WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Program Review Self-Study Template

Academic unit: **MUSIC**

College: **Fine Arts**

Date of last review **2001**

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) **2001**

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree: **Bachelor and Master - Music** CIP* code: **50.0901**

Degree: **Bachelor and Master Music Education** CIP code: **13.1312**

Degree: _____ CIP code: _____

*To look up, go to: Classification of Instructional Programs Website, http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55

Faculty of the Academic Unit

Name	Signature
Alla Aranovskaya	
Andrea Banke	
Deborah Baxter	D Baxter
Julie Bees	
Elaine Bernstorf	
Phillip Black	Philip Black
Sylvia Coats	Sylvia Coats
Catherine Consiglio	
Dorothy Crum	Dorothy E Crum
Lynn Davis Lynne Davis	Lynne Davis
Geoffrey Deibel	
Judy Fear	Judith Fear
Mark Foley	
Selim Giray	
John Goering	John Going
Michael Hanawalt	
David Hunsicker	David Hunsicker
Sarunas Jankauskas	
John Paul Johnson	
·ie King	
Randolph Lacy	R. A. Lacy
Mark Laycock	Mark Laycock

Victor Markovich	*Victor A. Markovich*
Walter Mays	
a Mozzani	*Dina Mozzani*
Scott Oakes	
Steve Oare	
Craig Owens	*Craig Owens*
Dean Roush	*D Roush*
Gerald Scholl	
Frances Shelly	*Frances Shelly*
Leonid Shukaev	*Leonid Shukaev*
Nicholas Smith	*Nicholas Smith*
Aleksander Sternfeld-Dunn	
Andrew Trechak	*Andrew Trechak*
Jeanne Vance	
Russell Widener	*Russ Widener*
Tom Wine	*Tom Wine*

Submitted by: **Russ Widener, Director, School of Music**   Date: **3/1/2013**

Name and Title

1.	Departmental purpose and relationship to the University mission (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

    a.   University Mission:

Wichita State University is committed to providing comprehensive educational opportunities in an urban setting. Through teaching, scholarship and public service the University seeks to equip both students and the larger community with the educational and cultural tools they need to thrive in a complex world, and to achieve both individual responsibility in their own lives and effective citizenship in the local, national and global community.

    b.   Program Mission (if more than one program, list each mission):

The School of Music at Wichita State University has a two-part mission: 1) to provide specialized training at the baccalaureate and master's degree level for music majors and non-majors; and 2) to provide cultural enrichment for the campus community, the Greater Wichita area, and the surrounding region, both in on-campus and off-campus settings.

    c.   The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission: Explain in 1-2 concise paragraphs.

The School of Music is a professional school with outstanding abilities to give our students the best learning experience possible. Our faculty are active musicians in performing, composing and publishing at consistently high levels. The performance faculty are principal performers in the Wichita Symphony Orchestra, Music Theatre of Wichita, Wichita Grand Opera, and other regional ensembles as well as national ensembles which are active during summer seasons. Because of that activity, we serve the community in multiple settings while recruiting students locally, nationally and internationally.

    d.   Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review? ☐ Yes ☑ No
        i.   If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

    e.   Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (s) (both programmatic and learner centered). Have they changed since the last review?
                                                                  ☐ Yes ☑No

If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

The School of Music is a comprehensive program involving the complete faculty and student body in interactive academic and performance activities. At the baccalaureate level, students in all music emphases, such as education, performance, theory, composition, etc., share a core of experiences in which all faculty serve in one capacity or another. The same principle applies to masters level programs. This core is identified by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the professional accreditation body, as "Basic Musicianship Studies." Some variety exists from school to school in the extent of this core; at WSU approximately 3/4 of the required music curriculum is common to all degree emphases.

The faculty of the School of Music provide instructional service within this core. For example, music performance (studio) faculty teach the applied major instrument to majors irrespective of their program emphasis (BM/BA or BME) and teach literature courses available to all emphases; music education faculty participate in fundamental aural skills and theory courses as well as provide specialized instruction in teacher training and performance courses; and the history/literature faculty also serve in performance and conducting roles. No distinction is made between the music education, theory/ composition, and performance emphases in the assignment of performance faculty to studio instruction of majors.

Students in these specialties interact within the courses, ensembles, and studio performance experiences that constitute the basic musicianship block; their musical achievements and activities are not determined solely or even primarily by their degree emphases. Their specialization (e.g., music education, performance, theory/composition) is evident only in the smaller portion of the curriculum devoted to course work in the emphasis or in the application of these studies to post-graduate matriculation (occupational placement in the profession or to appropriate levels of graduate study).

Learning Goals

Students who successfully complete degree and/or program requirements in music education, music performance, music and business, musical theatre, and music pedagogy will have the ability to:

1. Identify a basis for aesthetic judgment and the understanding and appreciation of musical quality
2. Achieve artistic and scholarly competency
3. Be prepared to serve the community and the region as leaders in musical understanding and critical artistic judgment
4. Be prepared to achieve future professional and or academic success
5. Be able to organize their thoughts in a clear and logical manner, and effectively express them in spoken and written communication.

Learning Objectives

A. Students will experience personal artistic enrichment and develop understanding of the
styles and performance practices of diverse musical eras through solo and ensemble participation in and attendance at numerous concerts, recitals, musicals, operas, master classes and music for special events. (Goals 1 & 2))

B. Students will achieve broad intellectual and interpretive skills and understanding as they pertain to their degree programs in the areas of music theory, music history, music education, music business, music technology, music performance, music pedagogy, musical theatre, opera, conducting and the appreciation of music. (Goals 1, 2, 3 & 5)

C. Students will develop musical understanding and critical artistic judgment as they

participate in a wide range of rewarding solo and ensemble performance experiences for the enhancement of the arts at the university and in the community. (Goals 1 & 2).

D. Upon completion of the course of study leading to a degree, minor or program endorsement in music, students will be prepared to seek professional placement within their chosen· field or pursue an advanced degree on a related field of study. (Goals 3, 4 &5).

> **2a. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, and graduates (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section). Complete a separate table for each program if appropriate.**

UG – Music

Last 3 Years	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Number)	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty with Terminal Degree (Number)	Instructional FTE (#): TTF= Tenure/Tenure Track GTA=Grad teaching assist O=Other instructional FTE			Total SCH - Total SCH by FY from Su, Fl, Sp	Total Majors - From fall semester	Total Grads – by FY
			TTF	GTA	O			
Year 1→	29	23	30.3	9.6	16.2	10202	93	21
Year 2→	28	28	28.8	7.2	15	9197	77	28
Year 3→	27	23	27.8	8.1	13	8394	67	13
Total Number Instructional (FTE) – TTF+GTA+O						SCH/ FTE	Majors/ FTE	Grads/ FTE
Year 1→					56.1	182	--	--
Year 2→					51.0	180	--	--
Year 3→					48.9	172	--	--

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

UG – Music Education

La Years	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Number)	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty with Terminal Degree (Number)	Instructional FTE (#): TTF= Tenure/Tenure Track GTA=Grad teaching assist O=Other instructional FTE			Total SCH - Total SCH by FY from Su, Fl, Sp	Total Majors - From fall semester	Total Grads – by FY
			TTF	GTA	O			
Year 1→	--	--	--	--	--	--	76	24
Year 2→	--	--	--	--	--	--	73	12
Year 3→	--	--	--	--	--	--	63	24
Total Number Instructional (FTE) – TTF+GTA+O						SCH/ FTE	Majors/ FTE	Grads/ FTE
Year 1→					--	--	--	--
Year 2→					--	--	--	--
Year 3→					--	--	--	--

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

GR - Music

L.. Years	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Number)	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty with Terminal Degree (Number)	Instructional FTE (#): TTF= Tenure/Tenure Track GTA=Grad teaching assist O=Other instructional FTE			Total SCH - Total SCH by FY from Su, Fl, Sp	Total Majors - From fall semester	Total Grads – by FY
			TTF	GTA	O			
Year 1→	--	--	--	--	--	--	49	18
Year 2→	--	--	--	--	--	--	44	16
Year 3→	--	--	--	--	--	--	46	16
Total Number Instructional (FTE) – TTF+GTA+O						SCH/ FTE	Majors/ FTE	Grads/ FTE
					↓			
Year 1→					--	--	--	--
Year 2→					--	--	--	--
Year 3→					--	--	--	--

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional;
KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional

GR- Music education

Last 3 Years	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Number)	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty with Terminal Degree (Number)	Instructional FTE (#): TTF= Tenure/Tenure Track GTA=Grad teaching assist O=Other instructional FTE			Total SCH - Total SCH by FY from Su, Fl, Sp	Total Majors - From fall semester	Total Grads – by FY
			TTF	GTA	O			
Year 1→	--	--	--	--	--	--	29	9
Year 2→	--	--	--	--	--	--	25	6
Year 3→	--	--	--	--	--	--	19	9
Total Number Instructional (FTE) – TTF+GTA+O						SCH/ FTE	Majors/ FTE	Grads/ FTE
					↓			
Year 1→					--	--	--	--
Year 2→					--	--	--	--
Year 3→					--	--	--	--

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional;
KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional

2b. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the scholarly productivity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		Performances			Number of Exhibits		Creative Work		No. Books	No. Book Chaps	No. Grants Awarded or Submitted	$ Grant Value
	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	Ref	Non-Ref	*	**	***	Juried	****	Juried	Non-Juried				
Year 1	3	7	20	20	12	8	9	143	549	1	10	17	32	0	11	1	356000
Year 2	7	7	23	26	4	2	9	125	569	1	11	20	41	0	0	3	8600
Year 3	4	2	37	19	12	1	9	113	627	1	14	18	50	0	1	5	42600

* Winning by competitive audition. **Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). ***Principal role in a performance. ****Commissioned or included in a collection.

a. Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the faculty/staff using the data from the tables in section 2 as well as any additional relevant data. Programs should comment on details in regard to productivity of the faculty (i.e., some departments may have a few faculty producing the majority of the scholarship), efforts to recruit/retain faculty, departmental succession plans, course evaluation data, etc.

Provide assessment here:

The School of Music Faculty are extremely active. Most of the Instrumental Faculty are involved with the Wichita Symphony, which includes eight concert pairs, two sets of five Children's Concerts, and four Pops concerts per year. Some perform regularly with Music Theatre of Wichita. Two of the Instrumental Faculty are in the St. Petersburg String Quartet, which tours internationally throughout the year and performs residencies in several international locations. This past year they applied for and received an invitation to perform in St. Petersburg, Russia for the 150th anniversary of the St. Petersburg Conservatory. They, along with the Lieurance Woodwind Quintet and Suprima, a student chamber orchestra, represented the United States. Members of the brass faculty and graduate students make up the Wichita Brass Quintet. Other faculty are busy presenting at national conferences, publishing, holding offices in their national organizations, and having their students participate in national and international competitions.

As to the qualitative level of these activities, the School of Music faculty have garnered honors of the highest order. Faculty have either won of been nominated for the following awards/distinctions, among others: the Pulitzer, the Grammy, the Carnegie National Professor of the Year, the Fulbright and the Guggenheim. They perform/present/tour annually throughout the world. They have an annual presence in Italy each summer with the *Canta in Italia* program which draws vocal students both nationally and internationally.

> 3. **Academic Program:** Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students. Complete this section for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan (s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).

a. For undergraduate programs, compare ACT scores of the majors with the University as a whole.

Last 3 Years	Total Majors - From fall semester		ACT – Fall Semester (mean for those reporting)		
	Music	Music Ed	Music	Music Ed	All University Students - FT
Year 1→	93	76	25.2	24.2	22.96
Year 2→	77	73	25.0	23.5	23.06
Year 3→	67	63	24.1	24.3	23.11

KBOR data minima for UG programs: ACT$\leq$20 will trigger program.

b. For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs.*

Last 3 Years	Total Admitted - By FY		Average GPA (Admitted) – Domestic Students Only (60 hr GPA for those with $\geq$54 hr reported) By FY			
	MM	MME	MM	MME	College GPA	University GPA
Year 1→	25	35	3.64	3.64	3.62	3.48
Year 2→	14	41	3.65	3.61	3.60	3.48
Year 3→	7	49	3.84	3.44	3.50	3.48

*If your admission process uses another GPA calculation, revise table to suit program needs and enter your internally collected data.

c. Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results.

In the following table provide program level information. You may add an appendix to provide more explanation/details. Definitions:

Learning Outcomes: Learning outcomes are statements that describe what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time of graduation. These relate to the skills, knowledge, and behaviors that students acquire in their matriculation through the program (e.g., graduates will demonstrate advanced writing ability).

Assessment Tool: One or more tools to identify, collect, and prepare data to evaluate the achievement of learning outcomes (e.g., a writing project evaluated by a rubric).

Criterion/Target: Percentage of program students expected to achieve the desired outcome for demonstrating program effectiveness (e.g., 90% of the students will demonstrate satisfactory performance on a writing project).

Result: Actual achievement on each learning outcome measurement (e.g., 95%).

Analysis: Determines the extent to which learning outcomes are being achieved and leads to decisions and actions to improve the program. The analysis and evaluation should align with specific learning outcome and consider whether the measurement and/or criteria/target remain a valid indicator of the learning outcome as well as whether the learning outcomes need to be revised.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have r̲ ple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis

Included in the appendices are matrixes of jury assessment criteria. That assessment occurs each semester in the performance juries (finals). There is a basic rubric (Wichita State University Music Jury Performance Assessment Rubric), which each department has adjusted for its own area: voice, keyboard, wind/percussion, and strings. Copies of those individual rubrics are also in the appendix. Those rubrics have been collecting data for individual students. We would like to begin to have each area study that data on an annual basis to determine areas of strength and weakness. Our tools are good, but targets have not been established at this time.

The Music Education Department has performed extensive assessment for reports to the College of Education; so their process has been very successful. We are expanding their processes to include the entire student body and programs outside the Music Education area. This would not be difficult—especially since some of those processes are done in classes outside Music Education.

d. Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results, employer surveys or other such data that indicate student satisfaction with the program and whether students are learning the curriculum (for learner outcomes, data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e).

Student Satisfaction (e.g., exit survey data on overall program satisfaction). Percent satisfied or higher								Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year		Result (e.g., 4.5 on scale of 1-5, where 5 highest)						Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
	N	M	N	ME	N	MM	N	MME					
1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1		See Below		
2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2				
3	12	91.7	22	77.3	9	44.4	4	100	3				

Most of our seniors are required to perform senior recitals and/or student teaching. These act as capstones for our School. One of our goals for the future is to collate the grades for those areas and organize them into researchable data.

Provide aggregate data on how the goals of the *WSU General Education Program* and *KBOR 2020 Foundation Skills* are assessed in undergraduate programs (optional for graduate programs).

Goals/Skills Measurements of: Oral/written communication, Numerical literacy, Critical thinking and problem solving, Collaboration and teamwork, Library research skills, Diversity and globalization	Results	
	Majors	Non-Majors
'r Recital; oral/written communication, critical thinking and problem solving, collaboration and teamwork, see Appendices A-H	Not assessed separately Embedded in course curriculum	
Senior Recital; oral/written communication, critical thinking and problem solving, collaboration and teamwork, see Appendices A-H	Not assessed separately Embedded in course curriculum	
Teacher Certification; oral/written communication, critical thinking and problem solving, collaboration and teamwork, see Appendices A-H	Required for State Licensure, 100% passed	
Instrumental/Choral Ensembles; oral communication, critical thinking and problem solving, collaboration and teamwork, see Appendices A-H	Not assessed separately Embedded in course curriculum	Not assessed separately Embedded in course curriculum
"Basic Musicianship" core curriculum; oral/written communication, critical thinking and problem solving, library research skills, diversity and globalization; see syllabus in Appendices A-H	Not assessed separately Embedded in course curriculum	Not assessed separately Embedded in course curriculum
Applied Music Lessons; oral/written communication, critical thinking and problem solving, collaboration and teamwork, see Appendices A-H	Not assessed separately Embedded in course curriculum	Not assessed separately Embedded in course curriculum

N. Not all programs evaluate every goal/skill. Programs may choose to use assessment rubrics for this purpose. Sample forms available at: http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/

e. For programs/departments with concurrent enrollment courses (per KBOR policy), provide the assessment of such courses over the last three years (disaggregated by each year) that assures grading standards (e.g., papers, portfolios, quizzes, labs, etc.) course management, instructional delivery, and content meet or exceed those in regular on-campus sections.
Provide information here:

We have no concurrent enrollment.

f. Indicate whether the program is accredited by a specialty accrediting body including the next review date and concerns from the last review.
Provide information here:

The School of Music is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). We were last reviewed in 2001 and were scheduled to be reviewed in 2011-12. We were approved for a postponement due to the nearly four year renovation our primary building, Duerksen Hall is currently undergoing. Our next review will be in the spring of 2015.

One of the concerns of the NASM report was the need for a course to address " . . . music from various cultures of the world." We have for several years had a successful course in world music that is very popular. Another concern was, "It does not appear that 'equipment adequate for the work of the music unit' is provided, given the condition of practice pianos and wind instruments, or that the institution has 'a plan for the regular upkeep of its facilities and upkeep and replacement of equipment." We now have a full time piano technician. Four years ago we had a donor-led project that resulted in the purchase of twenty-six new pianos for our practice rooms.

A longtime concern has been the Music Library. Three years ago the university renovated the language laboratory in Jardine Hall, and the music library was joined with the updated audio laboratory of the Department of Modern and Classical Languages to create a comprehensive auditory laboratory. This resulted is more than doubling the square footage of the music library. New audiovisual equipment and computers were purchased to greatly update our facilities.

GOALS - Advising has been a concern. We have a full time advisor for the School of Music, and we will begin this fall requiring each faculty member to have training in the CAPP software for the university. This will enable the faculty to better help with the advising of their students. We will also include the faculty more in long-range planning— especially with a new president and strategic plan under way. Assessment coordination throughout the School is another major goal in the near future.

g. Provide the process the department uses to assure assignment of credit hours (per WSU policy 2.18) to all courses has been reviewed over the last three years. Attach a few examples of course syllabi that communicates this policy to students (provide as an appendix).
Provide information here:

Our course credit hours are assigned as typical face-to-face courses. The time in class is comparable to the number of credit hours assigned. The online courses we have correspond to our face-to-face courses; so the credit hours are the same. Our private instruction is as follows: a music major receives a 30-minute lesson and an hour master class per week for 2 credit hours. Non-majors receive a 30-minute lesson per week and are not required to attend a master class—for 2 credit hours. Professors require various amounts of practice for these courses. Some instrumentalists are physically able to practice longer than others.

h. Provide a brief assessment of the overall quality of the academic program using the data from 3a – 3f and other information you may collect, including outstanding student work (e.g., outstanding scholarship, inductions into honor organizations, publications, special awards, academic scholarships, student recruitment and retention).
Provide assessment here:

Our music students have consistently received high ratings in national and international competitions and internationally auditioned summer festivals. Average ACT scores for our students are over 24. Lists of those accomplishments are included in Appendix J.

What is not listed in the Appendix, which is only student accomplishments for the last three or four years, is the longitudinal impact of WSU music students both nationally and internationally. Our graduates have performed on Broadway and the Metropolitan Opera. Nationally, our students' talents have been displayed at MTV, Spike Lee productions, Newport Jazz Festival, and Hollywood. Internationally, they have performed at the Vienna Staatsoper, London's West End, La Scala, Paris Opera, the Salzburg Festival - in short, major performing arts venues throughout the world. Several of our students have attained the vaunted position of being the best in the world at what they do (ex. Samuel Ramey, opera bass; Joyce DiDonato, opera mezzo-soprano; Matt Wilson, jazz percussionist) and have the awards and magazine covers to prove it. Put succinctly, the very best thing the School of Music has done historically (and continues to do) is to turn out an amazing number of students who are outstanding in their respective fields.

> **4. Analyze the student need and employer demand for the program. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).**

a. Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.

UG - Music

Majors				Employment of Majors*						
Last 3 YRs - Begins in fall and ends following summer	No. who enter or are admitted in the major	% enrolled one year later	1 Year Attrition %	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS**
Year 1→	35	62.9	37.1	**See Below**						Current year only
Year 2→	31	67.7	32.3							
Year 3→	33	51.5	48.5							↓

Race/Ethnicity by Major***										Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***								
		NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	MR	UNK	NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	MR	UNK
	Year 1→	5	4	1	1	7	0	69	0	6	2	0	0	1	1	0	17	0	0
	Year 2→	1	3	1	1	6	0	58	1	6	3	2	2	1	0	0	18	1	1
	Year 3→	0	2	0	1	1	0	58	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	10	0	1

UG – Music Ed

Majors				Employment of Majors*						
Last 3 YRs - Begins in fall and ends following summer	No. who enter or are admitted in the major	% enroll-ed one year later	1 Year Attrition %	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS**
Year 1→	33	63.6	36.4							Current year only
Year 2→	31	45.2	54.8							
Year 3→	23	47.8	52.2							↓

Race/Ethnicity by Major***										Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***								
		NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	MR	UNK	NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	MR	UNK
	Year 1→	0	0	2	0	6	0	66	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	21	0	0
	Year 2→	0	3	1	0	4	0	59	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	0	1
	Year 3→	1	0	1	0	0	0	56	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	23	0	0

* May not be collected every year

** Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: http://www.bls.gov/oco/ and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

*** NRA=Non-resident alien; H=Hispanic; AI/AN=American Indian/ Alaskan Native; A=Asian; B=Black; NH/PI=Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; C=Caucasian; MR=Multi-race; UNK=Unknown

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from the table above. Include the most common types of positions, in terms of employment, graduates can expect to find.

Provide assessment here:

The salaries listed below are from the Bureau of Labor Statistics web site and general figures from USD 259 in Wichita. Even the BLS web site had no data for many of our areas.

High School--$53,230—USD 259--$45,915 plus special incentives
Middle School--$51,960—USD 259--$45,915 plus special incentives
Special Education--$53,220—USD 259--$45,915 plus special incentives
Music Directors and Composers—$45,970
The median hourly wage of musicians and singers was $22.39 in May 2010. (Annual wage not available)

The College of Fine Arts will engage the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP) this summer. SNAAP is an annual online survey, data management, and institutional improvement system designed to enhance the impact of arts-school education. SNAAP partners with degree-granting institutions to administer the survey to their arts graduates. SNAAP provides national data on how artists develop in this country, help identify the factors needed to better connect arts training to artistic careers and allow education institutions, researchers and arts leaders to look at the systemic factors that helped or hindered the career paths of alumni, whether they have chosen to work as artists or pursue other paths.

SNAAP is administered by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research (George Kuh, Chancellor's Professor Emeritus) in collaboration with the Vanderbilt University Curb Center for Art, Enterprise and Public Policy (Steven J. Tepper, Associate Director).

Graduates of institutions that participate in SNAAP are invited to complete SNAAP's online questionnaire. Beginning with the 2011 administration, all members of every graduating class will be surveyed. Through SNAAP Wichita State will attempt to survey (i.e. identify, contact and request their participation) 4,898 alumni from the college dating back to 1960 graduates. We will also request and receive a report for each individual school in the college. The College of Fine Arts at Wichita State University is a comprehensive college consisting of three schools:

- The School of Art & Design (studio, art history, art education, graphic design)
- The School of Music (performance, jazz, music education, theory/composition)
- The School of Performing Arts (theatre, musical theatre, dance, theatre tech/design)

Arts alumni will be asked about:

- satisfaction with curricular and extracurricular experiences
- current and past education and employment
- relevance of arts training to work and further education

- types of art practiced and how often
- support and resource needs following graduation
- experiences as teachers
- income and support, student debt and other financial issues

Institutions receive reports that summarize the lives of alumni since graduation for:

- comparisons and analysis of the national aggregate group, and peer group, of respondents on key indicators (e.g., graduation rates, percentage pursuing arts careers, non-arts career paths, income levels)
- confidential internal institutional analyses of their alumni with appropriate comparison groups
- access to data files for individualized institutional research

5. Analyze the cost of the program and service the Program provides to the discipline, other programs at the University, and beyond. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

Percentage of SCH Taken By (last 3 years)			
Fall Semester	Year 1 - 2009	Year 2 - 2010	Year 3 - 2011
UG Majors	53.0	50.4	46
Gr Majors	15.4	15.1	17
Non-Majors	31.6	34.5	37

a. Provide a brief assessment of the cost and service the Program provides. Comment on percentage of SCH taken by majors and non-majors, nature of Program in terms of the service it provides to other University programs, faculty service to the institution, and beyond.

Provide assessment here:

The Following information is based on results from the National Association of Schools of Music. Institutions reporting: Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Wichita State University, Eastern Kentucky University, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Miami University (Ohio), Ohio University, University of Central Oklahoma. These are institutions about our size granting Masters Degrees.

Semester Credit Hours Production per FTE Faculty Member

	Number of Institutions Reporting	5th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	95th Percentile	Average	WSU
201-400 Music Majors	6	114.0	181.6	314.2	324.0	347.0	258.8	**106.1**

Number of Music Majors per Full-Time Faculty Member

	Number of Institutions Reporting	5th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	95th Percentile	Average	WSU
201-400 Music Majors	6	7.1	7.4	8	8.5	11.7	8.6	7

Average Instructional Salary (Full- and Part-time) per Music Major Student

	Number of Institutions Reporting	5th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	95th Percentile	Average	WSU

201-400 Music Majors	6	5,658	6,772	8,051	8,884	9,582	7,793	**9,786**

Total Annual Budget Comparison

	Number of Institutions Reporting	5th Percentile	25th Percentile	50th Percentile	75th Percentile	95th Percentile	Average	WSU
201-400 Music Majors	7	248,311	3,024,743	3,237,969	3,885,012	4,706,441	3,452,037	**3,423,114**

Report on the Program's goal (s) from the last review. List the goal (s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome. Complete for each program if appropriate (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).

(For Last 3 FYs)	Goal (s)	Assessment Data Analyzed	Outcome
	Development of curriculum to address music from various cultures of the world.	Needs assessment based on NASM curriculum standards and upon the skill outcomes for the program.	Addition of a course in World Music, which is also taught as an online course (and very popular)
	Need for equipment adequate for the work of the music unit, given the condition of practice pianos and wind instruments.	Needs assessment based on external consultant report and upon the skill outcomes for the program.	We now have a full time piano technician. Four years ago we had a donor-led project that resulted in the purchase of twenty-six new pianos for our practice rooms. Numerous wind instruments have been replaced as well, and more than a dozen string instruments have undergone major refurbishment.
	A twenty-year need to expand the music library facilities as well as an upgrade to very antiquated audio/computer equipment	Needs assessment based on NASM accrediting standards and upon the skill outcomes for the program.	The music library was joined with the updated audio laboratory of the Department of Modern and Classical Languages to create a comprehensive auditory laboratory. This resulted is more than doubling the square footage of the music library. New audiovisual equipment and computers were purchased to greatly update our facilities.

7. Summary and Recommendations

a. Set forth a summary of the report including an overview evaluating the strengths and concerns. List recommendations for improvement of each Program (for departments with multiple programs) that have resulted from this report (relate recommendations back to information provided in any of the categories and to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e). Identify three year goal (s) for the Program to be accomplished in time for the next review.

Provide assessment here:

STRENGTHS

The School of Music is an extremely active, hard-working school—for both students and faculty. Over 300 performances per year on our campus include Faculty recitals, Junior and Senior recitals, two Operas (with multiple performances), two Musical Theater productions (with multiple performances), approximately four concerts for each of the student ensembles: Wind Ensemble, Concert Band, Jazz Arts, A Cappella Choir, Madrigals, Concert Chorale, Women's Choir, Orchestra, Suprima Chamber Orchestra. Members of the Graduate String Quartet perform not only with the Wichita Symphony Orchestra; they perform fifty Children's Concerts per year. Many students and faculty perform with the Wichita Symphony Orchestra for eight pairs of Classics Concerts, two sets of five Children's Concerts, and four Pops Concerts per year. Faculty are constantly recruiting in schools and performance venues throughout the state, nationally, and internationally.

The Wind Ensemble and Orchestra performed in Carnegie Hall in 2011. The A Cappella Choir performed in Carnegie Hall in 2010. The Orchestra was invited to perform in Spain in 2008. The Suprima Chamber Orchestra, Lieurance Woodwind Quintet, and St. Petersburg String Quartet were invited to perform in St. Petersburg, Russia in 2012 for the 150th anniversary of the St. Petersburg Conservatory. These performances are in addition to multiple state and regional performances for faculty and student ensembles. Our students are ranked highly in national competitions and nationally auditioned summer festivals.

Performance and Creative/Research activity are definite strengths. Our assessment process is probably one of the most arduous at the university. We constantly assess our students in performance and classroom activities; collation of that data, except in Music Education, is what we need to address. We also need to unify and coordinate our assessment plans.

CONCERNS

One of the concerns that has been expressed by the administration is the need for reduction of the requirements in our comprehensive degrees. While several areas such as Vocal Performance and Music Education have recently reduced the number of credits required

for graduation, other programs will need to put forth proposals for degrees that are closer to the new 120 credit minimum established by the Board of Regents.

We have a lot of older faculty who will be retiring in the next few years. We have already replaced ten faculty in the last three years, but we anticipated many more searches in the next few years. Finding good faculty to replace the ones retiring will be difficult. One interesting fact reported in our data is that our graduates with Bachelor's degrees in Music Education have starting salaries above those of our entering Assistant Professors.

Another concern is the amount of scholarship aid that the School of Music has to give out to our students. While the number of endowed scholarships has doubled in the last ten years, the economy and the resulting bad performance of Foundation investments has reduced the amount we have to give. Also, $40,000 in Mill Levy Scholarship was recently taken away from the School to use in some other way.

Advising has been a concern. We have a full time advisor for the School of Music, and we will begin this fall requiring each faculty member to have training in the CAPP software for the university. This will enable the faculty to better help with the advising of their students.

GOALS

The development of a School of Music Strategic Plan.

Assessment coordination throughout the School.

The development of curriculum to offer multidisciplinary degrees.

An increase in the number of majors in our programs as well as increase our overall credit hour production.

Increasing the amount of scholarship money that we have for recruitment of music majors.

SCHOOL OF MUSIC PROGRAM REVIEW

APPENDIXES