Bylaws and then on the Regulations. We have assumed this would be in the fall (2015) or winter (2016). At that time, Council would vet the newly approved Regulations and address any lingering academic issues raised in its Nov 21 memo.

2. Council asked for a “transition plan” for moving continuing students and admitting new students to the School of Music. This plan is not included in the Proposal; it will be detailed at the same time the Regulations are presented to Council for review and approval.

3. Council noted the proposal should “discuss the implications for classroom space” and asks “will these programs be contained in the same buildings?” As explained in the Proposal, all three departments are currently housed in the Schoenberg Music Building where most of their classes are taught. Since there will be no changes in the undergraduate curriculum (with the possible exception of a slight reduction in General Education courses for Musicology majors), there are no anticipated implications for classroom space.
4. Council raised questions about on-going academic plans, such as a possible name change for the undergraduate major in Musicology. In its Department Response, each music-related department describes its major academic priorities for the next two years. For the Department of Ethnomusicology and the Department of Musicology, these priorities are integral to their recent Eight-Year Reviews and will be discussed in their upcoming Progress Reports.

5. Finally, Council asked for more rationale about the proposal to create a Shared Central administrative unit that will serve the SOAA Dean’s Office and the SOM Dean’s Office. The rationale has been expanded in the section on School-wide Governance. It is also important to note that elements of the shared units are still being studied by the Chancellor’s Office, including a thorough review of the IT needs by Vice Provost Jim Davis.

Memo from Committee on Academic Planning and Budget (Nov 19, 2014)

1. In its memo, CPB asked if the “definition of music” in the Pre-proposal was too narrowly defined. Section 2 of the Proposal contains a fully developed description of the proposed School of Music and a set of guiding principles (akin to a mission statement). During the past months, the School’s description and principles—first drafted by the faculty workgroup—were edited and re-edited many times and involved the committed efforts of many faculty members from all three music-related departments.

2. Without offering evidence, CPB stated, “it appears that the faculty in Ethnomusicology are the most disenfranchised as a result of the new school.” In Section 6, the Department Response from each faculty lists the benefits (pros) and challenges (cons) of being transferred to the proposed School of Music. Both Ethnomusicology and Musicology faculty members have concerns but neither indicated they were being excluded or disqualified by the description or guiding principles proposed for the new School.

CPB also recommended that the following statement be included: “no department will be disenfranchised.” The Proposal is replete with clear and unambiguous statements embracing the unique contributions of each of the three music-related departments. Simply put, the proposed School will not function without the commitment and engagement of Ethnomusicology, Music, and Musicology; the description of and guiding principles for the new School make this explicit. In a document written to be inclusive and positive, it seemed unnecessary to add the statement CPB recommended.

3. CPB raised concern about the shortfall of staff support and asked, “Do they have the right number of [staff] FTE to support the new school?” This issue is addressed in Section 4 of the Proposal. Based on a HR needs assessment conducted in August, the EVC/Provost and the SOAA Dean provided funds for three new staff members who were hired in the fall (2014). These are department-level staff, not staff proposed for the Dean’s Office. In the course of the next year, the Office of Academic Planning and Budget will continue to review the staffing needs to assure campus leaders that all three departments have adequate staff support. Additionally, the Proposal documents (p. 20) that the Chancellor and the EVC/Provost are committed to providing the necessary funds to achieve adequate staffing for both the new and the reconfigured Dean’s Offices.
4. Finally, and I quote: “CPB asks for confirmation whether any department or faculty member is harmed as a result of the proposed School of Music or the proposed redefinition of the School of Arts & Architecture.” This query cuts to the heart of the Academic Senate’s pending Appendix V review. The Chancellor, the EVC/Provost, and the two Deans neither intend nor foresee any harm to the affected faculty or departments in recommending the proposed actions; indeed, they see clear benefits for all.

A minority of faculty in Ethnomusicology, Musicology, and WACD is concerned about the proposed actions; this is evident in the “Department Response” of each of the three departments and by the number of “No” votes (Ethnomusicology 4 “No” votes of 44 eligible voters; Musicology 3 “No” votes of 16 eligible voters, and WACD 10 “No” votes of 36 eligible voters). During the upcoming Appendix V review of the two proposals, CPB and other Academic Senate agencies will have to decide whether there is real or potential harm to the affected faculty and departments if actions proposed by the administration were implemented.

I hope these comments are helpful; I am available during the Winter Quarter should further questions or issues arise. Lastly, I ask for a response regarding the timing of the faculty vote on School Bylaws and Regulations by end of February. In the meantime, I will continue facilitating the efforts of both workgroups in drafting these documents for both Schools.

cc.
Jan Reiff, Immediate Past Academic Chair
Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate Office

Faculty workgroups:

**SOAA Members**
- Rebecca Allen, DMA Chair
- Neil Denari, AUD Vice Chair
- Abe Hitoshi, AUD Chair
- Angelia Leung, WACD Chair
- Peter Lunenfeld, DMA Professor
- Hirsch Perlman, Art Chair
- Polly Roberts, WACD Professor
- Patty Wickman, Art Vice Chair

**SOM Members**
- Rosina Becerra, Ethnomusicology Chair
- Robert Fink, Musicology Professor
- Frank Heuser, Music Professor
- Professor Ray Knapp, Musicology Chair
- Steve Loza, Ethnomusicology Professor
- Neal Stulberg, Music Chair
October 27, 2014

Judith L. Smith
Dean/Vice Provost Emerita

Dear Judi,

Thank you for attending the Graduate Council’s meeting on October 17th to present UCLA’s Pre-proposal to Establish a School of Music and Redefine the School of the Arts and Architecture. Members found the presentation to be well-organized and informative and appreciate your time and attention to addressing this important issue.

The Graduate Council acknowledges the need for some level of consolidation and reorganization of music education at UCLA, but it also feels that the pre-proposal should be strengthened, and elaborate more on the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed actions. While there appears to be sound academic rationale for moving forward, the absence of clearly identified benefits (be they academic, financial, logistic, or administrative) should be addressed in advance so that the faculty and students are clear about the University’s rationale for changing the existing organizational structures. Such issues may be addressed more completely within the forthcoming formal proposal, and should be highlighted accordingly.

Of course, the Graduate Council remains very concerned about the interactions between faculty in the music departments and sincerely hopes that the ultimate proposal addresses how these interactions will improve as a product of the establishment of the new school of music (and redefinition of the School of Arts & Architecture).

Thank you for the work you are doing for UCLA. I hope you find this response to be helpful as you continue to facilitate and influence the ever-evolving landscape at UCLA.

Sincerely,

Alex Bui, Chair
Graduate Council

cc: Joel Aberbach, Chair, Academic Senate
    Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
    Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Jan Reiff, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
November 21, 2014

Judith Smith, Dean and Vice Provost Emerita
UCLA College of Letters and Sciences

Re:  Pre-Proposal to Establish a School of Music and Redefine the School of the Arts and Architecture

Dear Judi,

Thank you for visiting the Undergraduate Council (UgC) on October 24, 2014 to discuss the pre-proposal to establish a School of Music and to redefine the School of the Arts and Architecture (SOAA). Council members appreciate the deliberate manner with which you are proceeding with the process. In anticipation of the full proposal in the winter quarter, the council’s comments are below:

- The School Bylaws and Regulations are mentioned briefly on page 19 of the pre-proposal. The new School of Music would bring together existing departments from two different areas—SOAA and the College of Letters and Science. There are some important differences in the regulations of SOAA and the College, which will have to be addressed in the full proposal:
  - Undergraduate students in the College must obtain 18 units in the Foundations of Scientific Inquiry area of General Education (GE) while undergraduate students in SOAA only need 8 units. The proposal should include the GE requirements of the School of Music and rationale for matching the SOAA or the College or for having a new set of requirements.
  - SOAA students must complete a diversity requirement, and the College is implementing a similar requirement in fall 2015. The proposal should discuss a diversity requirement for the School of Music.

- SOAA has an online supplemental application for undergraduate admission, including a processing fee for applicants. The proposal should discuss the supplemental application process for the School of Music and whether it will apply to all three departments.

- A transition plan for all students moving into the School of Music in 2016 should be detailed in the proposal.

- The proposal should discuss the implications for classroom space. Will these programs be contained within their buildings?

- As stated in the June 10, 2014 letter from the Academic Senate Executive Board, the proposal should “speak directly to the way in which the combined educational efforts already underway in the virtual school have benefitted undergraduate and graduate students alike and suggest ways in which their educational experiences will be even better in the proposed new school.”
• The proposal should provide more rationale for the split of certain resources—Information Technology, Academic Personnel, HR Management, and Operations—between the new dean’s office and the dean’s office in SOAA.

• There are at least two curricular issues of which you should be aware as you proceed with the proposal:
  o The 2013-14 Program Review of the Department of Musicology strongly recommended that the department update its catalogue language to bring the name of the major in line with the name of the department. Though the Undergraduate Council has not yet received a proposal to do so, it is conceivable that, prior to the proposal being fully reviewed, the department may propose to change the name of the “Music History” major to “Musicology.”

  o On October 24, 2014, The SOAA FEC approved a proposal from the Advisory Committee for the Music Industry Minor to open the minor to all UCLA undergraduate students. Page 8 of the pre-proposal notes that this minor is open to only music students.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the pre-proposal. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me (x69449; jwg@chem.ucla.edu) or Undergraduate Council Committee Analyst, Matt Robinson (x51194; mrobinson@senate.ucla.edu).

Sincerely,

Jim Gober, Chair
Undergraduate Council

cc: Joel Aberbach, Chair, Academic Senate
    Alex Bui, Chair, Graduate Council
    Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
    Matt Robinson, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
    David Sears, Chair, Council on Planning and Budget
November 19, 2014

Emerita Vice Provost Judi Smith
Herb Alpert School of Music

Re: Proposal to establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and Redefine the UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture

Dear Judi,

Thank you for providing the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) with an overview of the proposal to establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music as an academic unit and redefine the School of Arts and Architecture at its meeting on October 3, 2014. The Council subsequently discussed the proposal on November 3. After discussion, the council voted unanimously to support the proposal but did, however, have questions that should be addressed in the final proposal.

CPB commented that the proposal for the new school may limit the definition of music, suggesting that the introduction on page 1, as well as descriptions that follow throughout the proposal, may be too narrowly defined. Instead perhaps it should refer “to the composition of music broadly defined, including but not limited to classical music, world music, popular music, and jazz.”

It appears that the faculty in the Department of Ethnomusicology are the most disenfranchised as a result of the new school. The Council recommends revising language and clearly stating that “no department will be disenfranchised”.

It appears that there is a disparity of funding between the three units. Referencing page six of the proposal, it is unclear why there are staffing shortfalls (see footnote to Table 3). Do they have the right number of FTE to support the new school? Does Ethnomusicology have the right number of FTE? CPB recommended clarification of the language on page six. Further, CPB recommends that the proposal clearly state that the administration will ensure availability of resources for all programs.

And finally, CPB asks for confirmation whether any department or faculty member is harmed as a result of proposed School of Music or the proposed redefinition of the School of Arts & Architecture.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this pre-proposal. The Council looks forward to reviewing the final proposal. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at sears@issr.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

David O. Sears, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate Office
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget