GRADUATE COUNCIL

LINK - Appendix V: Establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music with the transfer of three established department (Ethnomusicology, Music and Musicology) and the creation of a Dean’s Office.

LINK - Appendix V: Redefine the existing UCLA 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) and transferring two department (Ethnomusicology and Music) to the proposed UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music

The Graduate Council recommends the implementation of the two complimentary proposals to establish the new UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and to redefine the UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture. The new School will “foster musical and scholarly innovation through dedicated centers and degree programs, as well as provide a central portal through which music can engage with their disciplines on campus and beyond.” The redefined School “will continue its strong commitment to innovative education, pioneering research, dynamic public service and community engagement, and to the fundamental human value of creativity.” Given the extensive proposal development and review processes, the Graduate Council considers the proposed actions academically sound and in the best interest of the University of California.

Votes and consultation on the Proposals

With respect to the establishment of the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music

- Of the 15 eligible Senate faculty in the Department of Ethnomusicology, 11 voted in favor, 3 were opposed, and 0 abstained; 1 did not vote.

- Of the 19 eligible Senate faculty in the Department of Music, 14 voted in favor, 0 were opposed, and 0 abstained; 5 did not vote.

- Of the 10 eligible Senate faculty in the Department of Musicology, 5 voted in favor, 3 were opposed, and 2 abstained; all voted.

With respect to the redefinition of the UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture:

- Of the 15 eligible Senate faculty in the Department of Architecture and Urban Design, 5 voted in favor, 0 were opposed and 0 abstained; 10 did not vote.

- Of the 16 eligible Senate faculty in the Department of Art, 7 voted in favor, 3 were opposed, and 0 abstained; 7 did not vote.
• Of the 11 eligible Senate faculty in the Department of Design│Media Arts, 8 voted in favor, 0 were opposed, and 0 abstained; 3 did not vote.

• Of the 21 eligible Senate faculty in the Department of World Arts and Cultures/Dance, 6 voted in favor, 8 were opposed; and 0 abstained; 7 did not vote.

At its May 1, 2015, meeting the Graduate Council voted to support the proposed actions (9 in favor, 0 abstentions, 1 opposed, 1 recused; GSA Reps: 2 in favor) to establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and redefine the UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture.

Respectfully submitted:
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May 14, 2015

To: Alex Bui, Chair
Graduate Council

From: Linda Bourque, Chair
Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Proposal to Create the Herb Alpert School of Music and Restructure the School of the Arts and Architecture

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the Graduate Council’s request that the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction confirm that the Council appropriately handled the Appendix V action creating the Herb Alpert School of Music and restructuring the School of the Arts and Architecture. The Committee finds the decision of the Graduate Council consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate and the requirements of Appendix V.

At the request of Vice Provost Emeritus Smith, Rules and Jurisdiction has opined on a number of issues about the Appendix V procedures dating back to October 2014. One of those memos (February 28, 2015) is included in the documentation that accompanied your memo of May 8, 2015. It is not clear whether our correction to that memo sent on March 5 is included; it should be added to the documentation, and is attached.

It is the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction’s opinion that this process has been careful, fair and thorough. But we agree with the Graduate Council that the restructuring should be carefully monitored through 8-year reviews and other activities to insure transparency and the development of a sense of community in the new academic structure as the two Schools maintain and expand the excellence of arts education at UCLA.

Finally, please make sure that all of your documents refer to the School of the Arts and Architecture (emphasis added).

Attachment: Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction memo to Vice Provost Emeritus Smith, March 5, 2015

cc: Jason Throop, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
James Crall, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Joel Aberbach, Chair, Academic Senate
Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
Glyn Davies, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning and Budget
April de Stefano, Director of Academic Services, Graduate Division
Leo Estrada, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
Robin L. Garrell, Dean, Graduate Division
Fredye Harms, Principal Policy Analyst, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs
Jutta Heckhausen, Chair, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Marian McKenna Olivas, Committee Analyst, Rules & Jurisdiction
Jan Reiff, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
David Schaberg, Dean, Division of Humanities
Judith Smith, Vice Provost Emerita, Chancellor’s Office
Christopher Waterman, Dean, School of Arts and Architecture
May 11, 2015

Joel D. Aberbach, Chair
Academic Senate

Dear Joel,

I am writing in response to your request for the Graduate Council’s coordination of the Appendix V actions to establish a new School (UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music) and to redefine an existing School (UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture) at UCLA. Following review of the proposals and associated responses at its meeting on May 1, 2015, the Graduate Council voted to support the proposed actions (9 in favor, 0 abstentions, 1 opposed, 1 recused; GSA Reps: 2 in favor).

In your memo dated February 27, 2015, you note that the Executive Board recommended that the proposal be considered a “friendly” action and, if we concur, that the alternate dispute resolution process be invoked. The Board noted some opposition votes and asked that the council consider whether negative votes within a department should result in an unfriendly action.

As you know, the pre-proposal for these actions was submitted to the Academic Senate in Fall 2014, at which time, the Graduate Council (among many other Senate committees) provided its initial comments. Subsequent to these reviews, the proposals were finalized and resubmitted to all relevant parties, who were provided another opportunity to provide feedback. Before reviewing the proposal with the Graduate Council, which was assigned the designated committee to coordinate the actions, we forwarded it to the Undergraduate Council and Council on Planning and Budget, both of which responded affirmatively to the proposed actions. The Undergraduate Council, in particular, provided us with its assessment of the proposed actions (i.e., friendly or unfriendly) and reaffirmed the Council’s position that, despite the lack of unanimity in the votes, there was an overwhelmingly positive vote that supports expediting these actions via the alternate dispute resolution process.

Furthermore, given the significant work and consultation done by Vice Provost Emerita Judith Smith with preparing the proposals and considering the perspectives of all faculty in the impacted departments, the notion of conducting additional interviews to complete our investigation would seem duplicative and unnecessary. Additionally, via the Academic Senate’s 8-year review process, as noted by the Undergraduate Council, the proposed actions have been long supported by both Councils for a number of reasons (both curricular and administrative) that expressly support consolidating the various “music” disciplines under one School, which is already recognized – albeit virtually – as the Herb Alpert School of Music. As such, the Graduate Council again supports expediting the actions via the alternate dispute resolution process and believes that they will result in a logical organizational structure that encompasses and celebrates arts education at UCLA. After reviewing departmental responses to the proposed actions and assessing the extent to which the opposition is truly opposed to the establishment and redefinition, members note that, especially in the case of the Department of World Arts and Cultures/Dance, the expressed concerns were more about the Department’s future role in the redefined school, than opposition to the action. In recognition of the minority opposition however, the Graduate Council (in coordination with the Undergraduate Council) is committed to ensuring that its concerns are monitored and addressed via the regular 8-year program review process.
We also recognize that the timing of these actions—corresponding with the appointment of two new deans—will require their keen oversight and informed judgment when making academic and management decisions. The holders of these appointments should be effective mediators, who possess a great degree of sensitivity to ensure inclusivity and collaboration in governing the schools. We therefore strongly recommend that the Administration support quarterly School-wide town hall meetings so that all parties are privy—and may contribute to—future planning in both Schools. It will be imperative for the Administration to actively foster a sense of community within the new academic structure, and to ensure transparency in the decisions moving forward. It may even be appropriate that rather than wait for the new decanal appointments, that current Administration initiate open forums for discussion about moving forward with the new School, addressing the identified concerns of some faculty.

By copy of this letter, the Graduate Council requests the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction’s confirmation of the Council’s appropriate handling of the process and, upon receipt of its response, recommends divisional approval by the Legislative Assembly. I am also copying this letter to the Chair of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, Jutta Heckhausen, to inform CCGA of the pending action.

The Council wishes to recognize the tremendous effort by Vice Provost Emerita Smith with facilitating preparation of these proposals, the Undergraduate Council for its thoughtful and helpful analysis, and the faculty of both schools for their anticipated cooperation and support with maintaining the excellence of arts education that is so critical to the University.

If have any questions or require any additional information, please feel free to contact me via the Graduate Council’s committee analyst, Kyle Cunningham, at kcunningham@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Alex Bui, Chair
Graduate Council

cc: Linda Bourque, Chair, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    Serge Chenkerian, MSO/Executive Assistant, Academic Senate
    Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
    Glyn Davies, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning and Budget
    April de Stefano, Director of Academic Services, Graduate Division
    Leo Estrada, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
    Robin L. Garrell, Dean, Graduate Division
    Fredye Harms, Principal Policy Analyst, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs
    Jutta Heckhausen, Chair, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs
    Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
    Marian McKenna Olivas, Committee Analyst, Rules & Jurisdiction
    Jan Reiff, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    David Schaberg, Dean, Division of Humanities
    Judith Smith, Vice Provost Emerita, Chancellor’s Office
    Christopher Waterman, Dean, School of Arts and Architecture
Responses to the UCLA Proposal to Establish the Herb Alpert School of Music and Redefine the School of Arts & Architecture

1. Office of Academic Planning and Budget Response (April 15, 2015)
2. Undergraduate Council Response (April 9, 2015)
3. Council on Planning and Budget Response (April 7, 2015)
4. Graduate Council Request to CPB and UgC (March 12, 2015)
5. Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction Correction (March 5, 2015)
6. Smith Email (March 3, 2015)
7. Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (February 28, 2015)
8. Executive Board Designation Letter (February 27, 2015)

Updated 5/8/2015
April 15, 2015

Professor Joel Aberbach
Chair, Academic Senate
3125 Murphy Hall
140801

Dear Joel:

I have reviewed the proposals to establish the Herb Alpert School of Music by combining the departments of Ethnomusicology, Music, and Musicology and reconfiguring the School of the Arts and Architecture.

As stipulated above, the proposal to establish the Herb Alpert School of Music requires the transfer of three departments, two from the School of the Arts and Architecture (Ethnomusicology and Music) and one from the division of Humanities in the College (Musicology). Additionally, the establishment of a new school requires the provision of resources to create a Dean’s Office for the newly established school and a plan to retire the debt associated with the newly constructed Ostin Music Center.

Dean Waterman’s letter of support clearly identifies the resources associated with the two departments in the School of the Arts and Architecture and his intent to transfer those resources to the newly established school. The resources remaining with the School of the Arts and Architecture are sufficient to fund the redefined school in a manner that is consistent with the school’s current funding level.

Dean Schaberg’s letter of support also clearly identifies the resource associated with the department in the division of Humanities in the College along with his intent to transfer those resources to the newly established school.

EVC Waugh strongly supports both proposals and the Chancellor has agreed to provide the permanent funding necessary to establish a new Dean’s Office for the Herb Alpert School of Music. In addition, commitments of central resources have been established to both retire the debt associated with the Ostin Music Center and renovate the physical space in the Schoenberg building to establish the Dean’s suite.
Therefore, given the strong desire to move forward with establishing the Herb Alpert School of Music along with the commitments in place from central resources and school and divisional resources, I see no financial impediments towards establishing the school.

Should you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Glyn

Glyn Davies
Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Planning and Budget

cc: Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh
Chief Financial Officer and Vice Chancellor Steven A. Olsen
Dean David Schaberg
Emeritus Vice Provost Judith L. Smith
Dean Chris Waterman
April 9, 2015

Alex Bui, Chair
Graduate Council

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

Dear Alex,

The Undergraduate Council (UgC) completed its review of the two Appendix V proposals during its meeting on March 20, 2015. We noted the lack of unanimity in the votes on both proposals, but found sufficient explanation in the accompanying explanations, both from in the proposal and from the departments themselves. In our pre-review, we raised many points about the undergraduate curriculum and regulations, all of which were addressed in this final proposal. In the hopes of easing Graduate Council’s review, I will divide our comments below to address each proposal separately.

Proposal to Establish the Herb Alpert School of Music (HASOM)

The lack of unanimity in the votes from the three affected departments calls into question whether this Appendix V action is indeed “friendly.” The overall vote was overwhelmingly positive (30 – 6 “yes” among Senate Faculty and 71 – 7 “yes” among all faculty). The location of the Senate faculty “no” votes (three in Ethnomusicology and three in Musicology) and the accompanying departmental responses reveal curricular concerns for the proposed new school. Both departments express concern about the place for their scholarship in a School of Music, which could begin to resemble a traditional music conservatory, focused more on music performance than the study of music history and world music.

The council was pleased to see the detailed draft regulations for the proposed new school. We understand, from Vice Provost Emerita Smith’s correspondence in Fall 2014 that these regulations cannot be final until the school is constituted. The draft clearly addressed the council’s concerns about General Education and Diversity requirements for graduation. We did not see any more detail on admissions processes for the proposed new school. Currently, all applicants for undergraduate admissions in the School of the Arts and Architecture (SOAA), complete supplemental application materials and are evaluated by departmental faculty. This supplemental application also comes with an additional fee (on top of the UC application fee). The details of the undergraduate admissions process for the proposed School of Music needs to be developed, especially since student services (including admission) are proposed to be separate operations in SOAA and HASOM.
The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils called for the formation of a School of Music to house the Departments of Music, Musicology, and Ethnomusicology after the Program Review of the Department of Music in 2010-11 (echoing the previous two eight-year reviews of this department) and re-affirmed this call in the reviews of the Departments of Musicology and Ethnomusicology in 2013-14. In finally housing these three departments in a single school, though, we must be wary of the advice from the recent Program Review Reports. Recommendations about faculty civility and cooperation are beyond the purview of the council in this particular matter, but members wished to reiterate curricular issues, listed below:

- The Jazz Studies Program in the Department of Ethnomusicology has had a troubled past with the Department of Music. Enough time seems to have passed for reconciliation, but the 2013-14 review of the Department of Ethnomusicology revealed that many Jazz Studies majors preferred a conservatory-style program without the BA requirements for Ethnomusicology. The placement of Jazz Studies in the new school should be carefully considered.

- As we noted in our response to the pre-proposal in Fall 2014, the 2013-14 review of the Department of Musicology recommended that the department update its courses and change the subject area “Music History” to “Musicology.” Especially in light of the concerns about the role the department will have in the scholarship of the new school, the naming of these courses should be considered carefully.

- The 2013-14 Musicology Review also revealed that certain courses in the Music Department taken by Musicology students lacked sufficient rigor. This review went on to suggest more double-major programs among the three music-related departments. For this, or less-involved efforts of curricular integration, to occur, the three departments must cooperate. This cooperation is made even more necessary by the creation of the new school.

Proposal to Redefine the School of the Arts and Architecture

Here again, the non-unanimous vote raised questions about the “friendly” nature of this Appendix V action. Taken as a whole, the vote was positive (26 - 11 “yes” among Senate faculty and 38 - 13 “yes” among all faculty). The most troubling vote was in the Department of World Arts and Cultures/Dance (WAC/D) (6 – 8 “yes” among Senate Faculty and 11 – 10 “yes” overall). Though the “no” votes are not directly explained, the WAC/D response to the proposal outlines the department’s concerns about their position in the redefined school. Though WAC/D identified many benefits to the redefinition of the school, UgC members sympathized with the concerns expressed. Members did not feel that any further investigation into this split vote was necessary, but suggests that the Graduate and Undergraduate councils work together, through the program review process, to ensure that the trajectory of the redefined school, as it plays out, appropriately incorporates dance, performance, and the study of world cultures.

In terms of curriculum, we do not see any serious immediate implications from this Appendix V action. SOAA has operated effectively under its existing regulations for a number of years and has an engaged Faculty Executive Committee. Of course, as we have learned through the
program review process, resource availability and allocation often directly correlate to a department’s or a school’s availability to offer a robust curriculum. So, as we have said above, we look forward to working with the Graduate Council to offer support to the departments remaining in the redefined SOAA.

The council does realize that many of the above comments lie outside of the Appendix V process. But, with the designation of this as a “friendly” action and the expedited process that accompanies this designation, members felt it necessary to reinforce the concerns of the minority votes on both actions. If you have any questions or if any of the above points require clarification, please contact me (x69449; jwg@chem.ucla.edu) or Undergraduate Council Analyst Matt Robinson (x51194; mrobinson@senate.ucla.edu).

Sincerely,

Jim Gober, Chair
Undergraduate Council

cc: Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
    Matt Robinson, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
April 7, 2015

Alex Bui
Chair, Graduate Council

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

Dear Professor Bui,

Thank you for providing the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) with an opportunity to comment on the proposal for the establishment of the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and to redefine the School of Arts and Architecture. The Council discussed the proposal via email, since there were no meetings scheduled during the month of March. After discussion, the council voted to support the proposal (11 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstain).

The membership majority agrees that the questions brought up in November have been answered on the final proposal. We do not see any obvious financial issues, and support the request.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this revised proposal. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at sears@issr.ucla.edu, or via the Council on Planning and Budget’s committee analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu or x62470.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David O. Sears, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
    Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate Office
    Elizabeth Feller, Committee Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
March 12, 2015

Jim Gober, Chair
Undergraduate Council

David O. Sears, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

Dear Professors Gober and Sears,

As you know, the Academic Senate received the enclosed proposals from Emerita Professor and Dean/Vice Provost Judith Smith for the establishment of the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and the redefinition of the School of Arts & Architecture at UCLA. Smith is serving as the administrative liaison for the coordination and preparation of both proposals. The Academic Senate’s Executive Board has assigned the actions to the Graduate Council as the designated committee, which will follow the procedures as outlined in Appendix V of the Divisional Manual of the Academic Senate.

In order to facilitate the Graduate Council’s review and ultimate recommendations, I am writing to request the Undergraduate Council and Council on Planning and Budget’s feedback concerning the proposed actions. The Graduate Council’s initial determination is that the proposals constitute “friendly” actions, as recommended by the Executive Board, in which case, we will invoke the procedures for an Alternative Dispute Resolution.

In order to proceed accordingly, I am writing to formally request your councils’ reviews and respectfully ask for your responses no later than Thursday, April 9, 2015 so that the Graduate Council can complete its review before its deadline to respond to the Executive Board by April 24, 2015. As noted in the Executive Board’s assignment letter, dated February 27, 2015, Associate Vice Chancellor Glyn Davies has been asked to provide a statement on the financial feasibility and impact of the proposals, which will be critical for the Council on Planning and Budget’s review.

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me via the Graduate Council’s policy analyst, Kyle Cunningham, at ext. 51162 or kcunningham@senate.ucla.edu. Thank you in advance for your input and contributions to this important process.

Sincerely,

Alex Bui, Chair
Graduate Council

Cc: Joel Aberbach, Chair, Academic Senate
Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
Glyn Davies, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning and Budget
Elizabeth Feller, Committee Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
Linda Mohr, Interim CAO, Academic Senate
Matt Robinson, Committee Analyst, Undergraduate Council
March 5, 2015

To: Judi Smith  
   Dean/Vice Provost (on recall)  
   Los Angeles Division

From: Linda Bourque, Chair  
   Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Proposed School of Music and Reconfigured SOAA, Addendum

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction received your email sent on Tuesday, March 3, 2015, and realizes that we erred in determining the time line and set of approvals that must apply for both the proposed School of Music and the reconfigured School of the Arts and Architecture.

The Committee failed to realize that if the School of the Arts and Architecture was approved before the proposed School of Music two departments, Music and Ethnomusicology, would be left homeless for some period time. This is not acceptable from anybody’s point of view.

Thus, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction revises its ruling of February 28, 2015, to specify that neither the proposed school of music nor the reconfigured School of the Arts and Architecture are final until both proposals are approved by the Board of Regents. New bylaws, regulations, and other elections can be conducted by the two proposed schools after they are approved by the Board of Regents.

cc: Jason Throop, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction  
   James Crall, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction  
   Joel Aberbach, Chair, Academic Senate  
   Leobardo Estrada, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
   Jan Reiff, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
   Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate  
   Serge Chenkerian, MSO, Academic Senate  
   Marian Olivas, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
Dear Linda,

Thank you for your letter and the Committee’s thoughtful response. I am in NYC until March 14 but when I return, I would like to discuss the ruling with you. It seems to me that the vote for the SOAA bylaws cannot occur until the Regents ruling on the proposed School of Music. If the SOAA bylaw vote occurred earlier, faculty in Musicology and Ethnomusicology would be left ‘homeless’ without a vote or school governance. This would not be a problem for Musicology because they would still be part of the College until the Regents approved the establishment of the new School.

Based on my understanding of the situation, it appears that no vote could be scheduled until after the Regent’s action.

Best, Judi

On Mar 2, 2015, at 11:11 PM, Linda Bourque wrote:

Attached is the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction’s response to your inquiry dated January 8, 2015.

Linda Bourque
<r&j SOM February 28, 2015 FINAL.docx>
<1-30-03AcadPrgReviewProposal.pdf>
February 28, 2015

To: Judi Smith  
Dean/Vice Provost (on recall)  
Los Angeles Division

From: Linda Bourque, Chair  
Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Proposed School of Music and Reconfigured SOAA

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed your memo of January 8, 2015.

The Committee notes that the Pre-Proposal phase describing the development of a new School of Music and a reconfigured School of the Arts and Architecture has been completed. We interpret your memo to be a formal submission to the Executive Board of the Academic Senate. Two proposals were submitted, one for a new School of Music and one for a restructured School of the Arts and Architecture. At this time the Executive Board needs to:

- Determine whether an Appendix V review will be initiated;
- Notify the University of California Academic Senate that an Appendix V review has been initiated; and
- Establish the designated committee or committees; Appendix V states that both the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council would be the designated committees.

While a number of issues are raised in the memo, only one appears to be relevant for the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction. This is the following.

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?

To answer this question, we reviewed six documents.

- Bylaws of the Academic Senate, University of California;
- The Bylaws of the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate;
- Appendix V, Procedures for Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance (TCDD) of Academic Programs and Units, from the Los Angeles Division, Amended May 28, 1996;
- Procedural Manual for the Review of Proposals for Academic Programs and Units, dated January 30, 2003; and
- Standing Orders 105.1, 105.2, and 110.1 of the Regents.
In SB 80 (B)(5) the UC Bylaws specify that “Divisional Manuals shall include Bylaws of Faculties and Councils directly responsible to the Division.” They are silent as to when Bylaws should be developed relative to the timeline for establishing Faculties (e.g., schools and colleges) and Councils. But, SB 30 (B) states the following.

Initial elections in a newly established legislative agency of the Senate shall occur as soon as possible, and each person elected shall assume office immediately. If at the time of the election the unexpired term of such office is less than four months, the incumbent shall remain in the office until the end of the following term.

In UCLA Bylaw 50 (A), it states “The membership of each Faculty is determined by the Bylaws of the Los Angeles Division . . . [and] (4) All members of the Division who are members of departments assigned to the college or school (5) Such other members of the Senate as are specified in Divisional Bylaws 160 through 184 (Membership of Faculties).” [And] 50 (D) The government and supervision of each college and school at Los Angeles is vested in the Faculty concerned . . . “ The UCLA Manual is silent as to when Bylaws should be developed relative to the timeline for establishing Faculties (e.g., schools and colleges) and Councils.

Appendix V is silent regarding when bylaws are written and approved.

“Steps in the Process” states “The proposal should outline plans for establishing departmental bylaws and standing committees, and should as far as possible address larger governance issues such as FEC representation or the new unit’s membership in a constituency of the Committee on Committees.” But it goes on and states:

*Note: An Appendix V action is considered final ONLY after the Legislative Assembly vote. Until then, the programs/units in question should avoid circulating any materials or memoranda, or taking any actions, that assume the outcome of the vote (p. 4).*

“Steps in the Process” states and Appendix V implies that an Appendix V action is complete when it has been approved by the Legislative Assembly in the Los Angeles Division and transmitted to the “proper administrative officials.”

In contrast, Regents’ Standing Order 110.1 (amended March 15, 1996) makes it clear that academic units must be approved by the Regents.

The Board has established the colleges, schools, graduate divisions, certain other major academic units, affiliated institutions, and related activities at the several campuses and facilities of the University of California and, upon the recommendation of the President of the University, with the advice of the Academic Senate, has established the degrees awarded by the several academic units of the University. **The Board shall approve the establishment and disestablishment of colleges, schools, graduate divisions, and organized multicampus research units, upon the recommendation of the President with the advice of the Academic Senate. . . . (Emphasis added.)**

The *Procedural Manual* confirms that the Regents have final authority for establishing a new school or college. See pages 33-34 in the attached document. In contrast, information presented on page 2 of the *Procedure Manual* appears to contradict the information presented on
pages 37-38. The Procedural Manual is silent on when bylaws are written relative to establishing a new school or reconfiguring a school or college.

Committee Summary

After reviewing all of these materials, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction concludes that the Regents must approve the proposed school of music before the faculty can vote on new bylaws and regulations, but that faculty in the reconfigured School of the Arts and Architecture can vote on new bylaws and regulations when an approved proposal leaves the Los Angeles Division. SB 30 (B) supports this interpretation when it states that “Initial elections in a newly established legislative agency of the Senate shall occur as soon as possible, and each person elected shall assume office immediately.”

In spite of statements in “Steps in the Process,” the Committee sees no reason why the faculties of the two proposed schools cannot be developing new bylaws and regulations while the proposals are going through the Appendix V review.

cc: Jason Throop, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    James Crall, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    Joel Aberbach, Chair, Academic Senate
    Leobardo Estrada, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
    Jan Reiff, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
    Serge Chenkerian, MSO, Academic Senate
    Marian Olivas, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
February 27, 2015

Alex Bui  
Chair, Graduate Council

Glyn Davies, Associate Vice Chancellor  
Academic Planning and Budget

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

Dear Professor Bui and Associate Vice Chancellor Davies,

The Executive Board reviewed the proposal to establish the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Music and the proposal to redefine the UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture (SOAA) at its meeting on February 26, 2015. Although two separate proposals, they are interdependent and overlap in the approval process. Therefore, the Executive Board has approved the initiation of the Appendix V action for the SOAA and also recommends that the two proposals be considered together. The Executive Board has assigned the Graduate Council as the designated committee. It is the Board’s understanding that the Graduate Council will consult with other Senate committees as necessary, including the Undergraduate Council, Council on Planning and Budget, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (for bylaw and process review), as well as relevant administrators and students it deems appropriate.

Further, the Executive Board recommends that the Appendix V proposal be considered a “friendly” action and, if the Graduate Council concurs, that the alternative dispute resolution process be invoked. The Board recognizes that there are some opposing votes to the Appendix V action, particularly in the Department of World Arts and Cultures/Dance. However, we ask that you consider in your deliberations whether having some negative votes within individual departments, if counted separately from the division, results in an unfriendly action.

Finally, it is the Executive Board’s desire to complete the review process and schedule approval of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting in June 2015, if possible. Therefore, I ask that the Graduate Council complete its review process no later than April 24, 2015.

At this time, I am also copying Associate Vice Chancellor Glyn Davies with the request that the Office of Academic Planning and Budget provide a statement on the financial feasibility and impact of the proposals.

Thank you in advance for your work on this important proposal. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Joel D. Aberbach  
Chair, Academic Senate

cc:   David Schaberg, Dean of the Humanities  
Christopher Waterman, Dean of the School of Arts & Architecture  
Leo Estrada, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Jim Gober, Chair, Undergraduate Council  
Jan Reiff, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
Judi Smith, Emerita Vice Provost/Dean  
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Kyle Cunningham, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
January 28, 2015

Joel Aberbach, Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Proposal to establish the Herb Alpert School of Music and amend the College Bylaws

Dear Joel,

The College Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) reviewed the proposal to establish the Herb Alpert School of Music during our meetings of December 5th (Final Draft dated Dec 1, 2014) and January 23rd (official Proposal dated January 8, 2015). During both meetings, representatives of Musicology made brief presentations, and then our members discussed two matters at length—the benefits and challenges of establishing a new School and the request that the College Bylaws be amended to include representation for faculty with divisional appointments without departmental assignments (see attachment). I am pleased to report that on both matters our members were enthusiastic in their support and voted unanimously to amend our bylaws pending the establishment of the School (11 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain).

Our members believe that a School of Music as outlined in the proposal will benefit UCLA and the three departments by facilitating interdisciplinary teaching and research and celebrating the long tradition that music and the study of music has had on campus. In order to foster interdisciplinarity, we believe the arrangements reached between Dean Schaberg and the Department of Musicology faculty with regard to continued divisional support and the zero percent appointment in the Humanities are positive and will ensure continued collaborations across the College. Upon confirmation that the School of Music is approved, the College FEC will initiate a Bylaw change to include divisional appointments without departmental assignments in our membership profile.

As you consider the matter, please do not hesitate to contact us at cpalmer@mednet.ucla.edu or at jbristow@humnet.ucla.edu with questions. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Christina Palmer
Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee

Joseph Bristow
Vice Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee

cc: Lucy Blackmar, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education Initiatives
    Raymond Knapp, Chair, Department of Musicology
    Claire McCluskey, Assistant Registrar, Registrar’s Office
    David Schaberg, Dean, Division of Humanities
    Judith Smith, Dean and Vice Provost emerita, Division of Undergraduate Education
    Christopher Waterman, Dean, School of Arts and Architecture
    Scott Waugh, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Recommend Change in the College Bylaw to ensure that Musicology Faculty remain represented in the College FEC

Part VI. Membership of the Faculty Executive Committee

8. The membership of the Faculty Executive Committee has 13 voting members: the Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty and eleven faculty members, one elected from each of the academic groups below:

*Current:*
2. Art History; Classics, Asian Languages and Cultures; Linguistics; **Musicology**

*Recommended Change:*
2. Art History; Classics, Asian Languages and Cultures; Linguistics; **faculty with Divisional appointments** (w/o departmental assignment)
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