Introductory Remarks

In light of recent revisions to the format of Program Review (2011), this report has been crafted with the intent of aiding the Music Discipline in the process of transitioning to the new, multi-year system of program evaluation. Accordingly, comments in this report reflect an effort by the CEPC to evaluate the Music Discipline’s 2011 Program Review document within the broad context of the Vision exercise and Strategic Planning that have been built into Year One of the new process. As the Program Review submitted by Music contains many key elements of Vision and Strategic Planning, the members of the CEPC believe sufficient groundwork has been laid for the Music Discipline to proceed to the second phase of the review process in the fall of 2012. The CEPC would encourage the Music Discipline to collaborate with Bob Rutter in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness as the Discipline works to fine-tune assessment practices.

An overarching goal of the new process for program review is to support a culture in which program evaluation through self-study is an ongoing process. The members of the CEPC believe the Music Discipline has made a good first step in this process by identifying its own strengths and outlining opportunities for program improvement.

Strategic Planning, Vision, and Assessment

The Music Discipline has identified a number of areas where the program could be improved with the infusion of additional resources. The CEPC recommends that those resources be listed and prioritized within a Strategic Plan. It would be valuable for the Discipline to align its prioritized list of resource needs with the standard resources recommended for program accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Music. The Strategic Plan document should be designed to present a coherent view of programmatic needs that can be evaluated and acted upon by the College.

Additional full-time faculty. The Music Discipline has identified a need for additional faculty in the areas of Elementary Education, Woodwinds, and Keyboard instruction.

It was noted in the Review document that the existing full-time faculty in the Music Discipline are “able to cover the core courses, but have little capacity for adding elective courses or to manage future growth.” It will be valuable for the Music Discipline to articulate its vision for growth in course offerings, minor programs, and new majors/concentrations in parallel with a discussion of the impact of those programs on existing workload limitations. As presented in the 2011 Review document, the Discipline’s desire to develop new or expanded existing programmatic elements appears to stand at odds with current strains on the full-time faculty. Two examples follow:
An effort to create a Theory/Composition concentration (or major) was described in the Review document within the context of a new faculty hire (theory specialist); however, it would be valuable for the Discipline to comment on the impact that the proposed concentration might have on the teaching loads of other faculty within the Discipline. Will a new concentration require the creation of new courses that will put a strain on the Discipline to cover existing course loads?

An upgrade in the Liturgical music minor was described in the context of increased student demand, but the upgrade to the program was not linked to a specific impact on faculty workload. If the Discipline is able to flesh out the requirements of the proposed upgrade, then any impact that those upgrades might have on faculty workload could be detailed in the Strategic Plan.

**New or upgraded facilities and equipment.** A need for improved and or expanded facilities was discussed in the context of a prioritized list of space, equipment, and technology that was submitted to the Dean of the College in 2008. The items in that prioritized list should be incorporated into the Strategic Plan. It will be valuable for the Music Discipline to articulate its vision for improved or expanded facilities in parallel with a discussion of its vision for increased enrollment numbers. In that regard, it was noted in the Review narrative that the Music program has had an average of 53.2 majors/per year over the past five years, and that there is a desire for the Program to grow to a target range of 70-75 majors. Is the vision for growth consistent with the resource needs that were identified in the report submitted to the Dean in 2008?

**New or upgraded assessment plan.** As the Discipline reflects on the things that it expects graduates to know, be able to do, and value upon completion of the major (one component of the vision exercise), the Music Discipline should also devise and implement a simple plan for assessment of students that complete work in each of the major areas: music education, music performance, and liberal arts with a music emphasis. While the ultimate form of assessment will be up to the Discipline, the assessment process would be greatly simplified if the Discipline can identify an assessment instrument that can be used for evaluation of more than one concentration area. The Music Major Field test may provide a simple and objective tool for program assessment. Curricular elements recommended by NASM and DPI may provide a good foundation for the development of program specific assessment tools.

As the Music Disciplines continues work into Year Two of the Program Review process, the Discipline ought to make an effort to link its vision for program growth and improvements to specific assessment data. The narrative of the 2011 Review makes reference to assessment data, but no specific data points were incorporated into the Review.

**Future goals to be considered.** As the CEPC is not in a position to prioritize the Disciplinary Goals listed within the narrative of the Review document, the Music Discipline should revisit that list and identify three goals to work toward over the next year. Progress on those goals should be outlined in the Year Two document to be submitted in 2012.