

**Agenda and Evaluation Report for
Audit & Review Face-to-Face Meeting
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Music Majors and Minors, 2018-2019**

Date: 4/16/2019

Time: 3:34 p.m.

Place: CA 2080

Present: AVC Greg Cook; Dean Eileen Hayes (Arts & Comm); Department Chair/Program Coordinator Michael Dugan; faculty and staff in the Elementary Education program, including Cristina Ballatori, Myung Hee Chung, Christian Ellenwood and Rachel Wood; Audit & Review Team Chair Corey Davis; Audit & Review team member S.A. Welch; Catherine Chan and Joan Littlefield Cook.

- 1) The meeting was called to order at 3:06 p.m.
- 2) Introductions
- 3) Overview of review team evaluation, program comments: The Music Department and its programs produce successful graduates. More broadly, performances and camps offered by faculty, academic staff and numerous visiting artists/musicians enrich the broader Whitewater/Southeastern Wisconsin community and raise the university's profile among prospective students. The review committee would like to see the Department continue to align their assessment work of these great programs with university learning outcomes. The committee would also like to see clarification in the assessment schedule for given learning outcomes. The Department is overtaxed in terms of workload; FTE has remained at the same level despite a 25% increase in enrollment. Additional lines would better serve students and would also provide additional human resources to complete assessment work. Finally, and most urgently, the rehearsal spaces should be improved to address safety risks.
- 4) Discussion of Review Team's evaluation:
 - a) **Student and Faculty/Staff Safety Concerns:**

Rehearsal spaces are inadequate. Practice spaces are not only inadequate, but pose a health risk to students and staff. Specifically, the spaces represent a hearing loss hazard. There is a plan to address the problem with improvements to the practice rooms. This currently unfunded proposal entails the use of Wenger practice pods, which would cost approximately \$1.25 million. Acoustic foam wedges are being installed to absorb sound, but these modifications were made with little to no consultation from the Department or the College. Faculty will take decibel readings and reassess. Next step will be to examine drop ceilings. Overall, the Department needs to receive a clearer timeline for all of these proposed modifications, and the Department and College should be consulted more frequently.
 - b) **Clarifying and Aligning Assessment Data and Schedule:**

It is clear that the Music department collects and analyzes a multitude of data for its various programs and that they share the data with internal constituencies as well as external constituencies, notably NASM. However, the review committee would like to see greater alignment with university-level student level outcomes. Also, the committee would like to see the Department develop a clear assessment schedule.

Mike Dugan noted that the self-study didn't fully represent the volume of student performance assessment data that the Department collects. Dugan noted that Sharri VanAlstine has done a great job revising rubrics. They are still not fully aligned with University SLOs, but the Department pledged to make efforts to further align the rubrics where applicable. Review committee member S.A. Welch asked if students provide data in senior exit interviews that would "close the loop" in terms of assessment. Dugan said they do ask some relevant questions in the exit survey, but they lack pre-surveys from earlier in the collegiate career that could allow for comparison with the exit survey data.

c) **Staffing Issues:**

FTE has not kept up with enrollment growth. Thanks to a Departmental focus on recruitment and retention, the number of majors in the Department has grown from 128 to 174. Dugan stated that 200 would be an optimal number of majors and that 200 is achievable. However, despite this growth, commensurate faculty lines have not flowed to the Department. Time to degree has not been adversely affected, but this is only because some part-time academic staff have been converted to full-time, and because of an increased reliance on adjunct instructors. Greg Cook commented that this context was useful to have and that he now better understands the unique specializations in the Music Department. He will now be able to have better-informed discussion with Dean Hayes regarding Music staffing needs.

- 5) **Recommended Actions:** The evaluation report lists three recommended actions (see page 15, section VI., 4.) related to 1. Clarity of assessment schedule, 2. Assessment methodology and data, and 3. Student and staff safety concerns with current facilities (see * at end of report regarding follow-up).

Dugan responded to these recommendations by acknowledging that in the past, student sight-reading and rhythm competencies have been poorly assessed but that the Department is adopting a program to meet these challenges. In a similar vein, Dugan said that he would also like to see Department efforts focus more on assessment of students' music theory competency.

- 6) **Recommended Result:** *Continuation without qualification*

- **Please make use of the detailed comments in the evaluation report (below).**
- **See Section VI. 4. for details of recommended actions.**
- Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program's next self-study will be a "short" one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due **October 1, 2023 to the Dean of the College of Arts and Communication and November 1, 2023 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Review team report is attached below, including Recommended Actions and instructions for Progress Reports (if required).

**University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Committee Form: Review of Audit & Review Self-Studies
Undergraduate Programs, 2018-2019
Majors/Minors and Standalone Minors**

Date of Evaluation 11/29/2018 Short Self Study (SS*) _____
 Program: Music Major Minor

Evaluations submitted by: Corey Davis, S.A. Welch, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Deborah Wilk, Joan Littlefield Cook
Review meeting attended by: Corey Davis, Hephzibah Kumpaty, Deborah Wilk, Joan Littlefield Cook

I. Program Purpose & Overview: A. Centrality

1. The program contributes to the fulfillment of UW-Whitewater’s core values, Mission, and Strategic Plan.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. The program supports general education, proficiency, and/or other programs at UW-W.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

3. The program has achieved or is appropriately working toward achievement of at least two goals of Inclusive Excellence.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program has been responsive to actions recommended from the previous Audit and Review Report; Progress Reports have been submitted, if relevant.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. The program has several key features to offer in terms of fulfilling campus mission and strategic priorities. Its high quality music curriculum, dedicated faculty, collaboration, community engagement, student development and diversity are some of the key strengths. It is impressive to note the program’s commitment to outreach activities, locally, regionally and internationally. The program offers a variety of music camps and

performance events and hosts visiting artists; this year their marching band played in front of an 80,000-audience at the Lambeau field which is quite impressive and the department continues to hold annual holiday gala events to raise scholarship funds to music students.

- 2. Supports World of the Arts and several other GA courses.
- 2. The program supports a large portion of GENED courses with GA, GE and diversity designations. The GENED 110 is its major course serving 800 students annually.
- 3. Inclusive Excellence answer, 2nd bullet point, page 5, drops off mid-sentence.
- 4. The program completed its progress report, and Sharri Van Alstine's assessment project answer requests from the previous review. However, the progress report highlights that no progress has been made on sound abatement or acceptable practice spaces. Student safety continues to be an issue.
- 4. Will there be another faculty member joining the assessment project for the department since Jane Ferencz has retired?
- 4. I like the that the assessment plan has both breadth and depth in its focus

I. Program Purpose & Overview: B. Program Mission, Goals, & Accomplishments

1. The program’s mission statement reflects the nature and scope of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Goals and objectives were identified and undertaken to improve or advance the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has a process for setting and assessing goals, and making decisions about changes to the program goals.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program is considering potential revisions to mission, goals, or objectives; the program has a “vision” for where it wants to be in the future and how to get there.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0

No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. The program, faculty/staff, and/or students have earned recognition or awards.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

6. The program has achieved or maintained program-level accreditation or has considered seeking it, where appropriate.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Strong and specific mission statements
2. Enrollment is up 25%.
2. Not certain "to assist struggling students with the university tutoring program" is related to. General education or music specifically.
2. Has the department thought of a timeline for each goal (there are quite a few, so would it be better to focus on a few at a time, given the number of faculty and the fact that the enrollment has increased so much?--not a mandate, just an observation/thought)
3. Process is aligned with accreditation goals.
3. Responses were repeated twice, 8 and 11.
3. This section needs clarity...I note general statements regarding goal setting process and modifying goals based on data. Revisions were being considered although it's not clear what data they are based upon?
- 2-4. Discussion of progress on goals throughout year, with revision where necessary, is to be strong, as is response to changes in the profession. Your concerns for facilities upgrading and safety should be listened to and addressed by the administration. Your NASM accreditation is noteworthy, and those reports, accreditation, and remarks should be taken seriously by A/R.
4. I did not see a clear discussion on possible revisions of the goals.* Not where this fits in, but 1972 was a long time ago!!
5. The award list looks impressive. The program was a campus nominee for the Regent's award in 2014 and 2016. In addition, several students have won the "Richard G. Gaarder awards", a statewide recognition for music students.
6. Accrediting agency has cited program for inadequate and dangerous facilities.

II. Assessment: A. Curriculum

1. The program has a clearly articulated, efficient, and purposeful curriculum, including options or emphases within the program (if applicable).

Sufficient Evidence	5
---------------------	---

Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. If program offers dual-listed courses, the expectations of graduate students differ from undergraduate students; otherwise NA

Sufficient Evidence	0
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	5

3. Appropriate assessment data were used in making curricular revisions.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	1

4. The program provides opportunities for students to learn in ways that extend beyond the classroom, and discussed the extent to which students are involved in these activities and opportunities.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

5. Online courses are evaluated in ways that ensure effective delivery, continuous improvement, and student learning (if applicable)

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Audit and Review must recognize the timely manner music students actually achieve their degrees, given all the constraints of DPI, accreditation, and UWW requirements.
2. No dual-listed courses offered by program
2. NA because there are no dual listed courses in the program
3. Goal setting, annual assessments, data collection and review are done annually at the department level. There is some evidence of SLO tracking in courses and through exit interviews. It is not clear reviewing the data whether all SLOs are fully assessed across the curriculum. The report mentions the daunting work needed to fulfill campus audit and review expectations, given that the program has to meet external accreditation requirements by NASM once in 10 years and the campus and NASM requirements are two different things. Not sure where to draw the line but I believe it is critical that the program keep the NASM accreditation which is good for the campus, program and to attract quality students.
3. No curricular revisions were made.

- 3. Were there any performance based assessment measures used beyond alumni information?
- 4. Like the variety of extracurricular opportunities for your students
- 4. Numerous career preparation and extra-curricular activities are available to music majors and minors.

II. Assessment: B. Assessment of Student Learning

1. The program has a clearly articulated learning outcomes for students, courses are "mapped" to these learning outcomes, and some outcomes received specific attention during the review period.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Student learning outcomes are aligned with the LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes in a way that is reasonable and meaningful.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program has an appropriate assessment plan for measuring students' progress in attaining the outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. The program collected a variety of appropriate assessment data allowing judgments about the extent to which students are achieving learning outcomes.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. Program faculty consider assessment data in making changes to the curriculum, students' learning outcomes, and/or other aspects of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	3
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. Results of assessment efforts have been shared with appropriate internal and external constituencies.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0
No/Limited Evidence	0

Comments

1. The assessment rubrics and plans are not well designed for each discipline and it is unclear which SLOs received particular attention during the review period.
1. SLOs are clearly articulated but I encourage the program to consider some minor rewordings. For example, instead of "students will have the ...ability to..." consider phrasing this as "students will demonstrate..."; and instead of "students will be able to...", consider "students will demonstrate...". This probably feels like a small and somewhat picky point, but we really can't assess students' ability to do something or whether they have a skill, but only if they demonstrate the skill.
2. The curricular "mapping" (pgs 7-19) is there but it might be easier to interpret if presented in a spreadsheet format. This would allow the program to quickly see where in the curriculum each SLO is introduced, developed and assessed, and (especially) if any SLO is not sufficiently addressed in the curriculum.
- 3&4. I'm concerned by the lack of attention to the UW-Whitewater campus learning outcomes. I understand that the program SLOs are guided mostly by their accrediting body, but don't these LOs align pretty well with campus ELOs? Although the program asserts that "Our discipline does not utilize many of the measures listed in the prompt" (p. 26 in reference to the questions on the Senior Outcomes Assessment Survey, which are designed to assess the campus ELOs), I think a closer examination might yield more alignment than is being acknowledged. I'm confident that the Music program does emphasize, oral communication, teamwork, intercultural knowledge and competence, integrative learning, etc.
- 3-4. There is a lot of direct assessment of student learning taking place through auditions and juries--but I don't see any of this data summarized. I'm left wondering "'Where are these data? Who is using the data, and how? How do we know what students' strengths and weaknesses are?"
- 3-4. Please include the rubrics that are used to assess performances--what dimensions are included? What levels are included? I would argue that this program probably does MORE direct assessment of student learning than most others, but we need to find a way to summarize and communicate it in ways that others outside the discipline can appreciate (e.g., aligning it with the program and campus learning outcomes).
- 3-4. Systematic, structured assessments are completed on a regular schedule using a wide variety of assessment methods (pp. 23-26).
- 3&4 I like that there are juries to assess student performance, but I was unclear if these comments/votes are collected and viewed in aggregate to possibly see a trend.
4. I, personally, see missed opportunities for more timely assessment decisions. From what I could tell, it seemed like the curricular assessment was done only after students graduate. Perhaps, but this not as clear, the reevaluation is done yearly from the results of each year's graduates?
4. Lots of indirect survey data are collected and summarized.
4. The description of assessment using grading rubrics in World of the Arts is fine, but where are the data? World of the Arts is assessed by General Education, but we recognize Music's contributions to World of the Arts. Still, that is one course and does not account for assessment of the program's majors and their achievement of the program's SLOs.
4. The program offers four majors, a minor and four certificates. Are there specific SLOs developed and assessed for each emphasis within the major? The report shows specific SLOs along with curricular mapping for BM music education majors only.
5. (Pg. 28) The self-study states that "regular meetings are held to discuss programmatic aspects, including student learning." MELOS is discussed, but I'm not sure what other data are discussed. Are there summaries of rubric ratings from the juries? The self-study states "...we use direct student data and recommendations from various area assessments..." but I don't see any of those data summarized. Please help me better understand what DIRECT student data you are gathering, summarizing, discussing, and using.
6. I see where 'department information' is shared, but I'm not sure where assessment of student learning data are shared.

6. So, the external sharing of data is only done every 10 years?

1-6. Strong assessment work overall.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: A. Trend Data

1-2. Five-year enrollment and graduation trends reflect program vitality and sustainability.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. [MAJORS ONLY] Credits-to-degree show that students can complete the degree in four years, or reasonably efficiently.

Sufficient Evidence	3
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

4. Program has strategies to recruit and retain diverse students.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

5. [MAJORS ONLY] Composition of students approximates or exceeds the diversity of students at the University

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

6. Students can enroll in appropriate courses and proceed without delaying graduation.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

7. Claim that the program is oversubscribed, undersubscribed, or at optimum level is justified or supported by examples or data.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Enrollments are strong and continue to grow.
3. The students are graduating with significantly higher credits/degree when compared to the university average. Music Education majors, of course, naturally have more credits than the university average. Still, it is good to note that the department is looking at this issue for other music majors.
3. Explanation for BM Music Education requirements is sufficient.
4. The 90 mile radius for recruitment is a good strategy. The proposed College Diversity Coordinator for the College of Arts and Comm would be a very good addition to the University.
4. The program does an outstanding job at recruitment, but it's efforts have been damaged by cuts to the recruiting budget. Cutting the recruiting budget seems, to be blunt, stupid when there is a university-wide focus on increasing enrollment.
- 4-5: The program has been very supportive of advancing the campus IE efforts. In terms of two specific contributions to IE goals, the report mentions offering Intercultural curriculum and co-curriculum to a diverse student body and faculty/student engagement in recruitment efforts. How diverse is the student/faculty body? The program has about 150 majors and URM students are about 5-10 per year? How does this compare with the national data for recruitment of women and minorities in the music field?

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: B. Demand for Graduates

1. [MAJORS ONLY] Placement information indicates that program graduates find employment or continue their education.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Data suggests that employment opportunities for graduates of this program will remain strong.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. The program systematically tracks graduates of the program.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

2. There is a statewide shortage of music teachers in Wisconsin.
2. Loved that you went to the Occupational Outlook Handbook !
3. The WMB alumni band event is an awesome alumni outreach effort, as well as a unique way to track graduates. Proposed increases to social media efforts seem promising also.
3. The program tracks graduates through alumni surveys, alumni marching band events and social media which is excellent!
3. Tracking graduates is not sustainable by departments, it sounds like they are doing the best they can.

III. Student Recruitment, Enrollment, Retention, and Graduation: C. Comparative Advantage(s)

1. The program has unique features that distinguish it from competing programs--giving it a competitive edge

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1 love that the students hold the faculty in such high esteem!

IV. Resource Availability & Development: A. Faculty Characteristics

1-2. Information is provided about the composition of the department faculty & instructional academic staff (e.g., gender, ethnicity, expertise, academic rank, etc.)

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3-4. The program has identified staffing changes and anticipated areas of potential future need.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1-2. Very nice and clear chart!
 3. Absolutely love how you go to outside sources for information!

IV. Resource Availability & Development: B. Teaching & Learning Enhancement

1-2. Faculty & instructional academic staff are engaged in activities to enhance teaching and advising.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

IV. Resource Availability & Development: C. Research & other Scholarly/Creative Activities

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in research and/or scholarly/creative activities.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Faculty are engaged in performances throughout Wisconsin, the United States, and the world. Faculty also present research at national and international conferences and publish in leading academic journals.

Excellent faculty! Continue the good work.

1-2 Quite an impressive collection of faculty activity. I can see where this would help with recruitment

IV. Resource Availability & Development: D. External Funding

1-2. Faculty and staff (if relevant) pursue funding through grants, contract, and/or gifts.

Sufficient Evidence	4
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Faculty and academic staff not only pursue and secure grant funding to support their research and advance their discipline but also secure numerous visiting artist/musician grants.

1-2 I would imagine that finding funding is a challenge, however, this a nice collection of outside funding found.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: E. Professional & Public Service

1-2. Faculty (and staff, if relevant) are active in professional and public service, beyond the department.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1-2. I could see how this would help with recruitment

1-2. The numerous visiting artist/musician grants won by Music faculty and academic staff not only benefit and enrich the UW-W campus but the broader Whitewater and southeastern Wisconsin community.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: F. Resources for Students in the Program

1. The program has adequate personnel, student help, and service and supplies to serve its undergraduate students.

Sufficient Evidence	1
Some/Partial Evidence	4
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Too many courses are taught by adjunct staff due to insufficient FTE.

IV. Resource Availability & Development: G. Facilities, Equipment, & Library Holdings

1. The program has adequate facilities, equipment, and technological resources to effectively serve its students.

Sufficient Evidence	2
Some/Partial Evidence	2
No/Limited Evidence	1
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

1. Rehearsal spaces are inadequate. Practice spaces are not only inadequate but pose a health risk to students and staff. The university needs to fund the plan to address the practice room improvements.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations from the Department or Program

1. Program strengths are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

2. Areas of improvement and continued progress are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	4
---------------------	---

Some/Partial Evidence	1
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

3. Recommendations and resources are discussed.

Sufficient Evidence	5
Some/Partial Evidence	0
No/Limited Evidence	0
Not Applicable (explain why in comments below)	0

Comments

- 2. Again, it concerns me that the efforts to conduct, summarize, and discuss direct assessment of student learning seems to be viewed almost entirely as a "compliance effort" to meet university requirements.
- 1-3 Very thorough and clear discussions

VI. Reviewer Conclusions

1. Strengths of the Program

- 1. Faculty involvement in both on-campus and off-campus activities
 - 1. Outstanding faculty
- 2. Excellent opportunities for HIPs, including practicum, public performance, marching band, symphony and student professional organizations.
- 3. Performances and camps are a great form of community outreach and are also an excellent recruiting tool.

The program has several key features to offer to the campus and community; It's high quality music curriculum, productive and engaged faculty, community outreach and student development are some of the highlights. It is impressive to note the program's commitment to outreach activities, locally, regionally and internationally.

2. Areas for Work or Improvement

- 1. Improve practice facilities.
- 2. The Music Department needs more FTE. Enrollment has increased by 25%, yet FTE has remained unchanged. As a result, the department is over-relying on adjunct staff.
- 2. It is quite clear that the facilities are lacking. I am impressed that student enrollment has grown with the practice room conditions. Just a thought: is there external funding available for facilities (and not just for curricular)
- 2. It was unclear how often curricular re-assessment is done. From what I read it seems to range between 4-10 years. I would like to see evidence that it is done on a more regular basis.
- 3. Need increased recruiting budget, especially to attract more URM students.
- 4. Need more specificity in assessment schedule.

The assessment work should be streamlined with the university and NASM expectations. Consider ways to improve the assessment plan that includes a systematic review of the data and assessment tools to evaluate student learning outcomes.

3. Other comments/questions

- 1. The practice facilities are dangerous and threaten student and staff safety as well as future accreditation.

2. Is every assessment done every year? Are some assessments only completed every 10 years for accreditation?
Not everything needs to be done every year, but every 10 years seems too infrequent.
3. I am recommending continuation without qualification because this is an outstanding program. However, University administration should submit annual progress reports to the College of Arts and Communication and to the Department of Music on what is being done to address the student and staff safety concerns in the CA.

Really strong report of a well-functioning department that seems to meet the needs of students and faculty alike.

This was a thoughtful self-study.

Two of the recommended actions below are very similar to those of 5 years ago.

4. Recommended Actions

1. Develop a more specific timetable for program assessment, clearly specifying the schedule for each assessment. Specifically, assessment should be conducted more often, or evidence that demonstrates that assessment is being conducted on a regular schedule needs to be included in the self-study document.
2. Clarify how direct assessment of student learning is being conducted. If not already in place, develop systems for collection, analysis and summary, use of, and reporting of direct data of student learning.
 - a. Include student performance data in reports, including scores on the rubrics used in juries.
 - b. Clearly specify the direct data that are discussed and the role they play in program and course revisions.
3. Continue to work with the college and university to fully address facilities needs and d ways to improve the conditions of the facility. **NOTE: This is clearly *not* the department’s fault. University administration must attend to the student and staff safety concerns in the current facilities.***

5. Recommended Result

Continuation without qualification. Next self-study will be a shortened one focusing on the Recommended Actions from the current report.	X*
Continuation with minor concerns. Progress report may be required, at the discretion of the review team.	
Continuation with major concerns in one or more of the four areas; submit annual progress report to the College Dean & Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on progress addressing the major concerns	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years, at the Committee's discretion.	
Withhold recommendation for continuation, place on probation, recommend placing in receivership within the college, and require another complete Audit & Review self-study within 1-3 years at the Committee's discretion.	
Non-continuation of the program.	
Insufficient Information in the self-study to make a determination; revise self-study & resubmit.	

*The review team wishes to emphasize the important need for timely communication between the College, University, and department to ensure follow-up on safety and staffing issues. Action is needed to address safety issues.

*Because the recommended result of this review is to continue without qualification, the program’s next self-study will be a “short” one focused on the recommended actions from the current report. This short self-study is due **October 1, 2023 to the Dean of the College of Arts and Communication and November 1, 2023 to the chair of Audit & Review Committee.**