

A. Any planning documents currently in effect or in use (Long range planning, visitors report)
(Please do not provide previous NASM Self-Study documents.)

1. Strategic Plan as of (3/7/13).

The following are strategic planning documents that are being developed by the department as this self-study is being written:

Strategic Objectives

Teaching and Learning

Objective: The Department will maintain and enhance academic programs and ensure student success by:

- *Preparing students for entry-level positions in the profession and graduate schools.*
- *Reviewing and remodeling degrees to prepare students for an always changing world.*
- *Providing excellent advising so students succeed in all degrees.*
- *Providing support to enhance faculty teaching.*
- *Maintaining accreditation to demonstrate credibility in the field.*

Inclusiveness and Diversity

Objective: The Department will continue to build and retain an inclusive, diverse, and outstanding musical community by:

- *recruiting and retaining students, faculty, and staff of diverse backgrounds and capabilities*
- *maintaining and enhancing an atmosphere of inclusiveness for members of the department, the local and university community, and the region*

Scholarship and Creative Expression

Objective: The Department students, faculty, and staff will be recognized for their creative and scholarly contributions to the profession by:

- *supporting opportunities for scholarly and creative growth for faculty, students and staff*
- *seeking and promoting means by which students, faculty, and staff may pursue scholarly and creative activities*

Public Service and Community Engagement

Objective: The Department will maintain and enhance service opportunities to connect with external communities and serve as a model for life-long learning through a variety of cultural and educational activities by:

- *promoting student and faculty service to the profession, the university, and the community.*
- *maintaining and enhancing support for festivals, guest artists, faculty and student presentations at conferences, student and faculty touring, and publicity.*
- *maintaining and enhancing outreach into local and regional communities.*

Resource Development and Stewardship

Objective: The Department will exercise responsible stewardship of its programs and facilities by:

- *maintaining department budgets, enrollment management, and scholarship offerings to meet department objectives.*
- *ensuring that there are adequate faculty, staff, and support for professional development activities to meet department objectives.*
- *ensuring that there are adequate facilities, maintenance to support facilities, upgrades in technology, and upgrades in equipment to meet department objectives.*

2. As a part of the NASM self-study process, in the winter of 2013 the department conducted a survey of alumni. The results of this survey are as follows:



CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Music Alumni Survey

Alums Who Graduated from 2007 through 2012

SECTION	GENERAL TOPIC	PAGES
I.	General Questions for All Alums	2 - 8
II.	General Education and CWU Mission Questions: only for CWU alums with undergraduate degrees from CWU	9
III.	General Questions for All Alums	10 - 13
IV.	Senior Recital, Project, Thesis, Treatise, and/or Dissertation	13
V.	Career	14 - 15
VI.	Graduate Assistantship	16
VII.	Did You Attend Another University	16
VIII.	Reasons for Attending Other Universities	17
IX.	Demographic Questions and Final Comments	18

Survey notes:

- 109 undergraduate and 25 graduate alumni were sent surveys.
- CWU had emails for 94 alums. Links to the online survey were sent via postcards to 40 alums.
- Addresses were returned for four alums. Addresses were updated and re-sent to two alums.
- 21 alums responded to at least part of the survey for a response rate of 16%.

- 19 alums completed the entire survey for a response rate of 15%.

SECTION I – QUESTIONS FOR ALL ALUMS

1. What year did you graduate from CWU?

Year	- % -	- n -
2007		4
2008		1
2009		3
2010		5
2011		3
2012		4

2. Which Music degree program/s did you complete at CWU? Please check all that apply.

Degree	- % -	- n -
B.M. Performance		4
B.M. Music Education		14
B.A. Music		0
B.A. Jazz		0
B.M. Music Composition		0
Master of Music		3

3. We would like to find out more about what you are doing now. What field are your currently working in? Please check all that apply.

Vocation	- % -	- n -
Music Teacher (public school)		15
Music Teacher (Private School)		0
Music Teacher (Private Studio)		4
Professional Performer		0
Free Lance Musician		5
Graduate school		3
Seeking employment		0
Other (please specify)		3

- Campus Pastor

- Academic Advisor
- Retired

4. If you are working, would you please tell us your job title and the company you work for? If you are a graduate student, would you please tell us where and what degree you are pursuing?

- Elementary music specialist at Vashon School District I am a junior high band teacher, and I LOVE it! I got my degree in Broad Area Music education.
- Campus Pastor
- I am the Community Indicators Intern at the Institute for Public Policy and Economic Analysis at Eastern Washington University.
- Assistant high school band director. Pasco school district.
- Instrumental Music Teacher in the Tacoma School District. Band, orchestra, and drumline.
- Academic Advisor The Butler School of Music UT Austin
- Band and choir director. Park middle school Kennewick school district
- Instructor of voice and early childhood music at Columbia River Music Conservatory
- Substitute in the Lake Washington, Snohomish and Northshore school districts.
- Middle School/High School Choir Director Parma School District #137 Parma, Idaho
- Middle School Band/Choir-Snoqualmie Valley SD
- General Music Teacher, Northshore School District
- Grades 5-8 band and orchestra, First Creek Middle School, Tacoma
- Middle School Orchestra Teacher. North Thurston Public Schools. Lacey, WA
- Master of Music in Voice Performance at California State University, Northridge
- Director of Bands, Kirkland Middle School. Kirkland, WA.
- Band Director, Sunnyside High School. Master of Arts Leadership and Administration, Gonzaga

5. How important are each of the following competencies to your career? (Question modes are highlighted and bolded.)

	Not at all important (1)	Not important (2)	Somewhat important (3)	Very important (4)	Critical (5)	Average	Count
a. Thinking critically - check your and others' assumptions; consider multiple perspectives from various sources, etc.	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (3)	25% (5)	60% (12)	4.5	20
b. Written communications – purpose, organization, development, mechanics	0% (0)	5% (1)	10% (2)	30% (6)	55% (11)	4.4	20
c. Oral communications – vocal delivery, gestures, eye contact, good listening	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (4)	80% (16)	4.8	20
d. Quantitative reasoning - apply quantitative tools and computer skills to solve problems; comprehend symbolic representations	0% (0)	10% (2)	20% (4)	55% (11)	15% (3)	3.8	20
e. Information literacy - critically evaluate data sources as I gather relevant information	0% (0)	5% (1)	20% (4)	30% (6)	45% (9)	4.2	20
f. Students will be equipped with research skills and historical knowledge of music of different time periods, composers, and styles, using representative compositions. Applicable to music degree programs in the fields of music education, performance, composition, jazz studies, and music as general field of study.	0% (0)	0% (0)	35% (7)	25% (5)	40% (8)	4.1	20
g. Students will become literate musicians	0% (0)	5% (1)	5% (1)	15% (3)	75% (15)	4.6	20
h. Students will be equipped with a set of theoretical and conceptual abstractions that are useful for the understanding of music literature and applicable to music degree programs in the fields of music education, performance, composition, jazz studies, and music as general field study.	0% (0)	10% (2)	20% (4)	40% (8)	30% (6)	3.9	20

6. What did you like best about the Music program at CWU?

- Opportunities to play.
- I felt so prepared for my student teaching. I was comfortable in the classroom, and could not have asked for a better music education department and teachers. The professors at Central were very personable, and always available if I had questions or concerns. I felt that my education was very well rounded, and I was pushed to get involved in many different aspects of music and education.
- Quality performance ensembles and music faculty who have real-world and hands-on experience and know how to prepare you in your field.
- The community. The faculty bending over backwards for me. The quality of the ensembles.
- The performance experience. I was able to perform with very strong ensembles and study with knowledgeable instructors.
- The ensembles and professional teaching connections.
- Sense of community, playing in high level ensembles, faculty
- The opportunity to study directly with professors rather than courses taught by TAs. The opportunity to participate in a lot of different ensembles and performance opportunities.
- The ability to immerse yourself in music from 6-AM to 11-PM. I also enjoyed that professors cared, knew your names, and made you feel like they were investing themselves in your education, which is a pretty special thing that no school in this state can boast.
- Great teachers and the ability to be in multiple performing groups.
- Music Ensembles of all kinds.
- I loved that I could come in and talk with my professors at any time, about anything. They have a wealth of knowledge that I can't begin to know yet.
- My professors cared about me as a person, and always went the extra mile to make sure that I learned the material. Not just to pass a test, but to use in my career.
- Wind Ensemble. Larry Gookin is the best music educator ever!
- The large performing ensembles
- The high number of performance opportunities paired with a world class faculty.
- That's a tie: I liked the building/facilities, and the faculty! I miss the classrooms with useful technologies, the recital and concert halls, and the great practice rooms. The faculty was very knowledgeable and helpful, and I am very thankful to have been able to learn from and work with them.
- The community of people, and wind band program.
- Social Support from faculty.

7. How well did Music at CWU prepare you for each of these competencies? (Question modes are highlighted and bolded.)

	Not at all prepared (1)	Not prepared (2)	Somewhat prepared (3)	Prepared (4)	Very prepared (5)	Average	Count
a. Thinking critically - check your and others' assumptions; consider multiple perspectives from various sources, etc.	0% (0)	0% (0)	30% (6)	44% (8)	30% (6)	4.0	20
b. Written communications – purpose, organization, development, mechanics	0% (0)	0% (0)	25% (5)	45% (9)	30% (6)	4.1	20
c. Oral communications – vocal delivery, gestures, eye contact, good listening	0% (0)	5% (1)	35% (7)	25% (5)	35% (7)	3.9	20
d. Quantitative reasoning - apply quantitative tools and computer skills to solve problems; comprehend symbolic representations	0% (0)	5% (1)	50% (10)	35% (7)	10% (2)	3.5	20
e. Information literacy - critically evaluate data sources as I gather relevant information	0% (0)	0% (0)	40% (8)	35% (7)	25% (5)	3.9	20
f. Students will be equipped with research skills and historical knowledge of music of different time periods, composers, and styles, using representative compositions. Applicable to music degree programs in the fields of music education, performance, composition, jazz studies, and music as general field of study.	0% (0)	0% (0)	20% (4)	35% (7)	45% (9)	4.3	20
g. Students will become literate musicians	0% (0)	0% (0)	10% (2)	20% (4)	70% (14)	4.6	20
h. Students will be equipped with a set of theoretical and conceptual abstractions that are useful for the understanding of music literature and applicable to music degree programs in the fields of music education, performance, composition, jazz studies, and music as general field of study.	0% (0)	10% (2)	20% (4)	30% (6)	40% (8)	4.0	20

8. What aspects of the Music program at CWU need the most improvement?

- More classes more often. When I was at Central, I choose to go into the local music classrooms to volunteer my time, but it was not required. I went twice a week to Valley View, or Ellensburg High School and led sectionals, taught/conducted, or observed. I'm not sure if classroom presence is required now, but if not, that would be my suggestion.
- Complimenting or replacing the existing Education sequence with something more music-specific. Much of the music ed degree does not help with learning to educate in music.
- It takes way too long to graduate!!! There needs to be a discussion about what's important and what's less important for preparing students for graduation. Then, the less important stuff needs to be taken out.
- The course requirements for the Broad Area specialization need to change. I took one 3 credit class on general music but my first (and only) job was teaching general music for about 1/3 of my day. I fell flat on my face and resigned after 2 years. If a person is going to receive an endorsement in an area they need to show some type of competency. On a related note. Only one person seriously warned me about my inability to control a classroom when I was going to school. They were not even a CWU faculty member. Someone should have sat me down and told where I stand.
- Need to be more selective in who can become an Ed major.
- I am a band person. took instrumental music methods and was looking forward to learning how to teach orchestra, but that didn't happen. The class was VERY helpful for band (looking at literature, methods books, etc), but I feel like I received no training for teaching orchestra. The extend of my orchestra training was my two methods classes: high strings and low strings. In low strings, I never touched the bass. I have absolutely NO idea how to teach it. In high strings, I never played the violin. Again, the classes were great and I learned a lot, but I am was and still am not as ready to teach orchestra as I should have been receiving an Instrumental Music degree.
- Increased opportunities to study music entrepreneurship and music business.
- Jazz Education needs to be REQUIRED for the Music Education degree, hands down. As a school that has the best jazz department in the state, if not the Northwest, it is disappointing that approximately 2/3 of students leave CWU without ever learning about how to understand, let alone teach jazz. Jazz classes, band or choir, are required by most school districts, and I know from a few friends experiences that the jazz part of their job is the most terrifying. Yes, it is one more class and credit load to add, but sending students out prepared in an overlooked area seems crucial.
- Theory curriculum and ear training.
- Many of the music education classes and methods classes are not designed well. The classes need to be more uniform in expectations and goals. Many methods classes contradict each other and some do not aim at teaching as much as they are about playing. Some of the music education courses seemed to be focused on what not to do, not how to be a great teacher. Also, I think that there should be more opportunity to rehearse ensembles and get in front of groups

before getting to Field Experience/ Student Teaching. 10 minutes out of all Ed classes is not enough to show people if they should continue in the program.

- Space. As the department continues to grow (as it should!), you are quickly running out of adequate room to house them.
- More methods classes, and instrument repair should be a part of them. I would rather know how to fix a clarinet than 7 alternate fingerings for a note that no middle schooler will play.
- Piano Proficiency
- More in depth wind band history with more emphasis (meaning time) to spend on the last 20 years of music.
- The diction program, which I understand has already been adjusted. It needed to be longer than one quarter for four languages.
- Active mentorship of conductors, emphasis on performance, and preparation of educators for what they need to do beyond just teaching music.

9. Did you complete an undergraduate degree at CWU? (If alums answered Yes they were directed to Section 2, if they answered No they were directed to Section 3.)

CWU Undergrad?	- % -	- n -
Yes	[REDACTED]	17
No	[REDACTED]	3

SECTION II – QUESTIONS ABOUT CWU’S MISSION AND GENERAL EDUCATION GOALS

10. These next few questions relate to CWU's Mission and General Education goals. How strongly do you agree that your education from CWU helped you... (Question mode is highlighted and bolded.)

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	Average	Count
a. become a responsible citizen	0% (0)	6% (1)	31% (5)	38% (6)	25% (4)	3.8	16
b. become a responsible steward of the earth	6% (1)	6% (1)	31% (5)	38% (6)	19% (3)	3.6	16
c. become a productive and enlightened (informed, good learner, insightful) individual	0% (0)	6% (1)	13% (2)	38% (6)	44% (7)	4.2	16
d. value different perspectives	0% (0)	0% (0)	19% (3)	50% (8)	31% (5)	4.1	16
e. appreciate the breadth and depth of scientific and human knowledge	0% (0)	6% (1)	19% (3)	50% (8)	25% (4)	3.9	16
f. increase your sense of the interconnectedness of knowledge	0% (0)	0.0% (0)	13% (2)	50% (8)	38% (6)	4.3	16
g. integrate knowledge from diverse fields to solve problems	0% (0)	6% (1)	6% (1)	75% (12)	13% (2)	3.9	16
h. increase your awareness of the many ways that knowledge evolves	0% (0)	6% (1)	31% (5)	38% (6)	25% (4)	3.8	16
i. ask incisive and insightful questions	6% (1)	0% (0)	19% (3)	50% (8)	25% (4)	3.9	16

SECTION III – QUESTIONS FOR ALL ALUMS

11. Please select the response that best describes your opinion about your education at CWU.
 (Question modes are highlighted in bold).

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	Average	Count
a. I am very satisfied with my education from the Music department at Central Washington University.	0% (0)	0% (0)	11% (2)	32% (6)	58% (11)	4.5	19
b. The Music curriculum provided useful perspectives on critical issues facing the profession.	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (1)	63% (12)	32% (6)	4.3	19

12. What is your highest level of education?

Degree	- % -	- n -
Bachelor's		14
Master's		5
Doctorate		0

13. How many years did it take you to complete your degree program at CWU?

How long?	- % -	- n -
one year		0
two years		3
three years		1
four years		3
five years		9
> five years		3

Responses to “More than five years:”

- no response (even though they selected more than 5 years)
- 7
- 5 years, 1 quarter

14. Please list your opinions regarding the following areas. (If you did not take classes outside the school or department of music, answer only a. and b. of this question.) Question modes are highlighted.

	Low quality (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	High quality (5)	Average	Count
a. Overall quality of the CWU department of music	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	26% (5)	74% (14)	4.7	19
b. Quality of your specific focus of studies	0% (0)	5% (1)	5% (1)	47% (9)	42% (8)	4.3	19
c. Quality of CWU overall studies outside of music	12% (2)	18% (3)	29% (5)	29% (5)	12% (2)	3.1	17

15. On what instrument(s) did you take private studio lessons while studying at CWU?

- Piano
- Trumpet
- Clarinet
- Trombone
- Tuba
- Trumpet!
- Voice
- Vocal/ saxophone
- Trumpet and Voice
- voice
- Flute
- Voice, Choral Conducting
- horn, piano
- Clarinet
- Trumpet
- clarinet
- Cello
- Voice
- Trumpet
- Trumpet

Instrument	Count	Count
Cello		1
Clarinet		3
Flute		1
horn, piano		1
Piano		1
Trumpet		5
Trumpet and Voice		1
Trombone		1
Tuba		1
voice		3
Voice, Choral Conducting		1
Vocal/ saxophone		1

16. Please list your opinions regarding the quality of instruction at CWU in the following areas. If you did not have any classes in a specified field please select N.O. (Question modes are highlighted.)

	Low (1)	2	3	4	High (5)	N.O.	Avg	#
a. Basic Music Theory	0% (0)	0% (0)	21% (4)	32% (6)	37% (7)	11% (2)	3.7	19
b. Music History	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	42% (8)	53% (10)	5% (1)	4.3	19
c. Advanced Literature / Analysis	0% (0)	5% (1)	11% (2)	26% (5)	16% (3)	42% (8)	2.3	19
d. Studio Lessons	0% (0)	0% (0)	16% (3)	26% (5)	58% (11)	0% (0)	4.4	19
e. Teaching Methods / Pedagogy	0% (0)	5% (1)	37% (7)	11% (2)	42% (8)	5% (1)	3.7	19
f. Ensembles	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	5% (1)	95% (18)	0% (0)	4.9	19
g. General Education / Liberal Arts	5% (1)	10% (2)	26% (5)	26% (5)	16% (3)	16% (3)	2.9	19

17. Please describe any courses you think should be added for music majors/students.

- More elementary music classes.
- One year of observation/teaching before student teaching. More Piano.
- Are you kidding? There are too many requirements already. But if you were to add classes: Jazz education class; many students aren't prepared for this field. A financial organization/responsibility class. Students graduate with tons of debt nowadays. Wouldn't it be great is CWU music students were way below the national or CWU average in student debt.
- INSTRUMENT REPAIR!!! I deal with instrument repair DAILY and really have no idea what I'm doing. I'm lucky that everything I've tried has worked so far. This would seriously be the most useful music class for teachers!!! Music technology...including how to use recording software, how to set up recording equipment, using programs like Sibelius, etc.
- Music Entrepreneurship
- Jazz Education
- More emphasis on song literature and pedagogy for voice. 1 class in each as a performance major is not enough!
- There should be a reading band that works like the graduate auditions so rehearsal is a focus in the education.
- A course dedicated more fully to preparing a group from festival. Finding music that is acceptable for festival with groups that are beginning groups.
- Music Education Technology-how set up a sound board and what is an amplifier. Instrument Repair!
- Two quarters of student teaching, like the UW. They have one quarter of part-time student teaching and one quarter of full time student teaching.
- Fundraising and community outreach for music ed
- Sight Reading classes
- Rehearsal or Music Terms in Foreign Languages (How to survive a rehearsal and understand musical instruction outside of the US)
- Music program management. Help students understand everything that goes into running a music program in schools.

18. Please list any courses you were required to take that you think should not be required.

- Sociology 101
- Reading in the Content Field
- Education sequence
- Reduce the amount of required private lesson credits. The culture of "you need be in 4 or 5 ensembles to be a good student" needs to change. Students take too many ensemble and lesson credits, which delays graduation. Less education department classes. Less basic and breathe classes. It takes way too long to complete them. Perhaps there could be more overlap in requirements with the basic and breathe classes & education/music classes.
- None
- NA
- None
- Most of the education classes were a waste of time and would have been more useful if replaced with education classes specific to music
- N/A
- Counterpoint.

19. Did you complete a senior recital, senior project, thesis, treatise, or dissertation?

Students who answered "Yes" were sent to Section 4, students who answered "No" were sent to Section 5.

	- % -	- n -
Yes		14
No		5

If yes, at what university?

CWU	13
George Fox	1

SECTION IV – SENIOR RECITAL, PROJECT, THESIS, TREATISE, AND/OR DISSERTATION?

20. Do you feel that the breadth of your studies prepared you adequately for doing your senior recital, project, thesis, treatise, and/or dissertation?

	- % -	- n -
Yes		12
No		2

21. Were your senior recital, project, thesis, treatise, and/or dissertation advisors or committee members helpful?

	- % -	- n -
Yes		12
No		2

SECTION V – CAREER PREPARATION

22. Given your major or professional emphasis, do you feel you had adequate opportunities to work in the following situations?

	Yes	No	N/A	- n -
a. Performance with large ensemble (conducted)	100% (19)	0% (0)	0% (0)	19
b. Performance with small ensemble (non-conducted)	84% (16)	16% (3)	0% (0)	19
c. Solo performance	90% (17)	10% (2)	0% (0)	19
d. Teaching opportunities	53% (10)	37% (7)	10% (2)	19
e. Research/Writing projects	95% (18)	5% (1)	0% (0)	19

23. What advice would you give to present music students in regard to preparation for a career in music? Please emphasize your current career in music.

- Take every opportunity you can. Even if it's not on the top of your list you never know what your job will require and it's better to be prepared.
- Get yourself into the music classroom and get familiar with reading scores early on.
- Get as far as you can musically while in college. The discipline of in-depth study will help no matter what field you end up in. Ask questions and seek answers from professors. Take any opportunity you can to be more involved as a student- those opportunities often will help you become better at something you'll need later on. Work very hard at the methods classes and get competent on each instrument if you're an ed major. Teach and study other's teaching. Record yourself playing and teaching. Get professional feedback as often as possible.
- Don't feel like you need to be in 4 or 5 ensembles at once. If you decide not to go into music, it's ok, I didn't and I'm successful.
- If you want to become a music teacher, get in the classroom as much as possible.
- As a teacher, I believe all students studying music education must have PASSION and be MOTIVATED with youth. If you are getting an ed degree as a backup, please never teach. You will never enjoy it and your students will suffer!! Only do it if you really want to.
- Develop your practicing habit early. Do more than is required. Create something new.
- GO TO CONFERENCE AND PAY ATTENTION!! The "hard" parts of my job are not covered in a conventional music classroom. Paperwork, budgets, trips, fundraising, boosters etc.(music teacher)
- Do not find your comfort zone and stay there. Break out and try other ensembles or classes you think you may have difficulty with. These are the ones that will be most beneficial to connecting

ideas and theories of music in your main focus and help you understand and appreciate the depths of the musical realm.

- Spend more time focusing on song literature!
- Start early and figure out if the degree is right for you. It took me a long time to find the love of music education back at Central. Take as many opportunities that are available of interest and do not feel pressured into being overly active in everything to avoid burnout.
- Gain as much information as you can. Find a mentor professor that you can call years later and talk with about the things that you can't remember or never learned.
- Volunteer in as many classrooms as you can. Seek out ways to get experience actually teaching lessons. Experience is the best teacher.
- Jobs are limited!
- Practice More.
- I would advise singers to spend more time on coachings.
- Find a way to gain experience before leaving school. Volunteer, teach private lessons, but gain experience.

24. What advice would you give to current music students in regard to preparation for a career in music? Please emphasize your current career in music.

- I teach band. Take more score study. Make sure you understand your music theory.
- same as 21
- Same as above
- I'm assuming this should read, "future music students," not "current." I would say practice more, learn the basics of the piano, and start learning your theory.
- Do not spread yourself too thin.
- Jobs are limited!
- No really, practice more.
- Practice! Work harder than seems reasonable to develop your musicianship to as high a level as possible before it's too late!

25. Did you have a graduate assistantship in music while pursuing a post-baccalaureate degree from CWU? If alums answered yes they are sent to Section VI, if no they are sent to Section VII.

	- % -	- n -
Yes		2
No		15

SECTION VI – GRADUATE ASSISTANTSHIP

26. Please describe your assistant ships duties (e.g., teaching, etc.).

- Teaching, conducting, assisting
- MUS326, trumpet studio, conducting, jazz history

27. Please rate your assistantship experience according to the following factors:

	Terrible (1)	2	3	4	Excellent (5)	Average	Count
a. freedom from inappropriate duties.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.0	2
b. supervision, guidance, and attention received from your faculty supervisor.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	100.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	4.0	2
c. contribution of assistantship experiences to your personal and career development.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	4.5	2
d. preparation for subsequent professional responsibilities.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	50.0% (1)	50.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.5	2

SECTION VII – DID YOU OR ARE YOU CURRENTLY ATTENDING A UNIVERSITY OTHER THAN CWU?

28. Did you or are you currently attending a university other than CWU? If alums answered Yes they were sent to Section VIII. If they answered No they were sent to section IX.

	- % -	- n -
Yes		8
No		11

If yes, which university?

- University of Washington
- Getting my masters through Lesley University
- Eastern Washington University
- Strathclyde University-study abroad
- Coe College
- California State University, Northridge

- American Band College, Sam Houston State University for my Master's Degree
- Gonzaga

SECTION VIII – REASONS FOR ATTENDING OTHER UNIVERSITIES

29. How important were the following elements in deciding to attend another university? (Question modes are highlighted.)

	Not very important (1)	2	3	4	Very important (5)	Average	Count
a. Location	14% (1)	14% (1)	14% (1)	14% (1)	43% (3)	3.6	7
b. Cost of tuition	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (1)	29% (2)	57% (4)	4.4	7
c. Recommendations of a teacher	29% (2)	0% (0)	29% (2)	0% (0)	43% (3)	3.3	7
d. Recommendations of an acquaintance	42% (3)	0% (0)	14% (1)	14% (1)	29% (2)	2.9	7
d. Assistantship/Scholarship	57% (4)	14% (1)	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	2.0	7
f. Quality of education	14% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	86% (6)	4.4	7
g. Reputation of the school/department of music	14% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	86% (6)	4.4	7
h. Presence of particular faculty member(s)	29% (2)	0% (0)	29% (2)	14% (1)	29% (2)	3.1	7
i. Facilities	29% (2)	0% (0)	29% (2)	29% (2)	14% (1)	3.0	7

30. Do you have any comments or suggestions regarding that university?

- Their lack of a good music dept. made me realize how lucky I was to be at CWU.
- The performance spaces are not as nice (acoustically or visually) as CWU.
- An incredible program!

SECTION IX – DEMOGRPAHICS AND FINAL COMMENTS

31. Your approximate annual income is...?

Income Range	- % -	- n -
Less than \$20,000		3
\$20,001 to \$40,000		10
\$40,001 to \$60,000		5
\$60,001 to \$80,000		1
\$80,001 to \$100,000		0
\$100,001 to \$120,000		0
\$120,001 to \$140,000		0
Over \$140,000		0

Estimated, average annual income = \$35,484.

32. Are you...?

	- % -	- n -
Male		8
Female		11

33. Do you have any other comments for the Music department at Central Washington University?

- I wouldn't recommend going anywhere else! Amazing music department.
- Not to sound like a broken record, but it takes way too long to graduation, even for very disciplined students. Whatever you can do to reduce the amount of time graduation takes, the better. As an institution, you are not preparing students well if you make graduation take 5-6 years and therefore put students in debt.
- Love it! Proud to be a CWU Music alumni!
- I would love to be a part of an active Music Dept. Alumni association.
- Very happy with my experiences from Central! Very caring supportive staff

3. The department also has two earlier planning documents found below. The first is a long range plan developed a department committee and adopted by the faculty in 2006:

Central Washington University
Music Department
Long Range Planning Committee Report
Winter 2006

Background

Department Mission

The Music Department of Central Washington University serves the academic community, the region and Northwest, through offering of courses, cultural activities, and degrees relevant to the needs of its students. Within this comprehensive university, the Department functions as the component of a liberal arts institution that provides education in the musical arts.

The Department offers undergraduate curricula leading to the Bachelor of Music and Bachelor of Arts degrees and graduate work leading to the Master of Music degree. The growing demand for the "Central Music Graduate" is a source of pride for the music faculty and an incentive for continued dedication to the training of young musicians. In addition to our traditionally strong Music Teacher Education program, the Department provides high quality training for the performer, composer, conductor and music businessperson. The Department of Music is an institutional member of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

The premise upon which all goals and curricular decisions are based is that all CWU graduates with music degrees will be competent, literate musicians with solid grounding in theory, history, performance and composition, according to the specializations of each degree.

The department's adherence to the goals of these objectives can be seen in the general shape of its overall program. Historically, the department has long had the largest and best-known music education program

in the state. Presently over 175 graduates of the department are teaching music in public schools, community colleges and universities in the state of Washington (see Appendix B), with many more in other states throughout the country. The large ensembles of the department, the wind ensembles, the orchestra and the choirs, serve as the lynchpins of the program, as they provide the primary models for future music educators. Since the state has only K-12 certification, all students gain experience in one or more of these performing groups, no matter which grade level they intend to teach. Other degree programs, such as Performance, Composition and Music Business, have recently become stronger, as evidenced in the greater numbers of majors and expanded opportunities for performance. However, the department has retained the historical model of the ensemble-driven program; the other degrees, along with their curricula and performing groups, have been integrated as complementary areas of strength. The goal of artistic excellence has been greatly aided by the strength of these complementary degree areas. As the quality of individual students' performance ability rises, so does the artistic level of each of the performing ensembles, where majors of all degrees work side by side. It should be noted that the department considers no degree area superior to any other, and the collegial environment it strives to maintain is such that the degree track of any student has no relation to his/her standing in the community.

Department Mission and University Goals

The relationship of music department goals and objectives to those of the university are most visible in the University Shared Values that are part of the University Mission Statement. Values especially relevant to the department are the goals of:

1. Holding **“the student’s highest good as our paramount concern”**
2. Developing and maintaining **“a community that is both supportive and challenging.”**

The latter goal is articulated in the Chair’s introductory statement on the department web site, in all literature sent to prospective students, and both goals can be seen in the practices and attitudes of the faculty and administrators. Retreats by performing groups, extra study sessions conducted by faculty, open-door advising and student/faculty shared performances are all examples of these values. They can also be seen in the rapid administrative response to student concerns, e.g., changes in building hours, scheduling of classes to avoid conflicts, the institution of requested courses, acquisition of technological equipment for student use and advising issues.

Department Program Philosophy and Faculty Staffing Objectives

The objectives and programmatic philosophy described above have been the basis for all long-range planning. Much of this planning has been generated from a faculty study called “The 2010 Plan” which first appeared in 1999. Though approved only in principle at the time, the spirit of the plan guided the department's planning until it was revived and approved in 2002. It has been reviewed recently, in the winter of 2006, presented to the faculty and the changes approved in principle. Since this study includes much of the information called for by Category VIII of this year’s Program Review Self-Study, “Future Directions,” it has been supplied in total as the response to that item.

In this study, a philosophy for the overall shape of the department as described above was established, and a gradual increase in the music major population was originally assumed (in 1999), based on estimations articulated by the university administration. Since then the music major population has reached the maximum that can be sustained by the current department faculty.

The principle tenet, unanimously approved by the faculty, is the concept that, though other programs play substantive roles, the general shape of the program is determined by the needs of the large ensembles. This tenet springs from the recognition that these ensembles are not only critical in generating and maintaining the public identity of the department, but are required to provide music education majors, the largest single degree program in the department, with the experience and modeling that will enable them to succeed as music educators. In practical terms, this means that the composition of the student body and faculty is determined in large part by the following factors:

1. The number of students needed to staff each of the department’s large ensembles in the three major performing areas, Band, Orchestra and Choir:
 - The Symphonic Wind Ensemble and Concert Band
 - The Symphonic Orchestra
 - The Chamber Choir and University choir
2. The number and type of faculty needed to provide applied instruction for students in these ensembles:
 - Instrumental areas: strings, woodwinds (flute/piccolo, single reeds, and double reeds), brass, percussion

- Vocal areas: the number of faculty needed to provide applied instruction not only for choral majors, but for Broad Area music education majors whose secondary performance area is voice.
3. The number and type of faculty needed to direct each ensemble, faculty who can develop ensembles of the highest quality while maintaining a strong emphasis on pedagogical goals.

These factors resulted in the following strategies, embodied in the 2010 Long Range Plan:

The numbers of students in each applied area for staffing the department's major ensembles in an ideal manner were calculated, as were the number and type of faculty that would best serve the needs of the students and provide instruction for the program. This study resulted in the establishment of priorities for faculty hires and program directions and provided an objective perspective from which to analyze and evaluate the current program. As these priorities were implemented, substantive shifts in the composition of the faculty and student body in recent years became apparent. There have been several discernible trends:

1. *With more emphasis on hiring faculty to provide the highest quality applied instruction, the number of performance majors has increased dramatically, and with it the pressure on instructional resources. There is now more than twice as many performance majors (79) as there were 15 years ago (30). Since the applied curricular requirement for performance majors is two and three times that of non-performance majors, more faculty load credit (FLC) is absorbed by private study and less is available for other academic courses. The consequence of this will be addressed below.*
2. *While the number of music education majors has remained fairly constant until this year, 115-125, the percentage of students in this degree has dropped considerably as other programs have gained in strength. Twenty years ago music education majors comprised almost 80% of the music major population, this year that figure has dropped to about 40%. There are currently 101 declared music education majors.*
3. *Faculty hires with significant strength in composition resulted in more composition majors, and more students of all degrees participated in composition and arranging activities. This was true until recently; the resignation of the composition specialist last year, and the fact that the position was filled this year, and will again be filled next year with an adjunct, has led to a decline in the number of composition majors, a clear*

illustration of the consequence of staffing a program with adjunct, rather than tenure-track faculty.

4. *The Music Business degree has begun to attract an increasing number of students, particularly since the degree was changed from a B.M. degree, with its necessary high standards in applied music and inordinately heavy credit load, to the B.A. degree. The easing of performance expectations and lessening of required credits for the degree (138 to 122), has resulted in a steady growth in student demand.*

A comprehensive picture of the department can be provided with the following data:

B.M. Music Education.....	101	M.M. Music Ed.....	1
B.M. Performance.....	79	M.M. Performance.....	6
B.A. Music.....	50	M.M. Performance/Ped.....	3
B.M. Comp/Theory.....	6	M.M. Conducting.....	6
B.M. Music Business.....	17	M.M. Composition.....	1
Undergrad. Majors	253		17
Graduate Majors	17		
Certification only students	3		
Total Music Major students	273		
Music Minors.....	53		
Total students served	326		

These trends, coupled with the maintenance of the traditionally strong program in Music Education, have resulted in a gradually increasing student population. The overall music major population has increased from around 200 ten years ago to 273 in the fall of 2006 (including graduate students). The increase is not due to greater numbers of entering freshman, which has actually decreased slightly, but rather to a higher retention rate, which can be attributed to the increasing quality in each successive entering class, and to an increase in the number of transfer students accepted into the department. The additional instructional resources demanded by the increase in the music major population and the additional credits in applied studies generated by the greater numbers of performance majors has not yet received commensurate support from the university. The department now has only one more FTTT position (added only this year), than it did 30 years ago. The resulting instructional pressure has forced the department to consolidate its degree programs, promoting one program that does not demand extensive additional department instructional resources, Music Business, and deleting those for which present resources are inadequate. Examples of the latter include the deletion of the Master's degree in Music Theory and, some time ago, the Master's degree in Music History. The increase in students and the lack of corresponding

increase in TT faculty has resulted in a greater use of part-time, or adjunct, instructors, particularly in the academic areas of the core curriculum. Ten years ago adjunct instructors provided the equivalent of 1 FTE position, in the last two years they have provided the equivalent of 6.2 FTE positions. This year there are 19 FTTT faculty members (21 lines), 13 adjunct instructors (one of whom is FTNTT) and 10 Graduate Teaching Assistants. The instructional loads equate to 27.61 FTE, including the instruction provided by Graduate Assistants. The most current HEADS survey reveals that we are one full faculty member shy of achieving the national norms per student group in both TT and FTE categories. This, when extrapolated to the department as a whole, renders the department approximately four TT faculty short of national norms for the size of its student body

Source: Higher Education Data Survey, Academic Year 2004-2005, charts 39 and 40

Numbers of Music Majors Per FTE Faculty Member

<i>Public Institutions</i>	<i>Number of Institutions Reporting</i>	<i>5th Percentile</i>	<i>25th Percentile</i>	<i>50th Percentile</i>	<i>75th Percentile</i>	<i>95th Percentile</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>CWU</i>
<i>101-200 Majors</i>	93	4.7	5.9	7.4	9.4	12.2	7.9	
<i>201-400 Majors</i>	77	5.6	6.8	8.2	9.6	14.9	8.8	9.88

Numbers of Music Majors Per Full-time Faculty Member

<i>101-200 Majors</i>	93	5	8	10	13	20	11.1	
<i>201-400 Majors</i>	77	7	9	11	15	24.4	12.6	13.65

Department Secretarial and Technical Staff Support.

In 2003, the staff was increased from 1.5 to 2 office workers. In 2005, along with the move to the new building, 1.8 additional support staff members were added. However, even with this addition, staff resource still do not even match the average staff number for Music Units 1/3 to 1/2 our size. The following charts include the average FTE for office and staff for music units of 101-200 majors, and of 201 to 400 majors.

Source: Higher Education Data Survey, Academic Year 2004-2005, chart 24-2

NASM Office and Technical Staff Data; 2005-2006

	<i># of units reporting</i>	<i>Average FTE</i>	<i>Average .Cost</i>
<i>101-200 Majors</i>			
<i>Technical staff</i>	42	1.25	\$41,938
<i>Prof./misc. staff</i>	44	1.33	\$40,275
<i>Secretarial staff</i>	92	2.12	\$42,207
<i>Total</i>		4.7	\$124,420
<i>201-400 Majors</i>			
<i>Technical staff</i>	52	1.67	\$54,101
<i>Prof./misc. staff</i>	40	1.9	\$65,733
<i>Secretarial staff</i>	76	3.31	\$81,635
<i>Total</i>		6.88	\$201,469
<i>CWU (273 majors)</i>			
<i>Technical staff</i>		0.875	\$30,573
<i>Prof./misc. staff</i>		1.806	\$62,728
<i>Secretarial staff</i>		1.5	\$45,444
		4.181	\$138,745

The current music staff is comprised of:

- 1.5 secretarial workers (one full time office supervisor and ½ time office assistant)
- .875 Technical staff (.375 audio technician, .5 fiscal technician)
- 1.8 technical Professional and misc. positions (one FT hall manager, .8 piano technician)

Faculty Staffing Strategies

A major influence on faculty hiring strategies is the geographical placement of the campus. The distance of the campus from a major metropolitan area (Seattle), the state policy forbidding support for travel and difficulty of winter travel through a mountain pass makes it difficult to attract high-quality part-time applied faculty to teach on campus. We are also very much aware that only resident instructors can provide the attention, nurture and stability will ensure strong applied studios. These two factors are reflected in the priorities of the 2010 Plan. In general, assuming no needs in large ensemble or area directorships, the selection of new faculty has followed the strategy of:

1. Attempting to provide full-time, tenure-track (FTTT) artist faculty for all large-studio applied areas.

2. Combining small-studio instructional needs with additional strengths in the academic core common to all degree programs.
3. Since the department has had to secure adjunct instruction in both academic areas and small-studio applied instruction (viola, tuba, string bass and oboe), the problem of providing resident applied instruction has been met with the strategy of combining applied instruction with an academic area, seeking younger faculty who would welcome the chance to gain university teaching experience, even at low pay, as residents of Ellensburg. This has been successful in that the viola and tuba studios are being taught with great success by such part-time faculty, who also teach theory and a general music course. However successful this has proved in the short term, since these instructors will inevitably move on to more secure and better paying positions, this cannot be seen as a long-term solution.

Department Budget-University Support

The department has traditionally been under funded, at least by national norms. This is partly the result of Washington state higher education funding allocations, which traditionally are much lower than national norms. Compounding this is the fact that allocations are tied to student credit hours generated, and, unlike other states, there is no allowance made for programs in the Arts, which have a much higher student/faculty ratio than other disciplines. Music is one of eight departments and three programs in the College of Arts and Humanities, and the budgetary allotment from the university to the college does not acknowledge the higher student/faculty ratio, or the greater cost of supporting Music than other departments to any great extent. The consequence of this can be seen in the dramatic difference in national averages for Music Unit expenses, compared to those of this department as demonstrated in the following charts.

The first chart reveals that the total operating expenses (excluding faculty salaries) of the Music Department (\$175,419) does not even come close to the national averages for music departments half its size:

<i>Total budgets for Music Units with 101-200 majors (Chart 25-9)</i>					
<i>5th percentile</i>	<i>25th percentile</i>	<i>50th percentile</i>	<i>75th percentile</i>	<i>95th percentile</i>	<i>Average</i>
<i>\$44,900.00</i>	<i>\$111,098.00</i>	<i>\$243,900.00</i>	<i>\$379,431.00</i>	<i>\$644,024.00</i>	<i>\$280,737.00</i>

The second chart gives a breakdown of all the expenses of Music Units, with those of CWU provided for comparison:

EXPENSES OF THE MUSIC UNIT

<i>Public Institutions; 201-400 Majors</i>		<i>HEADS online Data Survey, 2004-2005, Chart 26-9</i>						<i>CWU</i>
	<i># Reports</i>	<i>5th Percentile</i>	<i>25th Percentile</i>	<i>50th Percentile</i>	<i>75th Percentile</i>	<i>95th Percentile</i>	<i>Average</i>	
<i>Fac/Prof travel</i>	72	\$3,365	\$5,622	\$10,000	\$17,250	\$29,808	\$12,714	\$7,992
<i>Grad Scholarship</i>	54	\$1,617	\$15,650	\$55,765	\$170,400	\$661,692	\$129,77	\$0
<i>Guest Artist</i>	66	\$1,125	\$5,075	\$12,250	\$26,875	\$60,716	\$19,740	\$2,049
<i>Instructional Supplies</i>	71	\$100	\$4,241	\$8,000	\$16,900	\$59,000	\$17,139	\$888
<i>Library (collection)</i>	40	\$684	\$2,000	\$6,050	\$15,000	\$41,739	\$16,328	\$5,000
<i>Library (perf scores)</i>	60	\$814	\$5,000	\$8,035	\$12,592	\$30,101	\$10,924	\$5,000
<i>Office Supplies</i>	75	\$1,701	\$5,000	\$7,000	\$12,866	\$32,060	\$11,794	\$7,125
<i>Operating Services</i>	40	\$2,000	\$5,525	\$11,808	\$29,125	\$81,739	\$33,690	\$17,735
<i>Postage</i>	62	\$810	\$3,075	\$5,000	\$7,000	\$10,988	\$5,883	\$2,630
<i>Printing/Duplication</i>	73	\$2,824	\$6,000	\$10,000	\$16,945	\$28,674	\$12,251	\$439
<i>Public Rel/Fundraising</i>	54	\$1,296	\$2,350	\$5,000	\$15,112	\$28,236	\$15,379	\$2,462
<i>Artists/Lectures</i>	36	\$1,000	\$4,025	\$6,850	\$12,248	\$43,370	\$11,919	\$0
<i>Student Recruitment</i>	63	\$1,048	\$2,750	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$24,733	\$7,629	\$0
<i>Student Travel</i>	68	\$1,675	\$5,750	\$14,931	\$32,050	\$102,689	\$27,416	\$14,001
<i>Student Wages</i>	70	\$2,000	\$6,036	\$15,500	\$23,360	\$46,550	\$19,507	\$37,082

<i>Technical Services</i>	73	\$2,943	\$11,500	\$20,000	\$32,648	\$62,686	\$23,530	\$26,204
<i>Technology Services</i>	59	\$1,000	\$2,900	\$5,000	\$11,500	\$30,397	\$8,915	\$4,908
<i>Tel/Fax/Elect Comm</i>	69	\$970	\$8,500	\$11,800	\$20,000	\$34,000	\$15,055	\$10,084
<i>Under Grad Scholarships</i>	71		\$68,528	\$145,332	\$23,800	\$582,338	\$255,14	\$26,900
<i>All other Expenses</i>	63	\$2,544	\$8,900	\$20,000	\$50,000	\$234,409	\$56,329	\$4,920
<i>Total Budget</i>		\$98,116	\$249,50	\$463,090	\$701,100	\$1,486,155	\$586,72	\$175,419

Note: Office supplies, postage, printing/duplication, student employment, telephone/fax represents 120% of the department Good and Services budget allotment.

Long Range Planning and the 2010 Plan

Planning and projections is a dicey matter in the Department. Even with the new facility, tight room scheduling caused by the a building already filled to capacity and the scarcity of faculty and staff resources and budgetary support, combined with a thriving student population results in much administrative time that is spent tinkering daily with meshing classes so that they fit in available rooms without creating conflicts for students or instructors, or with quarterly revisions of plans for how curricular needs will be met. This situation is exemplified by the difficulty in developing a course plan for the year, due in February of the previous year, when the situations of many part-time personnel, who teach more than half the academic classes, and Graduate TAs, whose areas of expertise and competencies directly affect the need for part-time instructors, are unknown. Thus, while navigating an efficient, consistent course is an important objective, the immediate concern of keeping the ship afloat tends to divert attention from course setting. While

the “band-aid” approach to keeping the program going has been successful thus far, it is at the cost of much stress and constant imaginative problem solving. However, the department has been able to maintain an objective view of its goals, its identity and its ability to serve the needs of its students with surprising efficacy, turning a seemingly constant state of flux into a flexible administrative stance that regards all change as opportunity for improvement.

The program is not so large or diverse that all faculty members cannot maintain a fairly clear notion of the department’s objectives as a whole, and the candid conversations in weekly faculty meetings tend to keep everyone abreast of the state of the department’s activities. The last several years have seen numerous changes in degree curricula, course offerings, and policy. These changes have come from several sources: the election of new chair five years ago resulted in a new leadership perspective and many changes have resulted from this; faculty members have made changes possible by virtue of their particular strengths, new faculty hires have brought with them their specialized competencies and some changes have resulted from the implementation of new technology.

Several faculty retreats, coupled with the work of the Long Range Planning Committee, enabled all faculty members, full and part-time, to voice their concerns, opinions and perspectives, and it has proved to be an effective means of establishing a common sense of purpose and philosophy. Retreats also provided opportunities to discuss and compile department strengths and weaknesses.

Current Strengths

- 1) The department has a strong faculty of professional music educators who work together with rare collegiality, have a well-balanced blend of areas of expertise and professional experience both in and outside academe, and are committed to providing the highest quality of musical experiences and training for their students. The faculty is professionally active, with a wide range of on- and off-campus performances, conducting experiences, music education involvement and scholarly and service activities.
- 2) The department is well respected on campus, in the state and in the region. It continues to maintain its reputation as the premier music education program in the state, and its

representative performing ensembles, already known for their excellence, are still increasing in stature. The recent addition of a music education specialist with strengths in research and the graduate program will enable the department to revive and even expand the graduate music education program.

- 3) The department concentrates its efforts on what curricular programs can be delivered with integrity, and does not try to spread itself too thin. (This goal is becoming increasingly difficult to achieve, as the increased numbers of majors have not been met with commensurate increases in TT faculty). Each program has enough of a student population and the instructional expertise to provide a comprehensive experience. The blend of curricular tracks offered and the talents of the students who engage in them constitute a cohesive whole in which the various parts complement and support each other.
- 4) Music performed by students and faculty ranges from early music on period instruments to contemporary music. The repertoire for wind ensembles, symphony orchestra, chamber orchestra and choirs always includes contemporary works, and the formation of a contemporary chamber players ensemble give many students the opportunity to experience music not often heard in traditional ensemble concerts (see Appendix I—recent representative programs).
- 5) The department has proved ready to change to match changing circumstances in the discipline, changes in technology and changes in programmatic pressures. Examples of this include:
 - a) the deletion of degrees no longer able to be supported
 - b) the changes in various degree curricula to strengthen their goals, such as the change in the Music Business degree to better reflect the normal goals of the music business major, and the inclusion of World Music in the history core.
 - c) The addition of new courses that take advantage of new faculty's special expertise
 - d) the institution of specializations to better compete in the market for talented students, such as the new B.A. Specialization in Jazz.
- 6) There is no hierarchy of importance within the program: faculty in all degree and program areas respect and support each other's work. This sense of mutual respect carries over into the student body; no one area is considered superior to any other.

- 7) The administration of the department has been successful at creating an atmosphere of trust, fairness, candor, integrity and collegiality, while maintaining expectations of the highest academic and musical achievements.
- 8) The Kairos String Quartet, a Resident Ensemble supported by an endowed professorship, brings many benefits to the department. It provides a model for string students, is a positive recruiting tool, and has been extremely influential in the enabling the orchestra to reach its present level of excellence. It also provides the department with outreach activities to schools and the community. Currently the endowment generates enough income to support 25% of the work load of the two TT faculty members of the quartet, and enables the hire of the two adjunct members of the quartet, who also serve as instructors in violin and viola,
- 9) The representative ensembles of the department in all areas, choral, orchestral, wind ensembles and vocal and instrumental jazz, groups that tend to project much of the image of the department to outside constituencies, are at an unparalleled level of excellence across the board.
- 10) The new building has given the department facilities that are superior. The only serious equipment lack is in the area of small instruments, the result of whimsical language in the legislation that contained the appropriation for the building and equipment. This language forbade the purchase of small instruments (really!). Thus, the department is currently well equipped with cellos and basses, but not violins and violas, with tubas and euphoniums, but not trombones or trumpets, etc.

Current Weaknesses: Many of the weaknesses of the program relate to the inadequacy of instructional and financial resources.

- 1) FTTT positions are inadequate to support the current student population and programs (see data presented on pages 5 and 6). The department believes that the program is thriving, but the inadequate number of faculty and staff has led to a number of weaknesses in the program:
 - a) The workload of TT faculty is increasingly devoted to applied music, leaving the instruction of core academic classroom courses to adjunct faculty. This year, with the TT composition position occupied with an adjunct faculty member teaching on a per-credit, part-time basis, all but one of the six core theory sections, upper division theory and two core music history sections are being taught by part-time faculty. This problem is also coming to the fore in other areas. The trombone instructor, also hired as Associate Band

Director, now has a very strong trombone studio, but can continue directing a band only by assuming an untenable overload.

- b) TT faculty average 1.8 contact unpaid overload workload units per quarter, resulting in annual average loads of 37.81 (36 instructional credits are the norm). The overload assumed by the faculty as a whole is equivalent to 3 full-time TT faculty members, close to the number of faculty short of national norms as suggested by HEADS data provided on page 5).
- c) Additional instructional staff would permit the department to enlarge and enrich general education offerings, currently only two courses per quarter. Part of this problem lies with the system of reward for credit generation in the university. All credit dollars generated by courses do not revert to the department but to a general fund. Thus, there is no incentive for generating credits in these courses, for creating new courses or for offering more sections. Every faculty load credit and every adjunct dollar devoted to General Education or Service courses robs the department of faculty load credits and adjunct dollars that could be directed to music major instruction. With adjunct dollars at a premium, this means that the Gen Ed courses are taught by Graduate Teaching Assistants at every opportunity, or by adjuncts, but rarely by Tenure-Track faculty.
- d) Instructional pressures and the dedication of the faculty to the needs of the students result in overloads, only some of which are officially acknowledged, that compromise the faculty's ability to focus on their own professional development and scholarship, and to department program development.
- e) Many elective and required upper division courses are dependant on the availability of qualified part-time instructors, e.g., MUS 359: Music in Cross-Cultural Perspectives, MUS 340: Analysis of Tonal Music, MUS 379: Philosophy of Music, MUS 440, Analysis of Non-Tonal Music and MUS 346: Counterpoint II. Such expertise is not available locally. Administrative conjuring is necessary on an annual basis in order to ensure that these courses are available.
- f) As discussed above (page 7), small-studio applied areas taught by adjuncts are vulnerable to the lack of consistent instruction, the difficulty of attracting highly qualified instructors and impossible recruiting conditions.

- g) Perhaps the most vulnerable program is the Music Business degree, which is unique to this university; no other institution in the Northwest offers it. An interdisciplinary degree, it offers students the opportunity to prepare for careers in music other than teaching or performance. The strategy to change the Music Business program from a B.M. to a B.A. degree has resulted in a steady increase of students in the program. It is also the subject of many inquiries from prospective students. However, the program has become a victim of its own success. Although the instructional demand specific to the degree is minimal (just one 3-credit course every other year), there is no faculty member with the time or space to advise these students knowledgeably, to explore internship possibilities with them, or act as the kind of cohesive agent with whom these students could identify. The faculty member presently teaching the course was not hired to do so, and is fully occupied in his other areas of expertise. The program also offers opportunity for further growth. The equipment that came with the new building has provided the opportunity to offer instruction in audio, or sound production, a program that would undoubtedly prove useful to students from other majors, besides providing a specialization within the Music Business degree. However, though resident expertise is available, this has not been proposed, since it would add to an adjunct expenditure that has already grown considerably past available funds. It is clear that while this degree offers much to students and has the potential to establish a unique niche for CWU, this depends more faculty resources becoming available. Indeed, without additional resources the program might have to be eliminated, as even the students currently declared in the major cannot be given the attention they deserve.
- 2) Based on the current department size, funding for the operational expenses of an active music program, including equipment, instruments, recruiting, ensemble music, ensemble touring, student help, administrative work, scholarships and performing expenses is inadequate. In almost all of these areas the department is well below the average for national norms as identified in the HEADS report for 2005-2006. This has been presented above, pages 7-8.
- 3) Based on the size of this department, staff support is inadequate—not even equal to national averages for music units half the size of this department. The relevant data from HEADS demonstrates this clearly (see data presented above, p. 5 and 6). This has resulted in

continual stress to the music office staff, an inordinate amount of secretarial work and advising assumed by the chair, which seriously hampers the ability to organize and lead discussion on issues of department policy, long-term planning, faculty/staff/student evaluation, publicity, alumni relations, and cross-campus issues.

- 4) Scholarship availability, which at \$26,000 is only 1/10 the average for comparable music units, pales even in comparison to the average of public music departments of 101-200 majors (\$148,788). This puts the department at an enormous competitive disadvantage for recruiting talented high school students.
- 5) The administration's stance on Professional Leaves has resulted in far fewer sabbaticals taken by music faculty than in any other discipline. There have been only 6 sabbaticals taken by music faculty in the last 20 years, with an average of 10 tenured faculty eligible to apply for sabbaticals in each of those years. University policy requires that sabbaticals can be granted only with the provision that remaining faculty can assume the instructional load of a faculty member on leave. This does not work for Music for several reasons:
 - a) With many faculty already overloaded, it is difficult for more overloads to be assumed.
 - b) Unlike other departments, many courses, such as ensemble and applied courses cannot be temporarily omitted from the quarterly schedule during a faculty member's absence.
 - c) Many music faculty members have expertise that is unique in the department. For example, there is only one TT faculty member with the expertise to teach each of the following: violin, cello, flute, single reeds, trumpet, trombone, horn and percussion. Since faculty tend develop close personal relationships with their students, they tend to feel personally responsible for their progress, and cannot conceive leaving their applied students in the hands of a less than fully satisfactory instructor. The funds available for adjunct instructors cannot, in most cases, attract instructors equal to the competence of tenure-track faculty.

Until this stance is modified, many tenured faculty members in the department will continue to be disadvantaged.

Program directions for the next five years.

The acquisition of the new music building has made dramatic positive changes in faculty and student morale and the delivery of the program. However, though there are potential new courses made possible by the electronic and audio equipment that came with the facility, the new building is not seen as affecting the balance of the program to any great degree, which has retained the ensemble/music-education-oriented model described earlier in this report. It also has not resulted in a substantially larger music major population. Rather, the slightly larger population of majors will enable a more flexible approach to course offerings, higher quality ensembles, and less stress on students who have to occupy key positions in several instrumental ensembles, particularly double reeds. While the new building has generated much enthusiasm for the increased space, new instruments, new equipment and new performing spaces, present classes are already full, and the faculty is even now consistently assuming uncompensated overloads to take care of the majors and minors now enrolled.

The reality of this situation is resulting in a gradual change in the fundamental attitude of the faculty. The department has up until recently maintained a kind of “open enrollment” policy. That is, any student whose entrance audition demonstrated a capacity to succeed in a music degree program, even minimally, was accepted, and music minor declarations were encouraged. This attitude was supported by two factors: the university attitude of encouraging constantly increasing enrollments and the department’s attitude of seeking to provide a place where students with talent but minimal background and experience could flourish, given the opportunity. This is now changing: the department must now develop strategies for limiting enrollments to numbers that can be realistically sustained. This is a complex issue; if performance on the acceptance audition is used as the only factor, the department’s goal of sustaining a strong and vital music education program will be compromised, as the best teachers are not always the best performers. While the proportions of students in the various performing areas as identified by the 2010 plan (see below) provide a basic strategy for guiding this effort, some means must be developed to ensure a balance of strong performers and dedicated, talented future music educators. This is one of the most important tasks facing the department in the near future.

The new building was theoretically designed to accommodate about 40 more music majors than our current population. In practice, the present total of 273 majors and 50 minors is testing the capacity already. Although the history of funding new positions within the last three decades is not positive, it is hoped that the present administration will recognize the present needs, add to this situation the effect that the new building will have, and find the means to increase the FTTT positions allotted to the department and support the program at a level that is closer to national averages.

The 2010 Plan

Approved by the Music Department Faculty, Fall 2003, Revised in Winter 2006

Committee Members:

Jeffrey Snedeker, LRPC chair, Chris Bruya, Hal Ott, Carrie Rehkopf-Michel, Vijay Singh

It is important to understand that this is NOT a strategic plan that describes how things will be accomplished; it is merely a vision of what we, collectively as a music faculty, desire for our future. What we become will largely depend on how our administration is able to assist us in meeting our goals.

Assumptions... by 2010:

- The general shape of the student body and faculty will continue to be influenced by the demands of large ensembles. Large Ensembles and Jazz Ensembles will continue to occupy a significant spot in the curriculum and will remain critical to the mission of the department. These groups will be the primary factors in determining the size and make-up of our student enrollment.
- The music education program will continue to be the single most important focus of the department.
- Other undergraduate programs of study, composition/theory and performance, will continue to provide complementary programs of study. The music business program will continue only if additional faculty resources are obtained.
- The graduate program will continue to attract and train outstanding students in the areas of conducting, music education, performance, performance/pedagogy, and composition. The size of the graduate program will remain about the same.
- Other undergraduate and graduate offerings in areas such as music technology, musical theatre, and instrument repair will be added to our degree offerings as resources become available.
- Each academic core area will be represented by at least one specialist in that area.

- Every orchestra/band/choral related applied area and piano will be represented by at least one full-time faculty member.
- Like-instrument and small ensembles will continue to play a vital role in contributing to the richness of the program, but will not be primary factors in determining the size and make-up of our student enrollment.

2010 Music Student Enrollment Profile

The following statistics were generated to establish the numbers of student instrumentalists and vocalists that could be considered "optimum" and "critical" for an ensemble-driven program in 2010 consisting of two concert bands, two concert choirs, two orchestras, and the six jazz ensembles (three bands, three jazz choirs). These numbers are not to be interpreted as quotas upon which faculty performance is evaluated, but serve to guide recruitment of students and staff suited to the programs offered by the department. There are certain assumptions made regarding some students participating in more than one ensemble (e.g., some clarinet players playing saxophone in jazz bands), but these details are not overly critical to understand this model as presented here.

Profile of student distribution among ensembles and lessons.

Instrument/Voice	Optimal No. of Students to field dept ensembles	Critical No. of Students to field dept. ensembles	Students in lessons, current '06	Students in bands & orchestra, current '06
<i>Flute</i>	18	15	18	15
<i>Oboe</i>	8	6	4	6
<i>Clarinet</i>	25	22	11	20
<i>Bassoon</i>	8	6	1	3
<i>Saxophone</i>	10	8	12	13
Total WW	69	57	46	57
<i>Horn</i>	12	9	14	14
<i>Trumpet</i>	20	15	23	25
<i>Trombone</i>	20	15	14	17
<i>Euphonium</i>	6	4	2	4
<i>Tuba</i>	8	6	5	5
Total Brass	66	49	58	65
Total Perc.	18	14	16	16
Total Piano	17	12	12	*
Total Guitar	6	3	18	*
<i>Violin</i>	28	24	16	19
<i>Viola</i>	11	8	8	6

<i>Cello</i>	10	8	5	7
<i>Bass</i>	7	6	4	4
Total Strings	56	46	33	36
<i>Voice (SATB)</i>	75	65	62	*
TOTAL	305	246	245	

Guitarists, pianists and vocalists all participate in either of the two choral groups, the 40 voice auditioned Chamber Choir or the 130 Voice non-auditioned University Choir.

Since the large choir has about 40% non majors, the data here is not relevant.

** In support of the substantial jazz program, it is assumed that at least 5 students in the clarinet studio will double on the saxophone.*

2010 Music Faculty Profile

2005/2006 Statistics

- 19 full time faculty positions (21 lines)
- 6.2 FTE in adjunct and
- 2.41 FTE in TA instruction
- Total FTE is 27.61
- 273 music majors

NASM Guidelines combined with Current Statistics and Department Model: NASM recommends 1 faculty per 8.8 students for public institutions with 201-400 majors (see data given on page 5). Using this as a model, the faculty should be:

273 current students ÷ 8.8 = 31.0 FTE faculty

246 "critical" students ÷ 8.8 = 27.95 FTE faculty

305 "optimum" students ÷ 8.8 = 34.66 FTE faculty

The 2010 committee conducted a survey of the faculty that overwhelmingly supported a strong priority in future hiring for tenure track positions should be to obtain at least one specialist for each applied area. The following model shows how specific responsibilities can be divided such that combinations of expertise can be constructed for future position descriptions.

Current Faculty Teaching and Administrative Responsibilities

Administrative and Released Time Load Credits

Chair (currently .75) 11-month contract

Associate Chair (currently .5) 9-month contract

Director of Bands (currently .17)

Director of Choirs (currently .17)

Associate Director of Choirs

Director of Orchestras (currently .17)
Director of Jazz (currently .11)
Music Education Area Coordinator (currently .25)
Scholarship Committee Chair (currently .083)
Composition/Theory Area Coordinator (currently 0)
Music History Area Coordinator (currently 0)
Music Library Liaison (currently 0; .083 desirable-- 1 load credit per quarter)
Woodwind Coordinator (currently 0)
Brass Coordinator (currently 0)
Strings Coordinator (currently 0)
Piano Coordinator (currently 0)
Voice Coordinator (currently .12 in Fall only)
Sonatina Festival Coordinator (currently .12 in Fall only)

Student Teaching released time averages 10 credits annually (this is divided amongst faculty who observe student teachers, and this amounts to the equivalent of 5/6 FT faculty member)

Ensemble Directors

Wind Ensemble
Symphonic Band
Chamber Choir
University Chorale

Jazz Band(s)
Vocal Jazz Choirs
University Orchestra
Chamber Orchestra

Instrument and area specific ensembles

Flute choir
Trombone Choir
Trumpet Choir
Brass Choir

Contemporary Music Ensemble
String Chamber Music
Saxophone Chamber Music
Piano Chamber Music

Core Academic Classes for Undergraduate Degrees taught by both Full Time and Adjunct Instructors

Introduction to Music Study (Freshmen and Transfers)

Music Theory (First Year, Second Year, Counterpoint I)

Music History (History Sequence)

Conducting I

Applied (see below)

Large Ensembles

Academic Classes required for Specific Undergraduate Degrees taught by both Full Time and Adjunct Instructors

Music Education (specific voice/instrumental methods, classroom methods)

Composition (applied study, Electronic Music, Orchestration)

Music Theory (Counterpoint II, Analytic Techniques I and II)

Music History (upper division surveys, Philosophy, World Music)

Conducting (II)

Music Business

Applied

Small Ensembles

Instrumental Class Methods (for music ed majors), currently taught by FT, adjuncts and Grad TAs

General Education Courses

MUS 101: History of Jazz (5 credits) presently taught by graduate assistant

MUS 102: Music Appreciation (5 credits) presently taught by adjunct

Large Applied Studios (75-100%), with few, if any academic courses currently taught by FTTT faculty. The load is taken with private lessons, chamber music, discipline specific ensembles and associated courses, e.g., pedagogy and literature.

<i>Flute</i>	<i>Trombone</i>	<i>Violin</i>
<i>Clarinet/Saxophone</i>	<i>Percussion</i>	<i>Voice</i>
<i>Trumpet</i>	<i>Piano</i>	<i>Voice</i>

Small Applied Studios with substantial classroom teaching duties (50+%) in History, Theory, Music Education, etc.:

<i>Horn (currently filled with FTTT)</i>	<i>Tuba/Euphonium (currently filled by adjunct)</i>
<i>Cello (currently filled with FTTT)</i>	<i>Viola (currently filled by adjunct)</i>
<i>Bassoon (currently filled with FTTT)</i>	<i>String Bass (currently filled by adjunct)</i>
<i>Oboe (currently filled by adjunct)</i>	<i>Guitar (currently filled by adjunct)</i>
<i>Saxophone (currently filled by adjunct)</i>	

Projections: 2010 CWU FTTT Faculty

Positions not involved in teaching applied music:

<i>Chair</i>	<i>Director of Orchestra</i>
<i>Associate Chair (.5 FTE)</i>	<i>Director of Jazz</i>
<i>Director of Bands</i>	<i>Choral/Vocal Jazz</i>
<i>Associate Director of Bands</i>	<i>Music Education</i>
<i>Director of Choirs</i>	<i>Music Education</i>
<i>Associate Director of Choirs</i>	<i>Composition/Theory</i>

Primarily Applied Positions (Large Studios):

<i>Flute</i>	<i>Trombone</i>	<i>Violin</i>
<i>Clarinet/Saxophone</i>	<i>Percussion</i>	<i>Voice</i>
<i>Trumpet</i>	<i>Piano</i>	<i>Voice</i>

Positions with substantial Classroom Teaching History, Theory and Applied Music

<i>Bassoon</i>	<i>Oboe</i>	<i>Bass</i>
<i>Horn</i>	<i>Tuba/Euphonium</i>	
<i>Cello</i>	<i>Viola</i>	

Non-applied core classroom needs:

Music business
Music history

Music theory

General education
World music

*TOTAL FTTT FACULTY 25**

CURRENT NUMBER OF FTTT FACULTY 19 (21 lines)

NASM recommends 1 faculty per 8.8 students for institutions with 200-400 majors. $290 / 8.8 = 32.95$

Additional hires could include the applied areas of piano accompanying and voice.

** The total of 25 FTTT faculty assumes that the areas identified above will be combined in various ways, depending on strengths of new hires, much as is our current practice.*

Long Range Planning Committee Proposals

The LRPC proposed the following prioritization for faculty hiring:

Preface to the following proposals: During past retreats the faculty has already identified and approved that small studio applied needs should be included in future hires whenever possible; "every orchestra/band/choral related applied area will be represented by at least one full-time faculty member." Therefore, each new job announcement will list the all of small studio needs along with the academic area that will occupy the major part of the load. This strategy, however, had one caveat that has come to the fore: "assuming no needs in large ensemble or area directorships" (page 6, above). The present trombone instructor was hired to direct the Concert Band and to revive a trombone studio that was critically low in both quality and numbers (having been taught by an adjunct for the previous three years). He did both, but with such success in the trombone area that applied trombone, trombone choir and a share of brass pedagogy and literature is now a full-time teaching load. He has continued directing the Concert Band, but only by assuming an unpaid overload, averaging 44-48 instructional contact hours annually, compared with the normal 36. The following hiring priorities are identified above and beyond this need.

Hires for current positions

1) The LRPC recommends that the current two open Tenure-Track positions should be used to address the areas of music education and associate director of bands with one position, and composition/theory with the other position.

Hires for potential new positions

1a) The LRPC proposes that the 1st new position be in the area of music theory (coupled with a small studio). Rationale: 21 credits of theory are required of most undergraduate music majors. There are additional courses such as analytical techniques that are required by some degree programs. Currently, there is 1 full-time faculty teaching one section in the theory area on a regular basis, and it is assumed that we will continue to have a coordinator of music theory after

the composition/theory line is hired in the future. Currently, adjuncts teach all but one the music theory sections.

1b) The LRPC proposes that a 2nd position be listed in music business. Rationale: Currently we have one music faculty member teaching in this area, and he lacks the load space to continue to coordinate, advise and implement this degree program without compromising his other responsibilities.

Note: these two areas are seen as being equally critical to the department, but in different ways. The theory position is needed to lend integrity to a fundamental academic aspect of the department's program in all degrees. The music business position is seen as critical to maintain a program that is attracting attention from students, could take advantage of new equipment that was provided with the building and provides a unique niche for the department and university in the state. It is possible that they could be combined into one position, though with the usual dilution that comes with compromise.

2) The LRPC proposes that the new 3rd position listed as a priority should be in the area of world music and general education (coupled with a small studio). Rationale: Currently all of our general education and world music classes are taught by adjunct instructors and teaching assistants. A full-time faculty member in this area would allow us to enlarge and enrich these programs critical to the College and University.

3) The LRPC proposes that the 4th new position listed as a priority should be music history (coupled with a small studio). Rationale: 19 credits are required of all undergraduate music majors in music history, and there are many other upper division and graduate history and literature courses that are required for some degrees. Currently only one full time faculty member regularly teaches in the music history area.

4. The second is a visitor's report from 2006. (next page)

Central Washington University

College of Arts and Humanities

Department of Music

Peter Gries, Chair

PROGRAM REVIEW

VISITORS REPORT

David Tomatz, University of Houston
Moore School of Music

April 9–12, 2006

I. Department Mission and Goals

The faculty and administration of the Department of Music demonstrate through this excellent document that they clearly understand the role of their school within the framework of a large university with a liberal arts tradition. There is a commitment to students through the carefully crafted degree programs, performance and pedagogical opportunities, and real life outreach exercises that prepare students to enter the job market with great success.

Student population growth in size and quality is articulated, as is the attendant stress for faculty to meet the academic and musical needs of these students. In the Mission and Goals statement and throughout the Self-Study document the concept of “an ensemble driven program” is articulated. It is explained verbally that this refers to the structuring of faculty positions based on the teaching of musical instruments most used in the high-profile ensembles.

The Mission and Goals document demonstrates careful and thoughtful planning. The Department of Music faculty and administration clearly understand who they are, what they are attempting to accomplish academically and musically, and where they fit within the larger University community. They also understand and respond to the needs and opportunities on campus and throughout the region and state.

II. Descriptions of Programs

The basic requirements of the undergraduate curricula are described in detail along with evaluative processes for students, faculty and planning. Basically the degrees are well structured. These degree programs have been reviewed and found to meet national standards by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), which is

the agency for accreditation of all college, university or conservatory music programs. The NASM accreditation is a peer review process in which the CWU Department of Music's documentation was reviewed by other music department administrators in a visit, and then reviewed by an elected council of peers at a national meeting. Needless to say, the 10-year renewal for accreditation by NASM is no small feat and worthy of mention in this document. The Bachelor of Arts with Elective Studies in Business is notable for its uniqueness in the region. It will need support to achieve the stated goals for the degree.

The graduate degree, Master of Music, has five tracks, which are similarly discussed in terms of curricula, goals and assessment. They are also well structured and have met national standards for accreditation. This year there are 17 graduate students, somewhat above average, a figure likely representing growing recognition of the program. The concept of there being a community of scholars within an area could be open to question. Apparently this is not an issue among the graduate students who interact in musical performance. A weakness, as described by the graduate students, and later confirmed verbally, is an insufficient number of graduate only academic courses in music.

An area of concern, perhaps a weakness, is the low number of credit hours awarded for applied study. For instance, required applied study in music education occupies 6% of the curriculum. This is far below national averages. In fact, many schools are requiring full hour lessons in music education with a concomitant expectation for excellence in solo performance. In the music education curriculum this meager two-year requirement is likely a consequence of the inordinate number of credits in

professional education, much of which is apparently unrelated to the needs of music teachers.

Another problem, articulated by students, is the severe limitation of applied instruction in keyboard as a secondary instrument and guitar as a secondary instrument, both of which are critical to preparation for music education. Students describe other problems of enrollment in applied lessons cuts from 60 to 30 minute lessons occurring in some instances.

III. Faculty

The faculty is impressive. The full time and adjunct faculty have excellent academic credentials that are appropriate to their teaching specialty areas. A review of the faculty vitas, Appendix D, reveals a group of individuals who are extraordinarily productive, teaching full loads, performing and conducting locally and regionally and beyond the state's borders, teaching many regional clinics, workshops and master classes, serving on committees, winning awards, and many other activities that reflect positively on CWU. There are instances of publication of articles in refereed national journals in music education.

The faculty is working to create a caring, nurturing environment for the students. They are successful in this endeavor. Students describe a wonderful environment of openness, trust and comradeship between students and faculty. The Chair and area heads serve as advisors to students, a serious undertaking in music. Students questioned the overall effectiveness of advising in music. It is suggested that administration and faculty, with student input, consider various options for enhancing the advising experience.

The faculty is committed to many service functions within the community and region. Performances, clinics, workshops, in-school functions and adjudicating are found on all faculty resumes. These activities reflect well on CWU and no doubt account in part for increased enrollment in music.

Faculty teaching was observed in class settings, private lessons and rehearsals. The level of instruction was very good to excellent. The quality of instruction by teaching assistants was also very good.

Almost all full time faculty are teaching in more than one area. This is positive and reflects on the broadly based American philosophy of higher education in music where everyone studies the history and theory of music, performance with laboratory ensemble experience, pedagogical methods, and general education. Generally, faculty teaching in multiple areas is a characteristic of smaller music programs where there is no option but to hire individuals who can teach in performance and theory or history, or conduct, etc. It appears that the CWU Department of Music is ready to move beyond this "small school" syndrome and consider hiring some respected specialists who can bring even greater scholarly and creative recognition to the school.

It is perhaps a weakness that there are not full time faculty with Ph. D degrees in music theory and music history, two vitally important areas in all undergraduate and graduate music degree programs. If the department is to have credibility throughout the program, faculty in history and theory should coordinate these areas and be productive in scholarly output. Moreover, these individuals could offer graduate courses to meet the needs of the MM degree program.

There is only one full time piano faculty member, a consequence of priorities of an ensemble-based philosophy. Unfortunately, there aren't student pianists who work as collaborative pianists. This represents a significant deficiency, or weakness, in the program. Collaborative piano performance, chamber music and accompanying, is an important area of study, with its own laboratory experiences that help to build a complete music program. If other instrumentalists are expected to have solo and large and small ensemble performance opportunities, shouldn't pianists also have solo and ensemble experience?

It is noted throughout the Self-Study that faculty are overworked and teaching too many hours. Limiting enrollment is being considered. The department may want to review all internal time commitments for efficiency, too. For instance, weekly faculty meetings are time consuming and are reflective of a small department where the faculty serve as a committee of the whole. Within the CWU music program there is a strongly established committee structure that could probably be used more efficiently. They could report to the faculty in monthly meetings as they do in other large music programs. There may be other internal time saving mechanisms. Faculty expressed the idea that the weekly faculty meeting led to cohesiveness and openness.

Finally, faculty may have to say no to overloads of extra ensembles and to accepting more students than they can handle. This is a tough call but one that should be considered.

Music Staff were found to be competent, diligent, thoughtful and certainly understanding of their tasks. The staff was enlarged recently, but as documented in the Self Study, p.52, and in interviews with staff and faculty, there continue to be tasks for

which there are insufficient staff hours available. Lack of full day staff support in the office is a serious problem. Funds are insufficient to hire student labor to fulfill the needs of evening recitals, recording and other similar duties. The glories of the new building and its state of the art electronics attract much attention, audiences and activity. Staff to support all this is a necessity.

This is a serious problem, a weakness that can be fixed with a relatively small amount of support.

IV. Students

Students were observed in classroom settings, in ensemble rehearsals, in lessons and engaged in discussion. They are generally bright, articulate, and motivated. The individual performance level was very good, and in some instances excellent.

Graduation rates are consistent and show a recent increase. Bachelor of Arts degrees and Bachelor of Music Education degrees make up more than 60% of the total. Performance degree enrollment has been increasing substantially in recent years.

As documented in the Self-Study, Appendix C, the Department of Music has a terrific success rate of placing graduates in teaching positions and placement in distinguished graduate programs throughout America.

In a meeting students articulated their appreciation for faculty support, the collegial atmosphere, and the wonderful ensemble opportunities. Almost all of those in attendance, about 45, indicated they had chosen CWU because of a specific faculty member or because of the reputation of the Department of Music. Many described meeting a faculty member while in high school, and then receiving a follow-up call and an e-mail. They felt wanted.

Issues of concern for students include the elimination of applied study in a secondary area, the reduction of lesson time from 60 to 30 minutes in BA and other instances, and the difficulty of getting needed classes from time to time. There seems to be a question of trust: students attempting to complete both a music education and performance curriculum are being told they cannot do this although already enrolled in these programs.

Ensemble performance is respected and coveted. Nevertheless, students described instances of individual students being in 20 hours of weekly ensemble rehearsals. The result is poor performance in lessons and academic courses. The rigors of touring and the expense to students were also discussed.

V. Facilities and Equipment

The new music building is wonderful. Bravo to all the administrators and faculty who were involved in the planning, politics, and follow-through needed to achieve such a grand success. The building is amply described in the Self-Study. To have a successful music program, and to build quality in the future, an institution needs outstanding faculty, top-notch students, and excellent facilities. CWU is prepared for the future!

At the University of Houston we completed a grand new music building in 1997 with an 800-seat opera house, multiple rehearsal and teaching spaces, etc. Our experience continues to be one of controlled growth. Constantly increasing tenure track faculty was not an option, although in a large city adjunct performance and academic faculty are available. But my point is, we have limited enrollment by audition. The result is more students wanting to attend our school and an increase in quality of all students, including music education. The argument described in the Self Study about

good teachers not necessarily being good performers seems to get ironed out, but there is always healthy tension.

An area of strength in music is the use of information technology. As described in the Self-Study, pp. 12-13 and Appendix F, the use of technology in all phases of instruction, the classroom, ensemble rehearsals and lessons, is excellent. It is a model of innovation and utilization of the latest "tech stuff." This represents a special effort on the part of many faculty to learn to utilize the equipment for the benefit of students.

VI. Library

The University Library collection of music books, music scores, sound recordings and reference materials is adequate to meet most needs of the undergraduate music curricula. Students can use library materials from all cooperating Washington and Oregon university libraries thus providing an almost limitless amount of music materials. Graduate students noted that they were dependent on this inter-library loan program to complete their research. They expressed appreciation for the efficiency of the library staff in securing the needed materials in a timely manner.

The University Library also provides 48 listening carrels, a small seminar type classroom used for the graduate research class in music.

The University Library is open many hours of each day and weekends.

Music students are involved in countless hours of rehearsal, classes, lessons, practice and walking to general education classes. The 10-minute walk (for each direction) may inhibit use of the library for students or faculty who would like to pop in to see a score or look up a small piece of information.

VII. Analysis of Review Period/Future Directions

These related chapters in the Self-Study, pp. 32-54, are very important documents worthy of careful attention. Many corporate and individual accomplishments are cited that reflect the results of work done by students, faculty and administration of the Department of Music. The music program has the largest undergraduate enrollment in Washington, superb facilities, regionally recognized high quality large ensembles, growing enrollments, 100% music education placement, and many individual honors, awards and accomplishments by students and faculty. It is a very positive perspective, one with an upward trajectory.

The section on “challenges” and how the department is meeting “those challenges,” pp. 36-37, is noteworthy for its candor. It also speaks well of the kind of serious thought and planning that take place in the Department of Music. The issues discussed include faculty and staff needs, the need for scholarships to attract top-level students, need for handbooks for policy statements, accompanying needs, etc. It discusses student problems and stress relating to ensemble work and touring.

New resources in the past five years describe the new music building, a new faculty position and 1.5 new staff positions. The building is a lifetime achievement, one that will have great impact for generations of CWU students.

The Long Range Planning Committee Report, beginning on p. 40, is another good document with discussion of the Departmental Mission and its relationship to University goals. There is a departmental philosophy statement that relates to staffing needs. Here one finds an often-repeated dictum that the large ensembles somehow form the basis for

the direction and shape of the department. There are various statistics used as a basis for the 2010 Plan.

Current Strengths and Current Weaknesses lists are included, pp. 48-53, that are quite specific and helpful.

The 2010 Plan has been approved by the faculty but with the caveat “that this is NOT a strategic plan that describes how things will be accomplished; it is merely a vision of what we...desire for our future.” (p. 55) They articulate the need for positions in music theory, music business, world music and music history.

There is no single mention of the need for development efforts as a potential solution for fiscal help.

VIII. Summary

What is the old saying, you can't see the forest for the trees? The planning documents are not forward looking and don't reflect on the potential for the future. In a sense they are looking at the trees.

I see a Department of Music that has well-structured curricula, an excellent faculty, a growing cadre of talented and very bright students, a unique esprit de corps throughout the department, and first rate ensembles that have earned strong reputations regionally. These are housed in a beautiful, functional, high tech music building that must be the envy of other schools in the state. More success and more students will follow.

In short, all the work and sweat of these past years is coming to fruition. The Department of Music is now positioned to become a premier music school that will be a window of light into the entire University community. To move forward the department

will need help. I have visited many state university music programs for accreditation purposes and in my estimation the CWU Department of Music already exceeds many of these schools in some areas.

For these reasons, the Department of Music deserves the confidence of the administration to move forward with vigor and self-assurance.

IX. Recommendations

As part of this report I was requested to offer “any recommendations to strengthen the department.”

These recommendations are, therefore, offered as a “friend of the court,” with the full knowledge of budget and fiscal realities and restraints, and with perspective on the difficulty of changing curricula or other requirements.

But in the best of all possible worlds, these immediate and longer-range suggestions, if implemented, will have powerful impact.

Immediate Help

1. Provide funding to change the ½ office staff person to full time. Provide small funding for more evening student help in recording and for recital and concert assistance. This limited assistance is critical.
2. Provide some limited funding to increase the hours taught by adjunct faculty in applied music to meet student lesson-needs as articulated above. This will help meet requirements in music education, for double majors and will inspire the hard working and committed students that they have earned the trust of the University.

3. This is the single most important step needed to move the Department of Music to a higher plateau. Allocate full tuition waiver scholarships to the Department of music to recruit students of the highest level. It is suggested that 8 new four-year tuition scholarships be granted each year for four years. At that point students will graduate and their scholarships will become available to the new crop of students. Lack of scholarship funding in music is a major weakness in a highly competitive environment. Moreover, music faculty and students already serve as CWU representatives in schools and public events throughout the state providing a visible window to the University. The students have earned this scholarship support. Finally, tuition waivers or other significant scholarship funding is common practice throughout American music schools.

Development

1. It is time to build a broadly based Friends of Music Society. Through annual memberships, fund raising events chaired by Society members, and other avenues of the Society, a new stream of funding will be opened to the Department of Music. It is our experience that this group, and funding level, will constantly grow.
2. Working with and through the Dean of the college and the appropriate University Development officers, efforts to develop significant scholarship and special project endowments are vitally important. This supposes that Society members will assist in identifying individuals who will be attracted to the opportunities the Department of Music can provide to assist students.

3. Establish contact with businesses and corporations that have foundations to support education and the arts. Ultimately they will want to support Department of Music students, programs and the Preparatory Program.

New Faculty Positions (2010 Plan)

- 1 The Department of Music has excellent faculty in performance, conducting, composition and music education. There are faculty from this group who also do a good job teaching music history and music theory. But the department lacks balance without giving equal weight to the essential areas of every undergraduate and graduate curriculum, music theory and music history. There is very great need for two new faculty, a Ph. D music theorist and a Ph. D music historian, to coordinate those areas, to teach graduate level courses, and to become productive and recognized scholars. These are vitally important positions for the Department of Music because they will strengthen academic study in music, commensurate to the other areas. These positions are essential for the Department of Music to emerge to the next level and to meet the academic needs of a growing graduate program.
- 2 The area of piano is understaffed and the piano as a collaborative instrument is neglected. A new piano faculty position, with emphasis in collaborative piano, is important and will have great impact on the keyboard area and will increase enrollment. Solo piano and collaborative piano performance will improve and this will also give greater balance to the department. This is an essential position in any important music school.

Curriculum

1. The music education curriculum has a seemingly disproportionate number of professional education courses and credits. Indeed, students commented on the number of education classes with materials unrelated to being a music teacher. No doubt there is an element of politics involved, but it is suggested that the Vice President for Academic Affairs establish a high level ad hoc committee to work out an equitable solution to this curricular problem, a four year music education program that takes five years to complete but is insufficient in the study of music.

2. Applied lesson requirements are insufficient in music education and inflexible in other programs. Also, it is normal for music education students to study secondary instruments, piano and guitar, to meet their teaching goals. It is also common for students to earn an education and performance degree simultaneously. Many excellent performers are undecided about life goals and want to keep their options open. It is suggested that the Department of Music study these issues to provide solutions.

3. Don't do anything to interfere with the continuation and development of the excellent major ensembles. Nevertheless, sometimes students have eyes bigger than their time capacity and take on too many ensembles in a given semester. That is not good for the student or the ensemble. It is suggested that the Department of Music institute a Two Ensemble Rule. No student may be in more than two ensembles in a given semester. Of course there will be exceptional cases. In those instances, when it appears important for a student to be in a third ensemble, a simple petition (form) granting this singular

exception should be signed by the student, ensemble director and the student's applied music instructor.

Finally, I had a wonderful experience visiting the Department of Music. Everyone was cordial, helpful, open and honest. I am especially appreciative of the Chair for organizing the visit so carefully and thoughtfully. The importance of this departmental review was also reflected in the time and thought dedicated to it by the Dean, the Provost and the Associate Provosts. Thank you!

B. Unit evaluation schedules and protocols (annual evaluations, program evaluation)

The encompassing rationale for all university assessment plans and processes is to provide a basis for continuous improvement of academic programs and student learning. The most prominent component of the academic assessment regimen is how student learning goals are accomplished. Outcomes assessment occurs in two interrelated ways at CWU: yearly assessment of student learning outcome obtainment and five-year program review processes.

Yearly Assessment of Student Learning: Each CWU degree program completes and submits a yearly assessment of student learning outcomes report. This report includes student learning outcomes and their relationship to departmental, college, and university goals. The report also includes methods of assessment, the population assessed, the timing of the assessment, results, feedback use and reporting to internal/external constituencies. All reports are evaluated by the Chair, Dean, and Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies. Feedback regarding the report and programmatic assessment processes is provided by the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Studies Office as related to assessment “best practice.” Thus, documentation of outcomes obtainment and assessment process improvement is incorporated in the same yearly process. Yearly reports are interrelated with the five year program review process in that summarized documentation of outcomes obtainment and program improvement is reported. The annual assessment of student learning outcomes report is due December of each subsequent academic year. See <http://www.cwu.edu/associate-provost/yearly-review> for more information. The department’s most recent evaluation of student learning are as follows:

**Central Washington University
Assessment of Student Learning
Department and Program Report**

Please enter the appropriate information concerning your student learning assessment activities for this year.

Academic Year of Report: 2011-2012

College: College of Arts and Humanities

Department Music

Program: *Bachelor’s degrees in Music: B.A. in Music, B.A. in Music with Specialization in Jazz; B.M. in Performance, B. M. in Music Education; B.M. in Composition/Theory*

1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

In answering this question, please identify the specific student learning outcomes you assessed this year, reasons for assessing these outcomes, with the outcomes written in

clear, measurable terms, and note how the outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.

The Department of Music continued to evaluate aspects of two student learning outcomes in the music core curriculum for academic year 2011-2012: *1. Students become literate musicians* and *2. Students will be equipped with a set of theoretical and conceptual abstractions that are applicable to and useful for the understanding of a substantial body of musical literature, applicable to music degree programs in the fields of music education, performance, composition, jazz studies, and music as general field of study.*

These outcomes are related to the Department of Music curricular goal: “Students will receive a foundation of knowledge and skills leading to specialization in one of the major programs in music education, performance, or composition” and the program goal “Increase the percentages of students retained in upper division from lower division courses.” This in turn addresses the College of Arts and Humanities student learning goals “Ensure that students develop disciplinary specific competencies for success in their field” and “Develop students’ intellectual and practical skills for lifelong learning.” The selected outcomes are consistent with CWU’s Core Theme 1: Teaching and Learning: Outcome 1.1.1: “Students will achieve programmatic learning outcomes,” and Outcome 1.1.2: “Students will persist to graduation with increased efficiency and rate.” They support CWU’s Goal I: “Maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life on the Ellensburg campus,” and Goal V: “Achieve regional and national prominence for the University.”

We chose to continue monitoring these outcomes through analysis of student achievement in the core music theory sequence, piano proficiency, and attendance and participation in Convocation and department concerts and recitals. As will be explained below, our particular interest was in evaluating the program changes instituted in 2011-12 based on prior assessment results.

2. How were they assessed?

In answering these questions, please concisely describe the specific methods used in assessing student learning. Please also specify the population assessed, when the assessment took place, and the standard of mastery (criterion) against which you will compare your assessment results. If appropriate, please list survey or questionnaire response rate from total population.

A) What methods were used?

2.1 We examined the grade distribution of the final aural and written exams for MUS 146 (written), 146A (aural) and 246 (written and aural), which represent the culmination of the first- and second-year theory courses (153 students assessed). The population assessed was all students in the first year sequence (primarily freshmen) and students at the end of the second year sequence (primarily sophomores), and was administered in the Spring quarter. The faculty would like to see 90% or more of the students earn a C or above on these exams.

2.2 A second direct measure of student literacy in aural and written music theory was the pass (retention) rate for the six-quarter sequence composed of MUS 144-146 and MUS 144A-146A and MUS 244-246 (184 students assessed). We chose to continue monitoring this rate to allow us to compare current data with the same information collected since 2007-2008. The population assessed was all students in the music theory sequence (basically all freshmen and sophomore students with some transfer students). The department goal is to maintain 90% pass rate throughout the sequence, with at least 75% of students completing the first year and 75% completing the second year.

2.3 We examined an indirect measure--the rating and commentary provided on the Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEOI) forms. We reviewed these data for MUS 146 and MUS 246 for Spring 2012 (95 students assessed). The department goal is to equal or exceed department and College means on selected items, and to have no items with means below the midpoint. The department assessment coordinator also reviewed the open-ended (constructed response, qualitative) student comments to note trends of student attitude toward these courses.

2.4 An important direct measure of student skill is the departmental Piano Proficiency exam required of all majors (53 students assessed). This exam is administered individually by a piano faculty member (or TA) on a quarterly basis. As a graduation requirement, it ultimately boasts a 100% pass rate. However, the department faculty has been dissatisfied with how many students must retake the exam, or wait until late in their program to attempt it. This is a difficulty for music education majors, as they are required to demonstrate proficiency prior to applying for placement in the student teaching internship. The department goal is a 90% or better first-time pass rate. Based on prior assessment data, the department instituted a new policy in 2011-2012 that aligns the final exam for the third quarter of piano, MUS 154A, with the proficiency requirement. Students not passing the exam/course will receive a "U" grade and will be required to repeat MUS 154A until proficiency is achieved. This will allow students the opportunity to learn without negative impact on their GPA.

2.5 Related to the selected learning outcomes, the department has a policy that requires student attendance at all Convocations (4 per quarter) and at least 8 concerts or recitals (314 students assessed). In addition to providing a breadth of music listening experience, we also believe that this is an indicator of student disposition (attitude) to engage in the community of musicians as an active listener. The department goal is to have 90% of students completing this requirement each quarter. We examined the percentage of students completing the requirement in each quarter of 2010-2011, and instituted a new policy in 2011-2012. Under the new policy, rather than linking quarterly completion of the requirement to the applied lesson grade (a policy which was inconsistently implemented and cumbersome), student attendance is tracked via a handheld scan of student ID cards at each event and tallied as a cumulative total. Students may fall behind or exceed the quarterly requirements without immediate repercussion, as long as the required total is reached by graduation. Absence at a Convocation requires 3 additional concerts or recitals, reflecting the department's belief that Convocation attendance represents a strong commitment to the learning community.

B) Who was assessed?

See above.

C) When was it assessed?

See above.

3. What was learned?

In answering this question, please report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the outcomes you assessed, and compared to the standard of mastery (criterion) you noted above. Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

3.1 We examined score distributions from the final aural and written exams for all sections of MUS 146, 146A, and 246 in the Spring of 2012 and calculated the percentage of students earning a C or better on the examinations. We compared this against the totals from 2010-11 and the department goal of 90% at C or above.

Course/Exam	% at C or above (2011-12)	% at C or above (2010-11)
MUS 146 Written	93	80
MUS 146A Aural	74	69
MUS 246 Written	89	84
MUS 246A Aural	79	70

These assessments relate to both learning outcomes described above, in that they illustrate a student's level of music literacy (in the sense of notational and theoretical constructs) and mastery of theoretical and conceptual abstractions necessary to understand a large body of music literature.

These data indicate that a) student achievement is increasing year-on-year, nearing our goal of 90% pass rate for these particular assessments, and b) students continue to be generally stronger in written than in aural theory.

Beginning in Fall 2011 and as a direct result of our assessment process, the written and aural skills components of the freshman music theory courses were split into two classes. We will continue to monitor student achievement on these exams in light of this substantial curriculum change.

3.2 Retention data for 2011-12 in the core music theory sequence demonstrate a downward trend relative to 2010-11.

Academic Year	MUS 144	MUS 145	MUS 146	Completed Sequence	MUS 244	MUS 245	MUS 246	Completed Sequence
07-08				50% (est.)				40% (est.)
08-09	77%	86%	78%	53%	85%	95%	87%	67%
09-10	79%	88%	89%	68%	84%	100%	96%	81%
10-11	87%	90%	92%	74%	91%	96%	92%	81%

11-12	83%	91%	91%	67%	84%	93%	91%	79%
-------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

We are near achieving the department goal of at least 90% of students passing each course of the sequence. We are near the goal of 75% completion for both years.

With regard to the split of MUS 144-146 into aural and written courses, much like a lecture and lab, we noted that of the 30 students (26%) that did not pass one of the quarters, 17 of them (15%) failed both aural/written that quarter, 4 (3.5%) failed written only, and 9 (8%) failed aural only. It appears that the splitting of course content did not result in a dramatic number of students failing one area or another and facing delay in sequence completion; however, it appears that students are having more difficulty with the aural component.

3.3 We examined student SEOI data for all Spring 2012 sections MUS 146 and 246 (7 sections, 95 students). This was the first year of the newly developed online format, that did not include “Course as a Whole” or “Instructor’s Teaching Effectiveness” questions which we reviewed in past assessment reports. However, individual item responses for all sections showed a clear trend of equaling or exceeding department and College means, indicating our department goal was met. Individual student comments reflected a few concerns with course content and structure/pacing as well as characteristics of individual instructors; as a whole, the vast majority of comments praised the rigor and level of engagement these courses required. We believe these student evaluations provide evidence of the effectiveness of the core theory sequence in its recent revision.

3.4 As mentioned previously, in 2011-12 the department instituted a new policy regarding the piano proficiency graduation requirement. In prior years, this assessment was independent of required or elective piano classes, and relied on the student to independently prepare the necessary skills during their program. This led to an unacceptable number of students delaying the proficiency exam until their final quarters on campus--a particular problem for music education students, who must complete the exam prior to student teaching.

Under the new policy, the final exam for MUS 154A (Class Piano III) is aligned with the proficiency requirements, and students who are not successful must re-enroll in the class until proficiency is demonstrated. In the first year of this policy, 75 students enrolled in MUS 152A (Class Piano I) in Fall of 2011. By spring, 53 students enrolled in Class Piano III (71% of the Fall enrollment). Of these, 45 passed the class and 38 were awarded proficiency. In terms of percentages, 51% of students who began the sequence completed with proficiency in 3 quarters of piano; 71% of students who enrolled Class

Piano III earned proficiency. As a new policy, it was unclear how student performance would be tracked, which resulted in the inconsistency of 7 students passing the class but not earning proficiency. In light of the new policy, it is difficult to compare these data with our prior standard of a 90% first-time pass rate. We believe that retention/attrition from Class Piano I to Class Piano III (currently 29%) will improve, and that we can approach 90% passing of Class Piano III in the first quarter attempted.

3.5 Beginning in Fall 2011, students attendance at department Convocations, recitals, and concerts was tracked using a handheld barcode scan of the student ID card. In order to graduate, students are required to attend all 4 Convocations and 8 additional performances per quarter of enrollment (a cumulative total). As this policy was implemented, Allen Larsen developed a powerful FileMaker tool to automate attendance tracking and reporting. For 2011-12, the percentage of students meeting or exceeding their required attendance was: Fall, 33%; Winter, 35%; and Spring, 48%. The overall annual rate for freshmen (the first class existing wholly under the new policy) was 52% meeting or exceeding the requirement. As it is possible for students to accumulate “extra” attendance, quarterly deficits are less of a concern. Therefore, beginning in Fall 2012, we will examine the percentage of students who are within 8 scans of their requirement at any given time. Preliminary Fall 2012 data indicate that 71% of students are within this range. Using 2010-11 data as a baseline, we will evaluate the reasonableness of a 90% quarterly completion ratio (defined as within 8 of required total) and adjust the target if necessary as the implications of the policy shift develop.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

In answering this question, please note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process. If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed. In addition, how will the department report the results and changes to internal and external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.).

The department will continue to monitor student performance and retention in the core theory sequence, the piano sequence, and completion of the Convocation/recital requirement. We believe that these elements of all music degree programs constitute the most important indicators of student progress toward degree, and any incremental improvements in these indicators are worth collective effort to achieve. We have not planned any new changes to the program for the current academic year; rather, we believe that careful monitoring of the results of last year’s changes will permit more informed interpretation and decision-making. However, we will continue to improve student support in the form of advising, degree planning checklists, feedback on attendance and

academic risk, and data management within the constraints of our current staff and faculty workload.

Results of ongoing assessment will be discussed in full faculty meetings and briefings with the CAH Dean and Associate Provost, and will continue to be an element of NASM certification. The annual reports available on the Associate Provost website will be linked on the department homepage.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year's assessment information?

In answering this question, please describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results. Please also discuss any changes you have made to your assessment plan or assessment methods.

Prior assessment information reinforced the importance of student success in the core sequences of music theory and piano, and led to heightened attention to retention in these courses. The detailed data collected over the last three assessment cycles was critically important to our discussions, and in light of the departure of a full-time tenure-track faculty member in music theory (we currently have an interim appointment with an ongoing FT/TT search) we hope to continue gathering this information.

Feedback on the 2010-2011 departmental report indicated that the department could refine the assessment plan to include measures of knowledge, skills *and* attitudes. We believe we have done this in measuring knowledge (music theory), skill (piano proficiency) and attitude (engagement in the musical community through attendance at performances). However, we will seek additional areas in which to assess student learning. For example, we are piloting the use of Waypoint Outcomes software through Blackboard in order to embed assessment in various courses (initially MUS 253C and MUS 102). This system may prove useful in tracking student performance in ensembles, upper division music theory and history class performance, and other important elements of the degree programs. An additional area of interest, also noted in the feedback from last year's report, is in the development of indirect measure of student success through exit interviews and alumni surveys.

In the Spring of 2012, the faculty met in a day-long retreat to discuss the long-term plan of the department. This was a fruitful exercise, which generated numerous thoughts and concerns that formed the basis for the departmental Long-Range Planning Committee's work this fall. We were able to articulate an

updated Vision, Mission and Values document which formed a useful backdrop to the University Strategic Planning process. Our immediate goal is to develop a new set of departmental student learning objectives aligned with NASM standards, the CWU, CAH, and Music Department Strategic Plans, and incorporated into our assessment plan. This ongoing work will continue to be a major priority in 2012-13.

Results of prior assessment reports were incorporated into the self-study required by NASM for their accreditation visit in Spring 2013. This work was ongoing throughout the 2011-12 academic year.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University:

Attached please find results of CWU Reading Assessment for Spring, 2012.

General Education Learner Outcomes Goals

REPORT (Spring 2012)

Course: MUS 359.01 (Dr. Maria Roditeleva-Wibe)

Rubric Element	Pass Native	Pass* Transfer	Non-Pass Native	Non-Pass* Transfer
Reading Rate	15/79%	3/16%	0/0%	1/5%
Summary-Details	8/42%	2/10.5%	7/37%	2/10.5%
Summary-Discipline Specific Vocabulary	8/42%	3/16%	7/37%	1/5%
Summary-Author's Intent	4/21%	2/10.5%	11/58%	2/10.5%

Central Washington University
Assessment of Student Learning
Department and Program Report

Academic Year of Report: 2011-2012

College: Arts and Humanities

Department: Music

Program: *Master of Music: Music Education*

1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

In answering this question, please identify the specific student learning outcomes you assessed this year, reasons for assessing these outcomes, with the outcomes written in clear, measurable terms, and note how the outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.

We examined several indicators related to two student learning outcomes: *Students gain knowledge and skills in one or more fields of music outside the major such as performance, conducting, theory and analysis, and history and literature* (NASM 2011-12 Handbook, XIV.E.2, p. 128) and *Students develop graduate-level perspectives on contemporary issues and problems in music education.* (NASM 2011-12 Handbook, XIV.E.3, p. 128). As part of the newly developed summer cohort MM in Music Education, students engaged in coursework in research methods and curriculum design relevant to their ongoing work in K-12 classrooms. We feel that developing competence and leadership in these areas are primary goals of our MM program, and wished to examine student performance in their initial quarter. Given the importance of a breadth of musical knowledge, we felt it was important to assess initial student skills and knowledge in aural and written music theory, musical audiation, and music history. These outcomes are linked to department goal 2. *Students will receive a general body of knowledge consistent with accreditation requirements of NASM, CAH student learning goal 1. Ensure that students develop disciplinary specific competencies for success in their field,* and university goal 1. *Maintain and strengthen an outstanding academic and student life on the Ellensburg campus.*

As indirect measures of student attitude related to the selected objectives, we examined SEOI results from MUS 560 and the aggregated data on inquiries, applications, and admissions to the new program.

2. How were they assessed?

In answering these questions, please concisely describe the specific methods used in assessing student learning. Please also specify the population assessed, when the assessment took place, and the standard of mastery (criterion) against which you will compare your assessment results. If appropriate, please list survey or questionnaire response rate from total population.

A) What methods were used?

i. We examined student achievement on a curriculum design project assigned as part of MUS 560: Instructional Development in Music Education. This project was evaluated by the instructor, with the expectation that 90% of students would receive a passing grade (75% or above) on the components of the project.

ii. We administered the CWU graduate music history exam, the CWU graduate music theory placement exam, and the *Advanced Measures of Music Audiation* (a standardized instrument developed by Edwin Gordon and widely used in research and education). As baseline measures of the first year of a new program, we had no pre-determined criterion levels. However, for the music theory and history exams, the traditional cut score is 80%. Students scoring below this threshold are required to enroll in review courses.

iii. As indirect measures of student attitude, we examined SEOI results from MUS 560 for this cohort, as well as an examination of inquiries, applications, and admissions to the new program for 2011-2012. These data were maintained by the faculty music education coordinator as a log of email and phone inquiries as well as a sign-up sheet from the WMEA state conference in February 2012. Our enrollment goal was a maximum of 15 students per cohort.

B) Who was assessed?

A complete cohort of 8 students enrolling as the initial candidates for the summers-only MM in Music Education.

C) When was it assessed?

The theory, history, and AMMA exams were administered July 6-7, 2012. The curriculum projects were evaluated August 17, 2012. Inquiry, application, and admission data were collected throughout the academic year 2011-2012.

3. What was learned?

In answering this question, please report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the outcomes you assessed, and compared to the standard of mastery (criterion) you noted above. Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

i. Students in MUS 560: Instructional Development in Music Education were required to design an ideal K-12 music program, a selected course within that program, a selected unit of study within that course, and specific lessons within that unit. This was accomplished using the Understanding by Design framework and required to be aligned with Washington State's Essential Academic Learning Requirements and the MENC voluntary national standards for music. All students were successful in these progressive assignments, scoring above 75% on evaluation rubrics. This exceeds our desired standard of mastery of 90% of students with a C or above. In one case, the student's work could serve as a model curriculum for any school and merited the highest praise.

ii. The following table contains the compiled results of the departmental music theory diagnostic exam (aural and written), the departmental music history diagnostic exam, and the AMMA percentile ranks (aural, written, and composite) for the complete initial cohort of summer MM students.

Area	Year	Theory Aural %	Theory Written %	History %	AMMA Tonal PR	AMMA Rhythm PR	AMMA Total PR
Chor	2012	81.81	69.37	48	96	96	95
Chor	2012	60.9	32.5	30	44	16	29
Chor	2012	61.36	45	60	57	65	56
Inst	2012	42.72	49.37	61.5	32	35	32
Inst	2012	44.09	42.3	-	32	30	38
Inst	2012	24	48.12	72	64	78	65
Chor	2012	90	63.75	60	94	87	88
Inst	2012	51.81	44.24	61	44	65	50

The traditional departmental cut score for the music theory and history exams is 80%, and students scoring below this threshold are required to enroll in graduate review courses in these areas. We were interested to note the wide spread of scores and the generally low performance among this cohort of full-time music teachers.

The AMMA is a valid and reliable standardized measure of music audiation widely used in research and higher education. It is predictive of musical achievement and most commonly used to identify students with various learning needs. In our sample, it correlates positively with the aural theory diagnostic exam. It would be expected that a random sample of college music majors would cluster at the 50th percentile. Our distribution of scores is not particularly surprising.

iii. Student evaluations (SEOI) of MUS 560 were generally strong. All responses were above the midpoint (3) although in some cases below department and college means. Students were particularly positive about course content being presented in an understandable sequence (mean 4.83, department mean 4.55, college mean 4.45) and the instructor encouraging students to connect course content to issues beyond the university classroom (mean 4.83, department mean 4.72, college mean 4.55). This is particularly gratifying given the general aversion among members of the profession to the subject matter at hand—curriculum and assessment. Students responded in a more mixed

manner to items “instructor used a variety of methods, as needed, to make content clear” (mean 3.50, department mean 4.42, college mean 4.41) and “course activities challenged students to think critically” (mean 4.00, department mean 4.67, college mean 4.54).

As an indirect measure of student (and potential student) attitude, we tabulated email and phone inquiries, applications, and admissions. Between Fall 2011 and summer 2012, the music education area chair received 23 inquiries resulting in correspondence, and 7 people signed up for more information at the CWU booth at the WMEA conference in February. We received 9 applications for admission and all candidates were qualified, resulting in 9 admissions. Of these, 8 began the program (one deferred until 2013 for personal reasons). We also had 3 non-degree (workshop only) attendees for the one-week intensive sessions. As this was the first year of a new program, we had no expectations as to the volume of inquiries and applications. We would like to enroll 15 students per summer, which would imply a future target level of 56 inquiries at the current yield rate.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

In answering this question, please note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process. If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed. In addition, how will the department report the results and changes to internal and external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.).

Based on student testing results, we are designing a graduate music theory seminar *for music educators* to address specific areas of weakness and emphasize practical applications of music theory in the classroom. This course will be taught in summer 2013. The same approach will apply for the music history seminar in summer 2014. We will also re-evaluate the exam preparation materials and the exams themselves to refine the approach for summers-only students who do not have access to remedial or review courses. The AMMA is a powerful and subtle tool—two of the students scored in the 90th percentile on this measure, indicating particularly strong audiation skills, and three were in the 30th percentile, indicating challenge in “visualizing” tonal and rhythmic patterns in the absence of sound. We will build on these strengths and account for these challenges in designing and instructing courses for this particular cohort.

MUS 560: Instructional Development in Music Education is a course that existed at one time but not offered for many years. It is representative of a rather technical and

laborious area of the professional educator's work, and shares this aspect with other areas of educational leadership and policy. Nevertheless, students produced work of quality, and in some cases exceptional and exemplary curriculum documents and plans. These students were clearly motivated and eager to apply their new perspectives on curriculum directly in their own classrooms. This is gratifying and will allow us to seek to replicate this success in future offerings of this course and others related to educational policy and educational psychology (two other areas that may be perceived as dry, boring, and aversive). Instructors will be encouraged to use multiple instructional methods and seek opportunities to elicit and strengthen student critical thinking skills in these courses.

We will continue to pursue all available methods to publicize the program. One option may be to gather current student testimonials and use this direct appeal to reach our target audience of practicing K-12 music educators.

Results of ongoing assessment will be discussed in music education committee meetings, full faculty meetings, and briefings with the CAH Dean and Associate Provost, and will continue to be an element of NASM accreditation. The annual reports available on the Associate Provost's website will be linked on the department homepage.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year's assessment information?

In answering this question, please describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results. Please also discuss any changes you have made to your assessment plan or assessment methods.

The primary result of previous assessments was the creation of the summers-only program itself. Low interest in the residential MM in music education resulted in nearly non-existent enrollments which were identified by the department, the Academic Planning Task Force, and CAH Dean as an area for concern. With the possibility of losing the program at the pre-eminent music education college in the region, we researched and designed the new program. This involved looking at online and summer programs at other institutions, creating or reactivating courses, redesigning existing courses to work in a hybrid summer format, and actively promoting the program.

In response to feedback on the 2010-11 report, we aligned program outcomes with NASM requirements, used indirect as well as direct methods, and endeavored to assess student attitude as well as knowledge and skill.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University: NA

Five Year Program Review: Each department or interdisciplinary degree completes a self study guided by an analysis of the programmatic curricula delivered within the department, faculty, students, facilities and equipment, library and technological resources. The self-study is prepared through the leadership of the department chair by the faculty of the department and is both descriptive and evaluative; it provides basic information on the nature of the department's programs and gives the faculty's assessment of the program's strengths and weaknesses. A program of self-study is the faculty's opportunity to scrutinize itself, to publicize its accomplishments and examine its shortcomings. A timeline for the five-year program review can be found at <http://www.cwu.edu/~avpugrad/programreview/fiveyearreview.html>

Academic Planning Task Force

The Academic Planning Task Force (APTF) was formed in 2009 and has undergone two phases that essentially utilized Dickeson's *Prioritizing Programs* to examine the criticality and possible streamlining of academic programs at Central Washington University. Quite a bit of data and analysis were amassed in 2009 and during the beginning of 2010. Since then there have been other useful methodologies developed, in particular the process for program planning and enrollment management, with an index developed from other tasks forces that utilized factors such as student demand, career opportunities, and program capacity. The new APTF task force committee is charged with extrapolating the best of each process to create a new method of analysis for programs at CWU with the aim of making the following four recommendations:

1. Programs that should be continued in their current state
2. Programs that need to be enhanced or expanded
3. Programs that need to be reduced, revised or refocused
4. Programs that need to be eliminated

The charge was **not** to eliminate Departments, but entails an assessment of programs housed in the Departments and Interdisciplinary Programs at Central Washington University. The new APTF committee will follow these steps:

1. Examine the previous methods and data of the APTF and examine the methods used in the Enrollment Management Task Force study to develop a new method of program analysis and planning

2. Examine and refine, if necessary, already collected data on programs
3. Using the new method, collected data, and revised, new information, develop recommendations on the enhancement, reduction and elimination of programs.
4. The recommendations should be discussed at the Provost Council, Faculty Senate, and the Cabinet
5. Any further refinements should be made and then at least 2 open forums should be held to discuss the recommendations, while the UFC should be consulted as appropriately outlined in the CBA, especially in the reduction and elimination recommendations.

The following are programs identified by the report that we must respond to:

Bachelor of Arts: Jazz Specialization – Revise/Reduce-Refocus

Bachelor of Music

Keyboard Performance – Revise/Reduce-Refocus

Composition – Eliminate

Vocal Performance - Revise/Reduce-Refocus

Master of Music

Composition Specialization – Eliminate

Conducting Specialization – Eliminate

Music Education Specialization – Eliminate

Performance Pedagogy Specialization – Eliminate

Performance Specialization – Eliminate

Music department Response to each of the above degree programs that were identified as needing to be revised or eliminated:

Report # 1

Impact Statements for Program Reductions and Eliminations

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title**Bachelor of Music: Composition****Name of person submitting report****Elaine Ross/Todd Shiver**

1. Describe the impact of this reduction or elimination for your department or interdisciplinary program. If you do not agree with the Task Force recommendation indicate what you would do to improve or refocus the program's operations. Each program regardless of the recommendation status in the Academic Planning Task Force spreadsheet has the option of defending its current operations.

The Bachelor of Music in composition is essentially a degree with an applied area of composition in addition to a primary instrument of performance. The appropriate way to view the degree is as a Bachelor of Music Performance Degree with composition and an applied instrument. The requirements are slightly different which is why it has a separate listing, but with the exception of composition lessons – described below, there are no additional courses required. It could be reorganized in the catalogue in this manner, but most universities grant degrees that specifically state “Bachelor of Music Composition” as it is slightly different than the other degrees.

The composition degree itself is the same as declaring a major in an applied performance degree or music education degree. It serves as an “applied studio” for the composing of music in addition to a student's applied studio for their instrument. There are currently several applied studios that are smaller than the composition studio, such as oboe or bassoon. These students are usually music education or performance majors and matriculate through those degree programs. Each studio is not separated as a specific specialization because, with the exception of specialized applied lessons in their

respective areas, the courses required are essentially the same. These core courses required for the Bachelor of Music in Performance (all areas), Bachelor of Music Education (all degrees), and the Bachelor of Arts are also required for the composition degree. With the exception of the applied composition lessons – 220, 320, & 420 – which are equivalent to applied studies MUS 264, 364, 464 for individual instruments – there are no additional courses that are specific to the composition degree program. The degree is listed in the catalog separately because it requires courses from the performance track, education track, and several upper division music theory courses that also serve a dual purpose as graduate level theory courses. Eliminating the composition degree would just reduce enrollment in these more advanced courses. However, these courses would still need to be offered as most, if not all, are required for one or more other undergraduate degrees.

Approximately 10-15 years ago, CWU had a very strong program in composition. After several years of adjunct and non-tenure faculty teaching the main theory and composition courses, in the fall of 2008 CWU re-instated a tenure-line position as the coordinator of music theory/composition. This position has provided stability and greatly improved the quality and retention of the composition studio. Since that time the composition program has been steadily increasing. There were 2 majors in the Fall of 2008 and there are now 11. The graduation rate the past five years has been very low as the program had not been thriving. Students are now matriculating through the degree program at a very steady pace. Two graduated in the spring of 2011 and 4 are anticipating graduation this coming spring 2012. An ideal number of majors for a department this size is 8-10 students. In short, the degree program is functioning the way it is designed to function. It supports the 8-10 highly qualified students and without any more resources cannot support any additional students. The studio itself is at capacity with a waiting list of qualified students who would like to add the major. The current theory/composition tenure-line position has a workload of 2/3 theory and 1/3 composition. The current tenure-line composition person also coordinates the theory area, with primarily adjunct support.

The Bachelor of Music in Theory/Composition was changed to a Bachelor of Music in Composition. The curriculum was substantially revised to provide practical courses for success in the job market and graduate school potential. The Bachelor of Music in Composition Degree at Central Washington University is primarily a study of acoustic composition and is intended for students with adequate knowledge/skills in the following areas: high level of musicianship as demonstrated through performance on a primary instrument; basic understanding of music theory concepts; application of basic compositional techniques; knowledge of significant composers and their compositional

techniques; and creative compositional potential. The new degree program does not allow acceptance into the program until the completion of the first year of study. Students are given the opportunity to focus on their applied instrument and solidify a basic knowledge of theory before studying applied composition. Acceptance into the composition takes place after completion of MUS 120 (an in-depth introduction to composition focusing on terminology, compositional techniques from a historical perspective, and small creative projects with specific parameters). This has been significant in improving the quality of the composition studio. The revision of the curriculum, changes to degree requirements, and new organizational leadership have made it a popular degree amongst students.

The strength of the degree is found in the talent of the students currently pursuing it. Many students who have pursued and graduated with this degree have attained a high degree of success. Although the number of composition majors at any one time does not compare to some of the other “composite” degrees, it is felt that this degree is appropriate to the Mission and scope of this department and offers an ideal complement to the other degrees in the program.

2. How will this action impact instruction, faculty workload, and division of labor in the department?

The elimination of this degree will have a minimal effect on faculty workload hours as it will only free approximately 4 workload units per quarter. This is the only additional instruction specific to this degree that is required. The number of students currently enrolled as majors and the number of students interested in the composition program would seem to far outweigh allocating only 4 workload hours per quarter for this degree program. All other coursework overlaps with the other Bachelor of Music/Arts degrees. In addition to this, MUS 120 (composition 1) also serves as an elective course for any music major interested in a composition class. This class is only offered once a year in the spring. The enrollment in this class for the past 3 years has been between 12-20 students. NASM (National Association of Schools of Music) requires some element of composition in the music curriculum. While there are small components of compositional elements in other classes that fulfill this requirement, MUS 120 provides a more advanced option for those students who wish to explore the creative side of writing music without declaring a major in composition.

The composition faculty member must also request extra compensation each spring quarter to teach a composition class which creates an overload. This must be added to the above for a total of 15 workloads per year to accommodate the composition courses.

3. Does the evidence indicate that there will be a significant decline in enrollments or will the reduction or elimination increase enrollments, maximization of course offering and faculty workload distribution?

The elimination of this degree program will likely have an adverse effect on enrollment to the department. A large number of students currently in the composition student, several applying for the degree each spring, transfer students, and incoming freshman select CWU as their choice of schools because this degree is offered. While not all are selected for the composition studio, they are often students who become vital to the department. The fact that they can still be involved in new music, take composition as an elective, participate in the performance of new music, and still pursue a degree in music even though they are not part of the actual “composition studio” actually strengthens the validity of maintaining the composition studio as it is. Increasing the number of students in the student would not only require more faculty resources, but would take away from the numbers in the other degree programs.

As previously stated, eliminating the composition degree would just reduce enrollment in the upper level theory courses which will generate fewer FTE’s. These courses would still need to be offered as they are requirements for other larger degree programs. Students in the composition studio and interested in composition help increase class sizes, generate more FTE’s in these courses, and help to support graduate level theory courses that are dually offered as both upper level undergraduate/graduate offerings.

4. How will the reduction or elimination affect interdependences with other programs and units, especially any documentation regarding coursework.

Students in the composition degree program support the coursework of all the other degrees. As stated above, the core coursework for all degree programs is essentially the same. Composition students often double major in music education or performance as well. They add to enrollments of these program specific courses. As previously stated, students in the composition studio and those interested in composition help increase class

sizes, generate more FTE's in these courses, and help to support graduate level theory courses that are dually offered as both upper level undergraduate/graduate offerings.

5. Will the reduction or elimination of this program have an adverse effect on scholarship, grants/contracts, or creative expression opportunities for faculty and/or students? If so, explain.

Composition is a significant facet of music that can provide much exposure for a music department. For the past three years in a row, a CWU student has won the Opus 7 Choral Composition Competition in Seattle, WA. This provided a performance of their respective works by Opus 7 – a professional vocal ensemble – and a cash award. Quarterly studio recitals are required of all composition students and have increased in quality. This past fall, it was necessary to present two separate studio recitals as the length of student compositions increased. The ability to compose longer, more substantial works shows a deeper understanding of compositional concepts. In addition, several different CWU faculty have had works nationally performed often. This already helps attract talented students to campus, but without a composition degree to consider applying for, these students will go elsewhere for these opportunities. The number of competitions, workshops, conferences, etc. that are soliciting new music from not only faculty, but students is enormous. Our current faculty and students are participating and being selected for such events. The elimination of the composition degree would minimize this participation and stifle CWU's recognition in this area.

New music is an important area of study for all music programs and is vital for the advancement of the field of music in general. The composition studio presents quarterly composition studio recitals in which all students compose/coach/and have a work performed in a public forum. This is valuable not only for them, but for other students in the department as well. A large number of students participate in these premieres. This gives them an opportunity to experience new techniques and understand the compositional process. While they are not composing themselves, the students who participate better understand the theoretical, rehearsal, compositional, and artistic elements that are involved.

Music composition is an interest of many music students. It would be virtually unheard of for a music department of this size to be void of any opportunities in music composition. The students in this degree program tend to be the most well versed in theoretical structure of music as well as those who can use these skills and say something artistically. These students raise the bar of all students around them. It provides a creative outlet in a different capacity than performing on their applied instruments. Most

students in the composition degree program are high level performing musicians on their respective applied instruments. To take this outlet away from them, would limit their potential not only as composers, but as performers as well. For many composition students, it is their way of most effectively and creatively communicating. Composition is viewed by many musicians as a prestigious undertaking. It is the core component of why we are here as musicians. A university this size supporting a music department this size without a composition degree is missing the most vital element of making music – “The creation of the music itself.”

6. Does the reduction or elimination of this program adversely impact diversity or inclusivity on our campus? If so, explain.

The diversity of music itself is important. Different types of music reach all different types of people. Many community members and university students/faculty attend composition recitals and are interested in new music. Eliminating these events will restrict exposure to not only new musical ideas, but will most likely reduce exposure to other areas of the music department.

New music is also important for the non-majors on campus. While technology provides endless opportunities for students and community members at large to experience, most especially, the pop culture, exposure to new music on campus of this type may be the only exposure some of the non-music majors will ever have. It is important for non-music students to know that their peers are actually composing and contributing to music in a significant way.

7. Discuss any unique or exceptional features of this program that should be considered in making a final determination on this action.

CWU offers a very unique opportunity for students interested in composition. The degree itself is structured differently than the other colleges/universities in the region. The University of Washington, for example, is very “electronically” driven and other state schools do not even offer such a degree at the undergraduate level. The Bachelor of Music in Composition Degree at Central Washington University is primarily a study of acoustic composition and is intended for students with adequate knowledge/skills in the following areas: high level of musicianship as demonstrated through performance on primary instrument; basic understanding of music theory concepts; application of basic compositional techniques; knowledge of significant composers and their compositional

techniques; creative compositional potential. In addition, CWU has the unique opportunity of offering some arranging/composition courses in the jazz area due to the strength of jazz/vocal jazz faculty. Acceptance into this degree program does not occur until the end of the first year of study which gives students the opportunity to feel confident that they are prepared to enter the composition degree program and to explore all other options as well. The performance component to this particular undergraduate composition degree is also unique. It provides students with opportunities in both composition and their applied area, simultaneously, thus making them more “hands on” composers.

8. Please provide any additional data you think would strengthen your case on the impact of this action.

The revision of the composition program is intended to support an applied degree in composition while still maintaining a performance element on students’ applied instruments. The goal is to give composition students the necessary skill set to become more informed and artistic composers. I believe this approach has helped strengthen the composition studio as it has not only grown in numbers, but in quality as well. The number of majors has increased in the past four years from 2 to 11 current majors – with several on a wait list. The ideal number is 8, given other teaching responsibilities. The graduation rate is also increasing. Two graduated last year and are both pursuing Master’s degrees in music and four are expected to graduate this year. CWU composition students have represented the department well recently.

The current theory/composition tenure-line faculty member’s teaching goals pertaining to composition include: a greater level of achievement of theoretical and compositional knowledge; a greater understanding in the creation of deeper, more meaningful music by the composition students; a greater appreciation by students of the practicality of theoretical and historical knowledge of a composer; teaching students ways to more quickly and effectively compose quality original music; and a greater sense of community and collegiality among the composition students which becomes an integral part of the music department’s student community. There has been significant positive progress in all four of these areas over the past four years.

The current tenure-line theory/composition faculty member would like to establish a Contemporary Music Festival. While this has not yet happened due to budget constraints and the amount of time required in the restructuring of the theory and composition curriculums, this is an endeavor that will be undertaken in the near future. This and other events like it have effects that benefit the department inclusively and the university

enrollment itself. These events would be intended to be a departmental effort where a composer of significant standing is invited for a residency to interact with composers, faculty, ensembles, and students. Workshops and performances of a number of this composer's works for different genres would occur during the residency. These types of events will not only provide recognition for our outstanding faculty, ensembles, students, and facilities, but will help establish CWU's music department as one of the regional leaders in composition. In addition, hosting an SCI (Society of Composer's, Inc.) conference at CWU would also provide significant notoriety for the department and the university. SCI is a substantial nationally known professional organization in which most significant composers are active members.

The impact of eliminating this degree would be hugely negative on the students, qualities of student enrollment, enrollment in upper level classes, creative opportunities for composing, creative opportunities to experience and participate in new music, and reputation of the music department. Once again, it would be virtually unheard of for a music department of this size to be void of any opportunities in music composition. Without composition, there would be no new music. Musicians need new music to keep the art vital. Studying music of the past is one thing, but if we don't foster and nurture new music we will run the risk of losing the art altogether. CWU's music department is and should remain a strong contributor in the art of composition.

Department Report #2**Program Action****Plan for Revision and/or Elimination**

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Bachelor of Music: Composition

Name of person submitting report

Elaine Ross/Todd Shiver

Action

Refocus

Reduction

Eliminate

Directions:

The purpose of this planning form is to outline how you would refocus the program, reduce the program, or eliminate the program.

Refocus the program

1. Please outline how you would refocus the program in terms of vision, mission, learning outcomes, curriculum and any collaboration with other programs, inside or outside your department. The program is self-limiting majors because of limited resources.
Only a new hire in this area would allow us to accept more majors in this area.
2. How is this new amalgamation designed to attract new students to the program and what learning and career benefits will be anticipated for the students? NO
3. Will there be new resources required? Will there be curricular needs, such as service courses, required from other departments? NO

4. Will there be financial savings as a consequence of refocusing the program and if so, what are they? NO
5. How will this change/enhance other departmental programs that are more robust? NA
6. Are there other data or educational circumstances that the APTF did not consider that should be considered? NO
7. Please provide a plan that shows current program offerings and how they would be changed over the next two years. If courses are offered for more than one program in the Department, please show how many sections or differences in timing to offer the course delivery over the next two years (**use attached Excel Table 1 to calculate**). NA

Table 2 – Staff Changes Resulting From Program Reduction or Elimination NA

Report # 1

Impact Statements for Program Reductions and Eliminations

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Bachelor of Arts Music: Jazz Specialization

Name of person submitting report

Chris Bruya/Todd Shiver

1. Describe the impact of this reduction or elimination for your department or interdisciplinary program. If you do not agree with the Task Force recommendation indicate what you would do to improve or refocus the program's operations. Each program regardless of the recommendation status in the Academic Planning Task Force spreadsheet has the option of defending its current operations.

The process of creating the BA Jazz Specialization began in 2005 with the degree first appearing in the 2006-7 catalog. The degree was created in response to current music students desiring an option for a degree with a jazz focus as well as anecdotal evidence from prospective students auditioning for entry to the department that a jazz option was important to them. In addition, a number of very talented recruits had decided to attend elsewhere due to our lack of a jazz degree option. The process began with research and discovery of what sort of degree program might best fit with our current faculty, facility and budget. While a BM Jazz Studies degree was by far the best way to go, it was apparent that without new funding to provide for at least one addition FTTT line, it would be impossible to go this route, as current faculty could not possibly offer the amount of courses required in such a curriculum. The next step was exploration of how to create a BA Jazz Studies, with reduced coursework and outcomes, as compared to the BM Jazz Studies. After looking at many other programs throughout the country, this looked like a possibility since for decades years the department had been offering a number of elective jazz courses: jazz band arranging, jazz composition, jazz ensembles (both large and small), jazz pedagogy, and history/styles. By modifying the existing BA degree into a specialization, it became clear that we could offer a BA Jazz Specialization using all of our current jazz offerings, with only needing to add jazz studio instruction (private lessons) to the curriculum. Throughout the proposal process many faculty expressed concerns with ballooning costs associated with the studio component of the degree as they anticipated that there would be a huge interest from both existing students and those yet to arrive. There was also a concern of elitism, i.e. that jazz students would somehow separate themselves from the rest of the department due to their very different curriculum. In response to these concerns, the BA Jazz Specialization was purposely created with a gatekeeper entry audition at the end of the sophomore year after the prospective jazz student completed specific requirements in the “classical” curriculum. The gatekeeper function was intended to keep the number of jazz majors to 20 or less (with a balance between the various instruments) and to create a “bar” that only those that already might have skills in the idiom could jump over. To make sure jazz students would stay involved with the rest of the department, half of the large ensemble credits in the jazz degree require participation in a traditional ensemble (band, choir, orchestra) the other half a jazz ensemble. The curriculum includes the music major core except for conducting, and in the jazz area, all existing jazz courses. The one new course created for this degree was MUS366, studio jazz. Costs were taken into account with this new course as one-to-one instruction is very expensive. With the projected number of students in any one area, it was reasoned that the department could absorb that cost, especially considering that these students would be no longer taking classical lessons. In essence, the associated costs would merely be a transfer of resources from one “area” to another.

Efficiencies were implemented at every opportunity and the jazz area was the first in the department to offer courses on a two-year rotation in order to maximize enrollment. Since many non-jazz majors take these courses, this has worked well with courses filling well beyond minimums.

In order to make sure that the new degree was seen by all as rigorous, an extensive jury rubric was created that has expected outcomes each quarter far in excess of anything seen in any of our other degrees. This doesn't necessarily make sense, as a BA should be less rigorous than a BM, however, the program as it is now is roughly about half of the expectations for most BM jazz studies degrees across the country, so it seemed like a logical curriculum.

The result of all the gatekeeping and hoops for students to jump through has been a very small program with never more than 10 majors, usually 1 to 3 graduating per year. We are now in the 5th year of the degree and I wonder if it is fair to evaluate the success of the program so soon after implementation, but more importantly, is it fair to evaluate with expectations of large numbers when the program was purposely created to be small and contained, serving a need at relatively little cost?

2. How will this action impact instruction, faculty workload, and division of labor in the department?

Elimination of the degree would not change any workload for FTTT faculty. All jazz courses, except for studio jazz, would continue to be offered. Some of these courses are required in other degree programs, and all can be considered electives, which is how most non-jazz students count them in their degrees.

Since Jazz Keyboard, Jazz Arranging, Jazz Composition were all electives before the Jazz specialization, but now are required, the department would save these workload units along with the applied jazz lessons which currently adds around \$15K to the adjunct budget.

3. Does the evidence indicate that there will be a significant decline in enrollments or will the reduction or elimination increase enrollments, maximization of course offering and faculty workload distribution?

In pure numbers there will likely be little effect to overall department enrollment. As was mentioned above, we were already offering all of the courses in the degree, except for studio jazz, before implementation. Since PT NTT faculty teach the studio component, and the other jazz courses are usually taught by FTTT faculty, very little would change in terms of course offerings, other than studio jazz. Elimination will not increase

enrollments either. The maximization of course offerings is already in place and faculty workloads currently take this into account in our 2 year schedule plan.

4. How will the reduction or elimination affect interdependences with other programs and units, especially any documentation regarding coursework. NO

5. Will the reduction or elimination of this program have an adverse effect on scholarship, grants/contracts, or creative expression opportunities for faculty and/or students? If so, explain.

The Jazz Band 1 recently appeared at the Jazz Educators Network National Conference. Last year the Vocal Jazz 1 appeared at the American Choral Directors Association National Conference. These sorts of “juried” appearances don’t happen by accident. They are a result of the hard work by both students and faculty in the developmental stages of the jazz idiom. I have witnessed a steady rise in both the quality and quantity of the jazz performances over the past decade, with an especially steeper ramp over the last 5 years. I believe this is due to the jazz degree and the influx of quality jazz instruction at the studio level. While the numbers in the degree have been small, the influence of those jazz majors on the rest of the students that participate in the big bands, jazz choirs and combos is obvious and important. Alumni have remarked upon hearing the current incarnation of the ensembles that the number and quality of the improvisers in these groups is profoundly better than in their day. The elimination of the BA Jazz Specialization would remove this element from our ensembles and we would quickly return to a lesser level of jazz expertise overall.

6. Does the reduction or elimination of this program adversely impact diversity or inclusivity on our campus? If so, explain.

Only in terms of the inclusivity of jazz as a degree in an otherwise broad music program. To eliminate jazz as a degree sends a subtle yet real message that it is a less valued genre.

7. Discuss any unique or exceptional features of this program that should be considered in making a final determination on this action.

It is important to note that are the only 4 year in the state with an actual jazz degree. Others have concentrations or certificates, but ours is a degree. Just this fact should be enough reason to continue the program.

Although I don’t have numbers to prove it, my sense is that we would have many more students in the BA Jazz Specialization if we were to lower the gatekeeper “bar” or

remove it completely. When I explain to prospective students that they will have to take nearly 2 years of classical lessons before being allowed to audition for the jazz degree, there is a definite deflation in their interest in CWU. Another issue limiting enrollment is the difficulty of the degree. If we were to lower our expectations in the jury area each quarter, I think more students would attempt it. I have already made this sort of adjustment once, but it is too soon to tell if it has had the desired result.

Probably the biggest obstacle to increased enrollment is the fact that we don't have an identified jazz instructor on each instrument. While we do have trumpet (Harbaugh), sax (Nikolaev), voice (Singh), guitar (Durkee), bass (Hamar), and drums (Williams), we don't have a jazz instructor on trombone or piano. The lack of a piano jazz instructor has especially hurt us as we lost a couple of very promising recruits only because we don't have a jazz piano teacher. They ended up attending schools with lesser jazz program and ensembles because of it.

8. Please provide any additional data you think would strengthen your case on the impact of this action. NONE

Department Report #2**Program Action****Plan for Revision and/or Elimination**

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Bachelor of Arts Music: Jazz Specialization

Name of person submitting report

Chris Bruya/Todd Shiver

Action

Refocus

Reduction

Eliminate

Directions:

The purpose of this planning form is to outline how you would refocus the program, reduce the program, or eliminate the program.

Refocus the program

1. Please outline how you would refocus the program in terms of vision, mission, learning outcomes, curriculum and any collaboration with other programs, inside or outside your department. We could limit the instrumentation that could be accepted onto the Jazz Specialization to just the instruments that we have specialist to teach jazz: Trumpet, Trombone (Possibly, currently searching), Saxophone, Drum-Set

2. How is this new amalgamation designed to attract new students to the program and what learning and career benefits will be anticipated for the students? This would focus the program to what the department has the resources to provide, for Saxophone and Drum-Set players this

would be vitally important to their survival as a professional musician, most of their employment will come from Jazz style engagements.

3. Will there be new resources required? Will there be curricular needs, such as service courses, required from other departments? No
4. Will there be financial savings as a consequence of refocusing the program and if so, what are they? Yes, we will not add any more areas of jazz instruction which would eliminate the need to add Guitar or Piano.
5. How will this change/enhance other departmental programs that are more robust? It will not
6. Are there other data or educational circumstances that the APTF did not consider that should be considered? No
7. Please provide a plan that shows current program offerings and how they would be changed over the next two years. If courses are offered for more than one program in the Department, please show how many sections or differences in timing to offer the course delivery over the next two years (**use attached Excel Table 1 to calculate**). **Really no change here, the biggest difference will be the elimination of the Guitar instruction (which is already been decided), and not adding Jazz Piano, or any other jazz applied instruction beyond what we currently have**

Table 2 – Staff Changes Resulting From Program Reduction or Elimination

Program Title

Person Completing Report

Please describe all affected faculty who may receive terminal contracts or be reduced. Please give their name, PID, Status (Tenured/TT/NTT), and years at CWU. Secondly, discuss the issues of redeployment and/or retraining for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Finally, discuss how and for what length of time the faculty member is needed for the phase out of the program.

Name: Jim Durkee

PID: 11726500

Status: NTT

Years at CWU: 19 years

Redeployment possibilities None

Retraining possibilities None

Needed for program? If so, discuss the length of time needed.

The Guitar program has already been slated to be eliminated; the only students remaining to be served would be jazz guitar students.

Report # 1

Impact Statements for Program Reductions and Eliminations

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Bachelor of Music: Keyboard Performance

Name of person submitting report

Todd Shiver

1. Describe the impact of this reduction or elimination for your department or interdisciplinary program. If you do not agree with the Task Force recommendation indicate what you would do to improve or refocus the program's operations. Each program regardless of the recommendation status in the Academic Planning Task Force spreadsheet has the option of defending its current operations.

We do not agree with the task force recommendation to eliminate the Bachelor of Music: Keyboard Performance. We should refocus, or reorganize the Bachelor of Music "performance" area to include all areas: Percussion/String/Wind/Keyboard/Vocal. I'm not sure why the keyboard and vocal areas were separated out from the other areas. My guess would be that the keyboard and vocal areas have a couple of required courses that are unique to their performance area: accompanying (piano) and diction (vocal) so at some point they were separated out from the other performance areas. Separating any of these performance areas out would probably place them on the "eliminate" list as well. Each of these areas have a symbiotic relationship within the department, eliminating any of these performance areas would have a huge impact on every area of the department and would lead to the eventual demise of the program. The department did eliminate one performance area two years ago, the guitar performance area. This decision was made because the department was told it had to cut something. Eliminating the guitar was deemed by the faculty to have the least impact on the ensembles in the department. However, now we are having difficulty with having the proper instrumentation for our jazz ensembles, particularly the jazz combos, because we do not have enough guitar students. Even this decision that had the least impact on the department is having a much bigger unforeseen consequence. Our piano students accompany students and choral ensembles, they play in the jazz bands and jazz combos, they are an integral component of our music program.

2. How will this action impact instruction, faculty workload, and division of labor in the department?

We have one faculty member who's workload would transition to teaching more of a group piano class. All music majors must demonstrate basic piano skills as a part of their requirements for graduation and most accomplish this by taking piano class, we currently offer 6 sections per quarter. This transition would save the adjunct funds that are currently going to pay instructors for these six sections. However, with the loss of our piano students we would need to hire at least two staff accompanist to accompany students and choral ensembles. Our Jazz program would also need to hire piano players

to perform with our jazz groups. My feeling is that it would be more expensive if we went in this direction.

3. Does the evidence indicate that there will be a significant decline in enrollments or will the reduction or elimination increase enrollments, maximization of course offering and faculty workload distribution?

Piano students come to Central to study piano with John Pickett and earn a bachelors degree, I don't see a lot of piano players coming to Central if they don't have the option to earn a BM degree. For most serious performers, the BA degree is not an option.

4. How will the reduction or elimination affect interdependences with other programs and units, especially any documentation regarding coursework?

As noted above, the elimination of the Piano program would have an impact on almost every performance area in the department, this is especially true for the choral and jazz areas, but all areas would be affected.

5. Will the reduction or elimination of this program have an adverse effect on scholarship, grants/contracts, or creative expression opportunities for faculty and/or students? If so, explain.

Performance wise, we have recently attracted top tier students from around the country and international students. Many of these students collaborate with music students in other performance areas like jazz combos (piano, bass, drums, and wind instruments), piano trios (piano and strings), choral ensembles, jazz choirs, etc. Just recently the department received national invitations for two groups: Vocal jazz at the ACDA conference in Chicago, and the jazz band 1 at the JEN conference in Louisville, both of these performances included piano players and would not have happened without the participation of a piano player.

6. Does the reduction or elimination of this program adversely impact diversity or inclusivity on our campus? If so, explain. NO

7. Discuss any unique or exceptional features of this program that should be considered in making a final determination on this action.

I feel that this is explained above.

8. Please provide any additional data you think would strengthen your case on the impact of this action.

Department Report #2**Program Action****Plan for Revision and/or Elimination**

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Bachelor of Music: Keyboard Performance

Name of person submitting report

Todd Shiver

Action

Refocus

Reduction

Eliminate

Directions:

The purpose of this planning form is to outline how you would refocus the program, reduce the program, or eliminate the program.

Refocus the program

1. Please outline how you would refocus the program in terms of vision, mission, learning outcomes, curriculum and any collaboration with other programs, inside or outside your department.

The Vocal and Piano Performance degrees should be included with the wind/percussion/string Bachelor of Music Performance tracks. They were separated out of this main grouping of performance areas because they contained some required courses that are unique to their area. However, 90% of the degree requirements for Keyboard and for Vocal are the same as the others. I realize that this is merely semantics

with no real changes, but one could pull any individual performance area out of that grouping and it would appear to be low enrolled.

2. How is this new amalgamation designed to attract new students to the program and what learning and career benefits will be anticipated for the students? NA
3. Will there be new resources required? Will there be curricular needs, such as service courses, required from other departments? NO
4. Will there be financial savings as a consequence of refocusing the program and if so, what are they? NO
5. How will this change/enhance other departmental programs that are more robust? NO
6. Are there other data or educational circumstances that the APTF did not consider that should be considered? NO
7. Please provide a plan that shows current program offerings and how they would be changed over the next two years. If courses are offered for more than one program in the Department, please show how many sections or differences in timing to offer the course delivery over the next two years (**use attached Excel Table 1 to calculate**). NA

Report # 1

Impact Statements for Program Reductions and Eliminations

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Composition

Name of person submitting report

Elaine Ross/Todd Shiver

1. Describe the impact of this reduction or elimination for your department or interdisciplinary program. If you do not agree with the Task Force recommendation indicate what you would do to improve or refocus the program's operations. Each program regardless of the recommendation status in the Academic Planning Task Force spreadsheet has the option of defending its current operations.

The Master of Music in composition is essentially a degree with a concentration in the area of composition in addition to the core requirements of all other Master of Music degrees. The appropriate way to view the degree is simply as a Master of Music Degree with composition as the area of focus. The catalog description for all the Master of Music degrees have been listed separately, but ultimately the core requirements are essentially the same with a handful of electives specific to that particular specialization. The reorganization of the catalog listings would solve these individual degree listings, including the MM in composition. The general requirements currently listed in the catalog include: 15-21 credits in major field, including 6 credits of MUS 700 – Thesis; 12-15 credits of other music credits including three credits in ensembles; 6-15 electives in supportive areas; and three credits – MUS 521 – Methods of Musical Research. This is consistent for all MM degrees. Revising this to include specific courses to select to fulfill these requirements will show that the overlap in courses makes these degree programs dependent on one another. In addition, several upper division music theory and music history courses also serve a dual purpose as graduate level theory courses. Eliminating the MM composition degree as well as other Master's degrees would just reduce enrollment in these more advanced courses. However, these courses would still need to be offered as most, if not all, are required for one or more other undergraduate degrees.

Approximately 10-15 years ago, CWU had a very strong program in composition. After several years of adjunct and non-tenure faculty teaching the main theory and composition courses, in the fall of 2008 CWU re-instated a tenure-line position as the coordinator of music theory/composition. This position has provided stability and greatly improved the quality and retention of the composition studio. Since that time the composition program has been steadily increasing. There were 2 majors in the Fall of 2008 and there are now 11. The graduation rate the past five years has been very low as the program had not been thriving. Students are now matriculating through the degree program at a very steady pace. Two graduated in the spring of 2011 and 4 are anticipating graduation this coming spring 2012, including one graduate student. An ideal number of majors for a department this size is 8-10 students. In short, the degree program is functioning the way it is designed to function. It supports the 8-10 highly qualified students (1-2 graduate students) and without any more resources cannot support any additional students. The studio itself is at capacity with a waiting list of qualified students who would like to add the major. The current theory/composition tenure-line position has a workload of 2/3

theory and 1/3 composition. The current tenure-line composition person also coordinates the theory area, with primarily adjunct support.

The graduate students in composition are part of the revised curriculum that the undergraduate program now follows. The Bachelor of Music in Theory/Composition was changed to a Bachelor of Music in Composition. The curriculum was substantially revised to provide practical courses for success in the job market and graduate school potential. The Bachelor of Music in Composition Degree at Central Washington University is primarily a study of acoustic composition and is intended for students with adequate knowledge/skills in the following areas: high level of musicianship as demonstrated through performance on a primary instrument; basic understanding of music theory concepts; application of basic compositional techniques; knowledge of significant composers and their compositional techniques; and creative compositional potential. The new degree program does not allow acceptance into the program until the completion of the first year of study. Students are given the opportunity to focus on their applied instrument and solidify a basic knowledge of theory before studying applied composition. Acceptance into the composition takes place after completion of MUS 120 (an in-depth introduction to composition focusing on terminology, compositional techniques from a historical perspective, and small creative projects with specific parameters). This has been significant in improving the quality of the composition studio. The revision of the curriculum, changes to degree requirements, and new organizational leadership have made it a popular degree amongst students. The graduate students enrolled concurrently with these students not only provide a higher level of student for the undergraduate students to interact and learn from, but themselves benefit from this unique curriculum design.

The strength of the degree is found in the talent of the students currently pursuing it. Many students who have pursued and graduated with this degree have attained a high degree of success. Although the number of composition majors at any one time does not compare to some of the other “composite” degrees, it is felt that this degree is appropriate to the Mission and scope of this department and offers an ideal complement to the other degrees in the program.

With the exception of the Master of Music Education degree, all of our Master Degrees are designed as more of an apprenticeship. In other words students come here to study with a particular professor to enhance their skills. Cello players come specifically to study with John Michel, Conducting students come to study with Nik Caoile or Larry Gookin. In order for the student to get the best experience, we must limit number of these students that can be accepted. If we accept too many conducting students, then they

don't get enough time in front of an ensemble conducting because it must be shared with the other too many other graduate students. The orchestra had 5 potential master of conducting students audition last year, we accepted only one. It's really about ensuring a quality of the experience for those graduate students who make it into our program.

2. How will this action impact instruction, faculty workload, and division of labor in the department?

The elimination of this degree will have a minimal effect on faculty workload hours as it will only free approximately .5-1 workload units per quarter. This is the only additional instruction specific to this degree that is required. All other coursework overlaps with the other Masters degree requirements and some of the Bachelor of Music/Arts degrees.

The biggest impact eliminating the MM in composition will have is that of increasing faculty workload. With the current budget constraints, the music department requires a graduate teaching assistant to teach 2 sections of 1st year aural skills, in addition to other responsibilities. In order to ensure quality instruction for these students, the teaching assistant must have an extremely strong background in music theory. Since we do not have a MM in music theory and all composition students need to have a substantial knowledge of music theory, that teaching assistant is a graduate composition student. Without TA funds to cover these FTE's generated by teaching assistants, additional faculty workload needed for these two classes alone will be 4 WL units per quarter, 12 for the academic year at least at the lowest adjunct rate of pay. There are also additional courses this TA could feasibly teach with the appropriate background, such as MUS 143 – Introduction to Music Theory (a fundamentals course) and MUS 347 – Electronic music; an additional 5 credits that would also need to be funded with faculty workload hours. The difference in funds required for 12-17 credits per academic year for an adjunct or full-time faculty member vs. that of a teaching assistant would be substantial.

Many of the graduate classes are cross listed classes and require no additional resources.

The graduate TA students generate a lot of FTE for the department that would need to be replaced with more expensive part-time instructors.

3. Does the evidence indicate that there will be a significant decline in enrollments or will the reduction or elimination increase enrollments, maximization of course offering and faculty workload distribution?

The elimination of this degree program will likely have an adverse effect on enrollment to the department. A large number of students currently in the composition studio, several applying for the degree each spring, transfer students, and incoming freshman select CWU as their choice of schools because this degree is offered. While not all are selected for the composition studio, they are often students who become vital to the department. The fact that they can still be involved in new music, take composition as an elective, participate in the performance of new music, and still pursue a degree in music even though they are not part of the actual “composition studio” actually strengthens the validity of maintaining the composition studio as it is. Increasing the number of students in the program would not only require more faculty resources, but would take away from the numbers in the other degree programs.

As previously stated, eliminating the MM composition degree as well as the other MM degree programs would just reduce enrollment in the upper level theory and history courses which will generate fewer FTE’s. These courses would still need to be offered as they are requirements for other larger degree programs. Students in the composition studio and interested in composition as a Master of Music with a composition “cognate” help increase class sizes, generate more FTE’s in these courses, and help to support graduate level theory courses that are dually offered as both upper level undergraduate/graduate offerings.

4. How will the reduction or elimination affect interdependences with other programs and units, especially any documentation regarding coursework.

Students in the MM composition degree program support the coursework of all the other MM degrees, as well as the undergraduate upper level theory/history courses. As stated above, the core coursework for all MM degree programs is essentially the same. Revising the catalog to show this, yet including specific courses to select from to fulfill these requirements, will show that the overlap in courses makes these degree programs dependent on one another. In addition, several upper division music theory and music history courses also serve a dual purpose as graduate level theory courses. Eliminating the MM in composition degree as well as other Master’s degrees would just reduce enrollment in these more advanced courses. However, these courses would still need to be offered as most, if not all, are required for one or more other undergraduate degrees.

5. Will the reduction or elimination of this program have an adverse effect on scholarship, grants/contracts, or creative expression opportunities for faculty and/or students? If so, explain.

Composition is a significant facet of music that can provide beneficial exposure for a music department. For the past three years in a row, a CWU student has won the Opus 7 Choral Composition Competition in Seattle, WA. This provided a performance of their respective works by Opus 7 – a professional vocal ensemble – and a cash award. Quarterly studio recitals are required of all composition students and have increased in quality. This past fall, it was necessary to present two separate studio recitals as the length of student compositions increased. The ability to compose longer, more substantial works shows a deeper understanding of compositional concepts. In addition, several different CWU faculty have had works nationally performed often. This already helps attract talented students to campus, but without a composition degree to consider applying for, these students will go elsewhere for these opportunities. The number of competitions, workshops, conferences, etc. that are soliciting new music from not only faculty, but students is enormous. Our current faculty and students are participating and being selected for such events. The elimination of the composition degree would minimize this participation and stifle CWU's recognition in this area.

New music is an important area of study for all music programs and is vital for the advancement of the field of music in general. The composition studio presents quarterly composition studio recitals in which all students compose/coach/and have a work performed in a public forum. This is valuable not only for them, but for other students in the department as well. A large number of students participate in these premieres. This gives them an opportunity to experience new techniques and understand the compositional process. While they are not composing themselves, the students who participate better understand the theoretical, rehearsal, compositional, and artistic elements that are involved.

Music composition is an interest of many music students. It would be virtually unheard of for a music department of this size to be void of any opportunities in music composition. The students in this degree program tend to be the most well-versed in theoretical structure of music as well as those who can use these skills and say something artistically. These students raise the bar of all students around them. It provides a creative outlet in a different capacity than performing on their applied instruments. Most students in the composition degree program are high level performing musicians on their respective applied instruments. To take this outlet away from them, would limit their potential not only as composers, but as performers as well. For many composition students, it is their way of most effectively and creatively communicating. Composition is viewed by many musicians as a prestigious undertaking. It is the core component of why we are here as musicians. A university this size supporting a music department this size without a composition degree is missing the most vital element of making music – “The creation of the music itself.”

6. Does the reduction or elimination of this program adversely impact diversity or inclusivity on our campus? If so, explain.

The diversity of music itself is important. Different types of music reach all different types of people. Many community members and university students/faculty attend composition recitals and are interested in new music. Eliminating these events will restrict exposure to not only new musical ideas, but will most likely reduce exposure to other areas of the music department.

New music is also important for the non-majors on campus. While technology provides endless opportunities for students and community members at large to experience, most especially, the pop culture, exposure to new music on campus of this type may be the only exposure some of the non-music majors will ever have. It is important for non-music students to know that their peers are actually composing and contributing to music in a significant way.

7. Discuss any unique or exceptional features of this program that should be considered in making a final determination on this action.

CWU offers a very unique opportunity for students interested in composition. The degree itself is structured differently than the other colleges/universities in the region. The University of Washington, for example, is very “electronically” driven and other state schools do not even offer such a degree at the undergraduate level. The Master of Music and the Bachelor of Music in Composition Degree at Central Washington University is primarily a study of acoustic composition and is intended for students with adequate knowledge/skills in the following areas: high level of musicianship as demonstrated through performance on primary instrument; basic understanding of music theory concepts; application of basic compositional techniques; knowledge of significant composers and their compositional techniques; creative compositional potential. In addition, CWU has the unique opportunity of offering some arranging/composition courses in the jazz area due to the strength of jazz/vocal jazz faculty. Acceptance into this degree program does not occur until the end of the first year of study which gives students the opportunity to feel confident that they are prepared to enter the composition degree program and to explore all other options as well. The performance component to this particular undergraduate composition degree is also unique. It provides students with

opportunities in both composition and their applied area, simultaneously, thus making them more “hands on” composers.

The number of composition majors accepted into the program is self limited by the department because of resources; we only have one faculty member with the expertise to teach the upper level classes required for composition majors. These upper level classes are also open to all of our majors and are typically full sections each time they are taught. My guesstimate would be that we would have 25 composition majors if we had the additional resources to support that number.

The composition students enhance the experience for all of the majors in the department because they get exposed to new and often contemporary music. Students get to participate in world premieres of new music when they perform on a composition recital, and also composition majors provide new arrangements of music for the various ensembles in the department.

8. Please provide any additional data you think would strengthen your case on the impact of this action.

The revision of the undergraduate program in composition directly affects the MM in composition. The program is intended to support an applied degree in composition while still maintaining a performance element on students’ applied instruments. The goal is to give composition students the necessary skill set to become more informed and artistic composers. I believe this approach has helped strengthen the composition studio as it has not only grown in numbers, but in quality as well. The number of majors has increased in the past four years from 2 to 11 current majors – with several on a wait list. The ideal number is 8, given other teaching responsibilities. The graduation rate is also increasing. Two graduated last year and are both pursuing Master’s degrees in music and four are expected to graduate this year, including a MM in composition graduate. CWU composition students have represented the department well recently.

The current theory/composition tenure-line faculty member’s teaching goals pertaining to composition include: a greater level of achievement of theoretical and compositional knowledge; a greater understanding in the creation of deeper, more meaningful music by the composition students; a greater appreciation by students of the practicality of theoretical and historical knowledge of a composer; teaching students ways to more quickly and effectively compose quality original music; and a greater sense of

community and collegiality among the composition students which becomes an integral part of the music department's student community. There has been significant positive progress in all four of these areas over the past four years.

The current tenure-line theory/composition faculty member would like to establish a Contemporary Music Festival. While this has not yet happened due to budget constraints and the amount of time required in the restructuring of the theory and composition curriculums, this is an endeavor that will be undertaken in the near future. This and other events like it have effects that benefit the department inclusively and the university enrollment itself. These events would be intended to be a departmental effort where a composer of significant standing is invited for a residency to interact with composers, faculty, ensembles, and students. Workshops and performances of a number of this composer's works for different genres would occur during the residency. These types of events will not only provide recognition for our outstanding faculty, ensembles, students, and facilities, but will help establish CWU's music department as one of the regional leaders in composition. In addition, hosting an SCI (Society of Composer's, Inc.) conference at CWU would also provide significant notoriety for the department and the university. SCI is a substantial nationally known professional organization in which most significant composers are active members.

The impact of eliminating the MM degree in composition would be hugely negative on the students, qualities of student enrollment, enrollment in upper level classes, creative opportunities for composing, creative opportunities to experience and participate in new music, and reputation of the music department. Once again, it would be virtually unheard of for a music department of this size to be void of any opportunities in music composition. Without composition, there would be no new music. Musicians need new music to keep the art vital. Studying music of the past is one thing, but if we don't foster and nurture new music we will run the risk of losing the art altogether. CWU's music department is and should remain a strong contributor in the art of composition.

Graduate students in all areas of the music department provide an added level of expertise, quality, and depth in the department. They are vital to teaching, learning, and general atmosphere of success in CWU's music department.

Department Report #2**Program Action****Plan for Revision and/or Elimination**

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Composition

Name of person submitting report

Elaine Ross/Todd Shiver

Action

Refocus

Reduction

Eliminate

Directions:

The purpose of this planning form is to outline how you would refocus the program, reduce the program, or eliminate the program.

Refocus the program

1. Please outline how you would refocus the program in terms of vision, mission, learning outcomes, curriculum and any collaboration with other programs, inside or outside your department.

With the exception of the Master of Music Education degree, all of our Master Degrees should be listed as “Master of Music” Degrees with different emphasis placed on Conducting, Pedagogy, Performance, and Composition. All of these different areas of emphasis share the same core classes like research, theory, and history. The remainder of masters level courses are determined by their area of emphasis. This act alone would enhance the graduate student numbers in the department, at least on paper.

With the exception of Music Education, all of the other areas are self limiting student enrollment because of the apprentice nature of the degree and because of the need for these master's students to not only work closely with a faculty mentor but to also have access to the department performing ensembles and other department resources.

2. How is this new amalgamation designed to attract new students to the program and what learning and career benefits will be anticipated for the students? NO
3. Will there be new resources required? Will there be curricular needs, such as service courses, required from other departments? NO
4. Will there be financial savings as a consequence of refocusing the program and if so, what are they? NO
5. How will this change/enhance other departmental programs that are more robust? NO
6. Are there other data or educational circumstances that the APTF did not consider that should be considered? NO
7. Please provide a plan that shows current program offerings and how they would be changed over the next two years. If courses are offered for more than one program in the Department, please show how many sections or differences in timing to offer the course delivery over the next two years (**use attached Excel Table 1 to calculate**). NA

Report # 1

Impact Statements for Program Reductions and Eliminations

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Conducting

Name of person submitting report

Nickolas Caoile/Larry Gookin/Todd Shiver

1. Describe the impact of this reduction or elimination for your department or interdisciplinary program. If you do not agree with the Task Force recommendation indicate what you would do to improve or refocus the program's operations. Each program regardless of the recommendation status in the Academic Planning Task Force spreadsheet has the option of defending its current operations.

Teaching – The elimination of the graduate conducting program would create a significant instructional impact on the music department. The graduate assistants in conducting provide several critical hours of direct contact instruction with the large ensembles (Jazz Band II, Vocal Jazz II, Kittitas Valley Youth Orchestra). Further, the graduate assistants serve as assistant conductors to the major large ensembles. As part of the 2-year curriculum, large ensemble directors assign repertoire solely rehearsed and performed by the graduate assistants.

Administration – The elimination of the graduate conducting program would mean a loss of administrative assistance in the large ensemble areas. For all programs (Choral, Wind, Orchestral, Jazz), this would mean library work, festival administration, and personnel management.

Leadership/Mentorship – The elimination of the graduate conducting program would consequently take away a leadership and mentorship presence that has made the undergraduate program attractive. The proficiency and level of artistry of the graduate student enhances the undergraduate experience.

With the exception of the Master of Music Education degree, all of our Master Degrees are designed as more of an apprenticeship. In other words students come here to study with a particular professor to enhance their skills. Cello players come specifically to study with John Michel, Conducting students come to study with Nik Caoile or Larry Gookin. In order for the student to get the best experience, we must limit number of these students that can be accepted. If we accept too many conducting students, then they don't get enough time in front of an ensemble conducting because it must be shared with the other too many other graduate students. The orchestra had 5 potential master of conducting students audition last year, we accepted only one. It's really about ensuring a quality of the experience for those graduate students who make it into our program.

2. How will this action impact instruction, faculty workload, and division of labor in the department?

With all workload duties mentioned in #1 considered absolutely critical to sustaining the excellence of the current program, the current faculty would absorb all duties. Each ensemble director would then be responsible for all lost teaching and administration amounting to about 20 hours per week.

The graduate TA students generate a lot of FTE for the department that would need to be replaced with more expensive part-time instructors.

Many of the graduate classes are cross listed classes and require no additional resources.

3. Does the evidence indicate that there will be a significant decline in enrollments or will the reduction or elimination increase enrollments, maximization of course offering and faculty workload distribution?

With the elimination of the graduate conducting program, I anticipate that there will be no change in enrollment. However, the student to professor ratio will increase. This would result in decreased personal contact, accessibility, and perhaps productivity.

4. How will the reduction or elimination affect interdependences with other programs and units, especially any documentation regarding coursework.

Graduate assistantship loads are pieced together from several different areas. The large ensemble assistants also contribute in other areas (Theory, Piano Class). These teaching positions would also be eliminated.

5. Will the reduction or elimination of this program have an adverse effect on scholarship, grants/contracts, or creative expression opportunities for faculty and/or students? If so, explain.

Yes, scholarship as defined for the ensemble director, includes developing an off-campus presence in the state, region, and nation. The ensemble directors cannot afford to these opportunities without the presence of the graduate assistants who cover the classes missed while away. Many of these opportunities take ensemble directors away for several days.

6. Does the reduction or elimination of this program adversely impact diversity or inclusivity on our campus? If so, explain.

Not directly.

7. Discuss any unique or exceptional features of this program that should be considered in making a final determination on this action.

The graduate student population in the department provides a core group of mature, advanced, talented, and dedicated musicians that enhance the musical experience of all of our undergraduate students. They perform side by side in ensembles with graduate students often serving as concert masters or principal players modeling for the younger undergraduate students and also teaching the undergraduate students in sectionals beyond the ensemble rehearsal. This is a big reason behind the success regionally and nationally of our ensembles and the “signature” status of our department.

Some uniqueness about this program is the general success of our alumni in obtaining notable positions and obtaining admissions to prestigious universities. Some of our recent graduates have won positions at major public schools, youth orchestras, and major schools of music.

8. Please provide any additional data you think would strengthen your case on the impact of this action.

Department Report #2**Program Action****Plan for Revision and/or Elimination**

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Conducting

Name of person submitting report

Nickolas Caoile/Larry Gookin/Todd Shiver

Action

Refocus

Reduction

Eliminate

Directions:

The purpose of this planning form is to outline how you would refocus the program, reduce the program, or eliminate the program.

Refocus the program

1. Please outline how you would refocus the program in terms of vision, mission, learning outcomes, curriculum and any collaboration with other programs, inside or outside your department.

With the exception of the Master of Music Education degree, all of our Master Degrees should be listed as “Master of Music” Degrees with different emphasis placed on Conducting, Pedagogy, Performance, and Composition. All of these different areas of emphasis share the same core classes like research, theory, and history. The remainder of masters level courses are determined by their area of emphasis. This act alone would enhance the graduate student numbers in the department, at least on paper.

With the exception of Music Education, all of the other areas are self limiting student enrollment because of the apprentice nature of the degree and because of the need for these master's students to not only work closely with a faculty mentor but to also have access to the department performing ensembles and other department resources.

2. How is this new amalgamation designed to attract new students to the program and what learning and career benefits will be anticipated for the students? NO
3. Will there be new resources required? Will there be curricular needs, such as service courses, required from other departments? NO
4. Will there be financial savings as a consequence of refocusing the program and if so, what are they? NO
5. How will this change/enhance other departmental programs that are more robust? NO
6. Are there other data or educational circumstances that the APTF did not consider that should be considered? NO
7. Please provide a plan that shows current program offerings and how they would be changed over the next two years. If courses are offered for more than one program in the Department, please show how many sections or differences in timing to offer the course delivery over the next two years (**use attached Excel Table 1 to calculate**). NA

Report # 1

Impact Statements for Program Reductions and Eliminations

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Music Education

Name of person submitting report

Bret Smith

1. Describe the impact of this reduction or elimination for your department or interdisciplinary program. If you do not agree with the Task Force recommendation indicate what you would do to improve or refocus the program's operations. Each program regardless of the recommendation status in the Academic Planning Task Force spreadsheet has the option of defending its current operations.

We believe the reduction or elimination of the MM: Music Education degree program would adversely affect the stature and reputation of the Music Department within the community of professional educators in the Northwest. We are fortunate to be widely perceived as perhaps the strongest institution in the state in the preparation of music teachers, with faculty in all areas regarded as professional leaders. The absence of a graduate program in music education would erode this confidence.

2. How will this action impact instruction, faculty workload, and division of labor in the department?

Reduction or elimination of the MM: Music Education degree would reduce or eliminate existing faculty workload in serving courses and thesis/project work for these students. Courses that permitted undergraduate enrollment would presumably be eliminated, removing advanced elective coursework from the undergraduate programs. The revised summers-only program would have minimal impact on faculty workload throughout the traditional academic year.

3. Does the evidence indicate that there will be a significant decline in enrollments or will the reduction or elimination increase enrollments, maximization of course offering and faculty workload distribution?

The current program has yielded few students in the past several years. We believe that the primary reason for this is the reluctance of practicing teachers to take a leave of absence or quit their jobs in order to pursue a master's degree. In response to this, the CAH Dean asked the Music Department chair and faculty to develop plans to increase enrollment. Beginning in Summer 2012, the department will be offering a summers-only MM with a target initial cohort of 15 students. If the MM: Music Education degree is eliminated, we would not be able to judge the viability of a summers-only program and possibly miss the opportunity to develop and maintain an innovative and attractive program. An additional advantage to a summers-only program would be the possibility that students finishing their BM and certification in the spring could commence graduate study while completing their required one year of teaching experience the following fall.

4. How will the reduction or elimination affect interdependences with other programs and units, especially any documentation regarding coursework.

Traditionally, students in the MM: Music Education degree serve as graduate teaching assistants in methods classes and performance ensembles. They also tend to elect coursework in applied study and conducting. The absence of advanced and experienced members of studios and ensembles would have a negative effect on the overall level of achievement in these areas.

5. Will the reduction or elimination of this program have an adverse effect on scholarship, grants/contracts, or creative expression opportunities for faculty and/or students? If so, explain.

Recruitment and retention of faculty is an important concern. Recent faculty searches have required a terminal degree (Ph.D, Ed.D, DMA), and departmental requirements for tenure and promotion include scholarly/creative work as an important component. Graduate faculty are able to support and further this work by including graduate students in research projects, and the process of advising graduate students in thesis/projects as chair or committee member provides a valuable opportunity to maintain a current knowledge of research and literature in the field of music education. Reduction or elimination of the MM: Music Education would adversely affect the department's position with regard to other institutions in attracting the interest of highly qualified candidates for faculty positions.

6. Does the reduction or elimination of this program adversely impact diversity or inclusivity on our campus? If so, explain.

We have no evidence that the MM: Music Education degree plays a significant part in the overall profile of CWU with regard to diversity or inclusivity. However, given the current interest in diversity in K-12 education, it is likely that MM students will continue include this issue as part of their coursework and thesis/project research. Reduction or elimination of this program will remove the possibility that CWU will be able to encourage and support future educational leaders in this area.

7. Discuss any unique or exceptional features of this program that should be considered in making a final determination on this action.

An undeniable strength of CWU's position regarding graduate study in music is the strength of its faculty in the areas of performance, conducting, and music education. Students earning an MM: Music Education at Central are able to craft a course of study

that uniquely suits their background and goals. While a summers-only program will necessarily shift the nature of the experience somewhat (for example, there would be no major university ensembles available), we will be able to use CWU and outside faculty in a unique and affordable program that will combine rigorous scholarly preparation with practical content that will be immediately relevant to teachers of instrumental, vocal, and general music.

8. Please provide any additional data you think would strengthen your case on the impact of this action.

We maintain that an MM: Music Education is a significant career goal for many music teachers in the Northwest. In addition to advancement in salary, teachers with several years of experience are motivated to improve their practice based on their growing professional curiosity and particular program needs. Arts advocacy and program development depend on a familiarity with research literature, curriculum innovation, pedagogical advances, and education policy that is rarely gained in an undergraduate certification program.

The Universities of Idaho and Montana and the American Band College (Medford, OR) offer summer-only or online programs that provide a basis for forecasting demand for a modified program at CWU. We note that the APTF analysis indicates Employment Growth Potential for this degree as "Moderate," and would maintain that given the financial and professional incentives within the K-12 system, this element could be considered high.

Department Report #2**Program Action****Plan for Revision and/or Elimination**

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Music Education

Name of person submitting report

Bret Smith/Todd Shiver

Action

Refocus

Reduction

Eliminate

Directions:

The purpose of this planning form is to outline how you would refocus the program, reduce the program, or eliminate the program.

Refocus the program

1. Please outline how you would refocus the program in terms of vision, mission, learning outcomes, curriculum and any collaboration with other programs, inside or outside your department. A summer only program attracts those professional music teachers who were not willing to quit their jobs and enter a traditional academic program. The summer intensive and hybrid courses will allow the student to complete a masters degree in three summers.

2. How is this new amalgamation designed to attract new students to the program and what learning and career benefits will be anticipated for the students? YES. Earning a Master's Degree will give them a pay raise and enhance their effectiveness as a master teacher.

3. Will there be new resources required? Will there be curricular needs, such as service courses, required from other departments? Since we will be offering these courses during the summer, no additional resources will be needed during the regular academic year. However, we will need to hire some specialist and adjunct teachers for the summer sessions. These classes will also be offered as workshops through continuing education. Si in addition to the cohort of Masters students, we could also have teachers taking courses to stay current on their certification.
4. Will there be financial savings as a consequence of refocusing the program and if so, what are they? NO
5. How will this change/enhance other departmental programs that are more robust? We traditionally offer very few is any summer courses in the music department, attracting teachers to the summer program will enhance summer revenues which will translate into more faculty development funds, and more funds to support technology in the classroom and studios.
6. Are there other data or educational circumstances that the APTF did not consider that should be considered? NO
7. Please provide a plan that shows current program offerings and how they would be changed over the next two years. If courses are offered for more than one program in the Department, please show how many sections or differences in timing to offer the course delivery over the next two years (**use attached Excel Table 1 to calculate**).

Since this is summer offerings, please see the tables below for the course offerings:

Central Washington University

Master of Music/Music Education Specialization

Summer MM Program

DRAFT 8/25/2011

Summer 1 (beginning 2012)

- Students complete music theory/history diagnostic exams online

Pre-Session (year 1 students only)	Session 1	Session 2	Session 3
	July 9-13	July 16-20	July 23-27
July 5, 1-5 pm July 6, 8-12 pm MUS 599 (1) Introduction to Graduate Project	8-9:50 am MUS 521 Methods of Musical Research (3)		
	10-11:50 am MUS 599 Seminar: Technology for Music Education (3)		
12-1 pm LUNCH			
	Intensive 1	Intensive 2	Intensive 3
	1-5 pm MUS 599 Seminar: Foundations of Curriculum and Assessment (3)	1-5 pm MUS 615 Graduate Seminar in Music: Conducting (3) MUS 598 Special Topics: General Music I (3)	1-5 pm MUS 554 Advanced Technique Class: Strings, Woodwinds, Brass, Percussion (3) MUS 536 Diction (3) MUS 598 Special Topics in General Music II (3)

Total credits: 16

Summer 2 (odd years beginning 2013)

- Students will submit project proposal online prior to Session 1

Pre-Session (year 1 students only)	Session 1 Dates TBA	Session 2 Dates TBA	Session 3 Dates TBA
Day 1, 1-5 pm Day 2, 8-12 pm MUS 599 (1) Introduction to Graduate Project	8-9:50 am MUS 613 Graduate Seminar in Music: Theory/Composition (3)		
	10-11:50 am MUS 611 Graduate Seminar in Music: Music Education: Psychology of Music Teaching and Learning (3)		
12-1 pm LUNCH			
	Intensive 1	Intensive 2	Intensive 3
	1-5 pm MUS 522 Advanced Orchestration (3) MUS 554(?) Advanced Technique Class: Guitar (3)	1-5 pm MUS 612 Graduate Seminar in Music: Music History and Literature (Instrumental, Choral) (3)	1-5 pm MUS 353(?) Jazz Improvisation (3) MUS 599 Seminar: Vocal Ensemble Studies (3)

		MUS 598 Special Topics: General Music III (3)	MUS 598 Special Topics: General Music IV (3)
--	--	--	--

- Project proposals approved by faculty during Fall quarter

Total credits: 15

Summer 3 (even years beginning 2014)

Pre-Session (year 1 students only)	Session 1 Dates TBA	Session 2 Dates TBA	Session 3 Dates TBA
Day 1, 1-5 pm Day 2, 8-12 pm MUS 599 (1) Introduction to Graduate Project	8-9:50 am MUS 612 Graduate Seminar in Music: Music History and Literature (3)		
	10-11:50 am MUS 611 Graduate Seminar in Music: Music Education: Contemporary Issues in Music Education (3)		
12-1 pm LUNCH			
	MUS 596 Individual Study (2) MUS 700 Master's Thesis, Project Study, and/or Examination (6)		

Total Credits: 14

Total Graduate Degree Credits: 45

- The Department of Music has discretion in matters of budget and staffing. Full-time, 9-month faculty can be paid per credit on a summer contract. Outside instructors can be offered adjunct contracts, an honorarium or flat fee, or a consultant contract. CWU faculty would be instructors of record absent an adjunct contract. Student tuition can be calculated per-credit based on projected expenses, or as a flat fee per summer.

- Housing is available through the CWU Conference Program. Currently, the Wahle complex charges \$22/ day, \$138/week. We will need to communicate with them once we have a projected number of students, as those apartments may be converted to year-round student leases. North and Kennedy Halls may be available in that case.
- Based on a \$250/credit tuition fee and a target cohort of 15 students per year in a 3-year cycle, a student would pay \$11,250 in tuition, plus travel, room/board, books. A full cohort of 15 students would generate on average \$56,250 per year. Year 2 (2 cohorts) would generate \$112,500; after Year 3 the program would generate \$168,750 each year. If enrollment targets are not met, there is flexibility to mutually agree on faculty/instructor compensation to weather a “lean” year.
- Courses and intensives could be attended by “workshop-only” or non-degree students as professional development for clock hours. This would increase the program revenue.
- The above Year 1 would be offered every year. Year 2 and 3 full-term courses could be rotated on an alternate-year basis, as could all intensives.
- The existing program will need to be changed to eliminate the ensemble requirement. We would need to bring MUS 554 classes off the reserve list and create a guitar section. We need to create a 500-level number for MUS 353.
- According to Graduate Studies policy, students can transfer up to 15 credits of prior graduate coursework. We would retain the flexibility to substitute credits (for example, applied study during summer, courses in other departments) and revisit course content as needed to meet the needs of individual students.
- Current entrance requirements include audition or video, writing sample, and 1 year successful public school teaching. We should revisit this and consider explicitly requiring undergraduate degree in music education and/or current teaching certification as well as various types of teaching experience beyond public school.
- We need to develop policies and procedures for theory/history diagnostic exams and remediation options.
- We should consider using verbiage consistent with the current trend of “Professional Master’s Degrees” to distinguish this practical program from a more research/scholarship-oriented MM.

- If we align the three-week sessions with the Summer Institute in Theatre Arts schedule, we should be able to coordinate marketing to their national and international list. Continuing Education will be a valuable resource for program publicity and recruiting.
- The current and proposed programs appear to be consistent with NASM guidelines. In spring 2001 CWU requested to have the PESB be the only outside accreditation for education programs--in other words, we would withdraw from NCATE. We will need to monitor this situation and ensure that assessment and data reporting meet NCATE standards should CWU continue with it. NCATE is currently very focused on field experience in culturally diverse settings, which is a challenge for a summers-only program.

Course Summaries:

MUS 353(?) Jazz Improvisation. Principles and practice of improvisation, strategies for teaching entry-level and developing improvisation in ensemble settings.

MUS 521 Methods of Musical Research. As in current catalog.

MUS 522 Advanced Orchestration. Principles and practice of instrumental and vocal arranging for teaching in diverse settings.

MUS 536 Diction in Singing Foreign Languages: As in current catalog.

MUS 554 Advanced Technique Class: Strings, Woodwind, Brass, Percussion, Guitar. Workshop to extend and refine performance and pedagogy for instrumental music.

MUS 596 Individual Study. Individual consultation with faculty on areas of specialization.

MUS 598 Special Topics: General Music I, II, III, IV. Methods, materials, teaching strategies, and lesson planning for PreK-5 general music.

MUS 599 Seminar: Foundations of Curriculum and Assessment. Principles and practice for sequential, standards-based curriculum and contemporary approaches to assessment in music.

MUS 599 Seminar: Technology for Music Education. Software for instruction, assessment, and performance. Sound recording and reinforcement. Web-based applications for administration and public relations.

MUS 611 Graduate Seminar in Music: Music Education: Psychology of Music Teaching and Learning. Survey of theory and applications in cognitive and social psychology of music.

MUS 611 Graduate Seminar in Music: Music Education: Contemporary Issues in Music Education. Current trends in differentiating instruction for all learners, academic language, integrated curriculum design, cultural competence, and advocacy.

MUS 612 Graduate Seminar in Music: Theory/Composition. Application of advanced analytical techniques in pedagogical settings.

MUS 612 Graduate Seminar in Music: Music History and Literature. Survey and in-depth study of historical and style periods in Western music and development of comprehensive curriculum and programming.

MUS 613 Graduate Seminar in Music: Music History and Literature. Survey of instrumental and vocal literature for teaching in diverse settings.

MUS 615 Graduate Seminar in Music: Conducting. Workshop to extend and refine conducting technique in instrumental and vocal settings.

MUS 700 Master's Thesis, Project Study, and/or Examination. Development and completion of a project in area of specialization.

Report # 1

Impact Statements for Program Reductions and Eliminations

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Pedagogy

Name of person submitting report

Carrie Michel/John Michel/Todd Shiver

1. Describe the impact of this reduction or elimination for your department or interdisciplinary program. If you do not agree with the Task Force recommendation indicate what you would do to improve or refocus the program's operations. Each program regardless of the recommendation status in the Academic Planning Task Force spreadsheet has the option of defending its current operations.

The Master of Music in Pedagogy currently has a small but growing enrollment and is a crucial degree to retain. The degree serves a large constituency of private studio teachers who often return to for graduate studies after completing a BM in Music Performance and having taught privately for a number of years. Many of these individuals will be the private teachers of our future undergraduate music majors. The degree is designed to systematically enhance the individual's ability to teach advanced technical skills; to expand their knowledge of repertoire, to understand historical and theoretical context of the repertoire; and to continue to develop their own performance skills.

It targets specifically those students who wish to concentrate on increasing the quality of their private studio. This is part of a symbiotic relationship with the public school programs that ensures a quality experience for all students.

2. How will this action impact instruction, faculty workload, and division of labor in the department?

Negatively—we depend on the graduate students to teach the less advanced underclassmen, supervise technique classes, and provide leadership in the ensembles

3. Does the evidence indicate that there will be a significant decline in enrollments or will the reduction or elimination increase enrollments, maximization of course offering and faculty workload distribution?

Enrollments would decline even as more and more potential students are seeking out this degree. Though institutional teaching positions may be in decline, private studio teaching businesses continue to be in demand.

Many of the graduate classes are cross listed classes and require no additional resources. The graduate TA students generate a lot of FTE for the department that would need to be replaced with more expensive part-time instructors.

4. How will the reduction or elimination affect interdependences with other programs and units, especially any documentation regarding coursework.

This degree program shares courses with the other graduate degrees and some undergraduate ones. The degree program offers no unique courses exclusive to the degree, and therefore no money is saved by the elimination of the degree program.

5. Will the reduction or elimination of this program have an adverse effect on scholarship, grants/contracts, or creative expression opportunities for faculty and/or students? If so, explain.

Yes, for chamber music scholarship/creative expression the faculty sometimes needs these graduate students to complete ensemble personnel.

6. Does the reduction or elimination of this program adversely impact diversity or inclusivity on our campus? If so, explain.

Yes, a proportionately large number of minorities are attracted to this degree program. Of the two current graduate students in this degree program of the string area, one is a Hispanic female and the other an African-American male. Of the BM Performance majors, a majority of them will make their livelihood in a private teaching studio. The Masters of Pedagogy degree serves a significant number of minorities with graduate aspirations.

7. Discuss any unique or exceptional features of this program that should be considered in making a final determination on this action.

8. Please provide any additional data you think would strengthen your case on the impact of this action.

With the exception of the Master of Music Education degree, all of our Master Degrees are designed as more of an apprenticeship. In other words students come here to study with a particular professor to enhance their skills. Cello players come specifically to study with John Michel, Conducting students come to study with Nik Caoile or Larry Gookin. In order for the student to get the best experience, we must limit number of these students that can be accepted. If we accept too many conducting students, then they don't get enough time in front of an ensemble conducting because it must be shared with the other too many other graduate students. The orchestra had 5 potential master of conducting students audition last year, we accepted only one. It's really about ensuring a quality of the experience for those graduate students who make it into our program.

Department Report #2**Program Action****Plan for Revision and/or Elimination**

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Pedagogy

Name of person submitting report

Carrie Michel/John Michel/Todd Shiver

Action

Refocus

Reduction

Eliminate

Directions:

The purpose of this planning form is to outline how you would refocus the program, reduce the program, or eliminate the program.

Refocus the program

1. Please outline how you would refocus the program in terms of vision, mission, learning outcomes, curriculum and any collaboration with other programs, inside or outside your department.

With the exception of the Master of Music Education degree, all of our Master Degrees should be listed as “Master of Music” Degrees with different emphasis placed on Conducting, Pedagogy, Performance, and Composition. All of these different areas of emphasis share the same core classes like research, theory, and history. The remainder of masters level courses are determined by their area of emphasis. This act alone would enhance the graduate student numbers in the department, at least on paper.

With the exception of Music Education, all of the other areas are self limiting student enrollment because of the apprentice nature of the degree and because of the need for these master's students to not only work closely with a faculty mentor but to also have access to the department performing ensembles and other department resources.

2. How is this new amalgamation designed to attract new students to the program and what learning and career benefits will be anticipated for the students? NO
3. Will there be new resources required? Will there be curricular needs, such as service courses, required from other departments? NO
4. Will there be financial savings as a consequence of refocusing the program and if so, what are they? NO
5. How will this change/enhance other departmental programs that are more robust? NO
6. Are there other data or educational circumstances that the APTF did not consider that should be considered? NO
7. Please provide a plan that shows current program offerings and how they would be changed over the next two years. If courses are offered for more than one program in the Department, please show how many sections or differences in timing to offer the course delivery over the next two years (**use attached Excel Table 1 to calculate**). NA

Report # 1

Impact Statements for Program Reductions and Eliminations

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Performance

Name of person submitting report

Jeff Snedeker/Mark Goodenberger/Todd Shiver

Master of Music with a Specialization in Performance

1. Describe the impact of this reduction or elimination for your department or interdisciplinary program. If you do not agree with the Task Force recommendation indicate what you would do to improve or refocus the program's operations. Each program regardless of the recommendation status in the Academic Planning Task Force spreadsheet has the option of defending its current operations.

The Master of Music in Performance is an important option for graduate study at CWU. It provides an opportunity and degree incentive for older students to receive advanced applied study on an instrument or voice. Because CWU lacks financial resources for scholarships, many students seek conservatory training out of state. The MM in Performance attracts advanced students to CWU who, by their example, inspire and attract more talented undergraduate students to attend. Graduate students serve as leaders, role models, and, when they come from other institutions, provide "outside" perspectives for undergraduates.

2. How will this action impact instruction, faculty workload, and division of labor in the department?

The department depends upon the graduate students to teach in many areas, especially applied lessons and education methods classes. The net result of reducing or eliminating the MM in Performance will increase the load of faculty who will no longer receive assistantship help from these graduate students. This change in load will negatively impact the applied undergraduate population, which will have to be reduced to accommodate the loss of assistantships. Thus, the loss of the Masters program will negatively impact music student FTE generation.

Many of the graduate classes are cross listed classes and require no additional resources.

The graduate TA students generate a lot of FTE for the department that would need to be replaced with more expensive part-time instructors.

3. Does the evidence indicate that there will be a significant decline in enrollments or will the reduction or elimination increase enrollments, maximization of course offering and faculty workload distribution?

See #2. With the loss of the program and corresponding assistantships, access to private instruction will be further restricted and the overall quality of student performance will be impacted negatively. This loss affects the quality of the ensembles, making the undergraduate program less desirable to quality students, and lowers the value of the students' education at CWU (see #4).

4. How will the reduction or elimination affect interdependences with other programs and units, especially any documentation regarding coursework.

Reduction or elimination of the MM in Performance will impact course offerings as described in #s 2 and 3. More importantly, it will effect the quality output of our ensembles and the morale within the department—graduate students provide significant leadership and modeling for professional behavior.

5. Will the reduction or elimination of this program have an adverse effect on scholarship, grants/contracts, or creative expression opportunities for faculty and/or students? If so, explain.

Absolutely. The opportunity to collaborate with graduate students, particularly in performance opportunities for both faculty and students, will be lost in ways that cannot be reproduced with undergraduates. Further, since we depend on graduate students to teach classes as TAs, faculty scholarship and creative activity, grant-writing, etc. will be hindered if faculty have to absorb their duties into their loads.

6. Does the reduction or elimination of this program adversely impact diversity or inclusivity on our campus? If so, explain.

The loss of the MM in Performance reduces the number of opportunities to recruit diverse individuals through the loss of assistantships and advanced programs. With scholarship money allocated primarily to incoming students (because there is so little to begin with). the assistantships provide the means and additional incentive for study through financial support for those outstanding students that might not have the means on

their own. The loss of advanced programs reduces the credibility of the department for higher quality education and artistic experiences to the campus and beyond.

7. Discuss any unique or exceptional features of this program that should be considered in making a final determination on this action.

The Music Department prides itself on being undergraduate-centered, but we depend on graduate students, especially performance majors, to give us leadership and teaching assistance that allow us to offer a basic curriculum, present outstanding ensemble performances at state and regional conferences, and generally allow us to succeed at what we do. The graduate students provide a core of specialized talent that raises the level of performance in every ensemble in the department. To lose that element of our department would be extremely detrimental.

8. Please provide any additional “data” you think would strengthen your case on the impact of this action.

With the exception of the Master of Music Education degree, all of our Master Degrees are designed as more of an apprenticeship. In other words students come here to study with a particular professor to enhance their skills. Cello players come specifically to study with John Michel, Conducting students come to study with Nik Caoile or Larry Gookin. In order for the student to get the best experience, we must limit number of these students that can be accepted. If we accept too many conducting students, then they don't get enough time in front of an ensemble conducting because it must be shared with the other too many other graduate students. The orchestra had 5 potential master of conducting students audition last year, we accepted only one. It's really about ensuring a quality of the experience for those graduate students who make it into our program.

Department Report #2**Program Action****Plan for Revision and/or Elimination**

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Master of Music: Performance

Name of person submitting report

Todd Shiver

Action

Refocus

Reduction

Eliminate

Directions:

The purpose of this planning form is to outline how you would refocus the program, reduce the program, or eliminate the program.

Refocus the program

1. Please outline how you would refocus the program in terms of vision, mission, learning outcomes, curriculum and any collaboration with other programs, inside or outside your department.

With the exception of the Master of Music Education degree, all of our Master Degrees should be listed as “Master of Music” Degrees with different emphasis placed on Conducting, Pedagogy, Performance, and Composition. All of these different areas of emphasis share the same core classes like research, theory, and history. The remainder of masters level courses are determined by their area of emphasis. This act alone would enhance the graduate student numbers in the department, at least on paper.

With the exception of Music Education, all of the other areas are self limiting student enrollment because of the apprentice nature of the degree and because of the need for these master's students to not only work closely with a faculty mentor but to also have access to the department performing ensembles and other department resources.

2. How is this new amalgamation designed to attract new students to the program and what learning and career benefits will be anticipated for the students? NO
3. Will there be new resources required? Will there be curricular needs, such as service courses, required from other departments? NO
4. Will there be financial savings as a consequence of refocusing the program and if so, what are they? NO
5. How will this change/enhance other departmental programs that are more robust? NO
6. Are there other data or educational circumstances that the APTF did not consider that should be considered? NO
7. Please provide a plan that shows current program offerings and how they would be changed over the next two years. If courses are offered for more than one program in the Department, please show how many sections or differences in timing to offer the course delivery over the next two years (**use attached Excel Table 1 to calculate**). NA

Report # 1

Impact Statements for Program Reductions and Eliminations

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Bachelor of Music : Vocal Performance

Name of person submitting report

Gayla Blaisdell/Todd Shiver

1. Describe the impact of this reduction or elimination for your department or interdisciplinary program. If you do not agree with the Task Force recommendation indicate what you would do to improve or refocus the program's operations. Each program regardless of the recommendation status in the Academic Planning Task Force spreadsheet has the option of defending its current operations.

Reducing or eliminating the Vocal Performance option from the Music department offerings would severely disable the overall quality of the music department as a "signature program." The music department has been recognized over and over as a thriving department within CWU as evidenced by the number of regional and national honors and awards granted to its faculty, ensembles and students. Voice is an integral part of the music community at Central. Looking at it realistically, the voice area is 1/3 of the music curriculum and student body – 1/3 Instrumental (Band), 1/3 Instrumental (String) and 1/3 Vocal (Choral). Reducing and eliminating just one area of expertise would cause an imbalance in the programs and would weaken the whole department. Vocal Performance majors take the leading roles in our award winning (two National awards in 2010 and 2011) and growing Opera program as well as participate as leaders in the regionally and nationally recognized choral ensembles. Vocal Performance majors serve as role models for Music Education and Bachelor Arts of students. Vocal Performance majors contribute at the highest level to the outstanding musical performances given by our CWU choral ensembles – Chamber Choir (the most competitive choir which relies heavily on performance majors), Women's Choir, Men's Choir, University Chorale, Central Singers, Vocal Jazz I, Vocal Jazz 2, Vocal Jazz 3. Reducing or eliminating the vocal major would make it impossible to attract the type of students necessary in the quantity necessary to fill these ensembles and keep them performing at their current high level.

There does seem to be an easy way to refocus the degree program. The Vocal Performance degree was separated out into an individual degree because vocal music demands one skill set that is not necessary for instrumental performance majors – facility with language and text. The vocal degree could easily be incorporated into the Bachelor of Music – Percussion/Wind/String Performance degree if we can address the additional language requirement under the larger degree category in the catalog. This should be possible, but it might take some creative writing to meet the constraints of the university curriculum committee and make sure that the specific needs of singers are met. The BM Percussion/Wind String Performance degree requires 6 Music Electives. If those 6 Music Electives could be specified as Diction for Singers 1, 2, and 3 for the Vocal Performance majors the other degree requirements are equivalent. I need some guidance about how to

list that specification in the degree narrative, but it seems to make sense to list all the Performance areas under one performance degree umbrella. This would make the numbers for the voice area similar to the numbers in the other instrumental areas when combined. We would also need to dovetail the Opera Production requirement into Ensemble participation and it would add Orchestration to the Vocal Performance major, but these adjustments could be made to unify the various areas of performance.

In terms of numbers of graduates, the Vocal Performance degree probably doesn't graduate fewer students than the String area or the Wind area, but because those areas are combined and voice is listed individually, the Vocal Performance degree was flagged in this process. Reducing or eliminating the vocal performance option at Central would be a serious injustice to the vocal majors if the committee penalized the vocal area simply because it has one unique need that resulted in the individual listing in the catalog.

2. How will this action impact instruction, faculty workload, and division of labor in the department?

Currently, we are already down one tenure-track faculty member in the vocal area. This is putting an undue amount of stress on the vocal area coordinator and only tenure track faculty member. Reducing or eliminating the Vocal Performance major would probably decrease our chance of filling that open position which would greatly diminish the quality of teaching for remaining the Music Education majors and Bachelor of Arts vocal majors. Vocal Performance majors make my job worth doing because they are the students who generally know how to work and have high expectations for themselves. They are the A students who are a joy to teach. Reducing or eliminating the Vocal Performance majors would relegate our vocal program to mediocre students who have very little drive and desire to excel in performance (some music education majors possess this drive, but not all). It would be very difficult to attract or keep highly qualified professors in an environment that didn't encourage the highest level of achievement in our field.

3. Does the evidence indicate that there will be a significant decline in enrollments or will the reduction or elimination increase enrollments, maximization of course offering and faculty workload distribution?

If the vocal performance track is eliminated, there would be a slight decline in enrollments at first, but based on the current required applied curriculum we would need to attract two music education majors to every one performance spot. Such a large pool of music education majors would dilute the overall quality of the vocal students. My goal for the voice area since I became area coordinator last January, has been to increase the number of performance majors for all the reasons mentioned above and because slightly

increasing the number of performance majors allows us to accept a smaller number of Music Education and BA majors. This is actually a benefit to our program because the class enrollments in our music core classes are stretched too thin. Increasing the vocal performance numbers and growing the program solves our problems in the department while reducing and eliminating the vocal performance degree aggravates our enrollment issues. Essentially, you can think of it this way, in a vocal performance major we get “more bang for the buck.” We raise the quality of the ensembles, provide role models and leaders, and gain students who contribute exponentially more than their non-performance counterparts to the entire department, but we accept actually fewer students who take up less room in our already overflowing music core classes.

4. How will the reduction or elimination affect interdependences with other programs and units, especially any documentation regarding coursework.

Reducing or eliminating the vocal performance degree will directly impact our choral ensembles as explained earlier. The effect would happen in stages – first the quality of the ensembles would start to suffer and then the numbers in the ensembles would decrease. The outstanding performances of our ensembles are significant recruiting tools for the music education degrees. Since the music education majors are not generally the strongest singers, eliminating the vocal performance majors from the groups would severely lower the overall quality and the groups would cease to attract serious music education majors. Therefore, the entire vocal area would suffer losses of enrollment and then eventually the entire music department would suffer loss of enrollment because the overall reputation of the department would be less attractive. There would also be ripple effects to the language department. There is a standing requirement that all voice performance majors must take a minimum of one year of either German or French. Ideally, we should be offering Italian to the vocal performance majors as well, but that has not been possible due to staffing in the Language department. I understand that German is another program that has been flagged for reduction or elimination. I would strongly urge the university to maintain an offering of German, not only for our vocal performance majors, but for other students as well. There is a trend currently for students to study Japanese, Russian and Chinese now instead of the European languages, however, many music students will still need those languages for research later in their field. All classically trained vocal performance majors must have a beginning understanding of language grammar and structure in order to sing in those languages. Limiting the offering to French only would severely weaken our credibility with other music schools in the nation. I recommend that my vocal performance majors take both languages if they can fit it into their schedules and many continue to request Italian and try to squeeze in Latin over the summer. Ideally, we would recommend that vocal performance majors take a year of French, German *and* Italian. Music Education majors also benefit from

studying the European languages but unfortunately, we cannot require them to take the language because of the high credits already involved in their degree. I hope that first year German continues to be offered for our students even if it is on a rotational basis every other year.

5. Will the reduction or elimination of this program have an adverse effect on scholarship, grants/contracts, or creative expression opportunities for faculty and/or students? If so, explain.

The most significant loss to the creative expression opportunities would be in the performance area of opera productions and choral ensembles. I have outlined the significant loss of quality that would occur in the choral ensembles earlier. If the quality of the choral ensembles suffers we will not be chosen to present at regional and national conferences and our national reputation will decline. CWU has historically offered one opera performance each year and since I came to Central the opera program has increased in visibility, quality and desirability. We have won national awards for our past two opera productions 2010 – 1st Place winner in Opera Production for The Tender Land and 2011 – 2nd Place winner in Opera Production for A Little Night Music. I rely on the vocal performance majors to fill the leading roles in these productions. If I do not have dedicated and driven students who desire to perform as soloists (many music education majors are not qualified to do so and do not desire to do so) opera at Central would cease to exist. It would be a loss to the department and the university if the opera program is crippled in this way when it is just beginning to flourish. Central's opera program is just now creating a national presence within the operatic field, our website is attracting those vocal performance majors interested in opera, and we are poised to expand in this area when some other universities have already eliminated their programs – i.e. University of Washington.

6. Does the reduction or elimination of this program adversely impact diversity or inclusivity on our campus? If so, explain.

The reduction or elimination of the vocal performance degree would mainly impact diversity and inclusivity within the music department. It is actually very important for the music department to remain balanced between its instrumental students and the vocal students and between the music education students and the performance students. One of the main recruiting statements that I share with potential students is that our music department fosters a diverse vocal experience. We offer classical choral ensembles, jazz ensembles and opera. We value the solo performer and the ensemble performer. We are strong in all areas and we encourage our students to be well-rounded musicians. If ONE area of the music curriculum is singled out and eliminated, it will weaken the overall

diversity of the experience. The balance would swing toward the instrumental majors both in music education and performance and the balance would swing toward favoring music education in general for the whole department. While we have traditionally been known for quality music education, we do not want to be known exclusively as a music education school because that affects the overall quality and perception of the program.

7. Discuss any unique or exceptional features of this program that should be considered in making a final determination on this action.

The vocal performance degree is unique and exceptional to the liberal arts experience as well. Because voice is a text based driven art form (unlike most instrumental music) we strive for highly literate and well-rounded students. I've already mentioned the emphasis placed on competency in multiple foreign languages, but vocal performance majors are encouraged to study literature and history in a way that fits ideally within the liberal arts mandate. Singers must study poetry (all art songs include a poetic text – our students must engage with that text on an analytic and meaningful level), languages (mentioned above), theater (most of my performance majors want to take theater offerings and I do encourage them to take what fits in their schedules), history (a general knowledge of history is necessary to understand the political and social context of almost all poetic texts and opera libretti), aesthetics, and even philosophy (singers must understand themselves and the way their minds work to make personal progress and to understand the characters that they portray). Slanting the degrees in the vocal area to favor the music education degree, which is much closer to a trade degree, ignores the concept of comprehensive liberal arts education. The Bachelor of Arts degree in music does include the liberal arts component but it doesn't impose the same level of focused concentration that the Vocal Performance degree requires. Most students who are Bachelor Arts students in voice take such a wide variety of courses that they do not have the mastery of the subjects that the more specific vocal performance degree demands. Offering all three types of degrees allows us to meet the needs of individual students and tailor their university experience to reflect their level of interest and personal goals.

8. Please provide any additional data you think would strengthen your case on the impact of this action.

Finally, I would like to address the state of the Vocal Performance major currently in the music department. This is my fourth year teaching at Central and I have been vocal area coordinator since January 2011. When I arrived at Central, I would agree that the overall quality of voice majors (in all degrees) was weak. There were probably a number of reasons for this. One main reason for the decline in the performance program was that there had been quite a turnaround in my tenure track line. When Diane

Reich, my predecessor, left CWU in 2007 she took many of her best students with her. The position was vacant for one full year during the search and during that year the program lost much of the momentum it had been building. Diane has also only spent 4 or 5 years at Central, which is just about the time when a program would have started to grow. We are still feeling the effects of those years. Another contributing factor was that recruiting was almost non-existent from the vocal instructors prior to my arrival and the former vocal area coordinator had unfortunately alienated many vocal instructors and choir directors in the region. This meant that the choral instructors were doing the only recruiting for the area and they mainly attract music education majors. I have been interested in recruiting since I arrived at Central, and since I became the Area Coordinator I am seeing a turnaround in the type of students we are attracting. Due to my work in the region judging solo and ensemble, visiting other schools for master classes and by establishing my reputation in the entire region as a competent and sensitive voice teacher, more and more vocal performance majors are considering Central as an alternative to expensive conservatory training and more and more vocal instructors in the region are sending their students here. This year, I was able to attract the 1st Place Winner of the State Solo and Ensemble Mezzo-Soprano Category who is here studying as a vocal performance major. She was recruited heavily by every school in the state and ended up at Central because of my reputation, our growing opera offerings, the overall quality and reputation of Central's music department and the fact that we fit her financial needs. In addition to my own draw for vocal performance majors, we have been lucky to add two new adjuncts to the voice faculty within the past year to strengthen the program, Dr. Melissa Schiel and Mr. Torrance Blaisdell. Dr. Schiel is establishing herself in the area as a superb performer and pedagogue and Mr. Blaisdell's long resume of opera and theater performance credits are making Central an exciting place to study voice. The current voice faculty is very strong and balanced. Every voice part is covered: Soprano – myself and Mrs. Mia Spencer, Mezzo – Dr. Schiel, Tenor – Mr. Blaisdell and Bass – Mr. Vijay Singh and Dr. Sidney Nesselroad.

The voice area has also recently seen a significant shift in the approach to our admission policy, which will affect future enrollment. The previous policy accepted almost every person who auditioned into one of the vocal degrees – Vocal Performance, Music Education or the Bachelor of Arts Music. This was the “leaky bucket” approach to admissions. I observed that in my first three years we had a large number of incoming freshman who were unqualified and unprepared for any music study and voice in particular. This actually weakened the entire vocal area because those students created a drag on the ensembles, in the courses and definitely lowered the applied experience and student morale at Central. Then during the first year or after the first year a large number of students would drop the major. In my opinion, this weakened the overall quality of the program and made the students who were serious about vocal study look

elsewhere. In the past year, we have changed the admission process to a more holistic process that allows us to be more selective. Each year now, I see a more qualified pool of students applying and coming to Central. The payoff for this will be evidenced in two or three years when the students that I have now as freshman and sophomores graduate.

Since my arrival at Central several changes have been made to the curriculum that are also enhancing our reputation as the place to be for vocal study. We expanded the Diction for Singers sequence from 1 quarter to 3 quarters of study. This is in line with all other major music programs across the country and allows our students the time to develop skills that will prepare them seriously for solo careers or graduate school. Last year the entire music department changed the applied lessons policies as well which has had a great impact on our voice lessons. In the past policy, we offered only 30-minute lessons to all voice majors (education and performance) except seniors who took an hour lesson. It is unanimously supported by the music faculty that a 30-minute lesson for performance majors was inadequate. While the faculty would ideally offer 60-minute lessons to all majors, a compromise was necessary due to the heavy credit load of our music education majors. So, the new policy requires 30-minute lessons for 11 quarters for music education majors and 60-minute lessons for 12 quarters for performance majors. Both of these changes to the curriculum were implemented this fall. Already in only one quarter, the voice area has undergone a significant shift. In addition, I have rewritten the Voice Area Syllabus and the voice faculty is now more unified in grading policies, attendance and expectations. Our vocal students are more focused, driven and are achieving more because the curriculum and the faculty expectations are more focused. Particularly the vocal performance majors are reaping a huge benefit from the additional instructional time now available in the hour lesson schedule. An example of the benefit was seen immediately this fall at the NATS (National Association of Teachers of Singing) competition. Our region, the Inland Empire Chapter, holds the competition at the end of October or the beginning of November. This has always placed our students at a disadvantage because of our late academic start and while Central has always been fairly successful at the competition, this year we swept the divisions. Roughly 1/3 of the approximately 80 voice students at CWU, were prepared with 10 minutes of very specific repertoire, confident and excited to perform after only 3 or 4 lessons. Due particularly to the change to 60 minute lessons for the lower division performance majors and the overall level of expectation in the vocal area we had 13 students place in the finals – about half of the students we took to the competition. Another advantage to the hour lesson curriculum change is seen in recruiting: it was difficult to recruit serious voice students in performance with the 30-minute lesson. Now that that issue has been resolved, students are more likely to take the performance degree seriously.

I admit that the numbers had been down in the department when I arrived in 2008, but we have been working at every level (changing curriculum, departmental communication to help mentor struggling students, better and more recruiting, attracting qualified and attractive adjunct faculty to join the tenure track faculty, and unifying the standards and expectations within the various voice faculty) to shore up the entire vocal studies area, including the vocal performance degree. I anticipate that the music department will sustain a higher number of vocal performance majors and see those students through to graduation in much larger numbers in the next several years. In my own vocal studio, I currently have 8 highly motivated vocal performance majors. One will graduate this spring and has applied to Juilliard, Eastman, the University of Michigan, University of Houston and Yale. I anticipate he will get into to several of those highly competitive programs, if not all of them. We should be proud to have students of his caliber at Central setting the standard, and he would not be on this path without the vocal performance degree. The other students are first and second year students who are keeping their grades up and working hard. I don't see any major stumbling blocks between them and graduation in a few years.

Current Vocal Area Numbers based on Area Coordinator Records of Students in the Applied Voice Sequence Winter 2012

- 17 Vocal Performance Majors
- 7 Vocal Performance and Music Education Double Majors
- 1 Vocal Performance and Composition Double Major
- 25 Total – Students pursuing the Vocal Performance Degree**
 - 4 – graduate in Spring 12
 - 1 – in academic limbo – trying to mentor him
 - 2 – began study in 2009 – should graduate in 2013 may be slightly delayed
 - 10 – began study in 2010– on track to graduate in 2014
 - 8 - began study in 2011 – on track to graduate in 2015 (1 showing academic weakness)
- 31 Music Education Choral Majors
 - 2 – graduate in Spring 2012
 - 3 – graduate in Fall 2012
- 3 Music Education Broad Area Majors – Voice Primary
 - 1 – graduates in Winter 2012
- 3 Composition Majors – Voice Primary
 - 1 – graduates in Spring 2012
- 8 BA Music Majors – Voice Primary

5 - trying to graduate in Spring 2012

80 Students pursuing degrees in voice

Given these numbers, the logic of reducing or eliminating one degree offering within such a large area of study would not create any significant benefit to the course offerings or faculty workloads because the vocal curriculum overlaps with the music education major and the other area performance majors to such an extent that no individual course is required solely for vocal performance majors. The courses required for the vocal performance degree must continue to be taught for the music education majors, they would simply have a smaller enrollment.

I urge the task force to allow the changes that we have made very recently time to attract incoming vocal performance majors and see them through in larger numbers to graduation. I am very happy to work with the University Curriculum Committee, to realign the separate Vocal Performance degree into a larger umbrella Performance degree while maintaining the unique study of languages and diction necessary for our students. This adjustment to the catalog listing should be fairly easy to accomplish and would lump vocal performance numbers into the larger pool of winds, strings, brass and percussion performance numbers with very little impact on the degree itself. Given that the voice area is gaining momentum and that a curriculum adjustment can be made to bring the degree into line with other music performance degrees; reducing or eliminating the vocal performance major would be a tragedy and gravely handicap the future of music at Central.

Department Report #2**Program Action****Plan for Revision and/or Elimination**

To be completed for each program identified by the Academic Planning Task Force as needing revision or elimination

Program Title

Bachelor of Music: Vocal Performance

Name of person submitting report

Gayla Blaisdell/Todd Shiver

Action

Refocus

Reduction

Eliminate

Directions:

The purpose of this planning form is to outline how you would refocus the program, reduce the program, or eliminate the program.

Refocus the program

1. Please outline how you would refocus the program in terms of vision, mission, learning outcomes, curriculum and any collaboration with other programs, inside or outside your department.

The Vocal and Piano Performance degrees should be included with the wind/percussion/string Bachelor of Music Performance tracks. They were separated out of this main grouping of performance areas because they contained some required courses that are unique to their area. However, 90% of the degree requirements for Keyboard and for Vocal are the same as the others. I realize that this is merely semantics with no real

changes, but one could pull any individual performance area out of that grouping and it would appear to be low enrolled.

2. How is this new amalgamation designed to attract new students to the program and what learning and career benefits will be anticipated for the students? NO
3. Will there be new resources required? Will there be curricular needs, such as service courses, required from other departments? NO
4. Will there be financial savings as a consequence of refocusing the program and if so, what are they? NO
5. How will this change/enhance other departmental programs that are more robust? NO
6. Are there other data or educational circumstances that the APTF did not consider that should be considered? NO
7. Please provide a plan that shows current program offerings and how they would be changed over the next two years. If courses are offered for more than one program in the Department, please show how many sections or differences in timing to offer the course delivery over the next two years (**use attached Excel Table 1 to calculate**). NA

Table 2 – Staff Changes Resulting From Program Reduction or Elimination NA

MDP III – EVALUATION, PLANNING, PROJECTIONS

C. Any current analytical or projective studies concerning the music unit
NA

MUSIC DEPARTMENT STRATEGIC PLAN FALL 2012

UNIVERSITY CORE THEME: 1. Teaching and Learning						
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 1.1 Enhance student success by continually improving the curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular programs						
CAH-related outcomes	Unit Outcomes	Indicators	Expected Performance Level (Criterion)	Indicator/Performance Level Reported By	Key Strategies/Initiatives	Budget/Resource Analysis
1.1.1 Create and maintain high quality academic programs	1.1.1 Students will demonstrate training and skills for entry-level positions to the profession or graduate school	1. Annual assessment of student learning 2. Job placement 3. Graduate school admission 4. NASM and PESB accreditation and program approval	1. Meet established department student learning goals annually 2. Meet 1 and 3 year hire targets for teacher candidates 3. 90% of students applying for graduate school will have at least one offer 4. Maintain NASM accreditation and PESB program approval	1. Music department 2. CTL OREA 3. Alumni survey (IR) 4. Music Office	DEPARTMENT/Internal: Review degrees according to the field, set targets for %s, alumni survey). UNIVERSITY/External: increase F/T lines, TAs, funding for dept needs	Staff position for advising and retention of students that can track students upon graduation; increase FT faculty lines
1.1.2 Promote interdepartmental programming and collaboration	1.1.2 Reviewing and remodeling degrees to prepare students for an always changing world.	1. Annual Assessment of Student learning 2. Annual Strategic Planning Process 3. Academic Planning Task Force	1. Meet established department student learning goals annually 2. Maintain NASM accreditation and PESB program approval 3. Implement APTF recommendations	1. Music department 2. NASM reaccreditation process and Handbook. 3. University Task Force	Align music courses with department learning outcomes. Account for hidden hours in the curriculum. Strive to make the curriculum more efficient. Efficient scheduling of music courses.	Staff advisor to track student's progress, keep students on track for graduation and offer suggestions regarding scheduling of courses and efficiency of offerings based on student feedback from advising.
1.1.3 Ensure that students develop disciplinary specific competences for success in music fields	1.1.3 Department faculty will continue to enhance their teaching	Faculty RPT, PTR including NTT review	All faculty will meet department, College, and University guidelines for teaching in RPT and PTR	Personnel processes; Music Office	The department will provide opportunities for faculty to remain current in and enhance their teaching and curriculum development; pilot peer review of teaching	Additional funds for Professional development
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 1.2 Enhance the effectiveness of student support services						
	Unit Outcomes	Indicators	Expected Performance Level (Criterion)	Indicator/Performance Level Reported By	Key Strategies/Initiatives	Budget/Resource Analysis
1.2.1 Improve advising of current and potential Music students	1.2.1 Students will receive effective advising	1. Time-to-degree and graduation rate 2. Number of advisees per faculty member on activity reports 3. Number of advising contacts per student per year	1. Time-to-degree and graduation rate at or above peer institutions in the field of music 2. Faculty advising loads reviewed annually and adjusted equitably 3. All students will meet with an advisor at least once a year	1. IR 2. Music Office 3. Music Office	UNIVERSITY: Support advising for improving time to degree, connections to community college, increase F/T faculty lines, create position for staff advisor (recruitment/retention), maintain enrollment numbers; DEPARTMENT: Initiate student survey	Need a Staff advisor (Possibly a position that is shared between admissions, advising and music); staff support for student survey

MUSIC DEPARTMENT STRATEGIC PLAN FALL 2012

1.2.2 Improve student and faculty knowledge of student support services available	1.2.2 Maintaining accreditation to demonstrate credibility in the field	NASM Accreditation Review.	The department will address any NASM standard that is identified through the accreditation process as not being met or needing improvement.	1. NASM Self Study. 2.NASM Visiting Team report.	UNIVERSITY: will provide the resources to help the Music Department meet NASM Standards. DEPARTMENT: work with the university and NASM to set a reasonable plan of action to address any NASM standards that are not being met or that have been identified as needing to improve.	TBD
UNIVERSITY CORE THEME: 2. Inclusiveness and Diversity						
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 2.1 Enhance the environment of inclusiveness for faculty, staff, and students						
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>
2.1.1 Build a more diverse musical community	2.1.1 The department will maintain a diverse musical community	1. diversity of inquiries, acceptances, enrollments, majors	1. Meet specific targets consistent with institution goals.	Staff Recruiter	DEPARTMENT: enhance music department image, outreach, recruiting, finances, degrees , bring groups/guest artists to campus that enhance diversity.	Need staff position in recruiting who can target musically talented minority students. Possibly a position that is shared between admissions, advising and music.
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 2.2 Increase faculty, staff, and student diversity by active programs of recruitment and retention for members						
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>
2.2.1 Build a more diverse musical community	2.2.1 The department will recruit and retain students, faculty and staff of diverse backgrounds in line with university goals	1. Department statistics for faculty/staff/student diversity 2. Department statistics for majors by instrument and area	1. Meet university goals for the Ellensburg campus in ethnic, demographic, etc. groups for qualified students, faculty and staff according to EEOC guidelines 2. Meet specific targets for balance of majors.	1. University Diversity Office, Registrar, HR 2. Music Office	UNIVERSITY: Improve connections with community colleges, increase F/T faculty lines, TAs; DEPARTMENT: increase retention through advising, touring, connections to alumni, teacher placement/supervisors in diverse areas of the region, outreach to underserved communities, more instrument purchase for availability to students from underserved communities, bring diverse groups to campus	Staff recruiter/retention specialist, Possibly a position that is shared between admissions, advising and music.
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 2.3: Ensure that CWU has inclusive and diverse curriculum						
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>
2.3.1 Improve students' knowledge of human cultures and diversity for success in a global society.	2.3.1 maintaining and enhancing an atmosphere of inclusiveness for members of the department, the local and university community, and the region	1. Number of and enrollment in Gen Ed offerings related to diverse music cultures 2.Number of and enrollment in cross-disciplinary programs	1. At least one fully enrolled Gen Ed course per quarter related to diverse music cultures 2. At least one cross-disciplinary program or course per year	1. Music Office 2. Music Office or specific program (DHC, CAH)	Review and remodel agrees to adapt, cross disciplinary degrees, better connection with alumni, expand gen ed options.	Change the current ethno musicologist from a lecturer to a full-time TT position. This will allow for service and research in that area and will enhance our cultural music education of our students
UNIVERSITY CORE THEME: 3. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE EXPRESSION						
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 3.1 Increase the emphasis on and the opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to participate in research, scholarship, and creative expression activities.						

MUSIC DEPARTMENT STRATEGIC PLAN FALL 2012

	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>	
	3.1.1 Maintain and enhance support for faculty, student, and staff research and creative activity.	3.1.1 supporting opportunities for scholarly and creative growth for faculty, students and staff	RPT and PTR success of faculty	All faculty will successfully meet expectations for RPT and PTR according to established department, College, and University guidelines.	Music Office, CAH Dean	UNIVERSITY: Increase FT lines, more funding support for professional development DEPARTMENT: review studio size ensemble/enrollment needs, increase opportunities for faculty presence at conference, guest artists. Ensure RPT and PTR guidelines are aligned with college and university guidelines	Increase FT lines and funding for additional adjunct hours
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 3.2 Increase the external funding received for research, scholarship, and creative expression by faculty, staff, and students							
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>	
	3.2.1 Enhance support for faculty, student, and staff research and creativity	3.2.1 seeking and promoting means by which students, faculty, and staff may pursue scholarly and creative activities	1. Department budget allocations 2. Number of grants and outside funding sources received	1. 1 workload unit for a faculty member to work on a SOAR grant for additional funds that would allow more reassigned time for grant writing. 2. At least one grant submission per year.	1. Music Office 2. Grants Accounting	University/College: additional funds beyond the amount set by the CBA for faculty/staff development. Department: Additional departmental funds from summer revenue (classes and camps) devoted to faculty, student, and staff research and creative activities.	Additional funds in the department budget that can be devoted to faculty, staff, and student scholarship and creative activities.
UNIVERSITY CORE THEME: 4. PUBLIC SERVICE AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT							
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 4.1 Enhance the commitment and the level of cooperation between the university and external communities							
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>	
	4.1.2 Enhance students' civic	4.1.1 Promoting student and faculty service to the profession, the university, and the community.	1. Number of students engaged in service	1. At least 25% of student per year involved in service 2. At least 15 students	1. Office of Civic Engagement 2. Preparatory Program director 3.	The department can adopt a civic engagement activity to support each year. The department could participate in the adopted	Additional 5 hours a week for a part-time staff member to
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 4.2 Increase participation in university sponsored life-long learning opportunities							
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>	
	4.2.1 Develop students' intellectual and practical skills for lifelong learning	4.2.1 maintaining and enhancing outreach into local and regional communities.	1. Number of outreach efforts per year	1. At least 1 community outreach event per year	1. Music Office	Compile and review department activities, Gen Ed offerings, student clubs, conference participation, community outreach, summer workshops, community service to evaluate future participation.	faculty service
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 4.3 Enhance the efforts of members of the university community to strengthen the economic base of the region and state							
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>	
	4.3.1 maintaining and enhancing support for festivals, guest artists, faculty and student presentations at conferences, student and faculty touring, summer camps and publicity.	1. attendance/participation in workshops, festivals, and camps	1. All workshops, festivals, and camps will meet enrollment targets and budgets	1. Directors of workshops, festivals, and camps	Compile and review department activities to evaluate economic impact and future participation.	Collaboration with Economics Department to do an economic impact study.	
UNIVERSITY CORE THEME: 5. RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND STEWARDSHIP							
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 5.1 Maximize the financial resources to the University, and assure the efficient and effective operations of the University through financial stewardship							

MUSIC DEPARTMENT STRATEGIC PLAN FALL 2012

	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>
5.1.1 Develop a climate of fundraising in the college	5.1.1 maintaining department budgets, enrollment management, and scholarship offerings to meet department objectives.	1. Current self-support budgets	1. Budgets will maintain or increase based on 2011-12	1. Music Office	Compile and review department self-support activities in this area to determine future efforts	
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 5.2 Develop and implement enrollment management and marketing plans that meet the enrollment objectives of the university						
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>
5.2.1 Departments	5.2.1 The department will maintain balanced enrollment by area in all degrees	1. Departmental enrollment by area	1. Meet enrollment targets annually	Music Office	Compile and review data on student time to degree, retention, advising, facilities use, etc. and their impact on major enrollment	staff advisor/recruiting/retention
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 5.3 Ensure the University has human resources necessary to accomplish all university objectives						
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>
5.3.1. Increase share of resources and match resources to growth	5.3.1 Ensuring that there are adequate faculty, staff, and support for professional development activities to meet department objectives.	1. Amount of funds available for professional development 2. RPT and PTR progress of faculty	1. Funding for professional development and sabbaticals 2. All faculty will meet RPT and PTR expectations	1. Music Office 2. Music Office, CAH Dean	develop specific plan prioritizing funds available faculty development opportunities	Additional support for faculty development and sabbatical leaves.
UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVE 5.4 Provide the facility and technology infrastructure and services appropriate to meet the university objectives, while maximizing sustainability and stewardship						
	<i>Unit Outcomes</i>	<i>Indicators</i>	<i>Expected Performance Level (Criterion)</i>	<i>Indicator/Performance Level Reported By</i>	<i>Key Strategies/Initiatives</i>	<i>Budget/Resource Analysis</i>
5.4.1 College equipment and facilities will be maintained and upgraded as needed	5.4.1 Ensuring that there are adequate facilities, maintenance to support facilities, upgrades in technology, and upgrades in equipment to meet department objectives.	1. Adherence to department technology plan	1. Department will monitor, upgrade, and replace technology in line with plan	1. Tech staff	Develop department technology plan, increase financial resources, hire technician	Funding for technology replacement/upgrade schedules