

## **ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT**

Department of Music  
College of Arts and Letters

Fall 2006

### **Review Team Members:**

Jackie R. Donath, Humanities and Religious Studies (team chair)

Hiliry Harvey, Department of English

Jonathan Porteus, Counselor Education

## I/OVERVIEW

### Documents Consulted

- *Department of Music Program Review Self-Study*, January 2006
- *California State University 2006-2008 Catalog*
- *Department of Music Program Review---Spring 2006 Appendix*
  - *Assessment Plan*
  - *Academic Program Review Report (Spring 1999)*
  - *Reponses to Program Review Report (Spring 2001)*
  - *Accreditation Visitor's Report (Spring 2001)*
  - *Institutional Research Documents*
  - *Alumni Survey*
- Vitae of Department of Music faculty
- Department of Music course syllabi
- Department of Music Staff Position Description Forms
- *Department of Music ARTP Policies and Procedures* (revised January 2006)
- Department of Music faculty meeting minutes
- *External Consultant Report for the Department of Music, May 10-11, 2006*

### Individuals Interviewed

- Dr. Ernie Hills, Chair, Department of Music
- Tenured Faculty Members, Department of Music
- Part-time Faculty Members, Department of Music
- Support Staff, Department of Music
- Department of Music students, both undergraduate and graduate
- Alicia Patrice, Fine Arts Librarian
- Dr. Jose Diaz, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Humanities, CSU Fresno, External Consultant

The Department of Music is one of eleven departments in the College of Arts and Letters. The Department also participates in the School of the Arts, an organizational framework which was constructed to facilitate collaboration among the departments of Art, Design, Music and Theater and Dance.

The Department describes itself as offering a "traditionally based course of study dedicated to providing thorough training and understanding for students planning careers in music." <sup>1</sup> The undergraduate curriculum has been developed to support two major baccalaureate foci---a Bachelor of Arts with a concentration in Music or Music Management; and a Bachelor of Music with the concentrations in instrumental, jazz studies, keyboard, music education, theory/composition or voice. The BA major requires 53-66 units (the music concentration has 23 units, the music management concentration requires 36 units) and the BM requires 76-79 units (units in the concentrations range from 33-36). The Department also offers a minor which requires 20 units.

The Department of Music also houses a graduate program which offers a Master of Music degree intended to provide its students with advanced study in one of five fields----conducting,

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Music, *Program Review Self Study* (California State University, Sacramento, January 2006), 3.

composition, music education, music history and literature, and performance. The Department also offers a post-graduate performer's certificate to "highly qualified instrumentalists, vocalists and conductors" who are accepted into the program after a "very competitive audition."<sup>2</sup>

The self study report identifies the Department's primary focus as performance and in-depth preparation in the academic disciplines of music. The Department's program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and "resemble those at major universities throughout the United States. The faculty, products of prestigious music schools and conservatories, strives to replicate the standards and curricular expectations of their own training."<sup>3</sup> The Department's 40 years of accreditation by NASM indicates a commitment to excellence that is noteworthy.

## **II/COMMENDATIONS**

- The Music Department is clearly made up of individuals who are talented artists, well-known in their field;
- The faculty of the Music Department demonstrates consistent commitment to their students;
- The Music Department's performance program is central to the University's mission of regional service and the 2010 theme of community engagement;
- Despite distinct problems with its performance facilities, the Music Department has continued to offer high quality live performances to the campus and the community-at-large;
- The Music Department faculty's outreach to the greater Sacramento area is admirable;
- The quality performances each year given by the Music Department faculty are impressive;
- The CSUS Music Department has undertaken a major initiative in The String Project;
- The annual Festival of New American Music organized and presented by the Music Department is to be commended.
- The Music Department carefully screens incoming music majors to ensure they are qualified for the program;
- The Music Department has created a solid and comprehensive performing arts environment for their students;

---

<sup>2</sup> *California State University 2006-2008 Catalog*, 500.

<sup>3</sup> Department of Music, 3.

- The individual attention given to each student by the faculty in the Music major is exemplary;
- Music Department staff members give enormous support to faculty and students, very often beyond what is expected of them;
- Students demonstrate a strong sense of overall admiration and respect for the Music Department faculty and staff;
- The Music Department has maintained a high rate of students in “good standing” especially when compared to the University average;
- The Music Department has been an active member of nationally important professional organizations such as NASM;
- The Music Department staff demonstrate genuine concern for Music students;
- The Department’s informal mentoring system to facilitate consistency across multiple section GE courses is a model effort.

### III/PROGRAM MISSION/RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS REVIEW

Item Found	Yes	No	NA
A. Undergraduate Program Mission and Goals	X		
B. Graduate Mission and Goals	X		
C. General Education Mission and Goals	X		
D. Evidence of Changes Made Since Last Review	X		
E. Program Change in Response to Discipline Changes		X	

#### A. Undergraduate Program Mission and Goals

A potential difficulty in the Department’s self-conceptualization appears in its Self Study description of its primary mission as the preparation of its “Bachelor of Arts students with a comprehensive [emphasis is the Review Team’s] education in music and the liberal arts and to also prepare students in the management emphasis with skills in business; to prepare its Bachelor of Music students with artistic understanding and capability for careers in performance, composition, music education and jazz; and to prepare talented graduate students, pursuing the Masters of Music degree for careers in the areas of conducting composition, music education, music history/literature and performance.”<sup>4</sup>

The Department also delineates a two-pronged secondary mission in its support of non-music majors. Through its contributions to General Education and Liberal Studies, the faculty of the Department of Music expands students’ awareness of and sensitivity to the meaning of music to educated people.

---

<sup>4</sup> Department of Music, 3.

The Department of Music includes an additional mission in its Self Study----the enrichment of regional culture through a heavy schedule of recitals and concerts available to the community-at-large.

While all of these activities are important and certainly appear to be worthy departmental goals, the variety of "missions" of the Department suggests that the faculty may be stretching themselves, their staff and their resources rather thinly in the service of being comprehensive and attempting to be all things to all students. A side effect of this "thinness" is that the Department's mission statements do not include any sort of value-based language that might provide a platform for assessment, improvement and planning, nor does the current set of mission statements facilitate reflection on the Department's goals.

Since a mission statement is the logical foundation of the long-range planning process, it should reflect the department's "big picture," defining why a department exists. It is clear to the Review Team that the Department of Music exists to make a difference in the lives of our students and in the quality of life in our community. Discussing the Department's reason for being and why faculty and staff do what they do should be the first step toward the refinement and narrowing of the Department of Music's mission.

An effective mission statement will provide a short, clear statement summarizing the Department's purpose. One measure of an effective mission statement is that each member of the Department will "understand, support, and be able to articulate that mission."<sup>5</sup> A concise and to-the-point mission statement will serve as the Department's touchstone, guiding decision-making and planning. Such a mission statement should clearly define the Department's services, doing so in a general, rather than in a reactive way; it should include the results it intends to accomplish in the community, and would focus on what is unique about the Sac State Music Department. In addition, a meaningful mission statement would be narrowed down in ways that would keep faculty and staff focused, while also being flexible enough to allow for creative ways for members of the Department to fulfill the mission.

Particularly in an atmosphere of decreasing expectations for support, the Department of Music, like all units of the University, must manage and focus its limited resources of people and money for maximum effectiveness.

While the Self-Study description of the mission is diffuse, the language the Department uses to describe itself in the *2006-2008 California State University Catalog* is much clearer and focused:

The fundamental purpose of the Sacramento State music curriculum is threefold: 1) to promote excellence in all aspects of music performance and academic course work, 2) to provide basic preparation for careers in music, and 3) to promote interest in all musical and artistic endeavors at the University and in the Sacramento community.

The main emphasis of the Music Department is upon performance. . .<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Peter F. Drucker, *The Five Most Important Questions You Will Ever Ask About Your Nonprofit Organization* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1993), 12.

<sup>6</sup> *California State University 2006-2008 Catalog*, 495.

It seems clear from this text, that the Department has made a start on a truly meaningful and effective mission statement and may now wish to consider refining its statement to lead to meaningful strategic and action planning.<sup>7</sup>

- **The Music Department should revisit and revise its undergraduate program's mission statement to align its strengths, values, priorities, activities and resources with its desired goals.** [1. a]

The Music Department is a wellspring for performing artists. All students highly praised their teachers and even mentioned they were attending this Music Department due to their individual teachers. The curriculum does not appear, however, to be abundantly responsive to new developments or changes. This is due, in part, to the fact that it is hard for a department to respond to new developments when, as in the Music Department, that would entail updated electronic equipment (please see notes in "physical facilities and equipment").

On the other hand, it must be noted that though the Department discusses a desire to be updated, most of its courses are focused on Applied Music, or the playing of the instrument itself. The Department might productively decide to embrace this vision of a Music Conservatory, per se, and center its future vision for itself as the region's foremost Music Conservatory in Classical music. This would not necessarily interfere with the Department's desire to enlarge its jazz program as many highly trained musicians are fluent in both media.

- **The Music Department could consider focusing on and embracing its unique strengths as a Conservatory for Performing Arts.** [1. b]

## **B. Graduate Mission and Goals**

The Department has defined its graduate mission, "to prepare talented graduate students, pursuing the Masters of Music degree for careers in the areas of conducting composition, music education, music history/literature and performance."<sup>8</sup>

The problems discussed in the preceding section on the undergraduate mission and goals are also reflected in the Department's graduate mission. A reconsideration of the mission of the graduate program might lead the Department to re-organize its Master of Music program. It was evident to the Review Team as a result of our conversations with the graduate students that they are mainly at Sac State to study under a particular professor. However, a number of graduate students in the Music Department voiced a desire to have more hands-on experiences in professional venues, and this seems justifiable since graduate students should be fine tuning their skills on their instruments or developing their abilities as composers, conductors, administrators, etc.

---

<sup>7</sup> Robert M. Diamond's *Designing and Assessing Courses and Curricula: A Practical Guide* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1998) might offer the department a useful starting point and resources for this often intimidating activity.

<sup>8</sup> Department of Music, 3.

- **The Department could consider how utilizing its already well-known programs could function as enticements for graduate student recruitment.**

[1.c]

The Music Department seems extremely well-placed to more explicitly create a graduate program that invites the student to participate alongside professional musicians. For example, the Music Department is widely known for its annual Festival of New American Music which showcases innovative cutting-edge music. An element of the Music Department's mission and curriculum could be to create a Master of Music Degree that revolves around and feeds into this yearly, unique avant-garde event. Similarly, the Music Department could encourage Composition students to write music for this event while receiving workshops from visiting composers. Likewise, Master students could be encouraged to perform and conduct the works of these visiting artists in temporary residence.

Another activity of note in the Music Department is its String Project, an outreach program. It would seem plausible that graduate students could be given administrative and/or teaching roles in this program to further their skills as Music Educators.

It also seems appropriate that the Department's graduate students have some role in supporting and implementing the Department and University's Destination 2010 goals. For example, they should participate in both the planning and functioning of the Performing Arts Building that is part of the campus' Master Plan. In this capacity, graduate students could:

- 1) Work administratively to book musical programs into the theater
- 2) Help stage manage orchestras, musicals, operas, shows
- 3) Work with sound engineers during performances
- 4) Act as liaisons for visiting performers and the University

Additionally, graduate students could be given pre-scheduled days on the Performing Arts Building calendar to:

- 1) Perform their own musical works
- 2) Stage manage student musical performances, such as musicals, etc.
- 3) Be the main sound engineer of student performances
- 4) Conduct the Music Department orchestra

The Music Department is already responsible for many highly praised musical programs; it would only be to its benefit and the benefit of its graduate students to create a Master of Arts in Music program that would allow these students to work within these venues alongside highly noted professionals, creating opportunities for mentored relationships within their specific field of musical interest. Developing such a professional/apprentice model might provide the Department's Master's Program with an opportunity to foreground its particular strengths.

- **The Music Department should revisit and revise its graduate program's mission statement to align its strengths, values, priorities and resources with its desired goals.** [1.d]

### C. General Education Mission and Goals

The Music Department defines its contribution to the University General Education Program as a "secondary mission."<sup>9</sup> The Department offers GE courses that it has defined as introductory and which it intends will "expand awareness and sensitivity" in the students who take these classes. While the overall goals of the General Education Program are outside the Department's purview, the Department might consider the meaningfulness of its contribution in a more discipline-specific and mission-driven way, producing a more explicit tie between the classes it offers to General Education students and departmental goals.

Certainly, the Department's contributions to Area C are fundamental to the learning goals of the General Education Program. Identifying the value of service to these students would elevate the meaningfulness of the Department's activities in this arena above the "mere" generation of necessary, but distastefully offered FTEs.

A similar feeling that service courses to Liberal Studies, also defined as part of the Department's secondary mission, are necessary, but fundamentally unattached to the primary goals of the Music Department reconfirms the Review Team's feeling that the development of a more comprehensive and holistic mission statement should be a central concern of the Department.

- **The Music Department should describe and align its desired goals in service to the General Education Program and Liberal Studies to a revised mission statement that clarifies the relationship between these activities and the Department's strengths, values and priorities.** [1. e]

### D. Evidence of Changes Made Since Last Review

The Self Study comments on the last review by asserting that the Department reviewed the Program Review Team's recommendations but undertook no substantive changes in response. A list of the 1999 Program Review recommendations and the Department's responses in 2001 were included in an appendix to the Self Study.

Several of the Department's responses in 2001 seemed to suggest changes or plans for changes which were not clearly documented in the 2006 Self Study:

- **Recommendations/Responses #7 and #15:** What changes/"progress" has the Department made in shifting enrollments from the BA program to the BM program? Did the Department Curriculum Committee revise the BA to include "a track in history and literature with limited performance standards?"<sup>10</sup> If so, did change produce the desired increase in majors?
- **Recommendations/Response #17:** Did the Department Curriculum Committee make any changes to the BM degree? Was a survey of BM graduates undertaken?
- **Recommendation/Response #18:** Has there been any review/revision of the Master of Music as anticipated in the 2001 response to the Program Review?

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>10</sup> Department of Music, *Program Review---Spring 2006 Appendix*, ("Responses to Program Review Report Spring 2001"), 2.

- **Recommendation/Response # 22a:** Was a follow-up alumni survey administered to refine the information received by the curriculum survey sent to alumni as part of the 1999 self-study? If so, what were the results and what action followed?
- **Recommendation/Response #22d:** Music 197: Music and Business appears in the *2006-2008 California State University Catalog* and is included as a core course in the Music Management Concentration. But there is no further information about the class' role as a potential capstone.
- **Recommendation/Response #24:** What standing committees were formed as a result of the 1999 Program Review? Does the Department have an executive committee?

**E. Program Changes in Response to Discipline Changes**

The Self Study cites a recent NASM publication, entitled *Creating a Positive Future for Art Music*, as an important document to understanding the pressures faced by departments of music who are committed to engaging in musical training and performance in a public setting. Although the concept of "art music" is referred to, the Music Department does not use this language in its curriculum, and the Self Study asserts that the Department sees no reason to change the ways its students are educated. The implication of this section of the Self Study seems to be that while conditions have changed over the past several years, the methods and theories of music education have not.

- **If the Department of Music feels that this NASM publication is so pivotal, it may want to consider using it as a touchstone for its Mission Statement.** [1. f]

**IV. ACADEMIC PROGRAM**

**1. Learning Expectations**

**Item Found**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>
A. Learning Expectations for Undergraduates	X		
B. Learning Expectations for Graduates		X	
C. Expectations Specified for Discipline	X		
D. Expectations for Reading and Writing in the Major		X	
E. Descriptions of Writing and Reading Assignments		X	only by course
F. Standards for Writing and Reading in Discipline		X	only by course
G. Plans for Development of Reading & Writing Skills		X	
H. Assessment Plans for Writing and Reading Skills		X	
I. Computer/Information Competence		X	
J. Expectations Clearly Communicated to Students		X	

**Item Found**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>
K. Curriculum to Achieve Learning Expectations		X	
L. Justification for Units in Excess of 120		X	as delineated by NASM
M. Matrix of Courses in Relation to Learning Expectations		X	related to subject/performance
N. Teaching Strategies ties to Learning Expectations		X	
O. Involvement in Distance and Distributed and Distance Education		X	

## A. Learning Expectations for Undergraduates

Drawing on the *NASM 2003-2004 Handbook*, the Self Study identifies four primary program goals for the preparation of students:

- A. To prepare students as performers on a major instrument
- B. To prepare students in the historical perspectives of music
- C. To prepare students in the theoretical elements of music
- D. To prepare students in the supporting areas of aural theory skills, keyboard skills, conducting, and technology

The Department also delineates undergraduate student competencies which support each of the program goals.<sup>11</sup>

While the program goals are laudable, they do not tie in as directly to student learning as they might and instead seem to emphasize the delivery of a specific curriculum rather than what students will learn. Although the competencies list is a more learning-based document, in the some specific areas, they seem unattached to particular, demonstrable learning:

- Performance, competency 5: "Been exposed to a large and varied body of music through attendance at recitals, concerts, operas, and other performances;"
  - History, competency 1: "Acquired a general knowledge of the major styles, genres, forms and composers from the middle ages to the present;"
  - History, competency 2: "Acquired an historical perspective of music based upon musical literature and the social context of its creation, including an exposure to music from non-western world cultures;"
  - Theory, competency 1: "Studies theoretical applications of music from the 17<sup>th</sup> century to the present;"
  - Supporting Areas, competency 1: "Acquired aural theory competency;"
  - Supporting Areas, competency 2: "Acquired keyboard competency;"
  - Supporting Areas, competency 3: "Acquired conducting and rehearsal skills
  - Supporting Areas, competency 4: "Acquired skills and understanding in the use of music technology."<sup>12</sup>
- **The Department should develop a set of undergraduate learning goals and competencies that explicitly describe active learning in the discipline**<sup>13</sup> [2. a]

The Self Study describes occasions for the communication of information about the program during summer and fall orientation, and information from the catalog is available in print and on the Department's website. The Department also employs a full-time staff member as a Music Admissions Counselor, who has primary responsibility for student advisement. In addition, applied music instructors meet weekly with students and are expected to discuss these matters with students.

However, the language of the Self Study focuses on program requirements and procedures and in the absence of well-defined learning expectations, these activities

---

<sup>11</sup> Department of Music, 5-6.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> The Department may want to consult Bloom's taxonomy. See Appendix D.

appear to be more mechanical than meaningful. The Self Study does not include any documentation of print or web-based materials that would communicate learning expectations to students. Additionally, the course syllabi the Team reviewed were uneven in their revelation of course and program-based learning objectives.

### **B. Learning Expectations for Graduates**

The Self Study does not include specific learning goals for graduate students in this section. Nor are there matrices in the assessment plan that focus on Master's level learning

- **The Department of Music should prepare a set of learning goals and specific competencies for its graduate program.** [2. b]

The Self Study does not really indicate how students are informed about learning expectations in a programmatic way at either the undergraduate or graduate level. It is possible that the Department might profitably draw on NASM language and processes to inform students at all levels of engagement in the major.

As a department, the faculty should come to consensus about what skills and competencies they want their graduate students to demonstrate, and at what levels, or in what venues. Again, the Review Team encourages the Department to strengthen the ties between graduate-level learning and performance to their wonderful yearly events (For example, "Composition Majors will have one piece preformed at the New American Music Festival," or... "at the end of this conducting class, each student will conduct for the festival or the String Project...")

### **C. Expectations Specified for Discipline**

Surprisingly, the Music Department does not specify different learning expectations for each of its degree programs----Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Arts with Music Management concentration, Bachelor of Music in Performance, Master of Music in Conducting, Composition, Music Education, Music History/Literature and Performance.

The Department should be able to develop specific learning expectations for each program. To this end, the Department might consider including language from NASM accreditation standards in both its programmatic learning expectations and embedding them at the level of course syllabi. This could be most simply done by referencing NASM standard-related content with a footnote and noting the standard. Consequently, each syllabus would reference National Standards that course objectives are seeking to meet and the syllabi from the Department's curriculum would, at a minimum, represent the NASM standards.

- **The Department of Music should create program-specific learning expectations.** [2. c]

### **D. Expectations for Reading and Writing in the Major**

The Department has not created specific reading and writing learning expectations for the major, although courses in music history and music education have written assignments.

### **E. Descriptions of Reading and Writing Assignments**

Unsurprisingly, given the Team's findings for item IV D, individual instructors are responsible for providing their students with descriptions of any reading and writing assignments within the context of course syllabi, specific course assignments and class meetings.

### **F. Standards for Writing and Reading in Discipline**

- **Recommendation: The Music Department could use the "Advisory Standards for Writing in the Undergraduate Major."** [2. d]

For writing in the Program, such as in a Music History class, it is recommended that the Department use a rubric to assess student writing. Please see Appendix C for a rubric already used by the English Department entitled, "Advisory Standards for Writing in the Undergraduate Major."

### **G. Plans for Development of Reading & Writing Skills**

The Department has no plans for developing students' reading and writing skills. The Self Study expresses basic satisfaction with the results of the writing instruction provided by the General Education Program.

### **H. Assessment Plans for Writing and Reading Skills**

The Department does not plan any assessment of students' reading and writings skills.

### **I. Computer/Information Competence**

The Music Department feels that its students enter the University with sufficient competence in general computer skills. The Self Study does not specifically address information competence. For the Department, an issue of significant concern is entering level student skills in computer music skills. Music 3: Midi Sequencing and Notation is designed to address this problem.

### **J. Expectations Clearly Communicated to Students**

There is anecdotal evidence that students in the Music Department undergo repeated evaluation and there is similar evidence that faculty practice a high level of sensitive and careful listening. However, students seem to depend on idiosyncratic, interpersonal interactions with their teachers in order to determine what is expected of them in any given situation.

- **The Department should provide students with a set of clear and explicit learning expectations, which are program-specific.** [2.e]

### **K. Curriculum to Achieve Learning Expectations**

The Review Team has noted its sense that the Music Department needs to develop a set of clear and explicit learning outcomes. This weakness in the undergraduate curriculum is magnified in the Music Department Master of Arts program. Graduate students remarked that they really had no choice in what classes they could take. They said that they could only take what was offered them, and that there was "...no room for choice." They also remarked that there were too many 299's offered in lieu of more formally designed classes, seminars, etc. One suggestion was that some courses be offered to

students that could be both upper division and graduate level, a split course that could be designed in a way that would ask more of the graduate students in terms of knowledge and workload. Under the supervision of the Graduate College, several departments have developed such courses successfully and the Faculty Senate has approved a set of guidelines and processes for such classes.

- **Some paired courses could be offered to both undergraduate students and graduate students.** [2.f]

A number of graduate students expressed a feeling of being overlooked as the Department's graduate offerings are limited. One reasonable approach that might address this issue would be to have graduate students work with the esteemed musicians who come from all over the world to perform at CSUS during the year.

Many of the graduate students suggested that they would welcome more workshops with visiting artists on campus. In this time of under-funding, this may seem hard to accomplish; however, since the Department of Music already has in place annual extravaganzas such as New American Music Festival, and other highly regarded venues, some graduate classes could be tied in with these ventures, even as 299s. In this way, a student of composition could work with a professional composer, a student conductor with a conductor, etc.

#### **L. Justification for Units in Excess of 120**

The required sequence of applied study on a major instrument has the potential to drive the actual number of units accumulated by a music major to significantly above 120.<sup>14</sup> The BA with a concentration in Music requires somewhere between 53 and 61 units (depending on how many units the student takes in applied music. The Department's catalog copy is a bit misleading, as a footnote indicates course requirements (MUSC 124 and MUSC 100 which are not listed in the course requirements of either concentration.)

Students choosing the Music Management concentration in the BA have an additional 13 units of requirements—a sequence of business-related classes.

The Bachelor of Music is a professional degree and requires at least 132 units. Similarly, students in the Bachelor of Music Education program are preparing for classroom teaching positions and it does not seem unreasonable for such a degree to require more than 120 units.

In discussions with undergraduate students, it appeared that they were pleased with the overall schedule of classes offered them. They voiced concern, however, with the G.E. requirements they had to take, and voiced a strong and consistent sense that their degree was overloaded with requirements which they felt weren't relevant.

The Department's perspective on its high unit major is contextualized by the NASM requirement that an accredited institution offer a music curriculum in which at least 65%

---

<sup>14</sup> *California State University Sacramento 2006-2008 Catalog*, 496.

of the classes are “Studies in the major and supportive courses in music.”<sup>15</sup> Compliance with this accreditation guideline would result in a 145 unit major and NASM has generously continued the accreditation of the BM degree despite this discrepancy. The Department has blamed the demands of the General Education program and cites its unresponsiveness to requests for a remedy to this problem.

A number of high unit majors have successfully convinced the University General Education/Graduation Requirements Policy Committee that courses required in the major actually meet the learning goals of specific GE Areas. There should be little question that the Music major includes such courses.

- **The Music Department could investigate which courses in the major could act as substitute General Education courses for Music majors and vigorously pursue this option with the University General Education Policy and Graduation Requirements Committee.** [2.g]

In addition, however, the Department should consider how it might reasonably reduce requirements in the major without damaging students' preparation. For example, while the curriculum is a solid, traditional classical music program, both faculty and students noted that the number of units required in piano for non-piano majors is burdensome.

- **The Music Department could consider reducing the number of piano classes required of non-piano majors.** [2. h]

#### **M. Matrix of Courses in Relation to Learning Expectations**

While the Music Department includes the requisite program-based matrices as an appendix to its Self Study, these charts do not highlight expected learning as much as they generally document the delivery of particular points of content in specific segments of the curriculum. For example, each matrix organizes courses and assessments into columns, but the learning which is being assessed is not detailed. While this may be, in part, a weakness of the matrix structure, which is not easily turned to complex information, the Department might add a column to the left side of the matrix which specifies a particular learning expectation and then indicates what courses include teaching and learning in that area.

Thinking about what precisely students are expected to learn rather than “preparation,” which is currently emphasized in the Music Department's primary goals, might lead the Department to rethink its list of student competencies and to develop more exact (and potentially more consistent) definitions of the levels of skills and knowledge it imagines a well-prepared baccalaureate holder would possess and be able to demonstrate (as opposed to “acquire” and “study”).<sup>16</sup>

- **The Music Department should revisit its matrix of courses in the context of specifically defined, departmental or programmatic learning expectations.** [2. i]

---

<sup>15</sup> Department of Music, 11.

<sup>16</sup> Department of Music, *Program Review, Spring 2006 Appendix, “Assessment Plan”* section, 1-2.

## N. Teaching Strategies tied to Learning Expectations

The Music Department does provide information about the relationship between its current assessment procedures and its major emphases in performance, music theory, music history and supporting areas. In this section of the Self Study Appendix, the Department provides detailed explanations of the processes by which students are assessed by the faculty.<sup>17</sup>

What is remarkable about these efforts is the degree to which, particularly in the performance, theory and supporting areas, the assessments are calibrated to the individual student's level at entrance and progress through the curriculum, which implies an unusual level of individuated teaching and learning in the Department.

## O. Involvement in Distance and Distributed Education

The Music Department offers two classes---MUSC 8: Basic Music and MUSC 18: Music Appreciation---on-line. The Department Self Study described plans to offer MUSC 129: American Music as an on-line class during the 2006-2007 academic year. These courses are intended to serve students in the General Education Program.

The Department offered no specific data related to or evaluation of these classes. One would expect they are assessed as part of the regular cycles of DDE and GE assessment.

## 2. Assessment

Item Found	Yes	No	NA
P. Detailed Description of Assessment Plan	X		
Q. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes		X	
R. Survey of Graduating Seniors	X		
S. Survey of Graduate Students		X	
T. Survey of Alumni	X		
U. Assessment Data analyzing program effectiveness of Department Learning Expectations		X	
V. Assessment Data analyzing program effectiveness of University Learning Goals		X	
W. Assessment analyzing Reading and Writing in the Major		X	
X. Assessment Data analyzing effectiveness of computer/information Competence Standards		X	
Y. Evidence of Consistency Across multiple sections of the same Course	X		
Z. Evidence of planning for improved Effectiveness of Program	X		

### P. Detailed Description of Assessment Plan

As mentioned above, the Music Department's *Program Review Spring-2006 Appendix* provides an overview of the ways in which the Department has planned and implemented student assessments. Especially given the personal attention provided to each student, the assessment plan should provide a framework within in which students' growth in each of the major competencies can be tracked and the evaluations which accompany specific points of contact between students and faculty should be made more public and transparent.

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid, 2-4.

While elements of an Assessment Plan are found in various documents, no coherent Assessment Plan is offered for the Department. Such a plan would include:

1. An annual timeline of assessment activities listing:
  - a. The name of each assessment
  - b. The intended recipient(s) of the assessment (e.g. Alumni)
    - i. The percentage of recipients if less than 100%
  - c. The person (s) responsible for administering the assessment
  - d. The person (s) responsible for coding/entering/analyzing
2. The timeline for analyzing and providing feedback on data
3. Policies/Procedures for Corrective Action (e.g. whether information will be considered by a Curriculum Review Committee and used to support program changes)
4. Policies/Procedures for dissemination of findings
  - a. The person(s) responsible for administering the assessment
  - b. The person(s) responsible for coding / entering / analyzing
5. The timeline for analyzing and providing feedback on data
6. Policies/Procedures for Corrective Action (e.g. whether information will be considered by a Curriculum Review Committee and used to support program changes)
7. Policies/Procedures for dissemination of findings

Ideally, data from assessments should be available to the public in a format that protects individual identity. The simplest way to accomplish this is through posting aggregated data on the Departmental Web Page.

- **The Department should ensure that meaningful data from its assessment activities be readily available to its students and interested members of the public in accessible formats. [3.a]**

Data should reflect 'growth' assessments of students in core areas as they move through the program (which is difficult to implement but made far easier by the fact that the Department is already conducting repeated assessments of students through their program).

Should this recommendation be accepted, it is recommended that student scores be aggregated in ways that are meaningful to prospective students and faculty engaged in quality improvement activities such as Curriculum Review. For example, data could be aggregated by all undergraduate students, by specific instrument, by 'upper division' students and 'lower division' students, or by any demographic variable(s) seen as important to faculty.

#### **Q. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes**

As is the case in many departments, particularly in the arts, what and how students learn and how the curriculum and/or specific kinds of teaching experiences affect learning remains largely a "mystical" realm. The Review Team assumes that student learning is being assessed in a variety of ways, but the Department is not effectively communicating its findings, processes or improvement efforts.

- **The Music Department should document its assessment of student learning outcomes and use its findings to contextualize curricular changes and program priorities.** [3.b]

### **R. Survey of Graduating Seniors**

Two programmatic surveys mentioned in various documents: a Graduating Senior Assessment Survey and an Alumni Survey. These instruments are mentioned in the Self Study, but little or no further references to them are made. Moreover, no reference to the frequency of these assessments is made.

It is hoped that these two assessments have a fair amount of consistency, thereby allowing responses to the same questions to be compared between graduating students and alumni. This would allow the Department to examine whether perspectives about the Department shift with exposure to the 'real world.' Further, such a process has the potential to address various unanswered questions that the Team had concerning the Department's role in preparing students pragmatically for positions in the regional employment market, or whether there is an undue emphasis on preparing students for Conservatory.

- **The Music Department should (1) document the frequency of administration of the Graduating Senior Assessment Survey and the Alumni Survey and (2) ensure considerable overlap between the two instruments.** [3.c]

### **S. Survey of Graduate Students**

If the Department is serious about its graduate program, all quality improvement efforts should be inclusive of graduate students, and sensitive to their specific needs.

- **The Music Department should undertake a regular schedule of graduate student surveys.** [3.d]

### **T. Survey of Alumni**

The *Self Study* and *Appendix* include references to a 2005 administration of an alumni survey. Certainly alumni should be consulted on a regular basis to help the Department evaluate the efficacy of its efforts. Surveying alumni would be particularly valuable in determining the 'direction' of pedagogy and the emphasis on performance versus teaching or other roles in allied professions.

- **The Department of Music should work with the Office of Institutional Research and append the standard Alumni assessment with more targeted, Department-specific questions.** [3.e]

### **U. Assessment Data Analyzing Program Effectiveness of Department Learning Expectations**

In conversation with the Review Team, the chair indicated that assessing students' performances is intricate and difficult to put into any sort of rubric form. However, the Review Team continues to be concerned with the ways in which performance standards

are communicated to the instrumentalists. Since the external consultant, Associate Dean Diaz, suggested an assessment format for instrumentalists, it would be a good idea to consider using said format, or constructing one that may more accurately reflect this Department.

The Review Team's central concern in this regard is our perception that with no commonly understood assessment tools to look at or discuss, there is no transparency to the program's way of evaluating its students. A significant issue then becomes germane---how do students know what elements of their performance (as instrumentalists or in more conventional classrooms) are being assessed or are seen as valuable components of the program in which they are participating. Providing regularized, standard criteria by which to evaluate their educational process would provide opportunities for students and faculty to engage in collaborative, explicit discussions of standards and expectations. Not only would such occasions benefit both students and faculty, they would also allow for program reform and provide an open invitation to discuss and revise said assessment tools.

For example, it could be possible to record each audition and then to type up the positives and negatives of the performance. As the student goes on to perform subsequent semester auditions, the jurist or teacher could once again type up a synopsis of the positive and negative aspects of the performance, alluding as well to the progress (or lack of progress) from the previous official audition. By doing so, this evaluative scaffolding would allow for a conversation between the student, teacher, and from time to time, outside reviewers.

To be more particular and rubric-based, it would not be unheard of to discuss specific points and then global points of a student's performance. One could mark a continuum, for instance, of a student's tremolo or vibrato, how in tune the performance was, or if the tone was a round whole sound vs. tight and lacking in acoustic richness. On a more global level, one could discuss the how pleasurable the music was, or artistic. It's understandable that the latter is harder to quantify and may not fit into a rubric paradigm; therefore, a short written note at the bottom of a rubric would be sufficient. However, specific attributes of musical performance such as keeping time, being in tune, tone quality, etc. could be discussed in a rubric-like fashion.

- **The Music Department should create an assessment tool that can be communicated to the student in order for assessment to be more transparent and understood.** [3.f]

It is clear that an enormous amount of assessment is conducted of students as they move through the program, as well as of the Department as students leave the program and as they reflect on the program when they are alumni. This level of evaluation is admirable and rare, but undermined by the following:

- A. poor documentation *of* and *at* assessment points
- B. missing assessment points
- C. the lack of consistent and valid and reliable documentation?

- **The Department should clarify its sequence and process of Undergraduate Assessments.** [3.g]

While Undergraduate Assessments follow an overall sequence (Entering Auditions, Semester Auditions, Jury Auditions, a Junior Qualifying Audition, Junior Recital Permission, Senior Recital Permission) this recommendation relates to a number of weaknesses in the process which the Team feels the Department can address with relative ease and which have the potential to have a significant beneficial affect on program quality and student success.

- **The Department should consider undertaking assessment of students' functions in collective /ensemble formats and not simply as soloists.** [3.h]

It appears that students are only assessed as soloists, without regard for their function in an orchestra or ensemble formats. This may be the prime focus of the Department (depending on the mission, goals, and objectives). If it is not, assessments of students in ensemble formats (trios, quartets, concerti, orchestras) would be indicated.

While it is not specifically stated in any documentation, undergraduate students in Music Department are subjected to a potentially elegant repeated measures assessment of their development.

- **The Department should document timelines for assessments as well as some of the anticipated analyses.** [3.i]

Formal undergraduate assessments are conducted in a sequence that includes:

- A. Entering Auditions
- B. Semester Auditions
- C. Jury Auditions
- D. a Junior Qualifying Audition
- E. Junior Recital Permission
- F. Senior Recital Permission

Each of these assessments is attended by criteria that determine a student's passage to the next level, a placement on hold, or demotion. However, there is no written mention of standard or objective criteria, and faculty members were not able to describe a consistent process across assessment points.

This system could be upgraded very quickly through consensus among faculty around a standard measurement that can be used for all assessments. Additionally, cut-points or anchors could be established for different levels of the program as desired. The same measure could be used for within- and between-performance analyses.

As an example of within-subjects analyses, individual students' growth could be compared at different time points. Skill-level or content knowledge could be assessed at entrance and at exit from the program. As an example of between-subjects analyses, groups of students could be clustered for analysis in cohorts and cross sectional analyses could be conducted of whole

cohorts of students at different points (e.g. all mean scores of students' Entering Audition could be compared to mean scores of all students' Junior Qualifying Audition). The ability to perform these kinds of analyses typically yields useful information, such as identifying periods of greatest and least 'growth' in students during their program of study, thereby allowing for discussion of pedagogical and other student needs during different phases in their education.

The Office of Institutional Research could link this program data with grades, GPA, and any other demographics that the Department might find meaningful or helpful.

Finally, there are no references in the Self Study to the specific ways in which graduate students in the Department are assessed.

- **The Department should prepare to assess graduate students.** [3.j]

#### **V. Assessment Data Analyzing Program Effectiveness of University Learning Goals**

Although the Self-Study asserts that, "the department's learning goals were constructed in alignment with the University learning goals," there is no data analyzing which specific baccalaureate learning outcomes inform Music Department student learning expectations.<sup>18</sup> Nor is there any documentation of a Departmental evaluation of its performance in the service of the University's Baccalaureate Learning Outcomes.

#### **W. Assessment Analyzing Reading and Writing in the Major**

The Department has undertaken no assessments of reading and writing in the major. The *Self Study* reveals that the Music Department has neither writing nor reading standards for the major.

#### **X. Assessment Data Analyzing Effectiveness of Computer/Information Competence Standards**

The Department surveyed alumni about their music technology skills and knowledge. The finding of a neutral stance among alumni was attributed to a single course offered, minimal equipment and lack of faculty in this area. The Department identified this as an area of concern.

The Music Department has not undertaken any assessment of their students' progress in the areas of general computer or information competence.

#### **Y. Evidence of Consistency Across Multiple Sections of the Same Course**

The Team's review of course syllabi revealed no significant inconsistencies in multiple section courses. The bulk of the Department's multiple section offerings are in General Education courses. One would expect any problems in this regard would be brought to the Department's attention during the 5-year cycle of GE Area C syllabi review undertaken by the General Education Course Review Subcommittee.

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, 13.

It is evident that the Department's current practice of having the chair perform reviews of multi-section course syllabi is effective.

## **Z. Evidence of Planning for Improved Effectiveness of Program**

From the Review Team's perspective, there is a significant disconnect in the Music Department's early assessment efforts and any plans for improvement of the program.

In response to Self Study Guideline Item H: "Discuss what changes are needed to enhance or improve the effectiveness of your academic program outcomes," the Music Department's response focuses on variety of funding, equipment and space needs and a problematic attack on the General Education Program requirements.<sup>19</sup>

While the Department has attempted to influence the General Education patterns of its majors by unsuccessfully appealing to the University General Education Graduation Requirement Policy Committee for substitutions, and while acknowledging the difficulties faced by students in high unit majors like music and the demands of the performance component of the major, the *Self Study* also explicitly refers to "a comprehensive education in music and the liberal arts. . ." as primary mission for the Department.<sup>20</sup> Such an assertion seems to contradict some of the negative comments about General Education in this section of the *Self Study*.

What these responses have in common is that they are not data-driven. No reference is made to the actual use of specific data, the persons responsible for analyzing it, or venues (e.g. faculty meetings) in which there might data-based discussion and subsequent action to improve program effectiveness.

- **The Music Department should establish policies and procedures that delineate use of data for program modification [3.k]**

Data should be used. Unused data undermine the integrity of an assessment system.

It is recommended that the Department establish policies and procedures that delineate use of data for program modification (curriculum review, course sequencing, course adoption, etc). 'Quality Improvement' actions on any of these procedures should be attended by an action plan, expected goals and objectives, a clear sense of the persons responsible, and timelines. For example, if alumni are suggesting that they should have had more training in recording themselves, an action plan could:

- A. identify the goals that could be established towards the objective of teaching students to record themselves
- B. persons responsible for identifying places in the curriculum where this could happen
- C. persons responsible for teaching such activities
- D. persons responsible for supporting such activities
- E. institutional supports needed for such activities
- F. timelines for the actions of each person.

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid, 13.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, 3.

- **The Department should create policies and procedures for data capture, data analysis, and data-based actions. [3.1]**

There is no clear policy or procedure on use of data, corrective action plans, and timelines. The Department needs to create a process that relates to the data usage and provides a method to undertake corrective actions.

### 3. General Education

Item Found	Yes	No	NA
A. Evidence exists that courses meet General Education criteria	X		
B. Evidence exists that service courses meet departmental and programmatic needs	X		
C. Evidence of consistency across multiple sections of GE courses	X		

#### A. Evidence exists that courses meet General Education criteria

All the Music Department's General Education courses were reviewed in the 2001-2002 cycle of assessment and syllabi review. All submitted courses were renewed. A similar review is currently being undertaken by the University General Education Policies/Graduation Requirements Committee and the General Education Course Review Subcommittee.

#### B. Evidence exists that service courses meet departmental and programmatic needs

The Music Department's only service course is MUSC 101: Experiences in Music. This is a class on music education for students enrolled in the Liberal Studies Program. The course was revised in 2002 at the request of Liberal Studies and continues to be part of the program.

#### C. Evidence of consistency across multiple sections of GE courses

The Department has instituted an informal mentor program to introduce new faculty to the requirements, teaching strategies and assignments associated with multiple section GE courses. This support system helps assure consistency. In addition, the Department Chair reviews multiple section course syllabi.

### 4. Diversity

Item Found	Yes	No	NA
A. Curriculum appropriately addresses increasing cultural diversity of CSUS students	X		
B. Department accommodates differences in student preparation and access to opportunity	X		
C. Department helps students gain effective knowledge of life in a diverse society	X		

#### A. Curriculum appropriately addresses increasing cultural diversity of CSUS students

The Music Department curriculum provides a variety of courses that reflect the diversity of the CSUS student body and our service region. A lower division core course in the major, MUSC 9: Music in World Cultures, introduces students to global musical literature. In addition through its concert program and performance study, the Music Department offers students both in the

major and in the larger campus and local community the opportunity to hear musical expressions from many cultures.

**B. Department accommodates differences in student preparation and access to opportunity**

The performance imperatives in the Music Department’s programs make differences in student preparation and access a significant matter. Although students come to the major at various levels of preparation and backgrounds, all music majors must meet entry levels of competence. Nonetheless, the Department is extremely interested in meeting students at their levels and helping individuals make progress in their skill and knowledge levels. Entrance auditions and placement examinations allow the Department to be extremely responsive and to focus on each student’s needs and success.

**C. Department helps students gain effective knowledge of life in a diverse society**

The Music Department believes that its ensemble experiences prepare students with the collaboration skills which will serve them well in the “real world.”

**V. STUDENTS**

<b>Item Found</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>
A. Student Profile	X		
B. Academic Support	X		
C. Professional Development	X		

**A. Student Profile**

The Department has maintained stable enrollment in its baccalaureate and graduate programs. The Department makes a compelling argument for its need to engage in ongoing, long-term and effective recruitment to supply its ensembles and orchestras as well as maintain a healthy cohort of majors. However, much recruitment is overly individualized---both in terms of specific students and by individual faculty.

The Music Department mirrors the ethnic patterns of the College of Arts and Letters with several small differences in terms of percentage of Asians, Hispanics and White students. Members of those groups are underrepresented in Music.

While the Department’s retention rate is similar to that of the College and University-at-large, it’s graduation rate is smaller. This difference was attributed by OIR to movement of Music majors into other majors on campus. This transfer is not mirrored by late movement into the major, in large measure because the eight semester applied music requirement no doubt discourages many students from changing to a music major once they’ve been attending CSUS for any significant period of time.

- **The Department needs to plan a more collaborative, consistent set of recruitment and publicity efforts. [4.a]**

Through discussions with students, faculty and staff, it has become clear that this Department is filled with very talented artists and dynamic players; however, individually and in groups, everyone manifested the same idea: each person is working individually and not as a team member. It appeared that many people were trying to accomplish

the same tasks individually. In areas such as recruitment and advertising if they worked together, so much more could be accomplished.

**B. Academic Support**

The Music Department depends on its tenured and tenure-track faculty in applied music and a full-time staff Admissions Counselor to advise majors. While the SNAPS survey identified “faculty in the major” as the most important resource for advising, the role of the Admissions Counselor should be of similar significance, given the departmental resources which are devoted to this position.

The Department did not offer any assessment or evaluative information to indicate student or faculty satisfaction with the current procedures and/or levels of academic support at the College or University level. Nor was there any mention of specific departmental advising materials made available to students during orientation or available on the Department’s web site.

- **The Music Department could profitably revisit its “informal” advising structure and develop materials and procedures that would serve students efficiently and effectively.** [4.b]

No changes to current practice were proposed.

**C. Professional Development**

The unique mentoring relationships which develop between applied music instructors and their students offer Music Department majors the opportunity to observe the demands of professional practice in a personal and effective way. The experiences of the Department’s concert and outreach activities also provide Music Department students with professional level experiences. The visibility of the Department’s students in the local community provides strong evidence of their professional caliber.

Music majors also participate in a number of organizations, such as Mu Phi Epsilon, the Student California Music Educators Association and student clubs which expose them to professional networks and allow them to make contact that will serve them well when they complete their university careers.

There is no discussion of special activities targeting the professional development needs of the Department’s Masters students.

- **The Department should organize a program of professional development activities and opportunities that serve the specific needs of its Masters’ students.** [4.c]

**VI. FACULTY**

<b>Item Found</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>NA</b>
A. Faculty Profile	X		
B. Faculty as Teachers	X		
C. Faculty as Scholars	X		
D. Faculty Service	X		

## **A. Faculty Profile**

The Self Study describes the part-time/fulltime ratio in the Music Department as almost 50/50. While the number of full-time faculty has remained relatively stagnant, part-time faculty hires have increased, a trend common to the College of Arts and Letters and the University as a whole. This ratio and dependence on part-time faculty for instruction places a special burden on the Department's full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty. While it was clear to the Team that the Music Department is staffed with exceptionally talented and committed part-time faculty, matters of governance and policy must fall to the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Especially in light of the issues that face the Department (and all departments in the University, for that matter), the faculty should meet consistently to discuss important issues and concerns. If the faculty meets on a consistent basis, they may find out how often they are duplicating efforts and come to a consensus about how to better manage their time and resources.

- **The Review Team recommends that the faculty consider decreasing their soloist frame of reference, order to increase and strengthen the collective formats in the Department.** [5.a]

It was the impression of the Review Team that many faculty members bring a natural *soloist* perspective to their activities and the Department and its students would benefit from more collective action. For example, recruitment and identification of potential students is done *by instrument*. While this is not necessarily a problem, the process appears to be rather inefficient in terms of each person performing all elements of recruitment and interfacing repeatedly with schools for individual contacts when numerous potential students may be contacted if various members of the faculty visited a campus.

## **B. Faculty as Teachers**

It was apparent from the Team's meetings with faculty members that, as instrumentalists, they have almost a mentor-like role with individual students---facilitating close and rich academic relationships. Students only had high praise for their teachers. The role of faculty as teachers in a one-on-one teacher-student relationship is very well established and strong. The role of faculty as teachers in a classroom setting was less obvious. This may be due to the strong music conservatory aspect of the Music Department.

## **C. Faculty as Scholars**

The vitae of the faculty, that were up to date, exhibited very strong scholarship, especially those who are full-time with a Ph.D. It was not possible to discern the scholarship of those faculty members whose vitae were missing or out of date. Similarly, a review of available course syllabi revealed a faculty which, in many important respects, embodies the CSU-system ideal of the teacher-scholar.

## **D. Faculty Service**

It is recommended that Faculty articulate the relationship between external activities (e.g. performances in the community) and faculty function.

The Music Department Faculty are very active in their performance in the community. While performance has great intrinsic value in terms of a faculty person's currency, as well as extrinsic value for RTP-related Service to the Community, some faculty are reporting over 300 performances per year. It would be beneficial if the faculty were able to better articulate the relationship between service in the community and their function as department faculty. This is especially the case with full-time faculty and has important implications for the Department's ARTP decision-making processes.

Given faculty members' busy external schedules, the Review Team was concerned about the level of serious commitment to the development of the Department and related activities that the faculty can make and wondered if these commitments to an external schedule result in a stagnant curriculum. It seems critically important that faculty not only articulate the relationship between their service in the community and faculty function but also explicitly link between these activities and the Department's understanding of its overall mission.

- **The Music Department faculty should discuss and then formally articulate the relationship between their external activities, faculty function, and the mission, goals and objectives of the Department.** [5.b]

## **VII. Support Staff**

The Review Team would like to make several recommendations regarding the Department's staff resources. In addition to the campus norm of administrative support coordinators, the Music Department employs several staff members to provide specialized services to faculty and students. The complexity of the Department's activities make this staff central to the success of the Music Department's efforts to provide both instruction and performances as part of its mission.

However, the roles of several staff seem ill-defined and the specific responsibilities of many of the staff should be clarified. The Review Team feels the Department might benefit from a re-examination of its staff structure and the specific responsibilities assigned to each position.

In discussions with the staff, it became apparent that some of the workers felt an obligation to do more than what was within their formal job descriptions. In fact, looking at the job descriptions it was noted that some descriptions of duties had not been updated, making it difficult for the worker to know to what extent a specific task was his/her responsibility or not. As an example, some technicians were doing the work that the College ITC should be doing.

- **The Department should up-date the job descriptions of each current staff member.** [6. a]

Though the staff as a whole spoke highly of the faculty, they did mention that communication was beginning to break down between the two groups. It should also be noted that weekly staff meetings are no longer part of the Department's agenda. It may be a good idea to start these meetings again so that concerns for, with, and by the staff can be discussed and acted upon in a timely manner.

- **Staff and Faculty should hold meetings on a consistent basis.** [6. b]

It appears that the Department enjoys the benefits of a very dedicated and tireless support staff. However, one impression of the Team is that there is an over-reliance on Department Support Staff when College-level supports exist.

One clear area of inefficient, and certainly unintentional overlap, relates to IT. Clearly, the Music Department has created a culture of “taking care of it in-house” in terms of IT, when this function is clearly a College Instructional Technology person’s function. It is not clear whether this is a result of Support Staff thinking that IT support will not meet faculty needs as well as they can; IT Staff lacking motivation or not responding in a timely manner; or some combination of factors. For the Review Team, this is another example of solo versus collectivist management and action, wherein individuals become responsible for whole processes versus parts of a team addressing smaller elements of the process.

- **Appropriate and consistent use of College-level resources would ease Department-level use of staff** [6. c]

A pattern has developed in the Music Department which leaves a great deal of work to fall on the shoulders of individuals. One example of this is the way that individual faculty members appear to be almost exclusively responsible for students in their areas of practice, leaving the Academic Advisor underutilized. This underutilization should be explored and corrected, or the need for the position should be reconsidered.

- **The Department should reconsider its current emphasis on using individuals for many functions and explore what tasks and responsibilities might be more effectively dealt with if shared or broken into more specific functions.** [6. d]

Individual faculty members also appear to be responsible for a great deal of the planning and inception of their performances. Therefore, despite the Department’s abundance of on- and off-campus offerings, it did not appear that there was a codified or staged procedure for convening events booking, reprographics, web-based advertising.

- **The Department should consider calling on the expertise of support staff earlier in the process of creating events, rather than continuing its excessive reliance on faculty initiative.** [6. e]

## VIII. SPACE

### A. Library

Since the Music Department’s extensive music collection has been moved to the Library Media Center, these holdings may be made more accessible to students. A protocol will be needed to identify students as Music students and deserving of enhanced access to these media.

Fang Gu, Director of the Media Center, reports that the Department's music holdings are being integrated with the Library's other holdings. A large proportion of the media have been already been added.

Given the critical role that media play in preparing students for performance as well as other academic tasks, all possible efforts to make media available to students as well as faculty should be made. For example, students could be given the same privilege as faculty when checking out media such as CDs and scores---meaning that they would be able to check media out of the library and not simply be limited to using the media within the library.

- **The Music Department could investigate what accommodations can be made within Library policies and practice to serve the special needs of their majors.** [7. a]

### **B. Performance Space**

The Music Department's theater has been a concern of all levels of the Department for quite some time, and has been on the forefront of the last self-study as well. Faculty members have stated as a group and individually that the recital hall in the Department is acoustically bereft. Not only is the quality of sound distorted during a performance, but the requisite air conditioning system can at times drown out the performer. It is imperative to be able to perform one's art in an acoustically acceptable arena. This is as important to a musician as a good sports stadium is to an athlete. Questions were raised by the committee about a possible inclusion of the Music Department into the Performing Arts Building that is part of the Master Plan, or Destination 2010. However, it appears that this building is fourth or fifth on the list and it may take up to ten years before this building begins construction. Therefore, it is highly recommended that the Music Department not wait for such a possibility in the future, but begin as soon as possible to realize its long held need for acoustically sound spaces of its own.

- **The Music Department's need for renovated or new solid, acoustically sound recital spaces should be a University priority .** [8. a]

### **C. Other Space Issues**

If the goals of the Music Department includes a desire to expand beyond performance, it is also recommended that it have a solid recording studio built where students and faculty can not only record their performances, but students can learn the business of music along the practical skills of sound recording, etc.

- **A recording studio should be built when the recital hall is renovated.** [8. b]

The physical facilities and equipment available to the Music Department and its students are very outdated. Students complain that they can hear other instruments throughout the building while they are trying to focus on their particular instrument or music score which can make the prospect of reading music nearly impossible to do. Staff has mentioned that there are no Smart Rooms in their building and that there is a need for them.

- **The Music Department’s physical facilities and equipment need to be updated.** [8. c]

Students resoundingly complained about their not having access to the building when needed. Since a student should practice four hours a day above and beyond expected school work and performances, quite often the only time left to practice is very late in the evening. Instructors also validated this concern of the students, and in fact instructors also complained that they did not have access to the building. In order for everyone to gain access, they have devised phone trees, etc.; however, in reality, sometimes doors are left open so students can get in, thereby creating the conundrum that the building now really is left vulnerable to theft.

It is highly recommended that in order to create a win-win situation – student/faculty access and protection of the building – that keycards are furnished to students and instructors so that access is attained while safety is maintained.

- **Given their special needs, Music Department students, faculty and staff need to have twenty-four hour access to the music building.** [8. d]

+++++

**The Program Review Team recommends approval of the Music Department program for the next six years.**

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Dr. Jose Diaz. "External Consultant Report for the Department of Music, May 10-11, 2006."

Appendix B: Sample Music Assessment Instruments

Appendix C: "Advisory Standards for Writing in the Undergraduate Major"

Appendix D: Bloom's Taxonomy

Appendix E: Compilation of Review Team's recommendations to the Music Department

**Appendix A**

**Dr. José Diaz:**

**“External Consultant Report for the Department of Music, May 10-11, 2006.”**

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SACRAMENTO

UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW

EXTERNAL CONSULTANT REPORT

FOR

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND LETTERS

MAY 10 – 11, 2006

## **Introduction**

I wish to express my gratitude for the most gracious hospitality received during my visit to California State University Sacramento. The cordial and open visits with Associate Vice President and Dean of Academic Program Dr. Mike Lee and Dean of Arts and Letters Dr. Jeffrey Mason were informative and greatly appreciated. Special thanks are extended to Music Department Chair Dr. Ernie Hills, the campus review team chaired by Dr. Jackie Donath, and the music faculty and staff for their warm hospitality and coordination of activities during the visit. Everyone's openness and warmth, including that of the students, helped make this visit an enjoyable experience.

Any omission of responses to CSU Sacramento's *Guidelines for External Consultant's Report* for this program review is unintentional and/or relevant materials were unavailable to me during the site visit and subsequent writing of this report.

## **Commendations**

The department is to be commended for having successfully resolved most of the issues raised during its *Program Review of Spring 1999*. In addition, the department is to be commended for the outstanding job it does in providing majors and other university students with quality instruction, a variety of opportunities to develop artistic and intellectual skills, and for creating a teaching environment conducive to student learning and faculty productivity. Specific strengths of the department are:

1. Highly qualified faculty committed to the success of their students, current in their area of expertise, and actively engaged in scholarly research and publication as well as artistic presentations in local, regional, national and international venues. The discussion of gender and ethnic balances in the arts invariably tends to give way to more important matters of artistic and/or scholarly accomplishment in addition to possession of appropriate credentials and experiences for the position. It is in the best interest of the department to offer positions to the most highly qualified applicants regardless of their gender or ethnicity. While at present the faculty composition does not reflect the gender and ethnic demographics of its region, its balance between the two considerations are likely more reflective of its candidate pool.
2. Successful NASM accreditation review that approved renewal of Final Approvals for the Bachelor of Arts in Music, the Bachelor of Music in Performance, the Bachelor of Music in Theory/Composition, the Master of Music in Composition, the Master of Music in Conducting, and the Master of Music in Performance. Plan Approval was granted for the Master of Music degrees in Music History and Literature and Music Education, Bachelor of Music degrees in Music Education and Jazz Studies, the Bachelor of Music in Music Management, and the Performer's Certificate.
3. Vibrant guest artist series including the New Millennium Concert Series and the Festival of New American Music. These programs enhance student learning through exposures to and contact with world-class artists and composers. At the same time these provide stimulating and innovative high caliber performances to the region's musical community.

4. Talented and dedicated students who have a strong sense of community in the program and within their respective areas of study.
5. Comprehensive Assessment Plan.
6. Strong advising program for entering students.
7. Successful hiring of an ethnomusicologist.
8. Clearly articulated learning outcomes for GE courses consistent with campus policy.
9. Freshman and Transfer Student retention rates within .10 of the University average.
10. Undergraduate and Transfer Student graduation rates within .10 of the University average.
11. Faculty accessibility to students for career/professional advising and mentoring.
12. Strong cohort of graduate students who share a strong sense of community with each other and with their faculty.
13. A healthy and respectable SFR between 12.2 and 13.9 given the nature of the discipline that is heavily dependent in one-on-one instruction and class sizes under 25 students.
14. Mostly clear publications and advising materials outlining degree and program requirements.
15. Up-to-date articulation agreements with regional community colleges.
16. Excellent and clearly defined Department ARTP Policies and Procedures document.
17. Excellent and newly renovated/outfitted Listening Lab with adequate score and sound recording resources for student and faculty use.
18. Adequate University Library resources including a CD collection recently moved from the department and an extensive web sound recording database, The Classical Music Library.
19. Substantial offerings of service courses to support GE and Liberal Studies that typically generates over half (274 in AY 05-06 and 297 in AY 04-05) of the department's average annualized FTE of 450 for the past two years. This balance between the department's major and service courses clearly demonstrates its responsiveness and sensitivity to generating resources to help sustain the more expensive course delivery modes.
20. Clearly articulated Mission Statement.
21. Healthy major enrollments in both undergraduate and graduate programs.

#### **Recommendations for improvement:**

1. The department should follow through with its stated intention to revise it's advising materials to reflect accurate program requirements.

In it's *Responses to the Program Review Report* of Spring 2001, the department stated:

“Beginning in Fall 2001, the department's advising materials will be revised to include two methods for completing a Concert Attendance Requirement. One option will be for students to enroll in MUSC 100. The other option will provide a procedure for students to report their concert attendance with their applied professor. This option will not require the student to enroll in an additional unit.”

The catalog does not include 8 units of MUSC 100 in the total unit count for the degree. Instead, the advising notes states “Each music major is required to

attend a minimum of 10 concerts and/or recitals each semester. MUSC 100 meets this requirement.” The department’s advising sheet lists “Required Additional Units (8 units) of MUSC 100.” There still exists an apparent contradiction between degree requirements as presented in the catalog copy and the advising materials.

2. The department should now begin to implement the next stage of its Assessment Plan that can include the following steps:
  - A. Align program goals with course goals and develop learning outcomes to achieve program goals. A sample review of major course syllabi revealed that these were highly individualized and inconsistent in listing learning outcomes. Some listed Primary Program Goals and some listed course goals of the instructor.
  - B. The department should develop clearly articulated direct measures of student learning. It is in the nature and history of the discipline that there exist numerous direct measures of student learning such as Keyboard Proficiency Examinations, Aural Theory Barrier Examinations, Juries, Junior Qualifying Auditions, Junior/Senior Recital Permissions and the culminating experience itself, the Senior/Graduate Recital. In this context the department appears to exceed the campus’ assessment requirements. There are forms that document these assessments and serve as records of date of performance and repertoire studied with space for subjective comment that determines passing or failure. But these forms do not serve as direct measures of student learning.

Objective evaluation of artistic performances may appear at first to be difficult to articulate and it is indeed a difficult task for music faculty to break down what we all agree to be a holistic assessment into separate parts precisely because the listener’s reaction to performances very often are greater than the sum of their parts. However, it is not too arduous a task to articulate those very details musicians methodically use and teach toward achieving artistic expression. Indeed no musician will argue that it is the degree of mastery of these technical considerations that determines the overall degree of artistic success. From here it is simply a matter of articulating the particular techniques and skills taught in order to provide a basis for objective and direct assessment that can inform artistic success. Attached please find copies of sample assessment instruments developed by the Department of Music at California State University Fresno for these purposes.

- C. The department should include program goals, competencies, and assessment procedures for its graduate program in its Assessment Plan. Assessment of the department’s graduate program is noticeably absent from all the documents submitted for review.
- D. Consider revising the Alumni Survey or develop a more informative indirect measure of student learning. The only assessment data produced so far is from an indirect assessment tool, the *Alumni Survey* of 2005. As such the Survey does inform the department about how good of job alumni *thinks* it is doing in meeting its program goals. However, question no. 4 of the Survey asks alumni to agree or disagree as to whether or not the student participated in an ensemble experience throughout the baccalaureate program. This indicates that the data collected from this survey may be flawed if graduate alumni were included.

Moreover, the question itself may or may not mean anything to the department because semesterly ensemble experience is a curricular requirement. This question is like asking alumni whether or not they agree or disagree with having fulfilled all course requirements for the degree.

- E. Develop an assessment matrix of writing standards appropriate to the scholarly requirements of the major. The *Self Study* states that there is no writing standards in the major (p.12) and the Chair confirmed in his meeting with the review team that the department had not yet been able to address this issue.
3. Explore potential for offering more course choices to Graduate Students consistent with concentration course listings in the catalog. Graduate students who met with the review team expressed a desire to have more course choices in their concentrations. They stated that they were limited to taking whichever course was scheduled in any given semester. The catalog does give the impression that students have various course options.
4. Improve academic advising for returning students to better effect graduation rates and time to graduation. An analysis of median graduation rates in this department for the years 1994-2003 indicate a comparably lower graduation rate (.06) within five years as compared to the University average of .19. The graduation rate improves to .21 for the department at 8 years, but is still out of comfortable range from the University graduation rate of .38. Transfer student graduation rates are at .10 of the University at 3 years and are the most aligned (.32) to the University rate of .38 at 6 years. 52 students in the BM degree plan have an unidentified concentration. Another obvious factor that may contribute to the comparatively low graduation rate is the high unit count for the degree compounded by hidden units (MUSC 100 and MUSC 14 A-C), which is all the more reason why students would benefit from a more structured advising system to help guide them through timely completion of the degree.

Undergraduate students related that academic advising was “hit and miss,” and the graduate students echoed their statement. Many students complained that it was difficult to schedule appointments with the Department’s Admissions Counselor for academic advising and when appointments were scheduled, the counselor was often absent.

The *Self Study* states that the 2003 SNAPS survey indicates that students rate major faculty as the most important resource for academic advising. However, the students attending the meeting with the review team did not give the review team the impression that this was the case. Graduate students stated that they were left to their own devices for seeking academic advising and for filing appropriate forms and clearances with the Office of Graduate Studies. The Department’s website states that students are assigned to an applied instructor for advising, but students did not communicate to the review team that this was in fact a practice in the department. Information about progress through the department’s degree plans are clearly stated on its website, but students did not indicate that they know about this resource, nor were graduate students aware of a graduate student handbook that the website states is available upon request in the department office. There is an exemplary Student Teachers Guidelines Handbook available through the department website.

5. Explore the possibility of consolidating areas taught by part-time faculty into one or

more full-time lectureships or tenure-track positions. According to the self-study there is an approximate 1:1 ratio between full-time and part-time faculty. While this ratio may provide the flexibility to enhance the department's ability to support its various program offerings, it may pose difficulties in terms of the department's capacity to participate in faculty governance at levels beyond the department and in reaching consensus on matters important to the department.

6. Have more regular faculty meetings or schedule longer meeting times. Part-time and full-time faculty who attended meetings with the review team stated that they were regular participants in the governance of the department. However, there was some concern expressed about the frequency of department meetings. Some faculty members felt that a one-hour department meeting per month wasn't sufficient for them to address more substantive issues.
7. Encourage faculty to be more engaged with university governance. Outside of the requisite department representative to the Faculty Senate, no evidence was provided to indicate that the department was actively involved in the governance of the university. Some faculty expressed concern that the university as a whole, particularly upper administration, was unaware of the excellence of this program. One way to begin enhancing visibility for the program on campus is for its faculty to participate more fully in university governance thereby giving voice to its concerns and adding its voice to the policy-making process at the university and college levels.
8. Seek Athletic Program support for the Marching Band. The sole function of a university Marching Band and its ancillary units such as Pep Band are to support and enhance the campus' athletic program. In the vast majority of institutions across the nation, the Marching Band is at the very least partially subsidized, if not substantially subsidized by athletics.
9. Explore ways to improve operational efficiency and productivity and improve working relationships between faculty and staff. The meeting with the department's seven staff employees revealed problems with procedures for admission to the major and a confusion about who is responsible for addressing the department's computer and computer-related technology issues. Some staff members related that it is becoming more difficult to meet the increasing demands of the department in a timely way. Friction exists between faculty and the staff member who is in charge of scheduling venues/development of promotional materials, as well as with the staff member who is in charge of audio and visual recording/instructional technology. The source of this friction may stem from faculty not fully informed or cognizant of staff workload and in the case of one staff member, the very real need for a flexible adjusted work schedule. In general staff members felt that faculty were insensitive to the amount of work they perform and felt unappreciated for services they provide. Staff related that they once had regular staff meetings, but this practice has been abandoned.
10. Develop a department vision supported by long-range planning. Faculty complained about a lack of scholarship monies, financial resources to enhance and support instructionally related activities, a perceived lack of collegial and administrative support, and a lack of collaborative recruitment efforts. The department currently services a total of 186 undergraduate majors and 30 graduate majors with no students declaring Jazz Studies as a concentration. Distribution of graduate students among

the concentrations was no provided so I cannot offer commentary on the graduate student distribution.

Even though the Dean expresses support of the program's mission, there is a real possibility of a hefty reduction in the College's allocation. I encourage the department to plan and articulate a vision for what it wants to accomplish in the next five to ten years. Consider whether or not the department will be able to effectively deliver all aspects of that vision given current or reduced funding levels. If additional resources are needed to reach that vision, from where will these come? Is the department willing to exchange some of the weaker elements of its program to achieve its vision? What internal measures will be employed to reach its vision? How will it collaborate with other campus units to achieve its vision? Potential outcomes for reaching the department's vision can include a.) a department faculty handbook outlining its policies, procedures, and governance structure, b.) an equipment and facilities maintenance and replacement plan, and c.) a development plan.

---

José A. Díaz, Associate Dean  
College of Arts and Humanities  
California State University Fresno

---

date

attachments

## **Appendix B**

### **Sample Music Assessment Instruments**

*California State University Fresno*  
**Individual Performance Assessment Form**

Student's Name \_\_\_\_\_ Performance Date \_\_\_\_\_

MA or BA Option \_\_\_\_\_ Instrument/Voice Type \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Performance (Circle One): Recital Jury I Jury II Performance Examination

Rating Scale: Outstanding = 6 (A+), Excellent/Very Good = 5 – 4 (A/B), Satisfactory = 3 (C), Unsatisfactory/Failing = 2 – 1 (D/F)

**Assessment of Technical Mastery:**

**Rating** \_\_\_\_\_

*Outstanding (6):* The student performs with pitch, intonation, articulation, and rhythmic accuracy at a very high level. Throughout the performance, the student's technical mastery is easily and consistently executed, and clearly exceeds the fundamental technical standards of their instrument or voice.

*Excellent/Very Good (5 – 4):* Throughout the performance, the student is well prepared and delivers a competent performance that exceeds the fundamental performance standards for technical mastery of their instrument or voice.

*Satisfactory (3):* Throughout the performance, the student is adequately prepared and delivers a performance that meets the fundamental performance standards for technical mastery of their instrument or voice.

*Unsatisfactory/Failing (2 – 1):* The student has significant technical weaknesses throughout the performance and either barely meets or falls below the fundamental performance standards for technical mastery of their instrument or voice.

**Assessment of Musicianship:**

**Rating** \_\_\_\_\_

*Outstanding (6):* The student clearly performs with a musical understanding at a very high level.

*Excellent/Very Good (5 – 4):* The student performs with above average application of fundamental musicianship skills.

*Satisfactory (3):* The student performs with basic application of fundamental musicianship skills.

*Unsatisfactory/Failing (2 – 1):* The student either barely meets or falls below a fundamental level of musicianship skills.

**Breadth of Repertoire:**

**Rating** \_\_\_\_\_

*Outstanding – Excellent (6 – 5):* The repertoire is above the standard acceptable for the student's current level of development and demonstrates an exceptional variety of musical styles and genres.

*Very Good - Satisfactory (4 – 3):* The repertoire is at the standard acceptable for the student's current level of development and demonstrates a sufficient variety of musical styles and genres.

*Weak – Failing (2 – 1):* The repertoire is below the standard acceptable for the student’s current level of development and does not demonstrate a sufficient variety of musical styles and genres.

**Stage Presence:**

**Rating \_\_\_\_\_**

*Outstanding - Excellent (6 – 5):* The student is dressed appropriately, exhibits confidence, poise, appropriately acknowledges other performers, bows appropriately, is clearly comfortable with his or her environment and is enjoying the act of performing.

*Very Good - Satisfactory (4 – 3):* The student is dressed appropriately, exhibits confidence, poise, appropriately acknowledges other performers, bows appropriately, but is slightly uncomfortable with his or her environment and/or with the act of performing.

*Weak – Failing (2 – 1):* The student did not dress appropriately, lacks two or more of the following elements: confidence, poise, appropriate acknowledgement of other performers, bowing. The student is clearly uncomfortable with his or her environment and/or with the act of performing.

**Memorization (if applicable):**

**Rating \_\_\_\_\_**

*Outstanding – Excellent (6 - 5):* The student performs with few or no lapses of memory. Recoveries, if any, do not detract from the presentation.

*Very Good - Satisfactory (4 – 3):* The student performs with few or no lapses of memory. Recoveries, if any, are noticeable and may or may not detract from the presentation.

*Weak – Failing (2 – 1):* The student performs with frequent and/or very noticeable lapses of memory. Recoveries, if any, are noticeable and detracted from the presentation.

**Overall Assessment of Performance:**

**Rating \_\_\_\_\_**

*Outstanding (6):* The student was rated outstanding in all assessment categories. The student’s performance was at or near a very high artistic level.

*Excellent - Very Good (5 - 4):* The majority of the student’s ratings were excellent or very good in each assessment category. The student exceeded established artistic and technical standards for his/her studio.

*Satisfactory (3):* The majority of the student’s ratings were excellent or very good in each assessment category. The student satisfactorily met established artistic and technical standards for his/her studio.

*Unsatisfactory – Failing (2 – 1):* The majority of the student’s ratings were unsatisfactory or failing in each assessment category. The student barely met or fell below the established artistic and technical standards for his/her studio.

**Faculty Comments:**

**Overall Rating:** \_\_\_\_\_ **A – C = Pass D – F = Fail**

(Tally ratings and divide by number of ratings assigned to arrive at corresponding letter grade)

**Faculty committee member signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

*adopted Fall 2004*

**California State University, Fresno, Department of Music  
PIANO PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION ASSESSMENT FORM**

Student \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Copies of each evaluator's observations will be made available to the student. A passing score requires that the summary in each category be "outstanding" or "satisfactory." Student must pass each of the seven categories (not necessarily at the same time) in order to successfully complete the Piano Proficiency Exam.

**Outstanding      Satisfactory      Unsatisfactory**

**I. Prepared pieces** (summary)      \_\_\_      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

Note  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Rhythmic  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Appropriate  
tempo \_\_\_\_\_

Tempo  
stability \_\_\_\_\_

Dynamics  
(horizontal) \_\_\_\_\_

Dynamics  
(vertical) \_\_\_\_\_

Style  
\_\_\_\_\_ PASS/FAIL

**II. Two-hand transposition** (summary)      \_\_\_      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

Correctly identifies new key  
signature \_\_\_\_\_

Right hand note  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Left hand note  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Tempo  
consistency \_\_\_\_\_

    \_\_\_\_\_ PASS/FAIL

**III. Concert pitch realization** (summary)      \_\_\_      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

Correctly identifies new key and key signature  
Note \_\_\_\_\_

Note  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Rhythmic  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

    \_\_\_\_\_ PASS/FAIL

**IV. Sight reading** (summary)      \_\_\_      \_\_\_      \_\_\_

Right hand  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Left hand  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Rhythmic  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Tempo  
\_\_\_\_\_

consistency \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ PASS/FAIL

**V. Score reading** (summary) \_\_\_\_\_

Upper voice note  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Lower voice note  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Rhythmic  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Tempo  
consistency \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ PASS/FAIL

**Outstanding      Satisfactory      Unsatisfactory**

**VI. Harmonization** (summary) \_\_\_\_\_

Chooses appropriate  
harmonies \_\_\_\_\_

Chooses appropriate chord  
pattern \_\_\_\_\_

Keeps pattern consistent throughout  
and rhythmically

secure \_\_\_\_\_  
Right hand

accuracy \_\_\_\_\_  
Left hand

accuracy \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ PASS/FAIL

**VII. Accompaniment** (summary) \_\_\_\_\_

Note accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Rhythmic  
accuracy \_\_\_\_\_

Accommodates to soloist's  
tempo \_\_\_\_\_

Sensitive to soloist's breathing and  
rubato \_\_\_\_\_

Balance with  
soloist \_\_\_\_\_

Style \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ PASS/FAIL

**COMMENTS:**

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

*Adopted Fall, 2003*

## Music History Competencies Rubrics

The student's knowledge of music history will be evaluated based on four major categories:

- knowledge of various style periods
- knowledge of the terminology and analytical tools of music
- knowledge of important composers, authors, theorists and publishers within each style period
- knowledge of a basic repertory of music drawn from each of the style periods.

The student's level of competency will be measured on the following scale:

### **minimum competency:**

- able to name and give approximate dates to the major style periods
- able to define basic music terminology (major, minor, monophonic, etc.)
- able to name major composers within each style period
- able to describe general musical characteristics of each style period

### **satisfactory competency:**

- able to name, define and give dates for stylistic subcategories (e.g. - minimalism, ars nova, etc.) within each style period
- able to discuss key genre (opera, concerto, etc.) and forms (sonata, rondo, etc.) within each style period
- able to name minor composers within each style period
- able to name major musical works within each style period and identify a core repertory when played

### **advanced competency:**

- able to trace the historical development, across style periods, of key genre, forms and ensembles (symphony, string quartet, etc.). Aware of different ideas of performance practice in different style periods.
- able to identify theoretical concepts and compositional methods within each style period
- able to name key theorists and writers about music from the different style periods
- able to identify and discuss scores of various key genres from each style period. Able to name key treatises and writings about music from the different style periods.

### **superior competency:**

- able to place the music of each style period into a cultural, historical and philosophical context. society. Able to compare and contrast genres, ideas, etc. from different style periods. Aware of key people, ideas, events, etc. that shaped music and its place in
- able to analyze important works from each period with regard to style, form, harmony, counterpoint, idiomatic writing for voice or instruments, text setting, etc.
- able to name important performers, publishers, librettists, and other important people in the development of music
- able to apply historical knowledge to informed performance practice

## **Appendix C**

### **“Advisory Standards for Writing in the Undergraduate Major”**

## ADVISORY STANDARDS FOR WRITING IN THE UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR

### **A EXCELLENT--A paper in this category**

- X Addresses the assignment thoughtfully and analytically, setting a challenging task.
- X Displays awareness of and purpose in communicating to an audience.
- X Establishes a clearly focused controlling idea.
- X Demonstrates coherent and rhetorically sophisticated organization; makes effective connections between ideas.
- X Provides clear generalizations with specific detail, compelling support and cogent analysis.
- X Cites relevant sources and evaluates their validity, effectively integrating them into text when appropriate.
- X Displays superior, consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English.

*ESL/Dialect Guideline: Grammatical errors are rare and do not interfere with overall effectiveness of paper; occasional imprecision in word choice and usage may occur.*

### **B STRONG--A paper in this category**

- X Addresses the assignment clearly and analytically, setting a meaningful task.
- X Addresses audience needs and expectations.
- X Establishes a clearly focused controlling idea.
- X Demonstrates clear and coherent organization.
- X Provides clear generalizations and effective support and analysis.
- X Cites relevant sources, effectively integrating them into text when appropriate.
- X Displays consistent control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English.

*ESL/Dialect Guideline: Some grammatical errors may occur throughout the paper but do not interfere with overall effectiveness; occasional inappropriate word choice or incorrect usage may occur.*

### **C ADEQUATE--A paper in this category**

- X Addresses the assignment with some analysis.
- X Addresses most audience needs and expectations.
- X Establishes a controlling idea.
- X Demonstrates adequate organization.
- X Provides support for and some analysis of generalizations.
- X Cites appropriate sources, adequately integrating them into text.
- X Displays adequate control of syntax, sentence variety, word choice, and conventions of Standard English; errors do not slow the reader, impede understanding, or seriously undermine the authority of the writer.

*ESL/Dialect Guideline: Grammatical errors, inappropriate word choice, or incorrect usage may occur throughout the paper but rarely interfere with effective communication.*

### **D SERIOUSLY FLAWED--A paper in this category**

- X Addresses the assignment inadequately.
- X Shows insufficient audience awareness.
- X Strays from the controlling idea, or the idea is unclear.
- X Displays formulaic, random, or confusing organization.
- X Lacks generalizations, or provides generalizations with inadequate support or analysis.
- X Fails to cite sources or cites and/or integrates them inappropriately.
- X Shows deficient control of syntax, word choice, and convention of Standard English; errors impede understanding.

*ESL/Dialect Guideline: Serious and frequent errors in grammar, word choice, or usage hinder communication.*

### **F FUNDAMENTALLY DEFICIENT--A paper in this category**

- X Fails to address assignment.
- X Demonstrates a lack of audience awareness.
- X Lacks a controlling idea.

- X Lacks organization or organizes illogically.
- X Displays inability to generalize, analyze, or support ideas.
- X Fails to use outside sources or misuses the texts of others.
- X Shows inadequate control of syntax, word choice, and convention of Standard English.

*ESL/Dialect Guideline:* An accumulation of serious and frequent errors in grammar, word choice, or usage prevent communication.

*Guidelines for Evaluating the Writing of ESL students:* The writing of ESL students should be held to native speaker standards for content and addressing the assignment. However, because certain types of errors persist in ESL writing even at an advanced level, some accommodation for ESL features is appropriate.

CSU,Sacramento, Fall 1999; univstads.99

**Appendix D**  
**Bloom's Taxonomy**

## Learning Domains or Bloom's Taxonomy

### The Three Types of Learning

There is more than one type of learning. A committee of colleges, led by Benjamin Bloom, identified three domains of educational activities:

Cognitive: mental skills (Knowledge)

Affective: growth in feelings or emotional areas (Attitude)

Psychomotor: manual or physical skills (Skills)

Since the work was produced by higher education, the words tend to be a little bigger than we normally use. Domains can be thought of as categories. Trainers often refer to these three domains as KSA (Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude). This taxonomy of learning behaviors can be thought of as "the goals of the training process." That is, after the training session, the learner should have acquires new skills, knowledge, and/or attitudes.

The committee also produced an elaborate compilation for the cognitive and affective domains, but none for the psychomotor domain. Their explanation for this oversight was that they have little experience in teaching manual skills within the college level (I guess they never thought to check with their sports or drama department).

This compilation divides the three domains into subdivisions, starting from the simplest behavior to the most complex. The divisions outlined are not absolutes and there are other systems or hierarchies that have been devised in the educational and training world. However, Bloom's taxonomy is easily understood and is probably the most widely applied one in use today.

#### Cognitive

The cognitive domain involves knowledge and the development of intellectual skills. This includes the recall or recognition of specific facts, procedural patterns, and concepts that serve in the development of intellectual abilities and skills. There are six major categories, which are listed in order below, starting from the simplest behavior to the most complex. The categories can be thought of as degrees of difficulties. That is, the first one must be mastered before the next one can take place.

Category	Example and Key Words
Knowledge: Recall data or information.	Examples: Recite a policy. Quote prices from memory to a customer. Knows the safety rules. Key Words: defines, describes, identifies, knows, labels, lists, matches, names, outlines, recalls, recognizes, reproduces, selects, states.

<p>Comprehension: Understand the meaning, translation, interpolation, and interpretation of instructions and problems. State a problem in one's own words.</p>	<p>Examples: Rewrites the principles of test writing. Explain in one's own words the steps for performing a complex task. Translates an equation into a computer spreadsheet. Key Words: comprehends, converts, defends, distinguishes, estimates, explains, extends, generalizes, gives Examples, infers, interprets, paraphrases, predicts, rewrites, summarizes, translates.</p>
<p>Application: Use a concept in a new situation or unprompted use of an abstraction. Applies what was learned in the classroom into novel situations in the work place.</p>	<p>Examples: Use a manual to calculate an employee's vacation time. Apply laws of statistics to evaluate the reliability of a written test. Key Words: applies, changes, computes, constructs, demonstrates, discovers, manipulates, modifies, operates, predicts, prepares, produces, relates, shows, solves, uses.</p>
<p>Analysis: Separates material or concepts into component parts so that its organizational structure may be understood. Distinguishes between facts and inferences.</p>	<p>Examples: Troubleshoot a piece of equipment by using logical deduction. Recognize logical fallacies in reasoning. Gathers information from a department and selects the required tasks for training. Key Words: analyzes, breaks down, compares, contrasts, diagrams, deconstructs, differentiates, discriminates, distinguishes, identifies, illustrates, infers, outlines, relates, selects, separates.</p>
<p>Synthesis: Builds a structure or pattern from diverse elements. Put parts together to form a whole, with emphasis on creating a new meaning or structure.</p>	<p>Examples: Write a company operations or process manual. Design a machine to perform a specific task. Integrates training from several sources to solve a problem. Revises and process to improve the outcome. Key Words: categorizes, combines, compiles, composes, creates, devises, designs, explains, generates, modifies, organizes, plans, rearranges, reconstructs, relates, reorganizes, revises, rewrites, summarizes, tells, writes.</p>
<p>Evaluation: Make judgments about the value of ideas or materials.</p>	<p>Examples: Select the most effective solution. Hire the most qualified candidate. Explain and justify a new budget. Key Words: appraises, compares, concludes, contrasts, criticizes, critiques, defends, describes, discriminates, evaluates, explains, interprets, justifies, relates, summarizes, supports.</p>

## Affective

This domain includes the manner in which we deal with things emotionally, such as feelings, values, appreciation, enthusiasms, motivations, and attitudes. The five major categories listed the simplest behavior to the most complex:

Category	Example and Key Words
Receiving Phenomena: Awareness, willingness to hear, selected attention.	Examples: Listen to others with respect. Listen for and remember the name of newly introduced people. Key Words: asks, chooses, describes, follows, gives, holds, identifies, locates, names, points to, selects, sits, erects, replies, uses.
Responding to Phenomena: Active participation on the part of the learners. Attends and reacts to a particular phenomenon. Learning outcomes may emphasize compliance in responding, willingness to respond, or satisfaction in responding (motivation).	Examples: Participates in class discussions. Gives a presentation. Questions new ideals, concepts, models, etc. in order to fully understand them. Know the safety rules and practices them. Key Words: answers, assists, aids, complies, conforms, discusses, greets, helps, labels, performs, practices, presents, reads, recites, reports, selects, tells, writes.
Valuing: The worth or value a person attaches to a particular object, phenomenon, or behavior. This ranges from simple acceptance to the more complex state of commitment. Valuing is based on the internalization of a set of specified values, while clues to these values are expressed in the learner's overt behavior and are often identifiable.	Examples: Demonstrates belief in the democratic process. Is sensitive towards individual and cultural differences (value diversity). Shows the ability to solve problems. Proposes a plan to social improvement and follows through with commitment. Informs management on matters that one feels strongly about. Key Words: completes, demonstrates, differentiates, explains, follows, forms, initiates, invites, joins, justifies, proposes, reads, reports, selects, shares, studies, works.
Organization: Organizes values into priorities by contrasting different values, resolving conflicts between them, and creating an unique value system. The emphasis is on comparing, relating, and synthesizing values.	Examples: Recognizes the need for balance between freedom and responsible behavior. Accepts responsibility for one's behavior. Explains the role of systematic planning in solving problems. Accepts professional ethical standards. Creates a life plan in harmony with abilities, interests, and beliefs. Prioritizes time effectively to meet the needs of the organization, family, and self.

	Key Words: adheres, alters, arranges, combines, compares, completes, defends, explains, formulates, generalizes, identifies, integrates, modifies, orders, organizes, prepares, relates, synthesizes.
Internalizing values (characterization): Has a value system that controls their behavior. The behavior is pervasive, consistent, predictable, and most importantly, characteristic of the learner. Instructional objectives are concerned with the student's general patterns of adjustment (personal, social, emotional).	Examples: Shows self-reliance when working independently. Cooperates in group activities (displays teamwork). Uses an objective approach in problem solving. Displays a professional commitment to ethical practice on a daily basis. Revises judgments and changes behavior in light of new evidence. Values people for what they are, not how they look. Key Words: acts, discriminates, displays, influences, listens, modifies, performs, practices, proposes, qualifies, questions, revises, serves, solves, verifies.

### Psychomotor

The psychomotor domain includes physical movement, coordination, and use of the motor-skill areas. Development of these skills requires practice and is measured in terms of speed, precision, distance, procedures, or techniques in execution. The seven major categories listed the simplest behavior to the most complex:

Category	Example and Key Words
Perception: The ability to use sensory cues to guide motor activity. This ranges from sensory stimulation, through cue selection, to translation.	Examples: Detects non-verbal communication cues. Estimate where a ball will land after it is thrown and then moving to the correct location to catch the ball. Adjusts heat of stove to correct temperature by smell and taste of food. Adjusts the height of the forks on a forklift by comparing where the forks are in relation to the pallet. Key Words: chooses, describes, detects, differentiates, distinguishes, identifies, isolates, relates, selects.
Set: Readiness to act. It includes mental, physical, and emotional sets. These three sets are dispositions that predetermine a person's response to different situations (sometimes called mindsets).	Examples: Knows and acts upon a sequence of steps in a manufacturing process. Recognize one's abilities and limitations. Shows desire to learn a new process (motivation). NOTE: This subdivision of Psychomotor is closely related with the "Responding to phenomena" subdivision of the Affective domain. Key Words: begins, displays, explains, moves, proceeds,

	reacts, shows, states, volunteers.
Guided Response: The early stages in learning a complex skill that includes imitation and trial and error. Adequacy of performance is achieved by practicing.	Examples: Performs a mathematical equation as demonstrated. Follows instructions to build a model. Responds hand-signals of instructor while learning to operate a forklift. Key Words: copies, traces, follows, react, reproduce, responds
Mechanism: This is the intermediate stage in learning a complex skill. Learned responses have become habitual and the movements can be performed with some confidence and proficiency.	Examples: Use a personal computer. Repair a leaking faucet. Drive a car. Key Words: assembles, calibrates, constructs, dismantles, displays, fastens, fixes, grinds, heats, manipulates, measures, mends, mixes, organizes, sketches.
Complex Overt Response: The skillful performance of motor acts that involve complex movement patterns. Proficiency is indicated by a quick, accurate, and highly coordinated performance, requiring a minimum of energy. This category includes performing without hesitation, and automatic performance. For example, players are often utter sounds of satisfaction or expletives as soon as they hit a tennis ball or throw a football, because they can tell by the feel of the act what the result will produce.	Examples: Maneuvers a car into a tight parallel parking spot. Operates a computer quickly and accurately. Displays competence while playing the piano. Key Words: assembles, builds, calibrates, constructs, dismantles, displays, fastens, fixes, grinds, heats, manipulates, measures, mends, mixes, organizes, sketches. NOTE: The Key Words are the same as Mechanism, but will have adverbs or adjectives that indicate that the performance is quicker, better, more accurate, etc.
Adaptation: Skills are well developed and the individual can modify movement patterns to fit special requirements.	Examples: Responds effectively to unexpected experiences. Modifies instruction to meet the needs of the learners. Perform a task with a machine that it was not originally intended to do (machine is not damaged and there is no danger in performing the new task). Key Words: adapts, alters, changes, rearranges, reorganizes, revises, varies.

Origination: Creating new movement patterns to fit a particular situation or specific problem. Learning outcomes emphasize creativity based upon highly developed skills.

Examples: Constructs a new theory. Develops a new and comprehensive training programming. Creates a new gymnastic routine.

Key Words: arranges, builds, combines, composes, constructs, creates, designs, initiate, makes, originates.

Bloom B. S. (1956). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: The Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Co Inc.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Bertram, B. M. (1973). *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, the Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain*. New York: David McKay Co., Inc.

Simpson E. J. (1972). *The Classification of Educational Objectives in the Psychomotor Domain*. Washington, DC: Gryphon House.

---

## Notes

Copyright 1999 by Donald Clark  
Created June 5, 1999. Updated July 5, 2001.

<http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/hrd/bloom.html>

## **APPENDIX E**

### **Compilation of Review Team's Recommendations to the Music Department**

## **1. Program Mission**

- a. The Music Department should revisit and revise its undergraduate program's mission statement to align its strengths, values, priorities, activities and resources with its desired goals;
- b. The Music Department could consider focusing on and embracing its unique strengths as a Conservatory for Performing Arts;
- c. The Department could consider how utilizing its already well-known programs could function as enticements for graduate student recruitment;
- d. The Music Department should revisit and revise its graduate program's mission statement to align its strengths, values, priorities and resources with its desired goals;
- e. The Music Department should describe and align its desired goals in service to the General Education Program and Liberal Studies to a revised mission statement that clarifies the relationship between these activities and the Department's strengths, values and priorities;
- f. If the Department of Music feels that this NASM publication is so pivotal, it may want to consider using it as a touchstone for its Mission Statement;

## **2. Academic Program**

- a. The Department should develop a set of undergraduate learning goals and competencies that explicitly describe active learning in the discipline;
- b. The Department of Music should prepare a set of learning goals and specific competencies for its graduate program;
- c. The Department of Music should create program-specific learning expectations;
- d. The Music Department could use the "Advisory Standards for Writing in the Undergraduate Major;"
- e. The Department should provide students with a set of clear and explicit learning expectations, which are program-specific;
- f. Some paired courses could be offered to both undergraduate students and graduate students;
- g. The Music Department could investigate which courses in the major could act as substitute General Education courses for Music majors and vigorously pursue this option with the University General Education Policy and Graduation Requirements Committee;

h. The Music Department could consider reducing the number of piano classes required of non-piano majors;

### **3. Assessment**

Given current University expectations and standard practices:

a. The Music Department should revisit its matrix of courses in the context of specifically defined, departmental or programmatic learning expectations;

b. The Department could ensure that meaningful data from its assessment activities be readily available to its students and interested members of the public in accessible formats;

c. The Music Department should document its assessment of student learning outcomes and use its findings to contextualize curricular changes and program priorities;

d. The Music Department could (1) document the frequency of administration of the Graduating Senior Assessment Survey and the Alumni Survey and (2) ensure considerable overlap between the two instruments;

e. The Music Department should undertake a regular schedule of graduate student surveys;

f. The Department of Music could work with the Office of Institutional Research and append the standard Alumni assessment with more targeted, Department-specific questions;

g. The Music Department should create an assessment tool that can be communicated to the student in order for assessment to be more transparent and understood;

h. The Department could clarify its sequence and process of undergraduate assessments;

i. The Department could consider undertaking assessment of students' functions in collective /ensemble formats and not simply as soloists;

j. The Department should document timelines for assessments as well as some of the anticipated analyses;

k. The Department should prepare to assess graduate students;

l. The Music Department should establish policies and procedures that delineate use of data for program modification;

m. The Department should create policies and procedures for data capture, data analysis, and data-based actions;

#### **4. Students**

- a. The Department needs to plan a more collaborative, consistent set of recruitment and publicity efforts;
- b. The Music Department could profitably revisit its “informal” advising structure and develop materials and procedures that would serve students efficiently and effectively;
- c. The Department should organize a program of professional development activities and opportunities that serve the specific needs of its Masters’ students.

#### **5. Faculty**

- a. The Review Team recommends that the faculty consider decreasing their soloist frame of reference, in order to increase and strengthen the collective formats in the Department;
- b. The Music Department faculty could discuss, and then formally articulate, the relationship between their external activities, faculty function, and the mission, goals and objectives of the Department;

#### **6. Support Staff**

- a. The Department should up-date the job descriptions of each current staff member;
- b. Staff and Faculty should hold meetings on a consistent basis;
- c. Appropriate and consistent use of College-level resources would ease Department-level use of staff;
- d. The Department should reconsider its current emphasis on using individuals for many functions and explore what tasks and responsibilities might be more effectively dealt with if shared or broken into more specific functions;
- e. The Department could consider calling on the expertise of support staff earlier in the process of creating an event, rather than continuing its excessive reliance on faculty initiative;

#### **7. Space**

- a. The Music Department could investigate what accommodations can be made within Library policies and practice to serve the special needs of their majors;

#### **8. Recommendations to the Dean/College/University**

- a. The Music Department’s need for renovated or new solid, acoustically sound recital spaces should be a University priority;
- b. A recording studio should be built when the recital hall is renovated;

- c. The Music Department's physical facilities and equipment need to be updated;
- d. Given their special needs, Music Department students, faculty and staff need to have twenty-four hour access to the music building.