



Program Review Self-Study Template

Academic unit: **MUSIC**

College: **FINE ARTS**

Date of last review **2013**

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant) **2016**

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?v=55>

Faculty of the academic unit (add lines as necessary)

Name

Name	Signature
Andrea Banke	On File
Deborah Baxter	
Julie Bees	
Elaine Bernstorf	
Phillip Black	
Catherine Consiglio	
Lynn Davis	
Geoffrey Deibel	
Judy Fear	
William Flynn	
Mark Foley	
John Goering	
Michael Hanawalt	
Alan Held	
David Hunsicker	
Sarunas Jankauskas	
John Paul Johnson	
Marie King	
Brian Krinke	
Randolph Lacy	
Mark Laycock	
Walter Mays	
Pina Mozzani	
Steve Oare	

Stephanie Patterson
Sam Ramey
an Roush
Justine Sasanfar
Gerald Scholl
Frances Shelly
Leonid Shukaev
Nicholas Smith
Kelly St. Pierre
Aleksander Sternfeld-Dunn
Andrew Trechak
Jeanne Vance
Russell Widener
Tom Wine

Submitted by: \_\_\_\_\_  
(name and title)

Date \_\_\_\_\_

In yellow highlighted areas,  
data will be provided

**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:

The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.

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.

Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review?  Yes  No

If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

Provide an overall description of your program (s) including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (s) (programmatic). 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 program itself has not changed since our last review, but we have reworked the statements of our goals and objectives in order to better define them in measurable terminology:

**Learning Goals:**

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

- 1) Identify a basis for aesthetic judgment and the understanding and appreciation of musical quality (Measured in the musicology/composition rubrics)
- 2) Demonstrate artistic competency (Piano proficiency and major instrument jury rubrics)
- 3) Demonstrate academic competency (Musicology/composition rubrics, CV rubric, and GPA)
- 4) Organize their thoughts in a clear and logical manner, and effectively express themselves in spoken and written communication (Musicology/composition rubric)
- 5) Serve the community and the region as leaders in musical understanding and critical artistic judgment (Ensemble participation and performances)
- 6) Achieve future professional and/or academic success (CV rubric)

**2. Describe the quality of the program as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates, and scholarly/creative activity (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section).**

**Complete the table below and utilize data tables 1-7 provided by the Office of Planning Analysis (covering SCH by FY and fall census day, instructional faculty; instructional FTE employed; program majors; and degree production).**

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																	
Year 2																	
Year 3																	

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

- Provide a brief assessment of the quality of the faculty/staff using the data from the table above and tables 1-7 from the Office of Planning Analysis 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. Many 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 Wichita.

Geoff Deibel, Saxophone professor, is in the *h2 Quartet* which tours and teaches master classes internationally. The Orfeo Trio, made up of Julie Bees, Leonid Shukaev and Evgeny Zvonnikov, has performed internationally. Alan Held, on our voice faculty, performs in operas throughout the world. Catherine Consiglio spent her sabbatical in Spring 2015 in Paraguay, performing and teaching. Mark Foley and Gerald Scholl both perform in The Colorado Music Festival Orchestra, which auditions internationally. Our composition faculty (Professors Mays, Roush and Sternfeld-Dunn, have their works performed internationally and have won international awards. Dr. Sternfeld-Dunn was a finalist for the American Prize in both the Chamber Music and Orchestra divisions.

Our music education faculty have presented at multiple conferences nationally and internationally.

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.

**See the appendix for a table of our faculty accomplishments in the Annual Report.**

**3. Academic Program: Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students 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. (Evaluate table 8 [ACT data] from the Office of Planning and Analysis).
- b. For graduate programs, compare graduate GPAs of the majors with University graduate GPAs. (Evaluate table 9 [GPA data] from the Office of Planning and Analysis)
- 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 in the table below. 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.

As a result of meetings regarding Strategic Planning, Program Assessment and our National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) accreditation review, the past three years have introduced curricular and programmatic changes throughout the School of Music. Due to the expertise of our faculty and the interest of our students, we have received permission from NASM to institute a Master's degree in Chamber Music. Our first coursework in that degree will begin this fall. After examining our Theory/Composition degree and its graduation rate, we (again with the blessing of NASM) have omitted the "Theory" portion of that degree to emphasize the "Composition" component. We also took a look at our course sequences in both the undergraduate and graduate levels—placing some courses on a rotation basis instead of each semester. We have also redesigned the summer coursework to better serve our graduate students already in teaching positions during the school year. We realized our audition process for acceptance and scholarship needed better coordination; so we have revised that process.

Last year, due to a variety of concerns, we established committees to address: Assessment, Recruiting, Acceptance to the School, both Faculty and Student Handbooks, Health and Safety issues for students, faculty and staff and scholarship coordination.

Some specific improvements are listed here:

- Based on best practices, the graduate history curriculum was changed from being broad era seminars to content specific historical topics.
- Based on oral examination results, the graduate curriculum was changed so students now have the option of taking two history courses or two theory courses. The previous curriculum required one history course and two history courses.
- Based on feedback from graduate students, the School of Music now holds a new graduate student orientation the week before classes start for advising, information and diagnostic exams.
- Based on best practices, the music education faculty eliminated Bibliography and Research from the core curriculum and increased the credit hours of Research and Design Methods, Psychology of Music and History and Philosophy of Music Education
- Based on best practices, the undergraduate Music Education faculty changed its aural skills requirements so it now has its own section of Aural Skills IV to prepare music educators for teaching aural skills in the public school system.
- To better align with the curriculum offered, the Composition and Theory Undergraduate and graduate degrees were changed to BM and MM in Composition.

All the above decisions are a result of a combination of protocols: evaluations of assessment, formal and informal discussions with and among faculty, staff and students. Also considered were assessment results from NASM and other accrediting bodies and musical associations.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
1. Identify a basis for aesthetic judgement and the understanding and appreciation of musical quality.	Musicology/composition rubric (This year we used the Steps Music Proficiency Exam) (MusC 335)	80% pass with a final score of "acceptable"	Avg. 2014-15=96%	Targeting a change in curriculum for 2016-17. With this great a percentage, no changes were deemed necessary.
2. Demonstrate artistic competency.	Piano proficiency (MusA 113-116)	80% students pass	81%	Changes to the Piano Pedagogy program. Dr. Sasanfar has revised the syllabi and handbook.
	Major instrument jury (MusA 232, 432, 434, 732, 734)	90% of students pass with grade C or better	Assessment scores were recorded, but not jury grades	Programmatic changes in the jury sheet forms and use of aggregate scores. Syllabi have been revised to more clearly define the expectations in juries.
3. Demonstration academic competency.	Musicology/composition rubric (This year using Steps Orchestration Final Project) (MusC 335)	80% pass with a final score of "acceptable"	Avg. 2013-15=90.3%	Very high
	Overall GPA	80% with 2.5 or better GPA	We have not been able to get this data for all students	We will begin collecting this data.
4. Organize their thoughts in a clear and logical manner and effectively express themselves in spoken and written communication.	Musicology composition rubric (This year using Steps Teaching and Self Evaluation) (MusC 335)	80% pass with a final score of "acceptable"	Avg. 2013-15=97%	Changes in the Musicology syllabi. The syllabi have been updated, but no major change is deemed necessary.
5. Serve the community and	Major ensembles GPA	90% with 3.0 or	Virtually	Development

region as leaders in musical understanding and critical artistic judgement.	(Bands, Orchestra, Choirs)	better GPA	all students in ensembles receive at least 3.0.	of a series of Badges aimed at music educators. We have already discussed a self-evaluation similar to those used at other universities. This is high on our priority list.
	Major instrument jury rubrics (MusA 232, 432, 434, 732, 734)	90% of students pass with grade C or better	Assessment scores were recorded, but not jury grades	Changes in applied syllabi. Syllabi have been revised to more clearly define the expectations in juries.
6. Achieve future professional and/or academic success	SNAPP data	Pilot project: no target was set	SNAAP data showed us equal to or above other universities	Changes in Music Education courses. We are developing new data questions for our next assessment with the College of Ed.
	CV rubric (under development)	Under development		

In the 2013 report, the School of music included an appendix of the jury assessment criteria. The jury assessment continues to occur at the end of each semester and continues to be a major source of data for assessing student progress. We are experiencing success in the use of the rubrics for assessing individual student progress for determining semester grades and in looking at whether students are progressing through their programs toward their capstone projects (senior recital permission). Departments also appear to be using the data anecdotally to look at the progress of students across the areas (voice, keyboard, wind/percussion, and strings). However, there still seems to be a gap in data reporting for central analysis across the programs.

Included in the appendix 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. As stated above, those rubrics have been collecting data for individual students; however, with changes in faculty inconsistent submission and sometimes little analysis of the data has occurred. It is clear with this review that we need to do extensive training of the faculty on this process, especially with new hires. We would like to begin to have faculty groups for each area study that data on an annual basis to determine areas of strength and weakness within their areas to better inform us at the program level. The tools we use need to be more consistent across all platforms (strings, voice, WP) in order to make a more meaningful use of the data. This way we can involve faculty more in the revision of the rubrics to meet the needs of the program assessment. We intend to seek consultancy to better determine what our needed data is and how to analyze it.

The Music Education Department has performed extensive assessment for reports to the College of Education; so their process has been very successful. I have met with the College of Education. In the fall (2016), they are going to a new assessment process called PASS (Performance Assessment System for Students). We are expanding their processes (currently used for our Music Education students) to include the entire student body and programs outside the Music Education area. This will not be difficult—especially since some of those processes are already performed in classes outside Music Education. They have not traditionally used the jury performance as one of their professional education assessments. They have used the piano proficiency assessment during this time period. Given new KSDE music licensure standards, the music education department will be developing new assessments and a new alignment to fulfill those standards. It is our plan to work toward a subset of common assessments for all music majors that will allow us to analyze the progress of all music majors with the specificity of analysis that we have experienced in music education as we go into our next program review time period.

- d. Provide aggregate data on student majors satisfaction (e.g., exit surveys), capstone results, licensing or certification examination results (if applicable), 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 outcomes of the program as listed in 3c).

Evaluate table 10 from the Office of Planning and Analysis regarding student satisfaction data.

Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
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 potential goals for the future is to collate the final recital grades in order to compare final recital grades with the semester jury data in order to get a better picture of how students progress within their programs across time. A bold goal would be to look at our native students (entered as freshmen at WSU) compared to our transfer students to make sure we are adequately meeting the needs of both groups.

(NEW) Exit Surveys for both UG and GR are available from our Academic Data Systems—with good reports. Here are some sample ratings:

“Prgm provided material on requirements”

	Yes	No	Valid n/Missing	
Fine Arts UG	97.60%	2.40%	336	0
Music Ed. GR	100.00%	0.00%	24	0
Music History, Theory and Comp GR	100.00%	0.00%	7	0
Music Perf GR	95.60%	4.40%	45	0

“Faculty well informed on prgm requirements”

	Yes	No	Valid n/Missing	
Fine Arts UG	91.70%	8.30%	336	0
Music Ed. GR	91.70%	8.30%	24	0
Music History, Theory and Comp GR	100.00%	0.00%	7	0
Music Perf GR	88.90%	11.10%	45	0

“Overall satisfaction with program”

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Satisfied or Higher
Fine Arts UG	0.30%	5.40%	16.70%	49.70%	28.00%	77.70%
Music Ed. GR	0.00%	0.00%	8.30%	37.50%	54.20%	91.70%
Music History, Theory and Comp GR	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.90%	57.10%	100.00%
Music Perf GR	2.20%	6.70%	15.60%	40.00%	35.60%	75.60%

The Alumni Survey is also available—with good reports. Here are some sample ratings:

“Satisfaction related to major”

	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Satisfied or Higher
Fine Arts	0.00%	25.0%	8.3%	25.0%	41.7%	66.7%

“Would recommend WSU”

	Definitely No	No	Neutral	Yes	Definitely Yes	Yes or Higher
Fine Arts	8.30%	25.0%	8.3%	8.3%	50.00%	58.3%

“Education improved quality of life”

	Definitely No	No	Neutral	Yes	Definitely Yes	Yes or Higher
Fine Arts	8.30%	16.7%	8.3%	33.3%	33.3%	66.7%



- e. 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).

Outcomes:	Results	
	Majors	Non-Majors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Have acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences</li> <li>○ Think critically and independently</li> <li>○ Write and speak effectively</li> <li>○ Employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques</li> </ul>		

Note: 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/>

We have not been assessing our General Education Program courses. This is, obviously, another goal for our School.

During this time period, General Education and KBOR 2020 goals have been assessed as embedded assessments in general education courses. For music majors, all of those courses are taken outside of the music department and reported through the General Education course assessments in those classes. Music Education majors take two courses in music history which are considered for their general education program. The musicology-composition rubric for MUSE 335 (See Listening Guide Evaluation) demonstrates the general education outcomes. See assessment rubric in appendix for alignment to the General Education goals above.

- f. 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.

- g. 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:

We are just concluding our Accreditation Evaluation by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). I turned in our Self Study February of 2015, and we had our visit in March of 2015. We received our Visitors' Report; I made my "Optional Response" to their concerns; the national committee met and had only 4 minor "Deferments" (concerns). This was a very positive outcome. My response to that report is included in the appendices.

- h. 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.

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. (Most, if not all, our professors do not consider 30 minutes long enough and teach longer lessons for music majors—without extra load credit. However, we are planning to consider changing the actual lesson time to 1 hour.) Non-majors receive a 30-minute lesson per week and are not required to attend a master class—for 2 credit hours. (A proposal is under way to allow non-majors to have the 30-minute lesson for 1 credit hour—to encourage more students to study privately.) Professors require various amounts of practice for these courses. Some instrumentalists are physically able to practice longer than others. (Brass and wind players cannot physically endure as long as those performing on keyboard or stringed instruments.)

- i. Provide a brief assessment of the overall quality of the academic program using the data from 3a – 3e 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.

**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. Evaluate tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning Analysis for number of applicants, admits, and enrollments and percent URM students by student level and degrees conferred.
- b. Utilize the table below to provide data that demonstrates student need and demand for the program.

Employment of Majors*							Projected growth from BLS** Current year only.
Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field	No. pursuing graduate or professional education		
Year 1						↓	
Year 2							
Year 3							

\* 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)

- Provide a brief assessment of student need and demand using the data from tables 11-15 from the Office of Planning and Analysis and 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—\$56,310—USD 259—\$48,364 plus special incentives

Middle School—\$54,940—USD 259—\$48,364 plus special incentives

Special Education—\$55,980—USD 259—\$48,364 plus special incentives

Music Directors and Composers—\$48,180

The median hourly wage of musicians and singers was \$22.39 in May 2010. (Annual wage not available)

Approximate salaries of music teachers in Kansas is included in the appendices.

**See the list of Alumni Accomplishments in the Appendixes.**

**5. Analyze the 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).**

Evaluate table 16 from the Office of Planning Analysis for SCH by student department affiliation on fall census day.

- Provide a brief assessment of the 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	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	95 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	Average	WSU
201-400 Music Majors	5	133.8	168.8	274.0	432.4	433.1	286.7	<b>106.1</b>

**Number of Music Majors per Full-Time Faculty Member**

	Number of Institutions Reporting	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	95 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	Average	WSU
201-400 Music Majors	5	7.1	7.7	9.4	9.9	11.3	9.1	<b>7</b>

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

	Number of Institutions Reporting	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	95 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	Average	WSU
201-400 Music Majors	5	5,452	7,110	7,504	10,493	10,971	8,247	<b>9,786</b>

**Total Annual Budget Comparison**

	Number of Institutions Reporting	5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	50 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	95 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	Average	WSU
201-400 Music Majors	7	2,409,124	2,930,064	3,629,002	3,775,661	4,738,140	3,480,049	<b>3,423,114</b>

**6. 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

### These are the suggestions from our last review:

- Prior to the next review in 2016:
  - Retirements of faculty have the potential to significantly impact the ability of the School of Music to continue to provide the quality of education that they currently provide. The administration of the College should be encouraged in developing a “succession plan” for key faculty positions.
  - **RESPONSE**—Retirements have been a major factor since our last review. In our strategic plan, we had major plans for the salary savings and capabilities of the new faculty we would hire. With the current budget cuts, we have lost approximately \$200,000 in salary savings. This year we have 10 open lines. We have lost several of those: full time Music Education Professor, full time Piano Technician, full time Clarinet Professor, full time Coordinator of Music Admissions position. This will greatly affect our recruiting efforts and the morale of our faculty and students.
  - Once results of the SNAAP survey become available, these results should be reviewed carefully to ascertain the level of satisfaction of School of Music graduates, as well as the current employment status of these grads. This is particularly necessary, given that current School of Music information in these areas is primarily anecdotal.
  - **RESPONSE**—A description of the SNAAP process and a summary of the SNAAP results is included in the appendices. The SNAAP process did not yield results that informed our programs to the level that we hoped. We are making plans to move toward using a new exit assessment and use a CV rubric (under development) to collect data and then use the PASS program (which will already be used by music education) in an effort to gather data on a higher number of exiting students.
  - In addition to the SNAAP data, the School of Music should make use of University exit and alumni survey data in program assessment. This data includes placement data, salary data and information regarding student satisfaction.
  - A review of the number of individuals enrolled in the School of Music “one year later” indicates a fairly high attrition rate. This may be normal for this type of School, if not, it should be addressed.
  - **RESPONSE**—We have stated in our Strategic Plan that we were looking forward to using salary savings to hire new faculty with more relevant 21<sup>st</sup> Century expertise and initiate new coursework also more forward-thinking for our students. Again, the recent budget cuts have swept not only salary savings but the positions listed above.
  - Tie the mission of the programs to the new University mission, goals and objectives.
  - **RESPONSE**—See the School of Music Strategic Plan in the Appendix

### NASM “Deferrals” were:

1. The Commission requests that the institution provide evidence of the creation and implementation of a plan for the acquisition and maintenance of pianos, orchestra and band instruments.  
**Response**—The School of Music will designate a percentage of Student Fees to be set aside for the acquisition and maintenance of pianos, orchestra and band instruments. (The recent cut of our Piano Technician Position is now a major concern in the area.)
2. The institution is asked to provide evidence that all constituencies in the music unit regularly receive information related to the preservation of hearing and musculoskeletal health and injury prevention.  
**Response**—We have already begun the process of informing and teaching our faculty, students and staff the significance of health and safety information. We are also requiring information regarding Health and Safety to be included in every syllabus.
3. The Commission wishes to confirm that if any part of a degree is delivered via distance learning means, the institution is required to provide information confirming its compliance with standards regarding distance-learning programs. The institution is asked provide evidence of compliance

particularly as it pertains to MUSE 821 Leadership and Administration in Music Education and MUSC 852 Introduction to Bibliography /Research.

**Response**— The School of Music has no online degrees. MUSE 821 Leadership and Administration in Music Education is not an online course. We are unsure how this error occurred. MUSE 852 Introduction to Bibliography/Research was offered as an online course for only one semester (summer 2015) on an experimental basis. The instructor was the WSU Director of Online Learning, Mark Porcaro, who agreed to teach the course on a one-time basis as we were awaiting the arrival of our new musicology professor.

4. The institution is asked to submit a Curricular Table for the proposed Bachelor of Music in Composition program and indicate how the new degree title is consistent with curricular content and meets all standards pertaining to essential competencies.

**Response**— We already submitted the appropriate Curricular Table; the committee must have misunderstood that fact.

## 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:

It may not seem that we have made much progress on the Assessment portion of our Program Review since our last report. However, we concluded our 4-year building renovation of the Duerksen Fine Arts Building. We participated wholeheartedly in the university-wide Strategic Plan process—including many animated discussions of where we are and where we would wish our students and ourselves to be in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. And we had a very successful Accreditation Self Study Report (accompanied by a flash drive adding 80 reports, processes, tables and descriptions), Consultant Visit, NASM Visitors and their report, the “Optional Response” and now the concluding details of that process.

We have gone through the processes of searching and hiring 7 new faculty in the past three years, and we are now in the process of 6 faculty searches, 1 Unclassified Professional search and 3 emergency hires. One of the Emergency Hires has been revised to an Adjunct position. One has been totally placed in Rescission (along with the \$50,000 that would have been the salary savings). One has been hired (losing the \$45,000 in salary savings). One faculty position was changed to an Unclassified Professional position as Coordinator of Music Admissions (Recruiting Coordinator)—in line with our Strategic Plan. However, even though we searched the position, there is now a hiring freeze on staff positions. So that faculty line has been lost—at least for the time being. To summarize, of 10 available lines, 5 have been lost.

While these recent challenges have an effect on faculty and student morale, the quality of our programs has continued. Our faculty continue to put students first. During this year we completed our NASM visit, have revised all of our course syllabi (for both active and inactive courses) in preparation for our HLC visit. We continue to assess our students using performance based assessments and are working with the College of Education to follow their processes in the recording and analysis of data (as is currently used by our music education program). Better use of technology to support data analysis of our assessments is

one of our primary goals. The recent hiring of younger faculty who are more familiar with these types of processes has already yielded support and modeling for this work.

## **APPENDIXES TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Assessment Plan

NASM Progress Report Response

School of Music Strategic Plan

SNAAP Description, SNAAP Summary of Report

Degree Statistics

Assessments and Their Alignments

STEPS REPORT 2013, STEPS REPORT 2014, STEPS REPORT 2015

Piano Proficiency Scores for Music Ed Majors 2013-14, Piano Proficiency Scores for Music Ed Majors 2014-15

KSDE Assessment #5—Music Proficiency Exam, KSED Assessment #6—Orchestration Final Project, KSDE Assessment #7—Music History Listening Guide, General Education for Music Ed Majors Music #7 Listening Guide Project

SOM ANNUAL REPORT (Faculty Accomplishments 2015)

School of Music Alumni Accomplishments

Graduate Program Assessment Report

Music Jury Performance Assessment Rubric, Jury Spreadsheets



**WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF MUSIC  
ASSESSMENT PLAN 2016**

Formative Assessment	Location in Educational Sequence	Process or Competency Assessed	Evaluation Rubrics Used	Purpose of Assessment	Use of Results	Assessors
Student Success Collaborative	SSC is in each semester for retention	Lower division coursework. Learning outcomes	Professor Reports	Document student progress. Provide feedback to students. Gatekeeper for upper division studios.	Illuminate and address any systemic curricular issues in the lower division sequence to improve pedagogy. Communicate results of performance to students.	School of Music Director and Faculty
Jury Performance	Every Semester	Tone, Intonation, Interpretation, Technique, Rhythm/Notes, Level of Material	Jury Performance Assessment Rubric	Document student progress. Provide feedback to students.	Illuminate and address any systemic curricular issues in the lower division sequence to improve pedagogy. Communicate results of performance to students.	School of Music Director and Faculty
Junior Placement	At the end of 2nd year of study	Jury Exams	Jury Performance Assessment Rubric	Document student progress. Provide feedback to students.	Determine Upper level capabilities	School of Music Director and Faculty

**WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF MUSIC  
ASSESSMENT PLAN 2016**

Summative Assessment	Location in Educational Sequence	Process or Competency Assessed	Evaluation Rubrics Used	Purpose of Assessment	Use of Results	Assessors
Senior Recital	Senior Year	Tone, Interpretation, Technique	Faculty Committee	Assess integration of performance, history and theoretical abilities	Communicate Results to Students and Evaluate Recital Process	School of Music Director and Faculty
Music History (MUS C 335)	Junior or Senior Year	History Knowledge	Musicology Rubric	Evaluate History Knowledge	Communicate Results to Students and Evaluate Course Process	School of Music Director and Faculty
Music Proficiency (MUS A 116)	Culmination of Class	Theory Knowledge and Application Ability	Class Piano Process	Evaluate Application Ability	Communicate Results to Students and Evaluate Course Process	School of Music Director and Faculty
Orchestration (MUS C 641)	Culmination of Class	Knowledge of Instruments, their ranges, transpositions and idiomatic writing	School Rubric	Evaluate Application Ability	Communicate Results to Students and Evaluate Course Process	School of Music Director and Faculty
Indirect Assessment	Location in Educational Sequence	Process or Competency Assessed	Evaluation Rubrics Used	Purpose of Assessment	Use of Results	Assessors
Alumni Survey	For Alumni	N/A	Being Developed	Student Satisfaction	Report to Faculty	School of Music Director and Faculty



WICHITA STATE  
UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS  
School of Music

April 9, 2016

National Association of Schools of Music  
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 21  
Reston, VA 20190-5248

To Whom It May Concern:

Please find enclosed my response to the COMMISSION ACTION REPORT. I would like to thank the Association for not only the thoroughness of this process, but the collegiality with which each step was conducted. The consultant, Dr. John Piersol, was extremely helpful and made his suggestions in a professional manner while making us all feel he was one of us—not merely a critic. The visitors, Dr. James Gardner and Dr. Joseph Downing, created the same atmosphere—emphasizing we are all entities of the same organization, with the purpose of educating our students in the most organized and productive manner.

Although extremely arduous, the process has been beneficial to our school and to me as the Director.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Russ Widener', written in black ink.

Russ Widener  
Director

**NASM Progress Report Response**  
**Wichita State University**  
**April 9, 2016**  
**Submitted by Russ Widener, Director, School of Music**

ITEM 1:

It is unclear whether the institution provides equipment and technology as appropriate to student learning purposes and to the size and scope of the a) music unit, and b) the degrees and programs offered, particularly with regard to pianos and orchestral and band instruments (see NASM Handbook 2014-15, Standards for Accreditation II.F. l.c., d., and f.). The Commission notes in the Optional Response to the Visitors' Report (pp. 18-19) the institution's recent hire of a full-time piano technician and the recent addition of resources dedicated to piano repairs. The Commission, however, requests that the institution provide evidence of the creation and implementation of a plan for the acquisition and maintenance of pianos, orchestra and band instruments.

WSU RESPONSE:

Wichita State University collects Student Fees each semester. We have been given an increase in the fees the School of Music will be allowed to receive next year. I have already asked the faculty for their needs in the areas of pianos and other instruments. An instrument priority list will be designed by the Music Advisory Council (MAC). The additional student fees will target the instruments on that list. As stated in our previous materials, we already spend over \$10,000 per year in piano maintenance; that will continue.

ITEM 2:

It is unclear that students and faculty are provided basic information about the maintenance of health and safety (see NASM Handbook 2014-15, Standards for Accreditation II.F. l.i.). The institution is asked to provide evidence that all constituencies in the music unit regularly receive information related to the preservation of hearing and musculoskeletal health and injury prevention. The Commission acknowledges that the institution has initiated a committee to begin presentations regarding health and safety and requests a report documenting the complete implementation of the strategies outlined in the institution's Response.

WSU RESPONSE:

Our Health and Safety Committee held a school-wide conference on Hearing Health February 2. A speaker from Communicative Disorders presented at this conference. Afterwards, members of the committee gave the results of their research concerning the uses of ear buds, the various types of hearing protection and the success rates of sound shields in ensemble rehearsal and performance. We are planning to continue this type of conference (required for the entire faculty, student body and staff).

We are now requiring all faculty to include the NASM Health and Safety links in their syllabi.

We have also posted information regarding hearing health throughout the school. A copy of that information will be included as Appendix I.

ITEM 3:

It is unclear how the institution meets all NASM operational and curricular standards for online and/or hybrid courses (see NASM Handbook 2014-15, Standards for Accreditation III.H.4.b.-e.). The Commission wishes to confirm that if any part of a degree is delivered via distance learning means, the institution is required to provide information confirming its compliance with standards regarding distance-learning programs. The institution is asked provide evidence of compliance particularly as it pertains to MUSE 821 Leadership and Administration in Music Education and MUSC 852 Introduction to Bibliography /Research.

WSU RESPONSE:

Our online courses have the same requirements as our face to face courses. MUSE 821 is not an online course at all. MUSC 852 was taught online (with all the same requirements) during one summer session only because our musicologist had resigned, and we hired another musicologist to teach that one course for the summer session. It is not our intention to repeat that online offering, and we have hired a tenure track musicologist who will teach the course in a classroom setting whether during the normal school year or in the summer.

ITEM 4:

It is unclear how the degree Bachelor of Music in Composition meets NASM Standards regarding consistency between degree title and content as it pertains to the proposed change in degree title from Bachelor of Music in Theory and Composition to Bachelor of Music in Composition (see NASM Handbook 2014-15, Standards for Accreditation II.I. Lg. and II.1.2.c.). The institution is asked to submit a Curricular Table for the proposed Bachelor of Music in Composition program and indicate how the new degree title is consistent with curricular content and meets all standards pertaining to essential competencies.

The Curricular Table we submitted in our last materials was already updated for the degree Bachelor of Music in Composition.

ITEM 5:

The Commission wishes to confirm that the Chamber Music emphasis in the degree Master of Music in Performance will not be listed in NASM publications. The institution may list this emphasis in its publications. Moreover, transcript evidence is not required for emphases within a major that has received Final Approval for Listing previously. The Commission requests that the institution submit a copy of the language to be included in the corrected Graduate Catalog 2016-2017 which refers to the title of this degree.

WSU RESPONSE:

Below is a screen shot of our listing in the newly published Graduate Catalogue. The link to our catalogues online is <http://webs.wichita.edu/?u=registrar&p=/catalogs/>

**MM—Chamber Music Concentration**

In addition to the core requirements for all MM programs, students must complete the course-work listed below. The program requires a total of 32 hours.

*Graduate Performance Study—10 hours of instruction in major medium*

MUSA 732\_\_ Applied Music Instruction  
(repeatable)

MUSA 734\_\_ Applied Music Instruction  
(repeatable)

*Chamber Music Ensemble—Choose from the following* .....4

MUSP 710\_, MUSP 711\_, MUSP 712\_, MUSP 713\_, MUSP 714 (audition required)

(J) Piano Accompaniment, (N) Woodwind Ensemble, (O) Saxophone Quartet, (P) Brass Chamber Ensemble, (S) String Ensemble and String Chamber Ensemble, (X) New Music Ensemble. Repeatable for credit.

*Other Required Coursework*

MUSC 786 Chamber Music Lit 1.....2

MUSC 787 Chamber Music Lit 2.....2

*Graduate Recital*

MUSP 873 Graduate Recital.....2

**APPENDIX I**  
**Poster Information and Photo of Poster on the Wall**

# For Best Hearing Health

- Reduce exposure time to sounds greater than 85 dB (anything above 85 dB is damaging to the ears)
- Acquire a decibel “APP” for your phone to monitor dB in your ensembles
- Reduce repeated or cumulative exposure to very loud sounds
- Use Musician’s Ear Plugs during loud passages of large ensemble rehearsals & performances
- Avoid hazardous sound environments, such as very loud music ensembles or any portable electronic device (phone/MP3/etc.) turned to maximum volume *especially when using “ear buds”*
  - Give ears a rest after exposure to loud sounds



The School of Music at Wichita State University expects every student to read and understand the Health & Safety Policies mandated by the National Association of Schools of Music on **Neuromusculoskeletal and Vocal Health & Advisories on Hearing Health** at:  
<http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/index.jsp?page=NASM-PAMA+Advisories+on+Neuromusculoskeletal+Vocal+Health> and  
[http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/index.index.jsp?page=NASM-PAMA\\_Hearing\\_Health](http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/index.index.jsp?page=NASM-PAMA_Hearing_Health)



## Hearing Health

- Reduce exposure time to sounds greater than 85 dB (anything above 85 dB is damaging to the ears)
- Acquire a decibel "APP" for your phone to monitor dB in your ensembles
- Reduce repeated or cumulative exposure to very loud sounds
- Use Musician's Ear Plugs during loud passages of large ensemble rehearsals & performances
- Avoid hazardous sound environments, such as very loud music ensembles or any portable electronic device (phone/MP3/ etc.) turned to maximum volume especially when using "ear buds"
- Give ears a rest after exposure to loud sounds



WICHITA STATE  
UNIVERSITY

The School of Music at Wichita State University expects every student to read and understand the Health & Safety Policies mandated by the National Association of Schools of Music on Neuromusculoskeletal and Vocal Health & Advisories on Hearing Health at:

<http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/index.jsp?page=NASM-PAMA+Advisories+on+Neuromusculoskeletal+Vocal+Health> and  
[http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/index.index.jsp?page=NASM-PAMA\\_Hearing\\_Health](http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/index.index.jsp?page=NASM-PAMA_Hearing_Health)



## Wichita State University School of Music Strategic Plan

**Primary Directive:** All action items conceived by the School of Music are intended to increase the number of majors entering and graduating from the music program. We believe that by implementing the action plans that will not require additional funding, we can increase and maintain 300 majors. However, we believe that with additional resources we could reach 450 majors.

**Goal 1** *Guarantee an applied learning or research experience for every student by each academic program.*

The School of Music is designed around the idea of applied learning for all students—both graduate and undergraduate. Students have a variety of different applied learning experiences depending on their specific major such as:

- All majors, regardless of area of focus, have performance juries each semester and give a recital as the culmination of their performance work at WSU
- All majors, regardless of area, perform in large ensembles and give regular concerts on and off campus throughout the year
- In addition, undergraduate performance majors participate in a variety of applied experiences on and off campus—including chamber music recitals, recitals off campus as service to the community (in retirement communities, businesses, etc.) as well as paid performances in the community for weddings, parties and background music for social events
- Graduate performance students often play in the Wichita Symphony, a professional orchestra that requires an audition and acceptance into the ensemble by the music director
- Music Education majors have an active applied learning experience throughout their time here that culminates not only with student teaching but also involves classroom observation in the public schools, peer teaching, and cooperative teaching during the four year curriculum.

In addition to these experiences, the School of Music will expand in three key ways:

- Our partnership with the Wichita Symphony provides a unique experience for our instrumental students. Currently there is no official partnership for vocal students outside the university. Over the next academic year, the Vocal area will investigate an official internship program with a regional opera company in Wichita.
- To further grow our graduate program and capitalize on partnerships existing in the community and current trends in the music field, the School of Music will expand its masters program with the creation of a certificate or

performance diploma for instrumentalists and vocalists, an additional track added to the instrumental conducting degree that focuses on Opera/Music Theater and two new graduate degrees: M.M. in Chamber Music Performance and an M.M. in Multiple Woodwinds, a degree which focuses on the ability of a single performer to perform on multiple woodwind instruments, a skill set that is needed in both Big Band and Musical Theater performance. We will try to establish a partnership with Music Theatre of Wichita as a training ground for those students. New graduate programs will be put in place by academic year 2015-2016.

- We will also assess an intensive three-week summer masters' program in music education, which can be completed in three summer sessions. This might or might not include on-line offerings. It will require integration of education, theory, history and performance faculty. This program is to target current teachers from a large geographic region.

### **Goal 1 with additional resources:**

If additional resources can be found, the School of Music sees two ways to grow the program and its national and international visibility.

- The expansion of the graduate program to include four doctoral programs unique to Kansas and two which are fairly unique to the country
  - a) DMA in Orchestral Performance. Using our ties with the Wichita Symphony, we would be the only school in the country to offer a doctorate focused on orchestral performing experience. A similar program was started at the Curtis School with a program to develop concertmasters of orchestras. It has proved to be a successful and prestigious program, which has garnered national and international attention for the violin program.
  - b) PhD in Special Music Education. Capitalizing on the successful undergraduate and graduate degrees in Special Music Education, it seems a natural fit to expand into a doctoral degree. This degree would be one of the few offered in the country and could be a more comprehensive version of the popular music therapy degree offered at other institutions.
  - c) DMA in Opera Performance. Our opera program is growing in prominence with the addition of Alumni Sam Ramey and Alan Held to the faculty, a doctorate in Opera Performance would be a natural outgrowth of the current program.
  - d) DMA in Chamber Music. One of the great strengths of our program is the chamber music. With internationally recognized ensembles like the St. Petersburg String Quartet and the Lieurance Woodwind Quintet, we provide exceptional training for students in chamber music.

To have a successful doctoral program, it will require 2 new tenure track lines in Musicology/Theory and increasing the Bassoon and Oboe Positions to full time (preferably tenure track). To be competitive in our

vocal area, the graduate program would require a vocal coach and the addition a staff accompanist.

Outside of faculty resources, additional office staff and a full time graduate coordinator will be needed. Additional funding for GTA and GA positions will be needed, and facilities—including the music library—will need to meet NASM standards.

- Not having a marching band has for years negatively affected our enrollment. Over the next year we will investigate, develop and design a marching ensemble ranging from 5-50 performers under the auspices of Sound Sport a DCI affiliated organization. This type ensemble would not incur the expenses normally associated with a full marching band. For this to be successful One adjunct position that would run Sound Sport with the possibility of some new GA/GTA support would be needed. Uniforms would be simple (i.e. Khakis, black shirts, etc.) and could be covered by students.

***Goal 2: Pioneer an educational experience for all that integrates interdisciplinary curricula across the university.***

The School of music places a high priority on interdisciplinary curriculum and feels this can be addressed in four key ways:

- 1) Reaching out to other schools throughout the university to find how our current offerings can be used to heighten existing curriculum in other programs. With free tickets being available to students, partnerships could be created where in which students from other programs would attend concerts as a requirement for a class.
- 2) Assess implementing the previously created Introduction to Fine Arts into the curriculum.
- 3) Encouraging faculty to create new interdisciplinary courses that could be team-taught as electives or potential general education courses
- 4) Assess current degree requirements to find two or three credits to be replaced by a required introduction to Music Technology course (1 credit) and one semester of Music Entrepreneurship that will cover topics like management, promotion, grant writing, C.V.'s, bios, etc. (1 or two credits). The Music Entrepreneurship course could be extended to create a certificate program in Arts Management

**Goal 2 with additional resources:**

In the interest of breaking down the silos that currently exist within the College of Fine Arts, we believe we would be served well by a new facility that houses all three schools in the CFA. Not only would this facilitate easier collaboration within the college, but new state of the art facilities would be a strong recruiting tool for potential students.

***Goal 3: Capitalize systemically on relevant existing and emerging societal***

***and economic trends that increase quality educational opportunities.***

The School of Music will place greater emphasis on providing an education that deals with the needs of the 21<sup>st</sup> century musician. In addition to the skills that have always been taught, more emphasis needs to be placed on the musician as an entrepreneur and, in reality, a small business owner. With this in mind, we will capitalize on the expertise of other schools and colleges throughout the university as well as experts in the field of arts management and members of the business community as well as partnering with other institutions. Each program will develop a general education program of study that accompanies the degree requirements for a music degree. While students will still be free to choose the general education courses that interest them most, this course of study will be emphasized as a way for students to get the most benefit from current general education offerings—including the College of Fine Arts' own Entrepreneurship in the Arts course.

**Goal 3 with additional resources:**

With additional resources, the School of Music would like to broaden the types of degrees and certificates currently offered that are connected to current trends in the business side of music as well as other fields outside of the Western Art Music tradition. These would include degrees in Music Business (arts administration), Audio Recording and Production, and Commercial music as well as expanding the scope of the current jazz program. In addition we could create a partnership degree with the health sciences and special music education.

**Additional Resources Needed:** New faculty lines that have specialties in the specific areas mentioned.

**Goal 4: *Accelerate the discovery, creation, and transfer of new knowledge.***

To fulfill this goal, the School of Music will take two actions:

1) The School of Music will use the funds it currently has to design a regional and local touring schedule for all major performing ensembles. Ensemble directors will create a schedule that allows for interaction with local/regional schools and participation in regional/local festivals.

2) Each program in the School of Music will evaluate its current curricula and develop a mission and plan for online education. A program may decide to offer an entire degree online (masters or undergraduate), partial fulfillment of degrees with some completely online courses, or an offering of hybrid courses to allow a new model for educating students.

#### **Goal 4 with additional resources:**

1) While touring in the area will provide local exposure, we believe there is great benefit to touring nationally and internationally with our ensembles. These tours not only get the name of the WSU School of Music outside Kansas; it also provides a huge cultural benefit to the students. Significant additional funds that would allow for a rotating touring schedule for each major performing ensemble will need to be secured.

2) In addition to a national touring presence for our ensembles, additional funding for faculty travel funds is needed for national and international travel to perform and present at conferences.

#### ***Goal 5: Empower students to create a campus culture and experience that meets their changing needs.***

The School of Music has struggled to create a sense of community among the students, and the inability to connect students was heightened by the three years of construction. The School of Music will take a three-pronged approach to helping create a community amongst the students, which encourages them to create their own unique experiences.

1) A monthly convocation that requires attendance of all music majors and serves as a recital hour featuring various students from the school of music. The purpose of the convocation is for students to observe their peers, which they may not normally hear, in solo performance. It will also serve as a monthly meeting in which announcements by faculty, staff and student organizations can be made.

2) Heavier promotion and involvement from the Music Fraternities and Sororities within the school of music.

3) Drawing up a set of policies setting guidelines that sanction and encourage student led organizations. The policies will make clear the faculty involvement, use of school facilities, and funding opportunities outside of the School of Music that will be available to student led organizations.

#### ***Goal 6 Be a Campus that reflects—in staff, faculty and students—the evolving diversity of society***

We believe the best way to increase diversity is by increasing the population of our music majors. Developing a thorough recruiting strategy over the next two years will do this. It will require:

1) A coordinated recruiting effort by faculty members.

2) A new approach to interfacing with potential students through different technological means, including—but not limited to—a website that is easy to navigate and highlights important information about the program. It will be

coordinated with the admissions department regarding potential students and digital communication tools.

In addition to improving the quality and quantity of our student body, all students wanting to become a major will be required to audition through the School of Music. This will be done during a scheduled audition day (potentially days) where students will audition, take a theory diagnostic exam, meet with the music department chair, tour the facilities and campuses, meet with admissions and financial aid as well as attend a concert of student or faculty performances. In addition, graduate students will meet with the director of graduate studies. Exceptions to this audition process could be made at the discretion of the studio teacher.

### **Goal 6 with additional resources**

There are several obstacles in recruiting at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. They deal primarily with the funding of each of these students. With additional resources, we could approach the undergraduate and graduate issues differently. With graduate students, our GA stipends cover only a portion of their tuition. Most institutions provide full tuition as well as a stipend to live on.

Our undergraduates are hampered by the limited scholarship funds provided as well as the limitations put on the current scholarships. With the additional funds, we would be able to have allocations to be used for scholarships or provide other incentives to students—travel funds, or professional development money.

### ***Goal 7 Create a new model of assessment, incentive, and reward process to accomplish our vision and goals.***

The School of Music can best achieve this goal by developing policies that incentivize our faculty to take positive risks and provide a clearer evaluation process for junior faculty.

- 1) We will create guidelines to provide incentive for creating cross-discipline learning opportunities for students—including policies for course load distribution, release time for planning, and research/creative activity credit.
- 2) For junior faculty we will develop a process for a third-year review by School of Music faculty.

### **Goal 7 with additional resources**

The biggest area of struggle for the School of Music regarding incentive and reward is the funding of adjunct and .5/.75 faculty members. Several of our adjuncts are at full loads—if not overload. However, they are significantly underfunded. In addition we have a few .5 and .75 faculty teaching in key areas. Unfortunately these are also underfunded and are often overload—which then requires additional funding at an

adjunct level. The result is faculty who are overworked and underpaid. Often these turn into positions with high turnover.

Ideally, these .5 and .75 positions would be converted into fulltime positions (either tenure track or non-tenure track), and new incentives would be created for adjunct professors that could include higher pay and potential benefits for those who are half time or more.



**STRATEGIC  
NATIONAL ARTS ALUMNI  
PROJECT**

TRACKING THE LIVES  
AND CAREERS OF  
ARTS GRADUATES



# 2013

INSTITUTIONAL  
REPORT

**Wichita State University**  
COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS





## STRATEGIC NATIONAL ARTS ALUMNI PROJECT

Tracking the Lives and Careers of Arts Graduates

May 6, 2014

Dr. Rodney Miller  
Dean, College of Fine Arts  
Wichita State University  
1845 Fairmount, Box 151  
Wichita, KS 67260-0151

Dear Rodney:

We are pleased to present your institution's results from the 2013 survey by the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP). In this report, you will find both your institution's confidential data as well as aggregate findings from peer institutions that participated in 2011, 2012, and/or 2013.

Before delving into your school's results, beginning in Section 2, we encourage you to review the front section, *Overview and Interpretation* (Section 1). Your SNAAP data will generate rich insights and, most likely, contain actionable findings. Information for determining the reliability of your data—the total number of alumni who responded, your school's overall response rate, and the sampling error—can be found in the *Respondent Characteristics* report(s).

This year, for the first time, you can compare your arts majors to equivalent majors from other institutions. This is a key new feature of the SNAAP Institutional Reports and a direct result of input from institutions like yours; we hope you find it useful.

In addition to your report in PDF, we provide you with a full data set of *identifiable* information. While you are free to use and publicize your data as you wish, please remember that individual responses are to remain confidential and that individual respondents should never be publicly identified.

To assist you in sharing and using your SNAAP data on campus, we provide a number of tools on our web site, including information about how other institutions are using their data. Please let me know if you would like further assistance, including consulting services customized for your needs.

The SNAAP annual report of national findings is in development and will be available in late summer. As a participating institution, you will see this report before it is released publicly.

Thank you for your leadership as part of this national effort to learn more about the lives and careers of graduates of arts programs.

Best wishes,

Sally Gaskill  
Director

PS SNAAP is currently engaged in a long-range assessment and planning effort that will determine the future paths of the project. We welcome your participation in the assessment process and hope you complete the SNAAP Planning Survey that you will receive later this month.



# STRATEGIC NATIONAL ARTS ALUMNI PROJECT

## SNAAP Institutional Report

### Table of Contents

#### Section 1: SNAAP Overview and Interpretation

About SNAAP

Interpreting Your Results

#### Section 2: Undergraduate Alumni

Data Highlights

Recent Graduates

Comparison Groups

Respondent Characteristics

Frequency Report

Alumni Comments

#### Section 3: Graduate Alumni

Data Highlights

Recent Graduates

Comparison Groups

Respondent Characteristics

Frequency Report

Alumni Comments





**STRATEGIC  
NATIONAL ARTS ALUMNI  
PROJECT**

**Section 1: SNAAP Overview and Interpretation**

**About SNAAP**

**Interpreting Your Results**



## About SNAAP

### What is the Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP)?

The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP) is an annual online survey, data management, and institutional improvement system designed to enhance the quality of arts-school education. SNAAP is generating rich, detailed information about the lives and careers of people with intensive training in the arts, broadly defined. SNAAP data can identify ways to better connect arts training to artistic careers, making it possible for arts leaders, educators, and researchers to understand and address the systemic factors that help or hinder the career paths of alumni, whether they work as artists or pursue other paths. SNAAP data allow participating schools to compare themselves with similar schools on multiple dimensions. The annual findings also provide insight into national patterns and trends resulting from detailed analyses of employment, career outcomes, and institutional experiences by artistic discipline, region of the country, cohort, and degree type.

SNAAP grew out of the Surdna Foundation's interest in helping arts training institutions across the country learn more about their graduates. Following several years of planning, three field tests of the survey were conducted beginning in 2008, and the first national administration occurred in fall 2011.

#### MISSION:

The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP) investigates the educational experiences and career paths of arts graduates nationally. SNAAP provides the findings to educators, policy makers, and philanthropic organizations to improve arts training, inform cultural policy, and support artists.



### Why is SNAAP important now?

Arts education institutions have expressed an urgent need for high quality, actionable data. The information SNAAP provides is especially timely given the changing environment in which arts training institutions operate: Career opportunities are shifting, competition for both students and resources is on the rise, and a generational shift in leadership is under way. Accreditation requirements also increasingly require information about alumni paths. To respond and plan effectively, institutions require comprehensive information.

### How can key stakeholder groups benefit from SNAAP?

**For leaders at educational institutions with degree-granting arts programs, SNAAP results can help:**

- inform, develop, and reform curriculum by discovering what aspiring young artists need to advance in rapidly changing arts fields;
- compare their training to that of similar institutions to identify relative strengths and areas needing attention;
- strengthen alumni engagement and support;
- clarify what students learned and how it has been used in both arts and non-arts contexts;
- address student and alumni career needs;
- enhance recruitment, public relations, marketing, strategic planning, and development efforts;
- provide evidence for the value of an arts education and alternative measures of success, including school and work satisfaction, for alumni working both inside and outside the arts.

**For policy makers, community development professionals, and funders, SNAAP's national reports point to:**

- opportunities and barriers, including debt, school networks, internships, and mentors, that influence the career pathways of arts graduates;
- contributions of people intensively educated in the arts to the creative economy nationally;
- local and regional arts workforce issues and market patterns for community developers and planners;
- gaps in the arts training ecology across disciplines, at different training junctures, and across various geographic locales;
- support mechanisms and resources needed to encourage and sustain artists in their most vulnerable five years after school and beyond; and
- the complex nature of creative careers in a contingent economy marked by high rates of self-employment, entrepreneurship, and work across disciplines and sectors.

**For parents and students considering intensive arts education, SNAAP's national reports can provide information about:**

- career patterns of arts graduates in the arts and in other fields;
- learning outcomes of arts graduates in terms of skills and competencies acquired in arts school and particularly valued by individuals working both in and outside the arts;
- influence of professional relationships and networks on career outcomes;
- obstacles to achieving arts training and professional goals;
- career satisfaction across different occupations and types of employment; and
- different experiences and training for students who go to arts schools.

**Who is surveyed?**

All living arts graduates of institutions that participate in SNAAP are invited to complete SNAAP's online questionnaire.

**What kinds of questions does SNAAP ask?**

- satisfaction with curricular and co-curricular experiences
- current and past education and employment
- skills acquired at the institution and their importance in the workplace

- relevance of arts education to work and further education
- turning points, obstacles, critical relationships, and opportunities
- support and resources needed after graduation
- types of art practiced and how often
- arts engagement with the local community
- income and support, student debt, and other financial issues



**How is SNAAP administered?**

SNAAP is a Web-based survey that collects data from alumni through questions with checkboxes and open-ended responses. The user-friendly, adaptive questionnaire was developed for sensitivity and responsiveness to the diverse pathways and experiences of arts graduates.

**What does it cost to participate in SNAAP?**

Thanks to the generous support of our funders, three field tests (2008, 2009, 2010) were conducted at no cost to participating institutions. To become a self-sustaining resource for the arts field, participating institutions now share the survey administration costs. Since 2011, fees have been based on institution size and have ranged from \$1,300 to \$2,800 for high schools and from \$3,300 to \$7,800 for postsecondary institutions. For institutions that conduct their own alumni surveys, such projects typically cost much more and lack access to the rich, informative comparison data SNAAP provides.



## SNAAP 2011, 2012, and 2013 Participating Institutions

SNAAP 2011, 2012, and 2013 institutions are located in 47 states, the District of Columbia, and two Canadian provinces. In 2013, half the participating institutions administered SNAAP for the first time.

In this list, institutions that participated in 2011 and 2012 are italicized, and 2013 institutions appear in regular font. Those marked with an asterisk (\*) include undergraduate alumni only; all other postsecondary institutions include both undergraduate and graduate alumni.

### United States

#### Alabama

University of Alabama in Huntsville\*

#### Alaska

University of Alaska Anchorage

#### Arizona

Arizona State University Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts, Tempe

#### Arkansas

Arkansas State University College of Fine Arts, Jonesboro  
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

#### California

Art Center College of Design, Pasadena  
California Baptist University, Riverside  
California College of the Arts, San Francisco  
California Institute of the Arts (CalArts), Valencia  
California Lutheran University, Thousand Oaks  
California State University–Fullerton  
Chapman University College of Performing Arts, Orange\*  
The Colburn School, Los Angeles  
Idyllwild Arts Academy<sup>a</sup>  
Laguna College of Arts and Design  
Los Angeles County High School for the Arts<sup>a</sup>  
Otis College of Art and Design, Los Angeles  
Orange County School of the Arts<sup>a</sup>  
San Francisco Art Institute  
University of California–Berkeley  
University of California–Davis  
University of California–Irvine  
University of California–Los Angeles School of the Arts and Architecture  
University of California–Merced†  
University of California–Riverside  
University of California–San Diego  
University of California–Santa Barbara  
University of California–Santa Cruz  
Woodbury University, Burbank†

#### Colorado

University of Colorado at Boulder College of Music  
University of Denver  
University of Northern Colorado, Greeley

#### Connecticut

University of Hartford, The Hartt School  
University of Hartford, Hartford Art School  
Western Connecticut State University School of Visual & Performing Arts, Danbury

#### District of Columbia

Corcoran College of Art + Design  
Duke Ellington School of the Arts<sup>a</sup>

#### Florida

Douglas Anderson School of the Arts, Jacksonville<sup>a</sup>  
Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton  
Florida International University College of Architecture and the Arts, Miami  
Ringling College of Art and Design, Sarasota\*  
Stetson University, DeLand\*  
University of Florida College of Fine Arts, Gainesville

#### Georgia

Georgia Southern University, Statesboro  
Georgia State University, Atlanta  
Valdosta State University Department of Art

#### Idaho

Brigham Young University–Idaho College of Performing and Visual Arts, Rexburg\*†

#### Illinois

Columbia College Chicago  
DePaul University, Chicago  
Knox College, Galesburg\*  
Millikin University College of Fine Arts, Decatur\*  
School of the Art Institute of Chicago  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign College of Fine and Applied Arts

#### Indiana

Butler University Jordan College of the Arts, Indianapolis  
DePauw University School of Music, Greencastle\*  
Herron School of Art and Design, Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis  
Indiana University Jacobs School of Music, Bloomington  
Indiana University Art Education Program, Bloomington  
Indiana University College of Arts & Sciences, Bloomington  
Purdue University, West Lafayette

#### Kansas

Pittsburg State University  
The University of Kansas School of the Arts, Lawrence  
Wichita State University College of Fine Arts

#### Kentucky

Bellarmine University, Louisville\*  
Western Kentucky University Potter College of Arts & Letters, Bowling Green  
University of Louisville

#### Louisiana

Louisiana School for Math, Science, and the Arts, Natchitoches<sup>a</sup>  
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge  
The University of Louisiana at Monroe School of Visual and Performing Arts  
The University of New Orleans

#### Maine

Maine College of Art, Portland

#### Maryland

Baltimore School for the Arts<sup>a</sup>  
Maryland Institute College of Art, Baltimore  
Washington Adventist University Department of Music, Takoma Park\*

#### Massachusetts

The Art Institute of Boston at Lesley University  
Boston Arts Academy<sup>a</sup>  
Emerson College School of the Arts, Boston  
Massachusetts College of Art and Design, Boston  
School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston  
University of Massachusetts, Amherst  
University of Massachusetts–Dartmouth  
Walnut Hill School for the Arts, Natick<sup>a</sup>





### Michigan

*Albion College\**  
 Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti  
*Interlochen Arts Academy\**  
 Kendall College of Art and Design at  
 Ferris State University, Big Rapids  
 Oakland University, Rochester  
 University of Michigan School of Art  
 & Design, Ann Arbor  
 Western Michigan University,  
 Kalamazoo

### Minnesota

*College of Visual Arts, Saint Paul*  
 Minneapolis College of Art and Design  
 St. Cloud State University  
 University of Minnesota–Twin Cities

### Missouri

*Evangel University, Springfield*  
 Kansas City Art Institute\*  
 Sam Fox School of Design & Visual Arts at Washington University in St.  
 Louis  
 University of Missouri–Kansas City

### Nebraska

Hixson-Lied College of Fine and Performing Arts at the University of  
 Nebraska–Lincoln

### New Jersey

*Seton Hall University, South Orange*

### New Mexico

*Santa Fe University of Art and Design\**

### New York

*Alfred University*  
*The City College of New York†*  
*The Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art, New York\**  
 Fashion Institute of Technology School of Art and Design, New York  
*Hamilton College, Clinton\**  
*Manhattan School of Music, New York*  
 New York University Tisch School of the Arts  
*Pace University, Briarcliffe Manor*  
*Pratt Institute, Brooklyn*  
 Rochester Institute of Technology  
*School of Visual Arts, New York*  
*State University of New York at New Paltz†*  
 State University of New York at Purchase College  
*Syracuse University*

### North Carolina

*University of North Carolina at Charlotte*

### North Dakota

*North Dakota State University Division of Fine Arts, Fargo*

### Ohio

*Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland*  
*Cleveland Institute of Art*  
 Cleveland Institute of Music  
*Columbus College of Art & Design, Columbus*  
 Kent State University College of the Arts  
 Miami University–Oxford College of Creative Arts  
*Ohio Northern University, Ada\**  
*The Ohio State University, Columbus*  
 Ohio University College of Fine Arts, Athens  
 University of Cincinnati College Conservatory of Music  
 University of Cincinnati College of Design, Architecture, Art, and Planning

### Oregon

*Pacific Northwest College of Art, Portland*

### Pennsylvania

*Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania*  
*Indiana University of Pennsylvania College of Fine Arts*  
*Lehigh Valley Charter High School for the Performing Arts, Bethlehem\**  
*Marywood University, Scranton*  
*Moore College of Art and Design, Philadelphia\**  
*Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Philadelphia*  
 Pennsylvania State University College of Arts and Architecture, State College  
 Temple University, Philadelphia  
*The University of the Arts, Philadelphia*

### Rhode Island

Rhode Island School of Design, Providence†

### South Carolina

*Coker College, Hartsville\**  
*College of Charleston School of the Arts*  
*South Carolina Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities, Greenville\**  
*University of South Carolina Columbia†*

### South Dakota

*Northern State University, Aberdeen*

### Tennessee

Austin Peay State University, Clarksville  
*Memphis College of Art, Memphis*

### Texas

*High School for the Performing and Visual Arts, Houston\**  
*Southern Methodist University Meadows School of the Arts, Dallas*  
 Stephen F. Austin University College of Fine Arts, Nacogdoches\*  
*Texas State University College of Fine Arts and Communication, San Marcos*  
*University of Houston*  
 University of North Texas, Denton  
*The University of Texas at Austin*

### Utah

University of Utah College of Fine Arts, Salt Lake City  
*Utah State University Caine College of the Arts, Logan*

### Vermont

University of Vermont College of Arts & Sciences, Burlington\*

### Virginia

*James Madison University, Harrisonburg*  
 Virginia Commonwealth University School of the Arts, Richmond  
*University of Richmond\**  
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville

### Washington

*Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma*

### West Virginia

*West Virginia University College of Creative Arts, Morgantown*

### Wisconsin

*Milwaukee Institute of Art & Design\**  
 University of Wisconsin–Madison Department of Art  
*University of Wisconsin–Whitewater*

### Canada

*Alberta College of Art + Design, Calgary\**  
 OCAD University, Toronto, Ontario

\*Undergraduate respondents only

†Institution excluded from analysis (including comparison groups)  
 due to limited numbers of cohort years

\*Arts high school



## SNAAP Staff

### Indiana University

*Director*  
Sally Gaskill

*Project Coordinator*  
Rebecca F. Houghton

*Research Analysts*  
Amber D. Lambert  
Angie L. Miller

*Project Associates*  
Yiran Dong  
Lanlan Mu  
Lotus Wang  
Jonathan Zilvinskis

---

*SNAAP Research Director*  
*Associate Director, Curb Center of Art,  
Enterprise, and Public Policy*  
*Associate Professor of Sociology*  
*Vanderbilt University (through June 30, 2014)*  
*Dean, Herberger Institute for Design and the Arts*  
*Arizona State University (as of July 1, 2014)*  
Steven J. Tepper

*SNAAP Senior Research Scholar*  
*Associate Professor of Arts Administration  
& Sociology*  
*Teachers College, Columbia University*  
Jennifer C. Lena

### Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research

*Director*  
Don Hossler

*Finance Manager*  
Marilyn Gregory

*Web Developer*  
Hien Nguyen

*Office Coordinator*  
Barbara Stewart

*Office Secretary*  
Katie Noel

### Indiana University Center for Survey Research

*Director*  
Ashley Bowers

*Senior Research Director*  
John Kennedy

*Director of  
Technologies*  
Kevin Tharp

*Study Director*  
Heather Terhune Marti

*Senior Web Programmer*  
Jason Francis

*Web Programmer*  
Barb Gelwick



### National Advisory Board

Kenneth C. Fischer, *Chair*  
*President, University Musical Society*  
*University of Michigan*  
*Ann Arbor, Michigan*

Antonia Contro  
*Executive Director, Marwen*  
*Chicago, Illinois*

Sarah Bainter Cunningham  
*Executive Director of Research, School of the  
Arts, Virginia Commonwealth University*  
*Richmond, Virginia*

Douglas Dempster  
*Dean, College of Fine Arts, The University of  
Texas at Austin*  
*Austin, Texas*

Chris Ford  
*Director, Baltimore School for the Arts*  
*Baltimore, Maryland*

Barbara B. Hauptman  
*Former Executive Director, Society of Stage  
Directors and Choreographers*  
*Rye, New York*



Samuel Hoi  
*President, Otis College of Art and Design  
(through June 30, 2014)  
Los Angeles, California*

*President, Maryland Institute College of Art  
(as of July 1, 2014)  
Baltimore, Maryland*

Steven Lavine  
*President, California Institute of the Arts  
Valencia, California*

Abel Lopez  
*Associate Producing Director, GALA Hispanic Theatre  
Washington, D.C.*

Ann R. Markusen  
*Director, Arts Economy Initiative  
Humphrey School of Public Affairs  
University of Minnesota  
Minneapolis, Minnesota*

Carlos Martinez  
*Principal and Global Design Leader, Gensler  
Chicago, Illinois*

M. Lee Pelton  
*President, Emerson College  
Boston, Massachusetts*

Stephanie Perrin  
*Retired Head, Walnut Hill School  
Orleans, Massachusetts*

Susan Petry  
*Chair, Department of Dance, The Ohio State University  
Columbus, Ohio*

Robert Sirota  
*Composer  
New York, New York*

James Undercofler  
*Chair, Arts Administration, SUNY Purchase  
Artistic Director, National Orchestral Institute  
Ithaca, New York*

## Funders

SNAAP would not exist without the support of our original funders, listed here. Revenue from participating schools will continue to provide core support, supplemented by funder support for specific research.

### Lead funding

Surdna Foundation

### Major partnership support

Houston Endowment

Barr Foundation

National Endowment for the Arts

Cleveland Foundation

Educational Foundation of America

### Photo Credits

*Many thanks to the 2013 participating institutions that contributed photographs to this and other SNAAP publications.*

*Cover, left to right:* University of Florida, Orange County School of the Arts, Eastern Michigan University, (photo courtesy of Mike Andaloro/Eastern Michigan University)

*Section Cover Pages, left to right:* University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Temple University (photo by Wan Peng), Millikin University

*Page 1:* Temple University (photo by Alyssa Pearson)

*Page 2:* Washington Adventist University

*Page 3:* Rhode Island School of Design

*Page 4:* Stephen F. Austin State University

*Page 5:* University of Utah

*Page 6:* Indiana University Bloomington

*Page 7:* Cleveland Institute of Music

*Page 8:* Kent State University

*Page 10:* Louisiana State University

*Page 11:* University of Cincinnati



## Interpreting Your Results



SNAAP 2013 marks the third national administration of the project. In this report, the results of the 2011, 2012, and 2013 administrations are combined to provide the most robust and meaningful data possible.

### Q: What were the response rates for the 2011, 2012, and 2013 administrations?

**A:** There are several ways to calculate response rates of large scale surveys involving multiple institutions. Table 1 displays the two primary ways that SNAAP calculates response rates. The “overall response rate” is the total number of respondents divided by the total number of alumni contacted. The “average response rate” takes the response rate for each institution and averages those rates. Both of these rate calculations include partially completed surveys in the total response rates and are adjusted to exclude undeliverable mailing addresses and alumni for whom contact information was not provided by the institution.

### Q: How does SNAAP contact your alumni?

**A:** SNAAP sends up to five email messages to the alumni you provided in your population file, plus to the additional email addresses provided through SNAAP’s contract with Harris Connect, an alumni contact service (when applicable; all but one institution participated in the Harris Connect service in 2013).

**Table 1: SNAAP Response Rates (Combined 2011, 2012, and 2013)**

Disposition	Number	Overall Response Rate*	Average Response Rate**
<b>Total number of records provided by institutions</b>	<b>1,069,599</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Records without email addresses	442,376	N/A	N/A
Bad email addresses: bounced back or undeliverable	55,766	N/A	N/A
<b>Total number of email invitations sent</b>	<b>627,223</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
Contacted by email but nothing returned	472,532	82.7%	83.5%
Refusals	5,157	0.9%	0.9%
	16,494	2.9%	3.4%
C	77,274	13.5%	14.6%
***	N/A	16.4%	18.0%

\* (minus undeliverable emails).

\*\*A rates.

\*\*\* available.

## SNAAP Report for Wichita State University

**Mission: The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP) investigates the educational experiences and career paths of arts graduates nationally. SNAAP provides the findings to educators, policy makers, and philanthropic organizations to improve arts training, inform cultural policy, and support artists.**

**Who is Surveyed: All living arts graduates of institutions that participate in SNAAP are invited to complete SNAAP's online questionnaire.**

Question	Quality	WSU %	SNAAP %
<b>Overall, how would you rate your experience at this Institution while pursuing your degree?</b>			
<b>UG</b>	Good	41	40
	Excellent	51	51
<b>GR</b>	Good	50	38
	Excellent	44	53
<b>If you could start over again, would you attend this institution?</b>			
<b>UG</b>	Good	34	34
	Excellent	38	41
<b>GR</b>	Good	37	34
	Excellent	38	41
<b>Satisfaction with Instructors in classrooms, labs, and studios?</b>			
<b>UG</b>	Good	31	38
	Excellent	56	52
<b>GR</b>	Good	36	36
	Excellent	55	53
<b>Satisfaction with Academic Advising?</b>			
<b>UG</b>	Good	42	37
	Excellent	32	25
<b>GR</b>	Good	33	35
	Excellent	38	33
<b>How well did this institution prepare you for your further education?</b>			
<b>UG</b>	Fairly well	25	25
	Very well	39	31
<b>GR</b>	Fairly well	25	16
	Very well	42	28
<b>How much this institution helped you acquire or develop research skills?</b>			
<b>UG</b>	Some	43	44
	Very much	31	30
<b>GR</b>	Some	37	37

	Very much	47	40
<b>How much this Institution helped you acquire or develop technological skills?</b>			
UG	Some	35	41
	Very much	19	28
GR	Some	28	39
	Very much	19	25
<b>How much this Institution helped you acquire or develop artistic technique?</b>			
UG	Some	24	33
	Very much	66	59
GR	Some	29	32
	Very much	66	53
<b>How much this Institution helped you acquire or develop leadership skills?</b>			
UG	Some	50	39
	Very much	22	26
GR	Some	37	39
	Very much	39	30
<b>How much this Institution helped you acquire or develop teaching skills?</b>			
UG	Some	29	32
	Very much	38	21
GR	Some	38	35
	Very much	52	38
<b>Did you do the following while at this Institution? UG</b>			
<b>Work with faculty on a project</b>		81	69
<b>Work with an artist in the community</b>		60	47
<b>Study abroad</b>		4	17
<b>Internship</b>		24	35
<b>Complete a portfolio</b>		46	61
<b>Did you do the following while at this Institution? GR</b>			
<b>Work with faculty on a project</b>		91	80
<b>Work with an artist in the community</b>		73	54
<b>Study abroad</b>		8	12
<b>Internship</b>		13	25
<b>Complete a portfolio</b>		42	55

# DegreeStats



WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

**Degree Title:** MUSIC  
**Award:** Bachelor Degree - BA  
**Required Hours:** 146  
**Definition:** A general program that focuses on the introductory study and appreciation of music and the performing arts. Includes instruction in music, dance, and other performing arts media.

Annual Cost of Degree		Annual Source of Investment	
Cost Category		Funding Sources	
Resident Tuition	\$ 5,621	Scholarships and Grants	4756
Fees	\$ 1,440		
Room and Board	\$ 7,130	Loans	5444
Books and Supplies	\$ 2,659		
<b>Total Annual Cost (estimated)</b>	<b>\$16,850</b>		
<b>Estimated Total Cost Over: 4</b>	<b>Years</b>	Other Funding Sources	
		Personal Investment	\$ 6,650
		<b>Total Annual Investment from All Sources</b>	<b>\$16,850</b>

Wage Information		Calculate Total Loan Debt or Degree Investment		
<b>%of Program Graduates Employed in Kansas</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>• Loan Debt</b>	<b>Degree Investment</b>	<b>\$21,776</b>
<b>Median Earnings of Program Graduates in Kansas</b>		<b>Interest Rate:</b>		<b>6.8</b>
Upon Entry	\$ 14,044	<b>Number of Years of</b>	<b>Estimated Monthly</b>	<b>%of Expected Annual</b>
After 5 years	\$ 35,864	<b>Repayment</b>	<b>Payment</b>	<b>Earnings</b>
		10	\$251	21%
		15	\$193	16%
<b>Or Choose your Own Earnings:</b>	<b>14044</b>	20	\$166	14%
		25	\$151	13%
		30	\$142	12%

Source: Kansas Board of Regents KHEDS AY Collection; KDOL Wage Records

**Alert:** Modifications were made by the user to the data presented on this page; click "Reset" to return to original values.

**Note:** When calculating "Total Degree Investment" the terms of repayment are expanded to include Loans plus a student's Personal Investment and any Other Funding Sources added above, and adjusts the reported Estimated Monthly Repayment to include these additional funding sources.

Kansas Board of Regents - 1000 SW Jackson Street, Suite 520 Topeka, KS 66612-1368 785.296.3421

# DegreeStats



WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

**Degree Title:** MUSIC  
**Award:** Bachelor Degree - BM  
**Required Hours:** 124  
**Definition:** A general program that focuses on the introductory study and appreciation of music and the performing arts. Includes instruction in music, dance, and other performing arts media.

Annual Cost of Degree		Annual Source of Investment	
Cost Category		Funding Sources	
Resident Tuition	\$ 5,621	Scholarships and Grants	4756
Fees	\$ 1,440		
Room and Board	\$ 7,130	Loans	5444
Books and Supplies	\$ 2,659		
<b>Total Annual Cost (estimated)</b>	<b>\$16,850</b>	Other Funding Sources	
<b>Estimated Total Cost Over: 4</b> Years	<b>\$69,574</b>	Personal Investment	\$ 6,650
		<b>Total Annual Investment from All Sources</b>	<b>\$16,850</b>

Wage Information		Calculate Total Loan Debt or Degree Investment	
% of Program Graduates Employed in Kansas	72%	• Loan Debt	• Degree Investment
			\$21,776
<b>Median Earnings of Program Graduates in Kansas</b>		<b>Interest Rate:</b>	<b>6.8</b>
Upon Entry	\$ 14,044	<b>Number of Years of</b>	<b>Estimated Monthly</b>
After 5 years	\$ 35,864	<b>Repayment</b>	<b>Payment</b>
		10	\$251
		15	\$193
		20	\$166
		25	\$151
		30	\$142
<b>Or Choose your Own Earnings:</b>	<b>14044</b>		<b>% of Expected Annual Earnings</b>
			21%
			16%
			14%
			13%
			12%

Source: Kansas Board of Regents KHEDS AY Collection; KDOL Wage Records

**Alert:** Modifications were made by the user to the data presented on this page; click "Reset" to return to original values.  
**Note:** When calculating "Total Degree Investment" the terms of repayment are expanded to include Loans plus a student's Personal Investment and any Other Funding Sources added above, and adjusts the reported Estimated Monthly Repayment to include these additional funding sources.

Kansas Board of Regents - 1000 SW Jackson Street, Suite 520 Topeka, KS 66612-1368 785.296.3421

# DegreeStats



WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

**Degree Title:** MUSIC EDUCATION

**Award:** Bachelor Degree - BME

**Required Hours:** 124

**Definition:** A program that prepares individuals to teach music and music appreciation programs at various educational levels.

Annual Cost of Degree		Annual Source of Investment	
Cost Category		Funding Sources	
Resident Tuition	\$ 5,620	Scholarships and Grants	6196
Fees	\$ 1,693		
Room and Board	\$ 5,348		
Books and Supplies	\$ 2,590	Loans	8185
<b>Total Annual Cost (estimated)</b>	<b>\$15,251</b>		
<b>Estimated Total Cost Over: 4</b> Years	<b>\$62,972</b>	Other Funding Sources	
		Personal Investment	\$ 870
		<b>Total Annual Investment from All Sources</b>	<b>\$15,251</b>

Wage Information		Calculate Total Loan Debt or Degree Investment	
<b>%of Program Graduates Employed in Kansas</b>	<b>75%</b>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> <b>Loan Debt</b>	<input type="radio"/> <b>Degree Investment</b>
			<b>\$32,740</b>
<b>Median Earnings of Program Graduates in Kansas</b>		<b>Interest Rate:</b>	<b>6.8</b>
Upon Entry	\$ 36,598	<b>Number of Years of</b>	<b>Estimated Monthly</b>
After 5 years	\$ 36,667	<b>Repayment</b>	<b>Payment</b>
		<b>10</b>	<b>\$377</b>
		<b>15</b>	<b>\$291</b>
		<b>20</b>	<b>\$250</b>
		<b>25</b>	<b>\$227</b>
		<b>30</b>	<b>\$213</b>
<b>Or Choose your Own Earnings:</b>	<b>36598</b>		<b>%of Expected Annual Earnings</b>
			<b>12%</b>
			<b>10%</b>
			<b>8%</b>
			<b>7%</b>
			<b>7%</b>

Source: Kansas Board of Regents KHEDS AY Collection; KDOL Wage Records

**Alert:** Modifications were made by the user to the data presented on this page; click "Reset" to return to original values.

**Note:** When calculating "Total Degree Investment" the terms of repayment are expanded to include Loans plus a student's Personal Investment and any Other Funding Sources added above, and adjusts the reported Estimated Monthly Repayment to include these additional funding sources.

**Wichita State University**  
**Music PreK-12, Table 2**  
**Assessments and Their Alignments**

2-11-05 Template: Revised 10-19-05; 10-01-07, Revised 5-8-08 by DJK/EDB, Last Revised 11-13-08, CF update 6-19-09, Revised 9-14-10 by Music Ed Program Committee Revised 1-17-13 by Tom Wine

**NOTE:** The Music Education PreK-12 program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). NCATE accepts decisions made by NASM as indication that special content/specialty areas meet national standards (See section 1, p. 1, "Relationships with other associations" at NASM web site at [nasmm.org/art.accredit.org/index.jsp](http://nasmm.org/art.accredit.org/index.jsp)). This accreditation will end in 2011. The plan is to apply to extend this accreditation for another 10 years.

**Transition Points in this Program:**

- I: Admission to Teacher Education
- II: Admission to Student Teaching
- III: Exit from Student Teaching
- IV: Program Completion

Common Assessment	Criterion	Course Where Assessment is Administered	Transition Point Where Used	Conceptual Framework Predominant Proficiency/Disposition	Predominant Type of Knowledge (Per NCATE Standard 1)
<b>Standard 1:</b> The teacher of general music has skills in teaching and evaluation techniques for vocal, instrumental, and general music.					
4 Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio Task 2	Acceptable or higher	MUS E 451—Student Teaching Elementary OR MUS E 469—Student Teaching Secondary	III	CKS1 PR3	Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills
8 Teaching Video Self Evaluation Rubric: vocal, instrumental and general music skills subscores	3 or higher on each	In MUS E 405- Student Teaching Seminar	III	CTA1	Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills
<b>Standard 2:</b> The teacher of general music has skills in improvising melodies, variations, and accompaniments.					
5 Music Proficiency Exam: Improvisation, variation and accompaniment subscores	3 or higher on each	MUS A 116P—Piano Class for Music Majors (Instrumental and Vocal) OR MUS A 232P—Piano Majors (Instrumental)	II	CTA1	Content Knowledge
<b>Standard 3:</b> The teacher of general music has skills in composing and arranging music.					



Wichita State University  
**Music PreK-12, Table 2**

Common Assessment	Criterion	Course Where Assessment is Administered	Transition Point Where Used	Conceptual Framework Predominant Proficiency/Disposition	Predominant Type of Knowledge (Per NCATE Standard 1)
6 Orchestration Final Project	3 or higher	MUS C 641—Orchestration	II	CKS1	Content Knowledge
<b>Standard 4:</b> The teacher of general music has skills in reading and writing music.					
6 Orchestration Final Project	3 or higher	MUS C 641—Orchestration	II	CKS1	Content Knowledge
<b>Standard 5:</b> The teacher of general music has skills in listening to, analyzing, and describing music.					
7 Music History Listening Guide Project: Analysis and description subscore	3 or higher	MUS C 335—Music History II	II	CKS1	Content Knowledge
8 Teaching Video Self-Evaluation Rubric: Analysis and description of music subscore	3 or higher	MUS E 405—Student Teaching Seminar	III	CKS1 PR4	Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Disposition
<b>Standard 6:</b> The teacher of general music has skills in evaluating music and music performances.					
3 Candidate Supervisor Student Teaching Evaluation Form: Item 9	3 or higher on each	MUS E 451—Student Teaching Elementary  OR MUS E 469—Student Teaching Secondary	III	CTA2	Student Learning
8 Teaching Video and Self Evaluation Rubric: Evaluation of music and performances subscore	3 or higher	MUS E 405—Student Teaching Seminar	III	PR4 CTA2	Disposition Student Learning
<b>Standard 7:</b> The teacher of general music has an understanding of music in relation to various historical periods and cultures.					
7 Music History Listening Guide Project: History and culture subscore	3 or higher	MUS C 335—Music History	II	HDD2	Content Knowledge
<b>Standard 8:</b> The teacher of general music has skills in establishing effective music-learning environments.					
2 Lesson Planning Literacy Rubric	3 or higher on each	MUS E 617 or 790V - Literacy in the Content Area	II	HDD1	Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills
<b>Standard 9:</b> The teacher of general music advocates for the school music program in the community at large.					
3 Candidate/Student Teaching Evaluation Form: Item 14	3 or higher on each	MUS E 451—Student Teaching Elementary	III	C3	Dispositions

Wichita State University  
**Music PreK-12, Table 2**

Common Assessment	Criterion	Course Where Assessment is Administered	Transition Point Where Used	Conceptual Framework Predominant Proficiency/Disposition	Predominant Type of Knowledge (Per NCATE Standard 1)
		<p>AND  MUS E 469—Student Teaching  Secondary</p>			
8 Teaching Video Self Evaluation	3 or higher on each	<p>In MUS E 405- Student Teaching  Seminar</p>	III	CTAI	Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills

**Wichita State University**  
**Music Education Program Committee**  
**Annual Report**  
**Fall, 2012-Summer, 2013**  
 Deadline March 8.  
 Submitted February 20, 2014

The Music Education Program Committee oversees the Bachelor's and Master's of Music Education programs. This report covers academic year 2012. It provides the answers to the questions identified in the Rubrics for Reviewing the Work of Program Committees and ends with the recommendations that were made based upon its review work.

The Music Education Program Committee consists of Professor Tom Wine (Program Chair), Professor Elaine Bernstorf, Professor JohnPaul Johnson, Assistant Professor Jeanne Vance (fall 2012), Assistant Professor Trudy Burkholder (spring 2012), and Assistant Professor Steve Oare and met monthly during Calendar Year 2012. The primary foci of those meetings were on course scheduling, program assessment changes, delegation of project responsibilities, and decisions related to the current reduction in school funding. The Music Education Program Committee is advised by the Music Education Advisory Council. The Advisory Council consists of five practitioners of whom one is a graduate of the program, and one current student. During Calendar Year 2012 the Advisory Council met once. The primary foci of this meeting was a review of the assimilation of WSU music education graduates into their first jobs.

**NOTE:** If the Program Committee oversees more than one program, under each of the questions listed below, have a subsection answering the question for each of the programs labeled with the names of the programs.

**Core Questions**

- 1. Is the program overall effective in preparing candidates to meet the expected outcomes:**
  - a. **program standards and;**
  - b. **Unit Conceptual Framework Guiding Principles; and**
  - c. **NCATE Knowledge standards (for education personnel program only)?**

Assessment Outcomes

(refer to the alignment table for the list of assessments and alignment information)

Name of Assessment	Standard Assessed	Transition Point Where Used	Conceptual Framework Proficiency/Disposition	Type of NCATE Knowledge Assessed	N (or score count)	% Pass
1a. Praxis test (if applicable)		4				

Name of Assessment	Standard Assessed	Transition Point Where Used	Conceptual Framework Proficiency/ Disposition	Type of NCATE Knowledge Assessed	N (or score count)	% Pass
2. KPTP Task 2	1,	III	T, PR		23	87
3. Candidate/Student Teaching Evaluation Item 9 Item 14	6 9	III	C	SL	17	99
4. Lesson Planning Literacy Rubric	8	II	CKS	PCK	6	67
5. Music Proficiency Exam	2	II	CKS	CK, PPKS	9	100
6. Orchestration Final Project	3, 4	II	CKS	CK	17	94
7. Music History Listening Guide Evaluation	5, 7	II	HDD	CK	13	
8. Teaching Video Self Evaluation	1, 5, 6, 9	III	CTA, da	PPKS	16	100

Note: The minimum percent of candidates passing assessments approved by the Unit Assessment Committee is 80%.

Based on available data, over 80% of candidates in the Bachelor of Music Education program met the criteria for every assessment but the lesson planning literacy rubric. Two out of the six students did not pass and are currently being remediated.

**2. Is the program effective in preparing graduates for state licensure exams (if required) in both total scores and the category scores?**

Yes. 100% of the students passed their Praxis tests.

**3. Are the assessments in Table 2 administered by faculty in every section and every semester the course is taught?**

The professors in charge of the proficiency examinations have been inconsistent in recording data. The music education department is currently in discussion with the piano faculty in order to rectify the situation. We also have a search in progress for a new music history professor. Currently, we have an interim professor teaching the class. We plan to inform the new faculty member of the assessment requirement once the hire has been made.

**4. How are data used by candidates and faculty to improve candidate performance? Have changes made by the Program Committee in prior years led to desired improvements?**

Assessment scores have consistently met defined criteria. The assessments in Table 2 were changed in the fall of 2012. With further experience and data, analysis of results will provide us with a more realistic view of our students' growth. Faculty continues to assess student progress in multiple ways and adapt teaching to meet student needs. For example, KPTP scores have been used to inform faculty of weaknesses in student preparation, and there have been changes made in the music methods courses.

The advisory council meets annually and provides information based on our annual report. However, we find it more beneficial to discuss the program with cooperating teachers as we go out into the schools to work with classes and to observe our students in their field placements. It is through this informal, collaborative environment that we are able to truly understand the needs of our students in this ever changing profession.

**5. What changes, if any, do data and/or information suggest for (a) the program, (b) the assessments and/or criteria/rubrics, and (c) operational elements—advisement, instruction, faculty, field/clinical placements, field/clinical supervision, record keeping, or resource?**

This Core Question is considered three times, once for each of the following:

a. the program

Pass rates for each of the assessments have been consistently high and therefore do not suggest that changes need to be made.

b. the assessments and/or criteria/rubrics, and

Obtaining piano proficiency exams scores for music education students has improved but we are still not getting them for everyone. This is in part due to the fact that proficiency exams are required of all students within the school of music, but data is recorded only for music education majors, causing confusion for piano faculty, especially the graduate TA's who teach some of the classes. With the school of music currently preparing for NASM accreditation, we believe this problem will be corrected because NASM now requires assessments for all music students. We believe the piano proficiency exams will be one of the assessments adopted by the whole school of music.

c. operational elements

No changes are suggested.

**MUSIC EDUCATION ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

**Wichita State University**  
**Music Education Program Committee**  
**Annual Report**  
**Fall 2013-Summer 2014**  
Submitted February 17, 2015

The Music Education Program Committee oversees the Bachelor’s and Master’s of Music Education programs. This report covers academic year 2013-14. It provides the answers to the questions identified in the Rubrics for Reviewing the Work of Program Committees and ends with the recommendations that were made based upon its review work.

The Music Education Program Committee consists of Professor Tom Wine (Program Chair), Professor Elaine Bernstorf, Professor JohnPaul Johnson, Assistant Professor Jeanne Vance, and Associate Professor Steve Oare. Faculty met monthly during Academic Year 2013-14. The primary foci of those meetings were on course scheduling, program assessment changes, delegation of project responsibilities, and decisions related to the current reduction in school funding. The Music Education Program Committee is advised by the Music Education Advisory Council. The Advisory Council consists of five practitioners of whom one is a graduate of the program, and one current student. During Calendar Year 2012 the Advisory Council met once. The primary foci of this meeting was a review of the assimilation of WSU music education graduates into their first jobs.

**NOTE:** If the Program Committee oversees more than one program, under each of the questions listed below, have a subsection answering the question for each of the programs labeled with the names of the programs.

**Core Questions**

- 1. Is the program overall effective in preparing candidates to meet the expected outcomes:**
  - a. Program Standards; and**
  - b. Unit Conceptual Framework Guiding Principles; and**
  - c. NCATE Knowledge standards (for education personnel program only)?**

Assessment Outcomes  
(refer to the alignment table for the list of assessments and alignment information)

Name of Assessment	Standard Assessed	Transition Point Where Used	Conceptual Framework Proficiency/ Disposition	Type of NCATE Knowledge Assessed	N (or score count)	% Pass
1a. Praxis test (if applicable)		4			12	100
2. KPTP Task 2	1,	III	T, PR		9	100

Name of Assessment	Standard Assessed	Transition Point Where Used	Conceptual Framework Proficiency/ Disposition	Type of NCATE Knowledge Assessed	N (or score count)	% Pass
3. Candidate/Student Teaching Evaluation Item 9 Item 14	6 9	III	C	SL	9	96
4. Lesson Planning Literacy Rubric	8	II	CKS	PCK	22	89
5. Music Proficiency Exam	2	II	CKS	CK, PPKS	12	100
6. Orchestration Final Project	3, 4	II	CKS	CK	6	87
7. Music History Listening Guide Evaluation	5, 7	II	HDD	CK	10	93
8. Teaching Video Self Evaluation	1, 5, 6, 9	III	CTA, da	PPKS	9	100

Note: The minimum percent of candidates passing assessments approved by the Unit Assessment Committee is 80%.

Based on available data, over 80% of candidates in the Bachelor of Music Education program met the criteria for every assessment but the music proficiency exam.

**2. Is the program effective in preparing completers for state licensure exams (if required) in both total scores and the category scores?**

Yes. 100% of the students passed their Praxis tests.

**3. Are the assessments in Table 2 administered by faculty in every section and every semester the course is taught?**

We do have data for each assessment. However, the data for assessment #5: Music Proficiency Exam was not input into STEPS. The numbers come from a search of our prior piano pedagogy professor's records. She retired after the 2013-2014 school year. We hired a new piano pedagogy teacher in the fall of 2014 and we are training her to record the appropriate data.

**4. Has the program committee reviewed data provided by the following key constituents? If so, what was the source of the information (e.g., completer survey, alumni survey)?**

- a. Program completers?
- b. Alumni?



### c. Employers?

We reviewed the data from the alumni surveys executed by the college of education, but only one music alum completed the survey. Therefore, they were unreliable. However, we received ten exit surveys from students graduating in 2014. In all, 90% of the surveys expressed overall satisfaction with all aspects of their degree program. However, one person consistently ranked the program lower than the rest. No employers submitted a survey. However, we are in constant contact with administration in USD259 and other districts. Anecdotally, administrators and local teachers seem quite pleased with our alumni. Our students have been among the first hires in several school districts and in the fall of 2014, two positions were held open with long-term substitute teachers in anticipation of hiring our graduates who were completing student teaching.

#### 5. Is the program successful in preparing candidates for effective practice?

Every student teacher in our area passed both the Praxis/PLT tests and KPTP. This leads us to believe that the music education program is preparing candidates for effective practice. Further, every student who searched for a job was hired (one student chose to forego music education and pursue instrument repair instead).

#### 6. How are data used by candidates and faculty to improve candidate performance? Have changes made by the Program Committee in prior years led to desired improvements?

We still are experiencing difficulty in receiving data for assessments that do not reside within the music education faculty. These assessments include the piano proficiency exams and the history project. We are currently in the process of changing faculty for these two positions. We are making a concerted effort to train the new faculty to record their data.

Our advisory council met once in March. The council included two teachers who have had student teachers recently, one December graduate who was substitute teaching (he has since found a job in Douglas), and one USD259 music administrator. The constituents seemed quite pleased with the students we have placed with them. However, they did make comments about minor changes we could make at the course level of the program relating to classroom management and technology. Some ideas have been integrated into the secondary methods and pre-student teaching courses, though we still feel we need to do more with technology. The music education faculty is currently discussing options for technology inclusion in each of the music education classes.

#### 7. What changes, if any, do data and/or information suggest for (a) the program, (b) the assessments and/or criteria/rubrics, and (c) operational elements—advisement, instruction, faculty, field/clinical placements, field/clinical supervision, record keeping, or resources?

This Core Question is considered three times, once for each of the following:

- a. the program

Pass rates for each of the assessments have been consistently high and therefore do not suggest that changes need to be made.

**b. the assessments and/or criteria/rubrics, and**

Obtaining piano proficiency exams scores for music education students has been a problem recently. This is in part due to the fact that proficiency exams are required of all students within the school of music, but data is recorded only for music education majors, causing confusion for piano faculty, especially the graduate TA's who teach some of the classes. With the school of music currently preparing for NASM accreditation, we believe this problem will be corrected because NASM now requires assessments for all music students. We believe the piano proficiency exams will be one of the assessments adopted by the whole school of music.

**c. operational elements**

No changes are suggested.

**Wichita State University**  
**Music Education Program Committee**  
**Annual Report**  
**Fall 2014-Summer 2015**  
 Submitted March 1, 2016  
 DUE MARCH 11

The Music Education Program Committee oversees the Music Education Program. This report covers academic year 2014-15. It provides the answers to the questions identified in the Rubrics for Reviewing the Work of Program Committees and ends with the recommendations that were made based upon its review work.

The Music Education Program Committee consists of four of the five program faculty and met twelve times during Academic Year 2014-15. One faculty member was on sabbatical each of the two semesters. The primary foci of those meetings were on the integration of the new national & state music standards into courses, recruiting, scholarships, and the NASM report for the school of music. The Music Education Program Committee is advised by the Music Education Advisory Council. The Advisory Council consists of four public school music teachers of whom three are graduates of the program, and two are current graduate students. All of the members have served as mentor teachers for our interns. During Academic Year 2014-15 the Advisory Council met once. The primary foci of these meetings were inform members of music education program assessment data and solicit their input regarding student readiness for the field.

**Core Questions**

- 1. Is the program overall effective in preparing candidates to meet the expected outcomes:**
  - a. Program Standards; and**
  - b. Unit Conceptual Framework Guiding Principles; and**
  - c. NCATE Knowledge standards (for education personnel program only)?**

Assessment Outcomes  
 (refer to the alignment table for the list of assessments and alignment information)

Name of Assessment	Standard Assessed	Transition Point Where Used	Conceptual Framework Proficiency/ Disposition	Type of NCATE Knowledge Assessed	N (or score count)	% Pass
1a. Praxis test (if applicable)		4			13	100
2. KPTP Task 2	1	III	T, PR	PPKS	16	100
3. Candidate/Student Teaching Evaluation Item 9 Item 14	6, 9	III	CTA2, C3	SL, Dispositions	16	96

Name of Assessment	Standard Assessed	Transition Point Where Used	Conceptual Framework Proficiency/ Disposition	Type of NCATE Knowledge Assessed	N (or score count)	% Pass
				SL		
4. Lesson Planning Literacy Rubric	8	II	CKS, HDD1	PPKS, PCK	22	100
5. Music Proficiency Exam	2	II	CKS	CK, PPKS, CTA1	24	87
6. Orchestration Project	3 & 4	II	CKS1	CK	15	90
7. Music History Listening Guide	5 7	II	CKS1, HDD2	CK	12	100
8. Teaching Video & Self Evaluation	1, 5, 6, & 9	III	CKS1, PR4, CTA1 & 2	PPKS, SL	15	91

Note: The minimum percent of candidates passing assessments approved by the Unit Assessment Committee is 80%.

Based on available data, over 80% of candidates in the Bachelor of Music Education program met the criteria for every assessment but the music proficiency exam. Further examination of Praxis scores showed that 80% of the students scored highest on the pedagogical portion of the test while scoring lower in performance and history.

**2. Is the program effective in preparing completers for state licensure exams (if required) in both total scores and the category scores?**

Yes. 100% of the students passed their Praxis tests.

**3. Are the assessments in Table 2 administered by faculty in every section and every semester the course is taught?**

We do have data input into STEPS for each assessment except for assessment #5: Music Proficiency Exam. We hired a new piano pedagogy teacher in the fall of 2014 and were training her to record the appropriate data, but severe medical issues precluded the recording of this data.

**4. Has the program committee reviewed data provided by the following key constituents? If so, what was the source of the information (e.g., completer survey, alumni survey)?**

- a. Program completers?
- b. Alumni?
- c. Employers?

Insufficient data was garnered from the alumni surveys executed by the college of education. No employers submitted a survey. However, we are in constant contact with administration in

USD259 and other districts. Anecdotally, administrators and local teachers seem quite pleased with our alumni. Our students have been among the first hires in several school districts and in the fall of 2015, one position was held open with long-term substitute teachers in anticipation of hiring our graduates who were completing student teaching.

**5. Is the program successful in preparing candidates for effective practice?**

Every student teacher in our area passed both the Praxis/PLT tests and KPTP. This leads us to believe that the music education program is preparing candidates for effective practice. Further, every student who searched for a job was hired.

**6. How are data used by candidates and faculty to improve candidate performance? Have changes made by the Program Committee in prior years led to desired improvements?**

We still are experiencing difficulty in receiving data for the piano proficiency exams. We are made a concerted effort to train the new faculty to record the data, but a major medical issue caused her to miss this assessment. We have checked with her this academic year, and the fall data has already been submitted to STEPS.

Our advisory council met once in March. The council included four teachers who have had student teachers recently. Two of the four are also enrolled in the graduate level music education program. The constituents seemed quite pleased with the students we have placed with them. However, they did make comments about minor changes we could make at the course level of the program relating to classroom management and technology. Some ideas have been integrated into the secondary methods and pre-student teaching courses, though we still feel we need to do more with technology. The music education faculty is currently discussing options for technology inclusion in each of the music education classes.

Changes Previously Identified	Effects of Changes	Additional Actions Needed
Integration of technology into music education courses	A few activities were added across the music education program that incorporated technology	The effect of the activities has yet to be measured. This area continues to be a problem due to lack of equipment and training of faculty
Training in Classroom Management	The pre-student teaching course adjusted its calendar to spend another 8% of total class time discussing class management skills	The pre-student teaching class assessment results suggests that students have a strong basic understanding of classroom management principles. We now need to find a way to assess student abilities in their intern settings

**7. What changes, if any, do data and/or information suggest for (a) the program, (b) the assessments and/or criteria/rubrics, and (c) operational elements—advisement, instruction, faculty, field/clinical placements, field/clinical supervision, record keeping, or resources?**

This Core Question is considered three times, once for each of the following:

a. the program

Finding and Related Data	Action Needed
The data suggests that over 80% of the music education students are meeting expectations	Data suggests that no changes are necessary

b. the assessments and/or criteria/rubrics, and

Finding and Related Data	Action Needed
The data suggests that over 80% of the music education students are meeting expectations	Data suggests that no changes are necessary

c. operational elements

Finding and Related Data	Action Needed
The program advisory committee advises more technology integration	The music education faculty are currently researching ways in which to incorporate technology into existing courses because there is no room in which to add a technology course into students' already overloaded programs. This continues to be a challenge for the faculty due to a lack of time, training, and equipment.
The program advisory committee advises more classroom management instruction	More time has been scheduled in classes to address classroom management. The next step is for faculty to develop a reliable and valid assessment to determine further class management needs.

**APPENDIX A: Faculty Meeting Agendas**

<p>8.25.15 Other items on the agenda include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. P&amp;C class which need to be put forward this month.</li> <li>2. Voice Pedagogy in the curriculum</li> <li>3. Liability insurance</li> </ol> <p>9.8.15 We have several things to clean up this afternoon.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CCF forms: Review that all are set to forward to P&amp;C</li> <li>2. KCOMTEP - What do we need to get out today?</li> <li>3. MME - admission requirements: Voice wants to include our requirements with their form.</li> <li>4. Table II assessments - Timeline to begin changes</li> <li>5. ST updates.</li> <li>6. Placement updates.</li> <li>7. As may arise.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. NafME - Meetings and publicity</li> <li>5. SOM Mission Statement</li> <li>6. As May Arise?</li> </ol> <p>9.14.15 Aleks has agreed to meet with us to talk about our declining enrollment in the MME program. This would be a good time to talk about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current class enrollments</li> <li>2. Kodaly and other workshops</li> <li>3. Summer degree program</li> <li>4. Long-term goals for the MME program</li> </ol> <p>11.3.15 We are going to meet tomorrow at 2:30 to talk about a Master Schedule. As part of that process, I would like to analyze where our upper classmen are in the program and how we perceive their rotation for the next four semesters. Be ready to roll up your sleeves.</p>	<p>12.4.15 Student teaching will now be referred to as "internship" and will apply to the pre-student teaching semester as well. Unit assessment will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Praxis</li> <li>2. KPTP</li> <li>3. Internship (ST) evaluation form</li> <li>4. Perhaps dispositions</li> </ol> <p>Content. Performance. Dispositions</p> <p>1.12.16 Tomorrow we have several items to visit:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Revised KSDE standards (Impact on Table II for College of Ed)</li> <li>2. Proposed Master Schedule for Fall (See attached)</li> <li>3. Summer schedule</li> <li>4. Some prospective graduate students and enrollment</li> <li>5. KMEA credit - Perhaps offer it as a "badge" credit</li> <li>6. MME instrumental conducting</li> <li>7. Orientation course change (Proposal attached)</li> <li>8. As may arise</li> </ol> <p>1.19.16 We have some carry over items from our meeting last week:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review of KSDE standards and recommendations to Elaine for the committee</li> <li>2. Schedule advisory committee meeting for March 1</li> <li>3. Schedule smartboard meeting with COE (Hoping for Jan 26)</li> <li>4. Comments regarding master schedule</li> <li>5. A May Arise</li> </ol> <p>2.16.16 Reminder that we are meeting today to clean up some loose ends for the semester, finalize the advisory committee information, review ST suggestions for fall, and present ideas for graduate orals.</p>
---	--

**Piano Proficiency scores for Music Ed Majors  
2013-14**

Piano Proficiency Scores for Music Ed Majors, 2013-2014										
Fall, 2013 (12/5/13)										
Name	WSUID	Key	Harmony	Interpretation	Technique/Fingering	Rhythm/Notes	Continuity	Improvisation		
Darren Brock	H476P532	3	4	4	5	4	3	5		
Bridget Carroll	H459B649	5	5	4	3	5	5	5		
Hannah Gabel	R677W979	5	4	5	4	4	4	5		
Claire Graveson	W329K428	4	5	5	4	4	4	5		
Austin Pyle	F888G635	5	5	5	4	5	5	5		
Justin Summers	A897T372	4	4	3	4	4	4	5		
Jeremy Thomas	M477D752	4	4	4	3	4	4	5		
KatLynn Titus	U572E387	5	5	4	5	4	4	5		
Spring, 2014 (5/7/14)										
Name	WSUID	Key	Harmony	Interpretation	Technique/Fingering	Rhythm/Notes	Continuity	Improvisation		
Christian Burgess	T455K273	5	5	4	5	3	4	5		
Charissa Memrick	B626K665	4	4	5	4	4	4	5		
Robert Miller	B959F498	5	5	5	4	4	4	5		
Bryce Sund	P855Y528	4	5	4	5	3	3	5		



Piano Proficiency Scores for Music Ed Majors  
2014-15

Piano Proficiency Scores for Music Ed Majors, 2014-2015									
Fall, 2014 (12/10/14)									
Name	WSUID	Key	Harmony	Interpretation	Technique/Fingering	Rhythm/Notes	Continuity	Improvisation	
Brooke Adams	h423q498	5	4	4	4	4	4	5	
Alexa Chau	j377e845	4	4	5	4	4	3	5	
Brian Gericke	k726q982	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	
Madeline Harder	g863e587	4	5	5	5	3	5	5	
Ellie Labes	k588r399	5	5	3	5	4	4	5	
Johannon Rucker	x763e428	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	
Tina Shetler	q439f574	5	5	4	4	3	4	5	
Nelson Spaulding	x458g894	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	
James Vaughan	v624j533	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	note: retook 2 skill areas Fall 2014, had previously passed in other areas, but I was not able to find those scores; I have given him as score here that has him passing overall, but is somewhat fabricated in terms of the details because I only heard him perform in two areas; thus his scores are based of those performances and general average scores. If you are uncomfortable with this I can keep digging....
Spring, 2015 (5/13/15)									
Name	WSUID	Key	Harmony	Interpretation	Technique/Fingering	Rhythm/Notes	Continuity	Improvisation	
Tyler Axe	m746n747	4	5	5	5	4	3	5	
Tyler Burgess	a752f999	3	4	5	4	3	4	5	
Derek Bruet	t823h266	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	
Anthony Calder	k445z544	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	
Alyson Golladay	b883u483	4	5	5	5	2	4	5	
Scott Hatfield	a793w782	5	5	5	5	3	3	5	
Kiana Jackson	n626g922	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	
Jordan Kasper	v769f365	4	5	5	5	3	3	5	
Michael Mays	x634g279	4	5	5	4	3	5	5	
Tyler Miles	e372q568	2	5	5	5	3	3	5	
Gabrielle Swank	k769k333	3	5	5	5	3	4	5	
Ariel Troutman	r558q633	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	
Garrett Viets	q743u399	3	5	5	5	3	4	5	
Lucas Whippo	f529u545	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	
Gabrielle Wiens	d259b968	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	

Music Education  
 KSDE Assessment #5  
 Music Proficiency Exam  
 Course #MUS A 116

Student \_\_\_\_\_ myWSU# \_\_\_\_\_ Mus. Ed./Mus. Perf. \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor \_\_\_\_\_

Level of performance: Target (4 or 5), Acceptable (3), Unacceptable (2 or 1)

Passing Criteria: Pass 80%, 28 points.

Traits/Subjects	Level of Performance			Program Standard	Transition Point	Primary CF Prof	NCATE Knowledge
	Unacceptable 1-2	Acceptable 3	Target 4-5				
Key SCORE =	Inconsistent knowledge and skill with key signatures.	Good knowledge and skill with a few mistakes	Excellent knowledge and skill with key signatures	2	II	CKS	CK
Harmony SCORE =	Difficulty with harmonic choices	Good ear for harmony with a few incorrect choices	Excellent ear for harmony	2	II	CKS	PPKS
Interpretation SCORE =	Inconsistent use of expressive elements or Lacks meaningful expression	Consistent use of expressive elements	Musical, sensitive, artistic use of style, tempo, phrasing & dynamics	2	II	CKS	CK
Technique / Fingering SCORE =	Inconsistent technique that obviously detracts from the performance	Strong use of technique with some occasional inconsistencies	Technique elements are consistent throughout the performance	2	II	CKS	PPKS

Rhythm / Notes SCORE =	Inconsistent rhythmic and/or note accuracy	Most rhythms and/or notes are performed correctly	Rhythms and/or notes are performed correctly	2	II	CKS	CK
Continuity SCORE =	Pulse is inconsistent and stops often to correct inaccuracies	Pulse is fairly consistent even with a few mistakes	Pulse is consistent throughout	2	II	CKS	PPKS
Improvisation SCORE =	Improvised melody and accompaniment are not logically developed. Much difficulty with harmonic language	Improvised melody and accompaniment have a good ear for harmony with only a few mistakes	Improvised melody and accompaniment are logically developed with creative expression	2	II	CKS	PPKS

TOTAL SCORE \_\_\_\_\_

Passing Criteria: Pass 80%, 28 points,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Adjudicator

ADJUDICATOR COMMENTS:

Level of performance: Target (Student's work is appropriate for performance), Acceptable (Student's work conveys sufficient understanding of Composing and Arranging), Unacceptable (student's work lacks understandings of tools for Composing and Arranging).

Passing Criteria: 70% (minimum score 17.5).

Traits/Subjects	Level of Performance			Program Standard	Transition Point	CF Prof	NCATE Knowledge
	Unacceptable (1 or 2)	Acceptable (3)	Target (4 or 5)				
Writes for appropriate ranges. Score =	Many notes are not within the expected ranges of each instrument and at least one part is transposed incorrectly	A small number of notes are not within the expected ranges of each instrument and some notes are transposed incorrectly	All notes are within the expected ranges of each instrument and transposed correctly	3, 4	II	CKS	CK
Appropriate Challenge Score =	Music is too challenging for the targeted performance group	Music is slightly more or less challenging than appropriate for the targeted performance group	Music is at an appropriate challenge level for the targeted performance group	3	II	CKS	CK
Valid Content Score =	The arrangement/composition sufficiently addresses less than 3 of the criteria	The arrangement/composition sufficiently addresses 3 of the 5 criteria	The arrangement/composition sufficiently addresses the development of tone, technique, phrasing, tuning & harmonic structure	3, 4	II	CKS	CK
Transcribes /Arranges Score =	Composition exhibits numerous inappropriate chord choices	Composition exhibits some inappropriate chord choices	Composition is appropriately harmonized.	3,4	II	CKS	CK
Imaginative Score =	Composition holds little interest in musical content	Composition exhibits interesting musical content with potential to maintain student interest	Composition routinely exhibits interesting musical content which maintains student/performer interest	3	II	CKS	CK

Total score \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria: 70% (minimum score 17.5)

Reviewer's plan for remediation plan (if needed) \_\_\_\_\_

Remediation completion date \_\_\_\_\_ Comments \_\_\_\_\_

(For STEP Programmer only) Pass the assessment: Yes No

Music Education

**Music History Listening Guide Evaluation**

KSDE Assessment #7

Course #MUS C 335: History of Music II

Level of performance: Target (Advanced understanding of music in relation to various historical periods and cultures.), Acceptable (acceptable understanding of music in relation to various historical periods and cultures.) Unacceptable (Limited understanding of music in relation to various historical periods and cultures.).  
 Passing Criteria: 60% (minimum 21 of 35)

Traits/Subjects	Level of Performance			Program Standard	Transition Point	CF Prof	NCATE Knowledge
	Unacceptable (1 or 2)	Acceptable (3)	Target (4 or 5)				
<b>Technical/Symbolic Vocabulary</b> Score =	The candidate demonstrates a limited vocabulary or inappropriate use of terms for analysis and description of music.	The candidate demonstrates an acceptable level of music vocabulary for analysis and description of music.	The candidate employs terms and concepts that are important to the analysis and description of music.	5	II	HDD	CK
<b>Form</b> Score =	The candidate does not demonstrate understanding of musical organization/form.	The candidate demonstrates appropriate skills in analyzing and describing musical organization/forms.	The candidate demonstrates an advanced understanding of musical organization/form.	7	II	HDD	CK
<b>Genre</b> Score =	The candidate does not demonstrate acceptable skills in analyzing and describing musical genre.	The candidate demonstrates appropriate skills in analyzing and describing musical genre.	The candidate characterizes and explains genres and styles by reference to specific musical details.	7	II	HDD	CK
<b>History</b>	The candidate lacks an acceptable level of understanding of music characteristics related to various historical periods.	The candidate demonstrates some understanding of musical characteristics related to various historical periods.	The candidate describes the principal stylistic features associated with specific historical contexts by comparing	7	II	HDD	CK

Score =								
<b>Cultures</b>	The candidate lacks an acceptable level of understanding of music related to various historical periods.	The candidate demonstrates an acceptable understanding of music related to various historical periods.	The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the political and cultural roles of the music by placing pieces in a historical context.	7	II	HDD	CK	
Score =								
<b>Evaluation of music and performances (Part 1)</b>	The candidate is limited in ability to evaluate music or performance skills or cannot evidence objective criteria for his/her evaluation.	The candidate demonstrates the ability to evaluate music and performances using one or more objective criteria.	The listening guide demonstrates the candidate's ability to evaluate music and performances with well-developed criteria based on well documented objective information.	7	II	HDD	CK	
Score =								
<b>Evaluation of music and performances (Part 2)</b>	The candidate is limited in ability to evaluate music or performance skills or cannot evidence subjective criteria for his/her evaluation.	The candidate demonstrates ability to evaluate music and performances using one or more subjective criteria.	The candidate demonstrates an ability to evaluate music and performances with well-developed criteria based on subjective information (affective qualities).	7	II	HDD	CK	
Score =								

Total score \_\_\_\_\_ Passing Criteria: 60% (minimum 21 of 35)

Reviewer's plan for remediation plan (if needed) \_\_\_\_\_

Remediation completion date \_\_\_\_\_ Comments \_\_\_\_\_

(For STEP programmer only) Pass the assessment: Yes No

GENERAL EDUCATION OUTCOMES for Music Education Majors

Music History Listening Guide Evaluation

KSDE Assessment #7; WSU General Education and KBOR 2020 outcomes embedded as noted.

Course #MUS C 335: History of Music II

Level of performance: Target (Advanced understanding of music in relation to various historical periods and cultures.), Acceptable (acceptable understanding of music in relation to various historical periods and cultures.) Unacceptable (Limited understanding of music in relation to various historical periods and cultures.).

Passing Criteria: 60% (minimum 21 of 35)

Traits/Subjects	Level of Performance			Music Program Standard	Transition Point	CF Prof	NCATE Knowledge	General Education Outcomes *See below
	Unacceptable (1 or 2)	Acceptable (3)	Target (4 or 5)					
<b>Technical/Symbolic Vocabulary</b>	The candidate demonstrates a limited vocabulary or inappropriate use of terms for analysis and description of music.	The candidate demonstrates an acceptable level of music vocabulary for analysis and description of music.	The candidate employs terms and concepts that are important to the analysis and description of music.	5	II	HDD	CK	GE1 GE3
Score =								
<b>Form</b>	The candidate does not demonstrate understanding of musical organization/form.	The candidate demonstrates appropriate skills in analyzing and describing musical organization/forms.	The candidate demonstrates an advanced understanding of musical organization/form.	7	II	HDD	CK	GE1 GE4
Score =								
<b>Genre</b>	The candidate does not demonstrate acceptable skills in analyzing and describing musical genre.	The candidate demonstrates appropriate skills in analyzing and describing musical genre.	The candidate characterizes and explains genres and styles by reference to specific musical details.	7	II	HDD	CK	GE1 GE3 GE4
Score =								
<b>History</b>	The candidate lacks an acceptable level of understanding of music characteristics related to various historical periods.	The candidate demonstrates some understanding of musical characteristics related to various historical periods.	The candidate describes the principal stylistic features associated with specific historical contexts by comparing	7	II	HDD	CK	GE1 GE3



Score =										
<b>Cultures</b>	The candidate lacks an acceptable level of understanding of music related to various historical periods.	The candidate demonstrates an acceptable understanding of music related to various historical periods.	The candidate demonstrates an understanding of the political and cultural roles of the music by placing pieces in a historical context.	7	II	HDD	CK	GE1 GE3 GE4		
Score =										
<b>Evaluation of music and performances (Part 1)</b>	The candidate is limited in ability to evaluate music or performance skills or cannot evidence objective criteria for his/her evaluation.	The candidate demonstrates the ability to evaluate music and performances using one or more objective criteria.	The listening guide demonstrates the candidate's ability to evaluate music and performances with well-developed criteria based on well documented objective information.	7	II	HDD	CK	GE2 GE4		
Score =										
<b>Evaluation of music and performances (Part 2)</b>	The candidate is limited in ability to evaluate music or performance skills or cannot evidence subjective criteria for his/her evaluation.	The candidate demonstrates ability to evaluate music and performances using one or more subjective criteria.	The candidate demonstrates an ability to evaluate music and performances with well-developed criteria based on subjective information (affective qualities).	7	II	HDD	CK	GE2 GE4		
Score =										
Total score	Passing Criteria: 60% (minimum 21 of 35)									

Reviewer's plan for remediation plan (if needed) \_\_\_\_\_

Remediation completion date \_\_\_\_\_ Comments \_\_\_\_\_

(For STEP programmer only) Pass the assessment: Yes No

\* General Education and KBOR 2020 Outcomes Embedded Alignment for Music Education majors

- General Education 1. Have acquired knowledge in the arts, humanities, and natural and social sciences
- General Education 2. Think critically and independently
- General Education 3. Write and speak effectively
- General Education 4. Employ analytical reasoning and problem solving techniques



School of Music Annual Report 2015

Faculty	WSU Recruiting	Presentations	Contributions	Performance	Student Achievements	Recital Committees	Miscellaneous and Awards	Publications
Herd	FALSE	Voice Search: <b>IMEA Bass School</b> .			Salome in San Antonio, Washington National Opera (Dialogues of the Carmelites), Teatro Real (Fidelio) (Madrid, Spain), Bavarian State Opera (Tristan und Isolde), Munich, Germany, San Antonio Symphony Orchestra (Sunflower from Weisaw/Bethoven 9 <sup>th</sup> Symphony), Opéra de Montréal (Elektra), Montréal, Canadian Opera Company (Siegfried), Toronto, Yale University Master Class/Private Coaching, Washington National Opera Domingo-Cairiz Young Artist Program.			
Hunsicker	TRUE	Midwest TPK Conl.	Piano Tech. Scholarship, Recruiting, WFP Head, Horn Search, Voice Search, Choir, PUP and Horn Search, SCM Assistance.	Lancaster Festival Orch, MTW, FAS and WBCQ.	2nd Trpt, Alabama Sym.			
Jankauskas	TRUE	Single Freed Day, 4 guest artists.		Marshall Univ., UT Austin, Tx, State at San Marcos, Greenbush, MO, Lucas, Mo, U.S.	2nd Flute, NGA in Greensboro, NC.			
King	FALSE	Executive*		Bluebird's Castle WSO, The Piedmonters for NGA in Greensboro, NC, USA, Italy.				
Krout	FALSE			Bonnet Quartet in NYC and Princeton Univ., Emporia State U., Lake Tahoe Summerfest Orch. (Assoc. Concertmaster), American Sym. in Carnegie Hall (Assoc. Concertmaster).			Taught at Elm City Chamberfest in New Haven, CT, and the Bard College Conservatory Preparatory Summer Program.	
Laycock	FALSE	Over 100 schools	SCM Finance and Promotion Committee, SCM Director, Evaluation Committee/Chair, SCM Director, SCM State Division, SCM Recruiting Committee, SCM Scholarship Committee, SCM Video Committee					
Mays	FALSE		Active on a national scale includes adjudicating the state orchestra competition in Indiana, serving as judge/clinician for two festivals in Las Vegas, appearing as featured clinician for the fall workshop of the Georgia Chayer of the American String Teachers Association, presenting a session at the American String Teachers Association National Conference, serving as panelist for the National Endowment for the Arts and serving on the Board of Directors for the Midwest Clinic. Moreover, I was an invited clinician for the <b>Midwest IMEA conference</b> . My article <b>Rehearsal and Performance Guide, Scintillating Strands from Britten's Simple Symphony</b> was published in the August 2015 issue of <i>American String Teacher</i> , the leading journal for orchestra educators. I was selected by Reggie Romine to be one of three string educators featured in a session on adjudicator training at the Kansas Music Educators Association In-Service Conference. I continued to remain active locally and statewide through school orchestra clinics and a week-long residency with the Wichita Symphony Orchestra.	World Sax Congress (SaxOpen) Extended Festival, Strasbourg, France, Mays' Moon Dances for Solo Soprano Saxophone Jonathan Huang-Cohen, Soprano sax, National Youth Music Competition, Jugend musiziert, Germany, Young Artist Program, German Republic in Chamber Music and Solo performance. Her winning program included a rendition of American composer, Walter Mays' Moon Dances for Solo Recorder (this rendition receiving special commendation by the jury). Note: Four other top applicants also played Mays' Moon Dances, Mays' Moon Dances (Solo Recorder version). This work popular with European Recorder players has just gone through its 4th printing by German publisher, Moseler Verlag, Celle in 12 years! Mays' Six Innovations to the Svara Mandala for Percussion Ensemble, Louisiana	7 Grand Orals, 2 Theses Defenses			
Mozzini	FALSE	I work with the admissions office, meeting potential students and parents. I also give a number of mini-lessons to potential students, several of whom attend lessons with me. I also give a number of mini-lessons in the fall at a session of Educators, will direct WSU in our graduate program this January and another is coming to audition for us in February.			3 WSU students were accepted at the IMEA (KCACTF) regional competition. 4 of my WSU and high school students were in shows at MTW. "In the summer I hosted a contingency of 2 US performers. 2 US Representatives of the Havana Biennial in Cuba. I also helped host them at dinner after the opening.	14	Absence of hosted 50 university and community fundations for the	

School of Music Annual Report 2015

Faculty	WSO	Recruiting	Presentations	Committees	Performances	Student Achievements	Reaction Committees	Miscellaneous and Awards	Publish/Grant	
Dare	FALSE	Went a guest clinician at four clinics & talked about preparation clinics and lessons to high schools at the Middle School Band Day. I also met with 4 campus visitors about coming to WSU to study music ed.	Presentations: Suburban Music Education Research Symposium, P. O. Midwest International Band & Orchestra Clinic, ASTA National Conference, KS American String Teachers, Hutchinson KS. I also presented at KMEA in Feb of 2015.		1. Blue Lake Fine Arts Camp Conductor. I also conducted the Central Plains League HS honor band last in January of 2015. I just completed the KASTA honor orchestra.	All education people can say we placed 100% of our students from the spring and most of the students from fall student teaching (very uncommon). Plus, Matt Kiepler was awarded the Outstanding Young Band Director Award from KBA.	2, plus 6 orals	Adjudicator: Kansas State Large Ensemble Festival Pioneer League Middle School Festival KS State Fair Marching Competition Southern Plains Marching Festival Clinician: Goddard Eisenhower Middle School Band, Misc: Program Director - Kodaly Summer Workshops; Organizer - CFA Summer Workshops; after Nov. 1 - director of bands Coleman Middle School Band Timothy Academy Band Doiglass Elementary School	Review Board Member for Music Educators Journal Kansas Music Review Editor	
Patterson	TRUE	This year I have been focusing my recruitment efforts in the state of Kansas, offering free All-State preparation clinics and lessons to high schools to start with. I have also been offering free clinics to more students playing the bassoon. Between my students and myself, we have started over 20 new bassoonists. I have continued to update and modernize the All-State clinics website that provides online clinics for winds, brass, and percussion students auditioning for district and all-state ensembles. Contacted all band directors in the state of Kansas about the Double Reed Day, also offered services for free clinics in the classroom			WGO, Guest recital Busfield College, Bluefield, VA					
Rough	FALSE				5-6 performances of works (2 national, 4 local/regional). On tarp 20 pieces on 14 concerts		9 Orals, 2 recital committees	Adjudicator WSU Piano Festival.	National: Publication by Journal of Research in Music Education. In Tune or Out of Tune: Are Different Instruments and Voice Helped Improve Musical Memory? (with Douglas & Rebecca McLeod). Publication by Calla Voca Music. SATB arrangement of Auld Lang Syne (co-arranged with Justine Sazanar)	
Sazanar/J	FALSE		Presentation at 2015 KGA convention, "The Well-Tempered Collaboration: Strategies for an Effective Conductor/Pianist Alliance in the Choral Rehearsal (co-presented with Michael Hanawalt). Presentation for WMMTA (Wichita Metropolitan Music Teachers' Association) series: "Tomorrow's Pianists: Preparing our Students for Real World Skills". Performance with Adam Unsworth, Associate Professor of French, Horn at University of Michigan, WSU Guest Artist Recital (February, 2015). Performance with WSU Concert Choral at KMEA (February, 2015). Performance with David Hunsticker, Assistant Professor of Trumpet, Thursday Afternoon Music Club Recital Series (September, 2015). Performance of new SATB arrangement, Hallelujah (Leonard Cohen), co-arranged with Michael Hanawalt by WSU Concert Choral (October, 2015). Performance with WSU Symphony (November, 2015).	3						
Shelby	FALSE			2 and Faculty Senate				Adjudicator State solo and ensemble contest in Lawrence.		
Shuteau	TRUE	Northwest Magnet High School, Wichita, KS Perry High School Concert, Derby, KS Goddard High School, Goddard, KS East High School recitals, Wichita, KS South West High School, Wichita, KS Youth Symphony Orchestra, Wichita, KS Middle School Orchestra Festival, Wichita State University, Wichita, KS Shawnee Mission North West High School recitaling Imp. Shawnee Mission, KS Olathe North West High School, Olathe, KS Olathe North West High School, Olathe KS Blue Valley South West High School, Overland Park, KS Salina Central High School, Salina, KS Salina Central High School, Salina, KS South High School, Lansing, KS Youth Symphony Orchestra, Wichita, KS	Presentations at KMEA, KGA, and other conferences. "The Well-Tempered Collaboration: Strategies for an Effective Conductor/Pianist Alliance in the Choral Rehearsal (co-presented with Michael Hanawalt). Presentation for WMMTA (Wichita Metropolitan Music Teachers' Association) series: "Tomorrow's Pianists: Preparing our Students for Real World Skills". Performance with Adam Unsworth, Associate Professor of French, Horn at University of Michigan, WSU Guest Artist Recital (February, 2015). Performance with WSU Concert Choral at KMEA (February, 2015). Performance with David Hunsticker, Assistant Professor of Trumpet, Thursday Afternoon Music Club Recital Series (September, 2015). Performance of new SATB arrangement, Hallelujah (Leonard Cohen), co-arranged with Michael Hanawalt by WSU Concert Choral (October, 2015). Performance with WSU Symphony (November, 2015).	3	Oklahoma State University Guest Artist Recital Series (as a Soloist) in Piano Trio, Black Hills Chamber Music Society Concert Series (as a member of St. Petersburg String Quartet), Performance at the Kansas Music Educators Association In-Service Workshop (as a member of St. Petersburg String Quartet) WSU Faculty Artist Recital (as a member of Orfeo Trio) as a cellist White Rock Concerts (as a member of St. Petersburg String Quartet) Villa St. Christie Hall, Meglen (Lucerne, Switzerland) Rhosogwren (Neuadd Y Dderwen, UK) Sancsar Art Gallery (Lincolnburg, KS) Music in Common Series of Chamber Music Concerts (Falls Village, CT) Summer Music from Greenboro (Greenboro, VT) Watermelon Concert Series (West Whaley, MA) Wichita Grand Opera (as a Principal Cellist), Century II Performing Arts Center, Carlsen Center Overland Park Wichita Symphony Orchestra (as a Principal Cellist), Wichita Grand Opera (as a Principal Cellist) Wichita Symphony Orchestra (as a Principal Cellist) Mexico City Conservatory Orchestra					
Smitth	TRUE		Performed at the int'l. Horn Society in LA	Waltz Blog, CFA T&P, SOM Health and Safety,		Jonathan Dobos won the Assistant/Unity Horn position with the Professional Horn Society. He was awarded a Wood Foundation Grant for \$5,000.00 which helped him finally buy the horn.			Self-published book, has sold over 500 copies—including Europe.	



## School of Music Alumni Accomplishments

Last	First	Year	Accomplishment
<b>Addis</b>	<b>Tate</b>	BM 2009	Received the Master of Music in organ from the Yale University Institute of Sacred Music. He is currently pursuing the coveted Artist's Diploma at the Oberlin Conservatory of Music and is now organist at the First Baptist Church in Asheville, North Carolina, where he has founded a series of organ recitals called "Bach's Lunch".
<b>Bergquist</b>	<b>Laura</b>	BME 1979	Recently concluded a position as Conductor of ALLEGIANCE - A NEW MUSICAL, starring George Takei and Lea Salonga. She has conducted National and International tours of MISS SAIGON, KING AND I and TITANIC, EMMA, DADDY LONG LEGS and many more.
<b>Bishop</b>	<b>Andrew</b>	BM 1993	Professor of Saxophone, University of Michigan
<b>Brown</b>	<b>Jordan</b>	BME 2007	KBA Outstanding Young Bandmaster 2015
<b>Brown</b>	<b>Mandy</b>	BM 2010	Washington National Opera: American Opera Initiative: Three 20-Minute Operas 2015. She also has been a Young artist at the Chitauqua Opera in 2014.
<b>Burcham</b>	<b>Rachel</b>		Finalist in LA's Next Great Stage Star Competition. She now plays the part of Eddie in "Mamma Mia" on Broadway.
<b>Campbell</b>	<b>Nathan</b>	BM 1981	After receiving his bachelor's degree from Wichita State University, moved to southern California in 1981. While freelancing, he completed his master's degree at USC, where he studied with Vincent DeRosa. Nathan has performed and recorded with the Los Angeles Philharmonic, Los Angeles Opera and San Diego Symphony. In addition to having performed with numerous local orchestras, he has been in the orchestra for many musical theatre productions in Los Angeles, including Sunset Boulevard, Beauty and the Beast, Ragtime, Phantom of the Opera, Lion King, The Producers and Wicked.
<b>Ciulla</b>	<b>Nicholas</b>	MM 2014	Nicholas Ciulla (MM 2014) is now the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Trumpet of the Alabama Symphony.
<b>Cripe</b>	<b>Max</b>	MM 1988	Max Cripe joined "The President's Own" United States Marine Band in July 1988. He was appointed principal French horn in 2004 and French horn section commander in 2015

## School of Music Alumni Accomplishments

Last	First	Year	Accomplishment
<b>Crust</b>	<b>Andrew</b>		Andrew Crust is a North American conductor based in Montréal and Colorado. His recent conducting positions include Cover Conductor of the Kansas City Symphony, Assistant/Cover Conductor of the Boulder Philharmonic, Music Director of the CU-Boulder Campus Orchestra, Assistant Conductor of Opera McGill, and Assistant Conductor of the CU-Boulder Symphony and Chamber Orchestra. He is in the final stages of a doctorate at the University of Colorado-Boulder in orchestral conducting with academic emphasis on Brahms performance practice.
<b>DePoint</b>	<b>Nathan</b>	MM 2006	Nathan DePoint is the Director of Artistic Administration at Ft. Worth Opera.
<b>Dozois</b>	<b>Jonathan</b>	MM 2015	Rochester Philharmonic Orchestra in February 2015 to serve as acting assistant principal horn.
<b>Dreiling</b>	<b>James</b>	MME 2003	WSU MME Instrumental Music Conducting, WSU Bands GTA - Director of Bands and Assistant Professor of Music at Berea College (Berea, Kentucky)
<b>Fraser</b>	<b>Sarah</b>	BM 2007	Sarah Fraser is an agent for Fletcher Artist Management, is an arts administrator at Opera America, and is directing at Castleton Festival.
<b>Gable</b>	<b>Mirella</b>	MM 2014	Accepted to the prestigious Aspen Music Festival where she studied with David Wakefield of the American Brass Quintet and performed in a WW Quintet with Per Hannevold, bassoonist in the famed Bergen Quintet. She also received a privately funded scholarship of \$5,000 plus travel. Currently 3rd Horn for the Wichita Symphony Orchestra and the Symphony of Northwest Arkansas and has subbed with the Oklahoma City Philharmonic and Rochester Philharmonic orchestras.
<b>Gilmore</b>	<b>Nicholas</b>	BM 2009 MM 2011	Nicholas Gilmore is the Artistic Director Heartland Opera Theatre Joplin MO; conducting Loveland Opera Theatre, Opera on the Avalon New Brunswick.
<b>Gilmore</b>	<b>Stephanie</b>	MM 2009	Stephanie Gilmore has performed with the National tour "Beauty and the Beast" and Off-Broadway/regional "Nice Work if you Can Get It".
<b>Goter</b>	<b>Rachelle</b>	BME 1994 MM 2010	WSU BME Instrumental Music and MM Clarinet Performance; Adjunct Professor of Clarinet and member of the faculty Tower Woodwind Quintet at Friends University (Wichita); Wichita Symphony Orchestra Clarinetist; Kansas Bandmasters Association recipient of the 2000 Outstanding Young Band Director award;
<b>Guerrero</b>	<b>Lily</b>	MM 2014	Lily Guerrero has performed with the Wichita Grand Opera, Winter Opera St. Louis.

## School of Music Alumni Accomplishments

Last	First	Year	Accomplishment
Hagstrom	John	MM 1990	2nd Trumpet, Chicago Symphony Orchestra
Hakoda	Ken	MM 1999 MM 2000	WSU MM Instrumental Conducting and MM Composition, WSU Bands GTA - Conductor and Music Director of the Salina Symphony (Salina, KS); Associate Professor of Music (Choir, Orchestra, Music Education) and Chair of the Music Department at Kansas Wesleyan University (Salina, KS); Recipient of the Kansas Bandmasters Association <i>2003 Young Outstanding Band Director</i>
Hamant	Dana	BME 1978 MME 1983	BME and MME Instrumental Music, WSU Bands GTA – Assistant Director of Bands at Friends University (Wichita); Recipient of the Kansas Bandmasters Association 2014 Outstanding Band Director Recipient of the 2012-13 National Federation of State High School Association's Outstanding Music Educator award; Formerly Wichita Public Schools USD 259 Beginning Band Specialist and Director of Bands at Wichita East HS and Wichita North HS; prior teaching experience as Director of Bands at Cimarron HS and Assistant Director of Bands at Hutchinson HS.
Hoelscher	Mark	BM 1986	Freelance Trombonist, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Bass Trombonist with the Millar Brass Ensemble.
Jazz			Jazz Website
Jones	Adam	BM 2007	Bass Trombone, The Philharmonic Orchestra of the State of Queretaro
Kleopfer	Matt	MME 2011	MME Instrumental Conducting – WSU Band GTA - Recipient of the 2015 Kansas Bandmasters Association <i>Outstanding Young Band Director</i> award; Recipient of the 2014 <i>Kansas Horizon Award for Exemplary First-Year Teachers</i> ; Director of Bands, Iola (KS) High School (2012-present)
Lesser	David	MM 2007	He is Principal Horn of the Dallas Wind Symphony (Principal on the much praised recording the ensemble's music of Percy Grainger) and a member of the Plano and Irving Symphony Orchestras



## School of Music Alumni Accomplishments

Last	First	Year	Accomplishment
Livingston	Edwin	BM 1996	In addition to a full playing, touring, and recording career he is also on the faculty at the USC Thornton School of Music, teaching bass in the jazz studies department. Livingston has also appeared in several feature films, including Ray and Dreamgirls, and has performed on The Tonight Show with Jay Leno, The Ellen DeGeneres Show, The Today Show, Live with Regis and Kelly and the A & E show Private Sessions with Queen Latifah. Livingston has also performed in the musical productions of Stormy Weather starring Leslie Uggams, Ain't Misbehavin' and SPAMALOT starring John O'Hurley. He has two CD's as a leader performing original music, The Edwin Livingston Group and Transitions.
Lovell	Chris	BME 2013	KASTA Young String Teacher of the Year 2013
Madden	John	MME 1987	WSU MM Instrumental Conducting and MME Instrumental Music, WSU Bands GTA - Associate Professor of Music, Associate Director of Bands and Director of the Spartan Marching Band at Michigan State University (East Lansing)
Mapp	Michael	MM 2007	KBA Outstanding Young Bandmaster 2014
Mathis	William	BME 1986	Professor of Trombone, Bowling Green State University
McKoin	Sarah	MME 1989	WSU MM Instrumental Conducting, WSU Bands GTA - Associate Professor of Music and Director of Bands at Texas Tech University (Lubbock)
Nebel	Dan	MM 2011	DMA program, University of Northern Colorado. one of four students accepted nationally to attend the Colorado College Music Festival from June 2012, Colorado Springs, CO. 1st prize at the International Horn Society's High Horn Excerpt competition at Brisbane, Australia in June, 2011. He is now a hornist with the United States Air Force Band of the Golden West, Travis AFB, CA and also serves as a media representative for the unit.
Pardee	Travis	BME 2000 BM 2000	WSU BME Instrumental Music Education and BM in Saxophone Performance--2015 Recipient of the Nevada 2015 Myra Greenspun Award for Teaching Excellence recognizing an exemplary public school teacher who is successful in using innovative teaching strategies and raising student achievement; Nevada Music Educators Association 2015 Music Educator of the Year award; Director of Bands and Chair of the Performing Arts Department at Foothill High School, Henerson, Nevada; Adjunct faculty member with the College of Southern Nevada, Henerson, NevadaWSU BME Instrumental Music Education and BM in Saxophone Performance –

## School of Music Alumni Accomplishments

Last	First	Year	Accomplishment
Parrish	Angela	BM 2010	She earned MM in Jazz Piano from UC – Greeley in spring 2012. Afterwards she moved to Los Angeles and just released her first album, "Faithful and Tall".
Powell	Michael	BM 1973	Trombonist with the American Brass Quintet and on the faculty of the Juilliard School, SUNY at Stony Brook and the Aspen Music School. He also performs regularly with the Orchestra of St. Luke's, the Orpheus Chamber Orchestra, The Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center, and many others.
Rau	Laura	BM 2009	She has been the Full-time Associate Director of Music at St. Michael the Archangel Catholic Parish, Leawood, Ks, since 2013. She is also a Doctoral Candidate ("all but dissertation") at the University of Kansas, student in the Church Music & Organ Division, expected graduation Summer 2016.
Shaw	J.D.	BM 1992	<b>J.D. Shaw</b> is Associate Professor of Horn at University of South Carolina and was formerly the French hornist with the internationally acclaimed Boston Brass where he was creative director, music arranger and co-owner of the ensemble. JD is an active solo artist and travels extensively throughout the United States as well as many countries in North America, Europe, and Asia.
Short	Aaron	BM 2011	Has performed with the Sante Fe Opera, DuPage Opera, Chautauqua Opera, Portland Opera, Florentine Opera
Silvey	Brian	MME 2005	WSU MME Instrumental Music Conducting, WSU Bands GTA - Associate Director of Bands and Associate Professor of Music Education at the University of Missouri (Columbia) School of Music
Simpson	Andrew	MM 2015	Andrew Simpson has performed with the Central City Opera, Sante Fe Opera, Chicago Opera Theatre.
Skipworth	Jacob	MM 2015	has performed with the Chautauqua Opera, Wichita Grand Opera.
Skornia	Dale	MM 1993	WSU MM Instrumental Conducting, WSU Bands GTA - Assistant Professor of Music and Director of Athletic Bands at Ferris State University (Big Rapids, Michigan)
Stanley	Anne Marie	BM 1991 MM 1993	Faculty, Eastman School of Music
Thompson	Steve	BM 1987	Professor of Trombone American River College, Sacramento, CA
Tryon	Andrew	MM 2009	U.S. Army Field Band of Europe in Heidelberg, Germany, considered the best band in Europe.
Tummons	Cathy	BME 2014	KASTA Young String Teacher of the Year 2014
Voth	John	BM 1995	since @1995 has been tubist with the Army Brass quintet in Washington, DC.

## School of Music Alumni Accomplishments

Last	First	Year	Accomplishment
Whaley	Jeffery	MM 2008	Principal Horn Position with the Knoxville, TN Symphony while continuing his full-time teaching position at Eastern Tennessee State University in Johnson City, TN.
Whisler	Dan	BME 2009	American Prize for Orchestral Conducting, currently Director of Orchestras at the Youth Performing Arts School in Louisville, KY.
Wilson	Matt	BM 1986	Wilson leads the Matt Wilson Quartet, Arts and Crafts, Christmas Tree-O and the Carl Sandburg Project. Matt is integral part of bands led by Joe Lovano, John Scofield, Charlie Haden, Lee Konitz, Bob Stewart, Denny Zeitlin, Ron Miles, Marty Ehrlich, Ted Nash, Jane Ira Bloom and Dena DeRose among others. He has performed with many legends of music including Herbie Hancock, Dewey Redman, Andrew Hill, Bobby Hutcherson, Elvis Costello, Cedar Walton, Kenny Barron, John Zorn, Marshall Allen, Wynton Marsalis, Michael Brecker, Pat Metheny, Bill Frisell and Hank Jones. Wilson has appeared on 250 CDs as a sideman and has released 9 as a leader for Palmetto Records as well as co-leading 5 additional releases.
Yeakley	Brian	BM 2012	He has performed with the Wolftrap Opera, Glimmerglass Opera, Houston Grand Opera.

## 2015 GRADUATE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

Wichita State University

School of Music

Program Name: Master of Music, Master of Music Education

Date: 5/13/2016

School/College: Music/Fine Arts Campus Box: 53

### I. The Graduate Program Assessment plan

#### **A. Mission Statement**

To provide trained musicians and music educators by preparing students for careers and further graduate study in Music, Music Education and related fields.

#### **B. Constituents**

The graduate students in the School of Music are the program constituents.

#### **C. Program Objectives**

1. To recruit and maintain a community of qualified degree-bound music graduate students.
2. To recruit and maintain a qualified faculty.
3. To maintain a curriculum that reflects the skills and knowledge necessary for employment in music and/or further graduate study.
4. To support the curriculum by regularly providing appropriate courses.
5. To provide suitable research tools and facilities.
6. To maintain graduates' satisfaction with the program.
7. To place a reasonable number of graduates into jobs or further study within one year.

#### **D. Educational Student Outcomes**

Graduating students will:

1. demonstrate proficiency in their chosen field.
2. be able to demonstrate the ability to conduct research in their chosen area of study.
3. be able to demonstrate a working understanding of music theory.
4. be able to demonstrate a working understanding of music history.
5. demonstrate the potential to discuss and solve contemporary problems in various aspects of music.

#### **E. Assessment of Program Objectives**

Program Objective 1. To recruit and maintain a community of qualified degree-bound music graduate students.

Assessment: To admit 10-15 students in the the program each year. The graduate coordinator will certify that all students accepted into the "full standing" category will meet GPA requirements and that international students will meet TOEFL requirements.

Program Objective 2. To recruit and maintain a qualified faculty.

Assessment: The Director will certify that the School of Music adheres to WSU employment, tenure and promotion policies; the Director will also conduct an annual review of each faculty member, according to school procedure.

The graduate coordinator will certify that at all final project committees will be chaired by graduate faculty members.

Program Objective 3. To maintain a curriculum that reflects the skills and knowledge necessary for employment in music and/or further graduate study.

Assessment: The School of Music will follow National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) guidelines for music curricula and will regularly undergo NASM accreditation.

Program Objective 4. To support the curriculum by offering appropriate courses in a timely manner.

Assessment: Graduate exit survey item "Course offerings enabled me to complete my degree in a timely manner"

target number: at least 80% agree

Assessment: The director will confirm that the School of Music course offerings will adhere to the WSU definition of credit hours.

Program Objective 5. To provide suitable research tools.

Assessment: to score at least 80% "Satisfied or higher" in graduate exit survey items "Library: Resources for research" and "Library: Overall satisfaction"

Program Objective 6. To maintain graduates' satisfaction with the program.

Assessment: on the graduate exit survey item: "On a scale of one (very dissatisfied) to five (very satisfied), rate your overall satisfaction with your program of graduate studies at WSU," the School of Music should score at least 80% "satisfied or higher"

Assessment: on the SNAAP (Strategic National Arts Alumni Project) survey question: "Overall, how would you rate your experience at WSU while pursuing your graduate degree?," the School of Music should score at least 3 on a 4-point scale.

Program Objective 7. To place a reasonable number of graduates into jobs or further study within one year.

Assessment: in the SNAAP survey item "After leaving your program at WSU, how long did it take for you to obtain your first job or work experience?," most graduates should respond 1, 2, 3, or 7 on the following scale:

<1> Obtained work prior to leaving WSU

<2> Obtained work in less than four months

<3> Obtained work in four to twelve months

<4> Obtained work after more than a year

<5> Have not yet found work

<6> Did not search for work after leaving program

<7> Pursued further education

Assessment: in the SNAAP survey item "How closely related was your first job or work experience to your training at WSU?," most graduates should respond "Closely related."

## **F. Assessment of Educational Student Outcomes**

Educational Student Outcome 1. Graduating students will demonstrate proficiency in their chosen field.

Assessment:

Every Masters student will complete a recital, thesis, or terminal project before graduation, as follows.

Music performance: graduate recital

Piano Pedagogy: Terminal project (choose one) Recital-Lecture or Professional In-service Presentation

History/Literature: Thesis

Theory-Composition: Thesis

Piano accompanying: Terminal Project

Music Ed: Terminal project

These will be assessed by a committee of three faculty, chaired by a graduate faculty member, using a standardized rubric.

Educational Student Outcome 2. Graduating students will be able to demonstrate the ability to conduct research in their chosen area of study.

Assessment:

Students will be assessed by their work in a sample project for a required course, Mus C 852, Intro to Bibliography and Research. Example: "Develop a thesis statement utilizing facts to support an opinion you have formed regarding some aspect of music history. The facts MUST be the foundation for the opinion. Passing Criteria: Student must score at least 3 on a 5-point scale on the proficiency rubric.

Educational Student Outcome 3. Graduating students will be able to demonstrate a working understanding of music theory.

Assessment:

Students will be assessed by their work in a sample project for a required course, Mus C 830, Seminar in Music Theory, such as: "Using a sonata-form movement of Haydn, Mozart, or Beethoven, analyze the score for formal structure, discussing form, harmonic analysis, and musical expression." Passing Criteria: Student must score at least 3 on a 5-point scale on the proficiency rubric.

Educational Student Outcome 4. Graduating students will be able to demonstrate a working understanding of music history.

Assessment:

Students will be assessed by their work in a sample project for a course in Music History/Literature chosen from the following: Mus C 893, 894, 895, 896, 897). Example: "Analyze a work appropriate to the musical time period you are studying. Identify the techniques used in the specific time period, such as modality, counterpoint, tonality, figured bass, partwriting, modulation, chromatic harmony, and form. \*\*You must have the professor's approval of the musical work to be analyzed."

Passing Criteria: Student must score at least 3 on a 5-point scale on the proficiency rubric.

Educational Student Outcome 5. Graduating students will demonstrate the potential to discuss and solve contemporary problems in various aspects of music.

Assessment: Every Master's student will successfully complete an oral examination before graduation. These will be assessed by a committee of three faculty, chaired by a graduate faculty member, using a standardized rubric.

## **G. Feedback into the Program**

Process:

The graduate coordinator will collect the graduate program assessment data for School of Music assessment reports. Review of the assessment plan will be an annual agenda item for the Music Activity Counsel (MAC), the committee of all music area heads. Any amendments to the mission, objectives, outcomes and plan will be disclosed in assessment reports.

## **H. Annual Report:**

The Assessment Report will contain:

1. The Graduate Program Assessment plan

2. Results from data collection for the previous academic year
3. Dates and results of meetings with MAC and the faculty regarding assessment results and any proposed changes to the assessment plan

II. Results from data collection for the previous academic year.

**E. Assessment of Program Objectives**

Program Objective 1. To recruit and maintain a community of qualified degree-bound music graduate students.

Assessment: To admit 10-15 students in the the program each year. The graduate coordinator will certify that all students accepted into the “full standing” category will meet GPA requirements and that international students will meet TOEFL requirements.

Admissions:

2013-14	28
2014-15	30
2015-16	38

Program Objective 2. To recruit and maintain a qualified faculty.

Assessment: The Director will certify that the School of Music adheres to WSU employment, tenure and promotion policies; the Director will also conduct an annual review of each faculty member, according to school procedure.

Result: Certified

Assessment: The graduate coordinator will certify that at all final project committees will be chaired by graduate faculty members.

Result: Certified

Program Objective 3. To maintain a curriculum that reflects the skills and knowledge necessary for employment in music and/or further graduate study.

Assessment: The School of Music will follow National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) guidelines for music curricula and will regularly undergo NASM accreditation.

Results: NASM accreditation is complete with no probationary measures for the graduate program

Program Objective 4. To support the curriculum by offering appropriate courses in a timely manner.

Assessment: Graduate exit survey item “Course offerings enabled me to complete my degree in a timely manner”

target number: at least 80% agree

Results:

2013	94.7%
2014	87%
2015	85%

Assessment: The director will confirm that the School of Music course offerings will adhere to the WSU definition of credit hours.

Results: Confirmed

Program Objective 5. To provide suitable research tools.

Assessment: to score at least 80% "Satisfied or higher" in graduate exit survey items "Library: Resources for research" and "Library: Overall satisfaction"

Results, "Resources for research"

2013 Library Resources for Research 84.2%

2013 Library: Overall Satisfaction 89.5%

2014 Library Resources for Research 86.2%

2014 Library: Overall Satisfaction 82.8%

2015 Library Resources for Research 90.5%

2015 Library: Overall Satisfaction 81%

Program Objective 6. To maintain graduates' satisfaction with the program.

Assessment: on the graduate exit survey item: "On a scale of one (very dissatisfied) to five (very satisfied), rate your overall satisfaction with your program of graduate studies at WSU," the School of Music should score at least 80% "satisfied or higher"

Results:

2013 89.5%

2014 81.7%

2015 78.5%

Assessment: on the SNAAP (Strategic National Arts Alumni Project) survey question:

"Overall, how would you rate your experience at WSU while pursuing your graduate degree?," the School of Music should score at least 3 on a 4-point scale.

Results: No Data was collected and we are eliminating SNAAP as an assessment tool

Program Objective 7. To place a reasonable number of graduates into jobs or further study within one year.

Assessment: in the SNAAP survey item "After leaving your program at WSU, how long did it take for you to obtain your first job or work experience?," most graduates should respond 1, 2, 3, or 7 on the following scale:

<1> Obtained work prior to leaving WSU

<2> Obtained work in less than four months

<3> Obtained work in four to twelve months

<4> Obtained work after more than a year

<5> Have not yet found work

<6> Did not search for work after leaving program

<7> Pursued further education

Assessment: in the SNAAP survey item "How closely related was your first job or work experience to your training at WSU?," most graduates should respond "Closely related."

Results: No Data was collected and we are eliminating SNAAP as an assessment tool

## **F. Assessment of Educational Student Outcomes**

Educational Student Outcome 1. Graduating students will demonstrate proficiency in their chosen field.

Assessment:

Every Masters student will complete a recital, thesis, or terminal project before graduation, as follows.

Music performance: graduate recital

Piano Pedagogy: Terminal project (choose one) Recital-Lecture or Professional In-service Presentation



History/Literature: Thesis  
Theory-Composition: Thesis  
Piano accompanying: Terminal Project  
Music Ed: Terminal project

These will be assessed by a committee of three faculty, chaired by a graduate faculty member, using a standardized rubric.

Results: Rubric was not implemented and a new method of assessment will be put in place

Educational Student Outcome 2. Graduating students will be able to demonstrate the ability to conduct research in their chosen area of study.

Assessment:

Students will be assessed by their work in a sample project for a required course, Mus C 852, Intro to Bibliography and Research. Example: "Develop a thesis statement utilizing facts to support an opinion you have formed regarding some aspect of music history. The facts MUST be the foundation for the opinion. Passing Criteria: Student must score at least 3 on a 5-point scale on the proficiency rubric.

Results: Rubric was not implemented and a new method of assessment will be put in place

Educational Student Outcome 3. Graduating students will be able to demonstrate a working understanding of music theory.

Assessment:

Students will be assessed by their work in a sample project for a required course, Mus C 830, Seminar in Music Theory, such as: "Using a sonata-form movement of Haydn, Mozart, or Beethoven, analyze the score for formal structure, discussing form, harmonic analysis, and musical expression." Passing Criteria: Student must score at least 3 on a 5-point scale on the proficiency rubric.

Results: Rubric was not implemented and a new method of assessment will be put in place

Educational Student Outcome 4. Graduating students will be able to demonstrate a working understanding of music history.

Assessment:

Students will be assessed by their work in a sample project for a course in Music History/Literature chosen from the following: Mus C 893, 894, 895, 896, 897). Example: "Analyze a work appropriate to the musical time period you are studying. Identify the techniques used in the specific time period, such as modality, counterpoint, tonality, figured bass, part writing, modulation, chromatic harmony, and form. \*\*You must have the professor's approval of the musical work to be analyzed."

Passing Criteria: Student must score at least 3 on a 5-point scale on the proficiency rubric.

Results: Rubric was not implemented and a new method of assessment will be put in place

Educational Student Outcome 5. Graduating students will demonstrate the potential to discuss and solve contemporary problems in various aspects of music.

Assessment: Every Master's student will successfully complete an oral examination before graduation. These will be assessed by a committee of three faculty, chaired by a graduate faculty member, using a standardized rubric.

Results: Rubric was not implemented and a new method of assessment will be put in place

### III. Dates and results of meetings with MAC and the faculty regarding assessment results and any proposed changes to the assessment plan

The 2015 Graduate report was approved by an Ad Hoc Committee consisting of the the previous graduate coordinator Dr. Mark Foley, and the new graduate coordinator Dr. Aleks Sternfeld-Dunn, and School of Music Director Prof. Russ Widener. Proposed updates for the 2016 Graduate Assessment plan will be voted on by the Music Advisory Council (MAC) in the first meeting of the 2016-17 school year.

Bi-Weekly meetings with MAC have been occurring since March to evaluate and work on the School of Music Program review with input by the School Music Assessment Committee which convened weekly meetings beginning in academic year 2015.

#### **Proposed Updates for the 2016 Graduate Assessment Plan**

##### **Mission Statement**

The School of Music graduate program has two core missions. The first is to serve the students. We encourage our graduate students in the various disciplines of the school to develop and grow as creative artists through applied learning experiences and engaging them in both critical and creative thinking.

The second mission is to serve as a window to the university for our global community. The college provides art at the highest level possible for community engagement, discussion and thought.

##### **Constituents**

The two primary constituencies of the graduate program in the School of Music are the graduate students and the regional arts community.

##### **Program Objectives**

- The addition of curriculum focused on not just research but critical and evaluative thinking skills.

##### **Student Recruitment**

- Based on enrollment trends increasing Program objective 1 from admitting 10-15 students to 25-30 students

##### **SNAAP DATA**

- Removing SNAAP data from assessment from Program Objectives 6 & 7

##### **Educational Student Outcome**

- Educational Student Outcome #2 will replace Bibliography rubric with a 95% pass rate for terminal oral exams.

- Educational Student Outcome #3 will replace theory rubric with 95% pass rate of C or better in MUSC 852 and MUSC 832, as well as a 95% pass rate for terminal oral exams
- Educational Student Outcome #4 will replace courses no longer offered with new history courses MUSC 891 and MUSC 892

## Music Jury Performance Assessment Rubric

		Outstanding		Above Average		Average		Below Average		Not Acceptable		Score
<b>Tone Quality</b>		5		4		3		2		1		Score
	Proper tone production is evident in all ranges and dynamic levels	Tone production is affected in some ranges and dynamic levels		Tone production is inconsistent		Elements of proper tone production are seldom present		Proper tone production is not evident				
<b>Intonation</b>		5		4		3		2		1		Score
	Pitch is consistently well centered	Minor problems exist in some ranges and/or dynamic levels		Intonation problems evident		Numerous intonation problems evident		Underdeveloped intonation				
<b>Interpretation</b>		5		4		3		2		1		Score
	Musical, sensitive, artistic use of style, tempo, phrasing & dynamics	Consistent use of expressive elements		Inconsistent use of expressive elements		Lacks meaningful expression much of the time		Notes are performed with little meaningful expression				
<b>Technique</b>		5		4		3		2		1		Score
	Technique elements are consistent throughout the performance	Strong use of technique with some occasional inconsistencies		Inconsistent technique that obviously detracts from the performance		Minimal evidence of technical proficiency		Technique is clearly inadequate for this performance				
<b>Rhythm/Notes</b>		5		4		3		2		1		Score
	Rhythms and/or notes are performed correctly	Most rhythms and/or notes are performed correctly		Inconsistent rhythmic and/or note accuracy		Many rhythms and/or notes are performed incorrectly		Rhythm and/or note accuracy is clearly inadequate				
<b>Level of Material</b>		5		4		3		2		1		Score
	Level of material exceeds expectations	Level of material somewhat exceeds expectations		Level of material is adequate		Level of material is slightly below expectations		Level of material clearly does not meet expectations				

Loss Juries Sp13

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Kheng	Su Kheng	MM	Piano	Accompanying	Bees	4	5	5	5	5	3
Chippeaux	Elizabeth	MM	Piano	performance	Bees	4	4	4	5	4	5
He	Jian	MM	Piano	Performance	Bees	5	4	4	5	5	5
Luecke	Rachel	MM	Piano	Pedagogy	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Karnes	Benjamin	B.M.	Piano	Performance	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Luecke	Sara	B.M.	Piano	Perf./Ped.	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Pack	Alexander	B.M.	Piano	Performance	Trechak	4	5	5	5	5	2
Cao	Esther	B.M.	Piano	Theory/Com	Bees	5	4	5	4	5	3
Kesler	Christina	B.M.	Piano	Pedagogy	Trechak	4	4	3	4	3	5
Luque	Andrea	B.M.	Piano	undecided	Fear	4	4	4	4	4	3
Martin	Brenna	B.M.	Piano	Performance	Bees	5	4	5	4	4	5
Graham	KC	B.M.	Piano	performance	Trechak	4	4	4	4	4	5
Guo	Ai	B.M.	Piano	Pedagogy	Fear	4	4	4	4	4	4
Lingg	Abigail	B.M.	Piano	performance	Trechak	5	5	3	5	5	5
Harshbarger	Anthony	B.M.	Piano	Performance	Bees	5	3	4	3	4	5
Mahoney	Cortland	B.M.	Piano	Theory/Com	Fear	3	5	4	4	5	4
Miller	Robert	B.M.E.	Piano	Music Ed.	Trechak	4	5	4	4	5	4
Barker	Anne	B.M.E.	Piano	Music Ed.	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Axmann	Sarah	B.M.E.	Piano	Music Ed.	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5





Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Axmann	Sarah	Sophom	Piano	BME	Trechak	4	5	4	5	5	5
Barker	Anne	Sophom	Piano	BME	Trechak	4	5	4	4	5	5
Cao	Esther	BM	Piano	Theory/Com	Bees	3	3	4	3	3	4
Chippeaux	Libby	MM	Piano	Perf	Bees	4	4	4	5	5	5
Graham	KC	Senior	Piano	Perf/Ped	Trechak	4	5	4	5	5	5
Griffin	Allison Tanik	Junior	Piano	Theory/Com	Fear	3	4	3	4	4	4
Guo	Ai	Junior	Piano	Ped	Fear	3	4	4	4	4	5
Harshbarger	Tony	Junior	Piano	BM	Bees	4	4	3	4	3	5
He	Jian	MM	Piano	Perf	Bees	4	4	4	5	4	5
Kang	Su Kheng	MM	Piano	Accomp	Bees	5	4	4	5	5	5
Karnes	Benjamin	Soph	Piano	Perf	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Kesler	Christina	Senior	Piano	Perf/Ped	Trechak	4	3	3	4	4	5
Lingg	Abigail	Soph	Piano	Perf	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Luecke	Rachel	MM	Piano	Ped	Trechak	4	4	4	4	4	5
Luecke	Sara Jo	Freshma	Piano	Ped	Trechak	4	5	5	4	5	5
Luque	Andrea	Freshma	Piano	Perf	Fear	4	4	3	3	4	4
Mahoney	Cortland	Junior	Piano	BM	Fear	3	5	4	3	4	4
Martin	Brenna	Senior	Piano	Perf	Bees	3	4	3	4	4	5
Miller	Robert	Sophom	Piano	BME	Trechak	3	4	4	3	4	3
Pack	Alexander	Freshma	Piano	Perf	Trechak	3	5	3	4	4	4



Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Su Kheng Ka	Su	MM	Piano	accompanyin	Bees	5	3	4	4	4	5
Chippeaux	Libby	MM	Piano	Piano	Bees	5	4	4	5	4	5
He	Jian	MM	Piano	Piano	Bees	5	4	4	5	4	5
Luecke	Rachel	MM	Piano	Piano pedag	Trechak	5	4	5	5	4	5
Karnes	Benjamin	BM	Piano	Piano	Trechak	5	4	5	5	4	5
Luecke	Sara Jo	BM	Piano	Piano	Trechak	5	4	5	5	5	5
Pack	Alexander	BM	Piano	Piano	Trechak	5	4	5	5	4	5
Cao	Esther	BM	Piano	Theory/Com	Bees	4	2	3	4	2	4
Kesler	Christina	BM	Piano	Piano	Trechak	3	2	4	4	2	5
Luque	Andrea	BM	Piano	Piano	Fear	4	4	4	4	4	4
Martin	Brenna	BM	Piano	Horn/Piano	Bees	4	3	4	4	4	4
Graham	KC	BM	Piano	Piano	Trechak	4	4	5	5	4	5
Guo	Ai	BM	Piano	Pedagogy	Fear	5	4	5	5	4	5
Lingg	Abigail	BM	Piano	Piano/Conce	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Harshbarger	Tony	BM	Piano	piano/Theory	Bees	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mahoney	Cortland	BM	Piano	Theo/comp/	Fear	4	5	4	4	4	4
Miller	Robert	BME	Piano	Choral/Piano	Trechak	5	5	4	4	5	4
Barker	Anne	BME	Piano	Piano	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Axmann	Sarah	BME	Piano	Piano	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5



COURSE:	Guitar Major		STUDENT	TONE		INTERPRETATION	TECHNIQUE	RHYTHM/ NOTES	LEVEL OF MATERIAL	TOTAL		
	Instrumental Performance	Course #		QUALITY	INTONATION							
INSTRUCTOR:	Craig Owens		FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	COURSE #	QUALITY	INTONATION	INTERPRETATION	TECHNIQUE	RHYTHM/ NOTES	LEVEL OF MATERIAL	TOTAL
YEAR:	Spring 2013		Phil	Bollig	452J	5	5	4	4	4	5	27
			Thornton	Bonner	232J	4	5	4	4	4	5	26
			Colton	Cox	432J	5	5	3	3	3	4	23
			Christian	McNolty	452J	5	5	3	4	3	4	24
			Michael	Peltzer	452J	5	5	3	3	3	4	23
			Anibal	Rivas	734J	4	5	5	5	5	4	34

University – School of Music  
 Student Assessment Sheet – Spring 2013

5 – highest, 1 – lowest

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	In ton.
Craig	Karen	Graduate	Clarinet	Non---degree	Jankauskas	3	5
Frazier	Audre	Soph.	Clarinet	Mus. Perf.	Jankauskas	3	3
Hasty	Lisa	N/A	Clarinet	Non---degree	Jankauskas	1	1
Johnson	Christina	Senior	Clarinet	Mus. Perf.	Jankauskas	4	4
Puder	Jason	Freshman	Clarinet	Music Minor	Jankauskas	4	4
Shepherd	Jamie	Masters	Clarinet	Mus. Ed.	Jankauskas	3	4
Sheren	Sarah	Soph.	Clarinet	Mus. Ed.	Jankauskas	2	1
Stone	Erik	Senior	Clarinet	Sp. Mus. Ed.	Jankauskas	4	4
Wells	Jordan	Junior	Clarinet	Mus. Perf. & Ed.	Jankauskas	4	4
Yang	Zhao	Masters	Clarinet	Mus. Perf.	Jankauskas	4	4

Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
4	5	5	5
2	3	3	3
1	2	1	1
3	4	4	4
3	4	5	3
4	4	4	4
1	2	2	2
4	3	2	4
4	3	3	4
5	5	5	5

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Registration	Command at	Interpretatio	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Rau	Nathan	Senior	Organ	piano	Davis	5	4	4	5	5	4
Cason	David	Senior	Organ	Organ	Davis	5	5	5	5	5	5
Harms	Patrick	Junior	Organ	Piano/Organ	Davis	5	4	4	4	4	4

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Schmidt	Eric	Soph	Percussion	Mus Ed	Scholl	2	1.5	1	1.5	1	1.5
Karnes	Ben	Soph	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	4
Hall	Justin	Junior	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	4.5	5	4.5	4.5	5	5
Taylor	Scott	Senior	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	4.5	4	5	5	4	5
Messner	Holly	Senior	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	4	4	3.5	3.5	4.5	4
Swoverland	Brandi	Senior	Percussion	Mus Ed	Scholl	3.5	4.5	5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Mikelait	Joseph	Senior	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	4.5	4	4	4.5	4	5
Mulkey	Bryce	Grad	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	4.5	4.5	4	4.5	4.5	5
Slater	Andrew	Grad	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	5	5	5	5	5	5





Last Name	First Name	Class	Voice Part	Major	Professor	Accuracy	Breath/into	Interp.	tone	lang/diction	presence/post.
Criswell	Jillian	soph	alto	BME	Crum	444443	4432.543	443343	443333	443333	343343
Foster	Sean	junior	tenor	BM	Crum	55445444.5	55444443.5	454.545444.5	554.544543.	55444445	4543.55444
Golladay	Alyson	junior	mezzo	BM/BME	Crum	43343.55	44353.54	33.533.53.54	443344	43.53435	3433.535
Hale	Matthew	fresh	tenor	BM	Crum	5355443.5	333.55344	33342.533.5	334.54334	4355443.5	43452.533.5
Memrick	Charissa	soph	soprano	BM	Crum	545443.53	4354344	54.55444.54	434.543.534	533.53433	544544.54
Parks	Alyssa	soph	mezzo	BM	Crum	4343.5335	433.53334	4333.5334	443.53.5344	433.53.5334	3333334
Sund	Bryce	junior	tenor	BME	Crum	4454443.5	3333.53.523	5453.54.534	4333.53.543	3343.5333.5	4453.5444

String Ensembles Sp13

Katherine Powell	Violin	-	4	4	3	4	4	4	23	4	4	Mark Foley
Katherine Powell	Violin	-	4	4.5	5	5	5	5	28	5	5	Selim Giray
Krista Kopper	Bass	-	4	4	4	4	4	4.5	25	4	4	-
Krista Kopper	Bass	-	4	4	4	4	4	5	26	4	4	Boris Vayner
Krista Kopper	Bass	-	5	4	4	4	4	4	25	4	4	Leonid Shukaev
Kristen Weddle	Cello	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	4	4	-
Kristen Weddle	Cello	-	4	3	3	3	3	4	21	4	4	Boris Vayner
Kristen Weddle	Cello	-	4	3	3	3	3	4	21	4	4	Catherine Consiglio
Kristen Weddle	Cello	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	4	4	Leonid Shukaev
Kristen Weddle	Cello	-	5	4.5	5	5	5	5	29.5	5	5	Selim Giray
Lauren Betts	Violin	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	26	4	4	Alla Aranovskaya
Lauren Betts	Violin	-	4	3	4	4	4	4	22	4	4	Boris Vayner
Lauren Betts	Violin	-	4	3	3	3	3	3	19	3	3	Catherine Consiglio
Lauren Betts	Violin	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	4	4	Leonid Shukaev
Lauren Betts	Violin	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	22	4	4	Mark Foley
Lauren Betts	Violin	-	3	3	3	3	3	5	22	4	4	Selim Giray
Lauren Betts	Violin	-	5	4	4	4	4	5	29	5	5	Alla Aranovskaya
Luis Salazar	Violin	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	5	5	Alla Aranovskaya
Luis Salazar	Violin	-	5	4	4	4	4	5	27	5	5	Boris Vayner
Luis Salazar	Violin	-	5	4	4	4	4	4	25	4	4	Catherine Consiglio
Luis Salazar	Violin	-	5	4.5	5	5	5	5	28	5	5	Mark Foley
Luis Salazar	Violin	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	29.5	5	5	Selim Giray
Maria Bagacheva	Cello	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	5	5	Alla Aranovskaya
Maria Bagacheva	Cello	-	5	4	4	4	4	5	29	5	5	Boris Vayner
Maria Bagacheva	Cello	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	27	5	5	Catherine Consiglio
Maria Bagacheva	Cello	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	5	5	Leonid Shukaev
Maria Bagacheva	Cello	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	5	5	Mark Foley
Melody Freeman	Violin	-	3	3	3	3	3	3	19	3	3	Selim Giray
Melody Freeman	Violin	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	4	4	Alla Aranovskaya
Melody Freeman	Violin	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Leonid Shukaev
Melody Freeman	Violin	-	4	3	3	3	3	4	22	4	4	Mark Foley
Melody Freeman	Violin	-	5	4	4	4	4	4	26	4	4	Selim Giray
Melody Freeman	Violin	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	29	5	5	Alla Aranovskaya
Ned Kellenberger	Violin	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	29	5	5	Boris Vayner
Ned Kellenberger	Violin	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	4	4	Catherine Consiglio
Ned Kellenberger	Violin	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	5	5	Leonid Shukaev
Ned Kellenberger	Violin	-	5	3	3	3	3	5	27	5	5	Mark Foley
Ned Kellenberger	Violin	-	5	4.5	5	5	5	5	29.5	5	5	Selim Giray
Ricardo Cavalcante	Viola	-	5	4	4	4	4	5	28	5	5	Alla Aranovskaya
Ricardo Cavalcante	Viola	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	28	4	4	Boris Vayner
Ricardo Cavalcante	Viola	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	4	4	Catherine Consiglio
Ricardo Cavalcante	Viola	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	5	5	Leonid Shukaev
Ricardo Cavalcante	Viola	-	5	4.5	5	5	5	5	29.5	5	5	Mark Foley
Roni Worcester	Cello	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	25	4	4	Alla Aranovskaya
Roni Worcester	Cello	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	26	4	4	Boris Vayner
Roni Worcester	Cello	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	22	4	4	Catherine Consiglio
Roni Worcester	Cello	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	25	4	4	Leonid Shukaev
Roni Worcester	Cello	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	22	4	4	Mark Foley
Rosemarie Barney	Viola	-	4	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	5	27	5	5	Selim Giray
Rosemarie Barney	Viola	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	4	4	Alla Aranovskaya
Rosemarie Barney	Viola	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	27	4	4	Boris Vayner
Rosemarie Barney	Viola	-	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	4	4	Catherine Consiglio
Rosemarie Barney	Viola	-	5	5	5	5	5	5	30	5	5	Leonid Shukaev
Rosemarie Barney	Viola	-	5	2	2	2	2	3	14	2	2	Selim Giray
Sharon Long	Viola	-	3	2	2	2	2	3	15	3	3	Alla Aranovskaya
Sharon Long	Viola	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	1	1	Boris Vayner
Sharon Long	Viola	-	3	3	3	3	3	3	20	3	3	Catherine Consiglio
Sharon Long	Viola	-	3	3.5	3	3	3	4	23	4	4	Leonid Shukaev
Sharon Long	Viola	-	3	4	4	4	4	4	21	4	4	Selim Giray
Teresa Landkammer	Violin	Junior	4	4	3	3	3	4	23	4	4	Alla Aranovskaya
Teresa Landkammer	Violin	Junior	4	4	3	3	3	4	23	4	4	Boris Vayner
Teresa Landkammer	Violin	Junior	3	3	3	3	3	3	17	3	3	Catherine Consiglio
Teresa Landkammer	Violin	Junior	4	4	4	4	4	4	24	4	4	Leonid Shukaev
Teresa Landkammer	Violin	Junior	5	4.5	5	5	5	5	29.5	5	5	Selim Giray
Teresa Landkammer	Violin	Junior	4	4	4	4	4	4	24.37692308	4	4	-

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instr.	Major	Professor	Tone	Inton.	Interp.	Techn.	Rhythm/N otes	Material level
Wells	Jordan	Sen.	Clar.	Perf.	Jankauskas	3	3.5	3.5	3	3	4
Sheren	Sarah	Jun.	Clar.	Sp. M. Ed.	Jankauskas	2	2	1.5	1	1.5	2
Forro	Jacob	Fresh.	Sax.	M. Ed.	Deibel	3	2	3.5	3.5	3	4
Burgess	Tyler	Fresh.	Sax.	M. Ed.	Deibel	3	2	2	2	2.5	3
Roe	Haley	MM I	Oboe	Perf.	Banke	3	3	3.5	2.5	3	5
Thomas	Jeremy	Jun.	Sax.	M. Ed.	Deibel	3	2.5	4	3.5	3.5	4
Larson	Sarah	Jun.	Oboe	Perf.	Banke	4.5	4.5	4	4	4	4
Tape	Alica	MM I	Oboe	Perf.	Banke	4.5	5	4.5	4.5	5	5
Korbe	Alexis	MM II	Flute	Perf.	Shelly	4	4	4	4	4	4
Brock	Darren	Jun.	Flute	M. Ed.	Shelly	4	3	4	3.5	3	3
Chen	Athens	MM I	Flute	Perf.	Shelly	3.5	3.5	3	4	4	3
Allen	Jonathan	Jun.	Clar.	M. Ed.	Jankauskas	2	1	2.5	2	3	2
Young	Luke	Sen.	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel	4	3.5	4	4.5	4.5	4
Steinbrock	Trevor	Jun.	Sax.	M. Minor	Deibel	4	3.5	4	4	3.5	4
Avila	Robby	MM I	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel	5	4.5	4	4.5	4.5	5
Messner	Seth	Jun.	Flute	Perf.	Shelly	5	4	4.5	5	5	5
Garden	Janelle	Fresh.	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel	4	4	4.5	4.5	4.5	4
Berryhill	Michael	MM I	Clar.	Cond.	Jankauskas	4	3.5	4	3.5	4	3
Hookit	Chia	Jun.	Flute	Perf.	Shelly	3	3	3	3.5	3.5	4
McPeck	Anastasia	Fresh.	Oboe	Perf.	Banke	4	4	3	3	4	4
Yang	Zhao	MM II	Clar.	Perf.	Jankauskas	4	3.5	4	4	3.5	5
Martin	Amanda	MM II	Bassn.	M. Ed.	Patterson	3	3	3.5	3	2.5	3.5
Lund	Brook	Fresh.	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel	4	3	4	3	3.5	4
Morrell	Karen		Sax.	Non-deg.	Deibel	3	3	4	4	3.5	5



Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Interpretation	Technique
Guo	Ai	Junior	Piano	B.M. Pedagogy	Fear	4	3	4
Martin	Brenna	Senior	Piano	B.M. Performance	Bees	4	5	4
Harms	Patrick	Senior	Piano	B.M. Performance	Bees	5	5	4
Pack	Alexander	Sophomore	Piano	B.M. Performance	Trechak	5	5	4
Luecke	Sara Jo	Sophomore	Piano	B.M. Performance + Pedagogy	Trechak	5	5	5
Riches	Luke	Graduate	Piano	M.M. Theory/Composition	Trechak	5	5	5
Axmann	Sarah	Junior	Piano	B.M.E.	Trechak	5	5	5





Last name	First name	class	major	professo	tone	technique	interpretation
Messmer	Mariah	fresh	BM	crum		3	3
Memrick	Charissa	junior	BM	crum		3	3
Klock	Katie	junior	BM	crum		3	4
Parks	Alyssa	junior	BM	crum		3	3
Hale	Matthew	soph	BM	crum		4	3
Viets	Garrett	fresh	BME	crum		4	3
Peterson	Sam	fresh	BME	Mitchell		2	2
Stepanek	Aaron	grad	MM	crum		4	4



STUDENT		TONE					RHYTHM/ LEVEL OF				
FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	Course #	QUALITY	INTONATION	INTERPRETATION	TECHNIQUE	NOTES	MATERIAL	TOTAL		
Phil	Bollig	734	5	5	4	5	4	3	23		
Thor	Bonner	434	3	5	3	3	3	3	20		
Derek	Bruey	232	4	5	2	4	2	2	19		
Nathan	Carpenter	232	4	5	2	2	2	2	17		
Christian	McNolty	452	5	5	4	4	4	3	25		
Anibal	Rivas	734	4	5	4	5	5	5	28		
Brady	Rohling	452	4	5	4	3	3	3	22		



Hunsicker Juries Sp14

Table 1

	Last	First	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	In-tonation	Inter-pretation	Technique	Rhythm/Notes	Material Level
	Burgess	Christian	Sophomore	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer	4	2	3	3	4	4
	Byers	Braden	Junior	Horn	Mus Ed	Smith	4	4	4	4	5	4
	Miller	Robert	Junior	Euphonium	Mus Ed	Black	3	3	2	2	2	5
	Dozois	Jon	Grad	Horn	Performance	Smith	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Tysick	Kenneth	Junior	Horn	Mus Ed	Smith	4	5	4	5	5	5
	Smith	Wyatt	Senior	Horn	Mus Ed/Perf	Smith	4	5	4	5	5	5
	Williams	Dalton	Grad	Trumpet	Performance	Hunsicker	4	4	5	5	4	5
	Fugate	Alex	Freshman	Trumpet	Engineering	Hunsicker	3	3	3	3	3	5
	Schlosser	Anthony	Sophomore	Tuba	Mus Ed/Perf	Black	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Simmons	Jake	Junior	Trombone	Mus Comp	Blauer	4	4	4	4	4	4
	Stuewe	Eric	Senior	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black	3	4	3	3	4	4
	Adamek	Mathew	Senior	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer	3	4	3	4	4	4
	Tracy	Taylor	Freshman	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black	4	4	4	4	4	4



Last name	First name	class	major	professor	tone	technique	interpretation
Billings	Chy	Grad	Opera Perf	Lacy	3.5	3.4	4
Carrall	Bridget	Fr	ME	Lacy	2.6	2.8	2.9
Dayvault	James	So	ME	Lacy	3.4	2.9	2.4
Heathcote	Leah	Fr	ME/Voc Perf	Lacy	3.5	2.9	3.1
Labes	Elizabeth	Jr	ME	Lacy	3.3	2.9	3.3
Lipinski	Emily	So	ME	Lacy	3.1	2.9	3.1
Mays	Michael	Sr	ME	Lacy	3.3	3.3	3
McCorkle	Stacy [Farthing]	Fr	Voc Perf	Lacy	2.6	2.6	2.5
Mitchell	Kevin	Grad	Voc Perf	Lacy	3.3	3	3.3
Monrad	Emily	Sr	ME	Lacy	3.3	3.1	3.3
Oswald	Trevor	Jr	ME	Lacy	2.8	3.1	2.6

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major Music/Perf	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level	
Karnes	Ben	Junior	Marimba		Scholl	15	14	14	15	15	15	Freshman 1-5
			Snare			13	n/a	13	14	15	15	Sophomore 5-10
												Junior 10 -15
												Senior 15-20
Gravesen	Claire	Freshman	Marimba	Sp Mus Ed	Scholl	5	4	5	5	4	4	Grad 20-25
			Snare			4	n/a	5	4	5	5	
			Timpani			5	n/a	4	4	5	5	
Harris	Steven	Freshman	Marimba	Mus Perf	Scholl	3	3	3	2	3	3	2
			Snare			3	n/a	4	4	3	3	4
			Timpani			4	n/a	3	3	3	3	3
Spaulding	Nelson	Freshman	Marimba	Mus Perf	Scholl	4	4	4	3	4	4	5
			Snare/Multi			4	n/a	4	4	4	4	5
			Timpani			3	n/a	3	3	3	3	3
Siler	Conner	Freshman	Marimba	Musc Ed	Scholl	4	4	5	4	4	4	4
			Snare			4	n/a	4	4	4	3	5
			Timpani			4	n/a	4	4	4	4	3

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instr.	Major	Professor	Tone	Inton.	Interp.	Techn.	Rhythm/Notes	Material level
Wells	Jordan	Sen.	Clar.	Perf.	Jankauskas		3	2	1	2	3
Sheren	Sarah	Jun.	Clar.	Sp. M. Ed.	Jankauskas		2	2	1	1	2
Forro	Jacob	Fresh.	Sax.	M. Ed.	Deibel		3	3	2	2	3
Burgess	Tyler	Fresh.	Sax.	M. Ed.	Deibel		3	3	3	1	3
Roe	Haley	MM I	Oboe	Perf.	Banke		2	4	2	2	4
Thomas	Jeremy	Jun.	Sax.	M. Ed.	Deibel		4	4	3	4	4
Larson	Sarah	Jun.	Oboe	Perf.	Banke		4	5	4	5	4
Tape	Alica	MM I	Oboe	Perf.	Banke		5	5	5	5	5
Korbe	Alexis	MM II	Flute	Perf.	Shelly		4	5	4	4	4
Brock	Darren	Jun.	Flute	M. Ed.	Shelly		3	3	3	3	4-Mar
Chen	Athens	MM I	Flute	Perf.	Shelly		2	3	2	2	3
Allen	Jonathan	Jun.	Clar.	M. Ed.	Jankauskas		2	2	3	2	2
Young	Luke	Sen.	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel		2	1	3	4	4
Steinbrock	Trevor	Jun.	Sax.	M. Minor	Deibel		5	5	5	5	4
Avila	Robby	MM I	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel		4	4	5	5	5
Messner	Seth	Jun.	Flute	Perf.	Shelly		5	5	5	5	5
Garden	Janelle	Fresh.	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel		5	5	5	5	4
Berryhill	Michael	MM I	Clar.	Cond.	Jankauskas		4	4	4	4	3
Hookit	Chia	Jun.	Flute	Perf.	Shelly		3	3	3	3	4
McPeek	Anastasia	Fresh.	Oboe	Perf.	Banke		3	3	3	4	4
Yang	Zhao	MM II	Clar.	Perf.	Jankauskas		5	5	5	5	5
Martin	Amanda	MM II	Bassn.	M. Ed.	Patterson		2	3	3	3	4-Mar
Lund	Brook	Fresh.	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel		3	3	3	4	4
Morrell	Karen		Sax.	Non-deg.	Deibel		4	3	3	3	3

T. ... Juries Sp14

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Interpretation	Technique
Axmann	Sarah	Jr.	Piano	BME	Trechak	5	5	5
Guo	Ai	Jr.	Piano	BM	Fear	5	5	5
Harms	Patrick	Sr.	Piano	BM	Bees	4	5	4
Luecke	Sara Jo	Soph.	Piano	BM	Trechak	5	5	5
Martin	Brenna	Sr.	Piano	BM	Bees	5	4	4
Pack	Alex	Soph.	Piano	BM	Trechak	4	4	4
Riches	Luke	Grad.	Piano	MM	Trechak	4	5	4





Zvonnikov Juries F14

LAST	FIRST	CLASS	INST	MAJOR	PROF	-tone	INTONATION	INTERPRETATION	TECHNIQUE	RHY/NOTES	MATERIAL
Watson	Alistar	Senior	Violin	Music	Zvonnikov	5-	5	5-	5-	5-	5
Hund	Hannah	Soph	Violin	Music	Zvonnikov	5-	4+	5-	4+	5-	5



Last name	First name	class	major	professor	tone	technique	interpretation
Adams	Brooke	Junior	MusEd	ESD	3.5	3	3
McCorkle	Stacy	Soph	Perf	ESD	3.5	3.5	3
Miles	Tyler	Soph	MusEd	ESD	3	3	3
Swank	Gabrielle	Soph	MusEd	ESD	3	3	3
Witcher	Lexy	Fresh	Perf	ESD	3	3	3





Sāsanfar Juries F14

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Messner	Richard	Grad	Piano	MM perf	Trechak		4	5	4	4	5
Riches	Luke	Grad	Piano	MM theory	Trechak		3	4	3	4	5
He	Jian	Grad	Piano	MM perf	Bees		4	5	4	5	5
Luecke	Sara Jo	Sr/400	Piano	BME Sp Ed	Trechak		4	5	4	5	5
Karnes	Ben	Sr/400	Piano	BM Perf/Perf	Trechak		4	3	4	5	5
Martin	Brenna	Sr/400	Piano	BM Perf	Bees		4	5	4	4	5
Guo	Ai	Sr/400	Piano	BM Ped	Fear		4	4	4	5	5
Lingg	Abby	Sr/400	Piano	BM Perf	Trechak		5	5	5	5	5
Miller	Robert	Sr/400	Piano	BME	Trechak		4	5	4	4	5
Hamilton	Aiden	Fr/100	Piano	BM theory	Bees		4	5	4	4	5

Paterson Juries F14

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instr.	Major	Professor	Tone	Inton.	Interp.	Techn.	Rhyth m/Not es	Material level
Denton	Lindsay	1 Fl		MME	Shelly	4	3	3	3.5	4	2
Eberly	Anna	1 Fl		MM	Shelly	5	4	4.5	5	5	5
Riffel	Tyler	3 Sax		BME	Deibel	2	3	3	2	2.5	2
Jensen	Jimmy	1 Sax		MM	Deibel	5	4	5	4	5	4
Chen	Athens	2 Fl		MM	Shelly	4	3.5	3	3	3	3
Garden	Janelle	2 Sax		BM	Deibel	5	4	4	4	5	5
Young	Luke	5 Sax		BM	Deibel	4	4	4	3.5	4	4
Messner	Seth	4 Fl		BM	Shelly	5	4	3.5	5	5	5
Roe	Haley	2 Ob		MM	Banke	4	4	3	3.5	3.5	4
Martin	Amanda	4 Bsn		MM	Patterson	3	3	4	3	3	4
Owens	Jenny	1 Fl		BME	Shelly	2	3	2	2	2	2
Larson	Sarah	4 Ob		BM	Banke	4	4	3	3	3	4
Tape	Alica	2 Ob		MM	Banke	4	4	4	4	4	4
Sharon	Sarah	4 Cl		BME	Montoya	2	1	2	1	1	1
Schrag	Jeremy	1 Cl		MME	Montoya	4	3	4	3	4	4
McPeck	Anastasia	2 Ob		BM	Banke	3	3	3	5	5	5
Vaughn	James	3 Cl		BME	Montoya	3	3	4	3	3.5	3
Vanek	Gabi	1 Bsn		MM	Patterson	3	2	3	3	2	3
Brock	Darren	4 Fl		BME	Shelly	3	3	3	3	3	3
Avila	Robby	1 Sax		MM	Deibel	3	3.5	4	4	4	4
Summers	Justin	4 Sax		BME	Deibel	2	2	2	2	2	2
Lund	Brook	2 Sax		BM	Deibel	3	3	4	3	4	3
Wells	Jordan	5 Cl		BM	Montoya	3	2	2	2	3	3
Turanosoff	Vadim	1 Cl		MM	Montoya	2	3	4	4	4	3



Last name	First name	class	major	professor	tone	technique	interpretation	ID
Billings	Chy	Grad	Opera Perf	Lacy	3.6	3.9	3.9	n738g383
Carroll	Bridget	So	ME	Lacy	3	3.1	2.9	h459b649
Contreras	Jaime	Fr	Voc Perf	Lacy	2.7	2.9	2.8	c476w965
Dayvault	James	Jr	ME	Lacy	3.3	2.9	2.6	h635z488
Gaitan	Stewart	Grad	Opera Perf	Lacy	3.2	2.9	3.4	b282r947
Hale	Matthew	Jr	MT/Voc Perf	Lacy	3.5	3.2	2.8	j286p935
Heathcote	Leah	So	Voc Perf	Lacy	3.9	3.5	3.7	t393a677
Labes	Elizabeth	Sr	ME	Lacy	4	3.7	3.8	k588r399
Mays	Michael	Sr	ME	Lacy	3.3	3	3.2	x634q279
Nuest	Benjamin	Fr	Voc Perf	Lacy	2.9	3.2	2.9	s824g533
Rucker	Johannon	Fr	ME	Lacy	2.8	2.9	3.4	x763e428
Wiens	Gabrielle	Fr	ME	Lacy	3.1	3.2	3.1	d259b968
Wilkerson	Anthony	Fr	ME	Lacy	2.2	2.2	2.4	z393p286
Williamson	Heidi	Fr	Voc Perf	Lacy	3.2	3	3.3	m668q494

Hunsicker Juries F14

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Tracy	Taylor	So	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black	4	3	3	3	3	3
Garber	Jon	Fr	Tuba	Jazz Bass	Black	2	3	1	2	3	1
Hatfield	Scott	Jr	Euphonium	Mus Ed	Black	4	3	3	4	3	4
Pauley	Brandon	Gr	Trumpet	Perf	Hunsicker	4	4	4	4	4	5
Axe	Tyler	So	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker	2	2	2	2	4	2
Stuewe	Eric	Sr	Euphonium	Mus Ed	Black	3	3	3	3	3	4
Morrison	Justis	Jr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer	3	3	2	3	3	3
Kary	Joshua	Fr	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black	2	2	3	2	3	2
Schlosser	Anthony	So	Tuba	Perf	Black	4	3	3	4	3	4
Davis	Cameron	Fr	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker	4	3	4	4	4	4
Rucker	Johannon	Fr	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black	3	3	4	4	4	3
Goetz	Harrison	Fr	Horn	Perf	Smith	3	3	3	4	4	3
Fugate	Alex	So	Trumpet	Accounting	Hunsicker	3	3	3	4	4	4
Macias	Glyn	Fr	Trombone	BA Mus	Blauer	4	4	4	4	4	5
Simmons	Jake	Sr	Trombone	Comp	Blauer	3	4	4	3	4	5
Martin	Brenna	Sr	Horn	Perf	Smith	3	3	4	3	4	4
Wensley	Diana	Gr	Trumpet	Perf	Hunsicker	5	5	5	5	5	5
Burgess	Christian	Jr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer	4	4	4	3	4	4
Reynolds	Matt	Gr	Horn	Perf	Smith	5	5	5	5	5	5
Brake	Jeremy	Fr	Trumpet	Perf	Hunsicker	1	3	2	2	3	1
Nuest	Ben	Fr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Widener	3	3	3	3	3	2
Northern	Jordan	Gr	Trombone	Cond	Widener	4	5	4	4	4	5
Adamek	Mathew	Sr	Trombone	BA Mus	Blauer	3	4	3	3	4	4
Amend	Derrick	Fr	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker	2	2	1	2	2	1
Williams	Dalton	Gr	Trumpet	Cons	Hunsicker	3	4	4	5	4	4

734Y				Studio Grade	Jury Grades	Semester (Overall) Grade	Tone (1-5)	Technic (1-5)	Interpretation (1-5)
Andrews	Preston	MM	A	A-, B, A-, A-, B+, B+	<b>A-</b>	3,4,4,3,4,3,3	3,3,3,3,3,3,3	4,4,3,3,3,3,3	
Guerrero	Lily	MM	A	N/A	<b>A</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Hernandez	Andrew	MM	B	B+, A-, A-, A-, A-, B+, B+	<b>B+</b>	4,4,4,3,5,5,3	3,3,3,3,3,4,3	3,3,3,4,4,5,4	
Mitchell	Kevin	MM	A	N/A (Recital)	<b>A</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Rogier	Joel	MM	A	A-, A-, A-, A-, A-, A	<b>A</b>	4,3,4,5,3,4,4	4,3,4,4,3,4,3	5,4,3,4,3,4,4	
Skipworth	Jake	MM	A	A-, A-, A-, A-, A-, B+, A-	<b>A</b>	3,4,3,4,4,4	4,4,3,3,4,4	4,5,4,4,3,3	
Stepanek	Aaron	MM	A	A, B+, B, B+, B+, B, A	<b>A-</b>	3,3,4,4,3,4,3	3,3,4,4,3,4,3	3,3,4,4,3,4,4	
Votava	Luke	MM	A	B, A-, B+, B+, B, B+, B	<b>A-</b>	3,3,3,3,4,3,4	2,3,3,3,3,3,3	4,3,3,4,4,4,4	
434Y									
Parks	Alyssa	BM	A	B, A-, A-, A-, A-, B+, A-	<b>A</b>	3,3,3,3,4,3,3	3,3,3,3,4,3,3	3,3,3,3,3,3,3	
Perkins	Anthony	BM	A	B+, B+, B+, A-, B+, B+, B+	<b>A-</b>	3,3,5,3,4,4,4	3,4,3,4,3,3	3,3,4,3,3,3,3	
232Y									
Gies	Kristoph	BM	A	A, A-, A-, A-, A-, A-, A-	<b>A</b>	4,4,3,4,4,3	4,4,3,3,3,3	4,4,3,4,3,3	
Groth	Jacob	BM (MT)	A	A,A,A, A-, A-, A	<b>A</b>	4,4,5,4,5,3,4	4,4,3,5,4	5,4,4	
Knapp	Drew	BM	A-	A-, A-, A-, A-, A-, A-, A	<b>A-</b>	3,4,3,4,4,4,3	3,3,3,4,3,3,3	3,3,3,3,3,3,3	
Larrison	Daniel	BM	C	F (Did not appear)	<b>D</b>				
Viets	Garrett	BME	A	A-, A-, A-, A-, A	<b>A</b>	5,4,3,3,4,4,4	5,5,3,3,3,4,4	5,4,3,4,4,4,3	

STUDENT												
LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	CLASS	INSTRUMENT	MAJOR	PROFESSOR	ZONE	INTONATION	INTERP./STYLE	TECHNIQUE	IMPROVISATION	MATERIAL LEVEL	
Cox	Colton	senior	guitar	Performance	Flynn	3	5	4	2	4	4	
Bonner	Thor	junior	guitar	Performance	Flynn	3	5	3	3	3	1	
White	Micah	sophomore	guitar	Jazz Studies	Flynn	5	5	5	5	5	5	
Bollig	Phil	graduate	guitar	Jazz Studies	Flynn	4	5	4	5	4	5	
McNolty	Christian	junior	guitar	Jazz Studies	Flynn	4	5	4	4	4	5	
Bruey	Derek	sophomore	guitar	Mus. Ed.	Flynn	3	4	2	3	2	1	
Carpenter	Nathan	sophomore	guitar	Theory/Comp	Flynn	3	4	2	2	2	1	







Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Blauer	Juries	Formation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Parley	Brandon	Gr	Trumpet	Perf	Hunsicker	4		3	4	4	4	5
Schlosser	Anthony	So	Tuba	Perf	Black	4		4	3	4	4	4
Burgess	Christian	Jr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer	4		3	3	3	4	4
Axe	Tyler	So	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker	2		3	3	2	3	3
Morrison	Just is	Jr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer	2		2	2	2	2	2
Dozois	Jonathan	Gr	Horn	Perf	Smith	5		5	5	5	5	5
Hatfield	Scott	Jr	Euph	Ed	Black	3		3	3	4	4	4
Simmons	Jake	Sr	Trombone	Mus Comp	Blauer	4		3	3	4	4	4
Adamek	Mathew	Sr	Trombone	B of Arts	Blauer	4		4	4	3	4	4
Kary	Joshua	Fr	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black	4		3	3	3	4	4
Davis	Cameron	Fr	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker	3		3	3	3	3	3
Rucker	Johannon	Fr	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black	3		3	3	4	4	4
Goertz	Harrison	Fr	Horn	Perf	Smith	3		3	3	3	3	3
Fugate	Alex	So	Trumpet	Business	Hunsicker	3		2	3	3	3	4
Macias	Glyn	Fr	Trombone	B of arts	Blauer	4		3	3	3	4	4
Martin	Brenna	Sr	Horn	Perf	Smith	3		4	3	3	4	5
Stuewe	Eric	Sr	Euph	Mus Ed	Black	3		4	3	3	3	4
Wensley	Diana	Gr	Trumpet	Perf	Hunsicker	5		5	5	5	5	5
Graber	Jon	Fr	Tuba	Jazz	Black	3		4	2	3	3	3
Reynolds	Matt	Gr	Horn	Perf	Smith	5		5	5	5	5	5
Brake	Jeremy	Fr	Trumpet	Perf	Hunsicker	2		2	2	2	2	2
Amend	Derrick	Fr	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker	2		2	2	2	2	2
Nuest	Ben	Fr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Widener	3		3	3	3	3	2
Northern	Jordan	Gr	Trombone	Cond	Widener	4		4	3	3	3	2
Williams	Dalton	Gr	Trumpet	Cond	Hunsicker	5		4	4	4	5	



Lucas Juries F14

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
						pedaling	continuity				
						voicing					
								3			
Messner	Richard	grad	Piano	M.M. Perform	Trechak		4	5	4	4	3
Riches	Luke	grad	Piano	M.M. Theory	Trechak		2	4	4	4	4
He	Jian	grad	Piano	M.M. Perform	Bees		5	5	5	5	5
Luecke	Sara Jo	senior	Piano	B.M.E. Specia	Trechak		5	5	5	5	5
Karnes	Ben	senior	Piano	B.M. Perform	Trechak		4	4	4	5	4
Martin	Brenna	senior	Piano	B.M. Perform	Bees		4	5	4	4	4
Guo	Ai	senior	Piano	BM Pedagog	Fear		5	4	4	4	5
Lingg	Abby	senior	Piano	BM Performa	Trechak		5	5	4	5	5
Miller	Robert	senior	Piano	BME	Trechak		4	4	4	4	4
Hamilton	Aiden	freshman	Piano	BM Theory/C	Bees		5	4	4	4	4

Baxter Juries F14

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instr.	Major	Professor	Tone	Inton.	Interp.	Techn.	Rhythm/Notes	Material level
Jeffery	Brittany	Grad	Voice	MM	Baxter	3.5	3	3	3.5	3.5	4
Novotny	Constantine	Grad	Voice	MM	Baxter	4	3.5	4	4	4	4
Ramseur	Carolyn	Grad	Voice	MM	Baxter	4.5	4	4	4	4	4
Wilkerson	Amanda	Grad	Voice	MM	Baxter	3.25	2.75	3.25	3	3.5	4
Crandall	Kathleen	Fresh	Voice	BM	Baxter	3.5	3	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.5
Siebuhr	Ryan	Fresh	Voice	BM	Baxter	3	3	3	3	3	3
Wells	Jessie	Fresh	Voice	BM	Baxter	3.5	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25	3.25
Ernst	Elizabeth	Fresh	Voice	BA (BM)	Baxter	2.5	2.5	3.25	2.5	3	3

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Hund	Hannah	Sof	violin	violin	Zvonnikov	4	3	3	3 4-	3	5
Salazar Avila	Luis	Sof	violin	violin	Aranovskaya	5	4	4	4 5-	5	5
Schmidt	Caitlin	G	cello	cello	Shukaev	4	4	4	4	4 4+	5
Power	Alexis	Sen	violin	violin	Aranovskaya	5	5	5	4	4 4+	4
Smith	Allis	F	dbass	dbass	Foley	3	3	3	3	4 4-	3
Johns	Alana	Sof	dbass	dbass	Foley	4	4	4	3	4	5
Shelden	Steffhanie	Sof	Cello	Cello	Shukaev	4	4	4	4	4	4
Day	Riley	S	dbass	dbass	Foley	4	4	4	4	4	5
Harder	Madaline	Sof	cello	cello	Shukaev	5	4	4	4	4	5
Jackson	Kiana	F	dbass	dbass	Foley	4	4	4	4	4	4
Turgeon	Lane	F	dbass	dbass	Foley	4 4+	4	4	4	4	4
Brungardt	Virginia	G	violin	violin	Giray	3 5-	3	3	4	4	4
Estanbuli	Dima	Sof	violin	violin	Aranovskaya	4 5-	4 5-	5-	4+	5-	4+
Francis	Yecheskel	G	viola	viola	Vayner	4+	5-	5-	4+	5-	4+
Magee	Jasmine	J	cello	cello	Shukaev	4 5-	4 5-	3	3	4	5 5-
Betts	Laureen	S	violin	violin	Aranovskaya	4	4	4	4	4	4 5-
Amstutz	Alina	S	violin	violin	Aranovskaya	4	4	4	3	3 4-	3
Korenchuk	Natalia	G	violin	violin	Giray	5-	4	4	4 4+	5-	5
Landkamer	Monica	Sof	viola	viola	Consiglio	2	3	3	3 3-	3	3
Austin	Caleb	Sof	viola	viola	Consiglio	3-	3	3	3 3-	4	3
Klozik	Niek	F	viola	viola	Consiglio	3 4-	3 4-	4	4	3 4+	5
Wells	Daniel	F	viola	viola	Consiglio	4+	4	4	4	4 5-	4
Watson	Alistair	S	violin	violin	Zvonnikov	4+	4 4-	4 4-	4 4-	4 4-	5
Markel	Jason	S	cello	cello	Shukaev	4+	4-	4	4 3+	4-	5
Vermilyea	Evan	S	dbass	dbass	Foley	5 5-	5-	5-	5-	5 5-	5
Nailon	Sarah Jane	S	violin	violin	Giray	3	3	4	3	3	4
McPherson	Deja	Sof	violin	violin	Giray	2 3-	2 3-	2	2	3	3
Gabel	Sarah	Sof	violin	violin	Giray	3	3	4	3	3 4+	4

## Sternfinale - 1. Runde - Juries Sp15

Last name	First name	class	major	professor	tone	technique	interpretation
Adams	Brooke	Junior	MusEd	ESD	4	4	3.5
Miles	Tyler	Soph	MusEd	ESD	3	2.5	3
Swank	Gabrielle	Soph	MusEd	ESD	3	3	2.5
Witcher	Lexy	Fresh	Perf	ESD	3	3	3

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instr.	Major	Professor	Tone	In-ton.	Interp.	Techn.	Rhythm/Notes	Material level
Hund	Hanna		Violin		Zvonikov	5	4	4	5		5
Francis	Zeke		Vla			5	5	4	5		5
Cavalcante	Ricardo		Vla			4	4	4	5		4
Day	Riley	Grad	Double Bass	Perf	Foley	4	4	4	4		5
Johns	Alana	Junior	Double Bass	Perf	Foley	4	3	3	3		4
Kaspar	Jordon		Double Bass	Ed.	Foley	4	3	4	4		4
Turgeon	Lane	H.S. Guest	Double Bass	Perf	Foley	3	5	4	4		4
Jackson	Kiana	Freshman	Double Bass	Ed.	Foley	4	4	4	4		4
Harder	Madeline		Cello		Shukaev	4	5	5	5		5
Austin	Caleb		Violin			3	3	4	4		5
Ortiz	Jorge		Cello		Shukaev	5	5	5	5		5
Amstutz	Alina		Violin		Aranovskaya	2	2	2	3		2
Nichole	K		Vla	Composition		4	4	4	4		4
Nisly	Jeff					5	5	5	5		4
Gaber	Jon		Double Bass	Jazz	Foley	4	3	4	3		4
Hooper	Zac	Freshman	Sax			5	4	4	4		4
White	Micah		Guitar		Flynn	5	5	5	5		5
McNolty	Christian		Guitar		Flynn	5	5	3	4		4
Ogborn	Evan	Senior	Double Bass	Jazz	Foley	4	2	3	3		5
Bruey	Derek		Guitar		Flynn	4	5	2	3		3
Sizemore	Nathan		Guitar		Flynn	4	5	2	3		3

<b>732Y</b>			Studio Grade	Jury Grades	<b>Semester Grade</b>	Tone (1-5)	Technic (1-5)	Interpretation (1-5)
Andrews	Preston	MM	B	B+, B+, A-, A-, A-, A-, B	<b>B+</b>	3+	3	3
Rogier	Joel	MM	A	A-, A, A, A-, A, A, A	<b>A</b>	5	5	3+
Votava	Luke	MM	A	B+, A-, A-, B+, B+, A-, B	<b>A</b>	3+	3	4+
<b>734Y</b>								
Hernandez	Andrew	MM	A	A-, B+, B+, A-, B, A-, B+	<b>A-</b>	3+	3-	4
Mitchell	Kevin	MM	A	N/A	<b>A</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Skipworth	Jake	MM	A	N/A	<b>A</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stepanek	Aaron	MM	A	B+, B, A-, B+, B, B	<b>A-</b>	3+	3	4
Tholl	Carter	MM	I	Postponed	<b>I</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>434Y</b>								
Parks	Alyssa	BM	A	B+, A-, B+, B+, B+, B	<b>A-</b>	3	3	3
Perkins	Anthony	BM	B	B+, B+, B+, B+, B+, B, A-	<b>A-</b>	3	3	3
<b>232Y</b>								
Gies	Kristoph	BM	B	A-, A, A-, A-, A-, A-, B+	<b>A-</b>	4	3+	4
Groth	Jacob	BM (MT)	A	A-, A-, B+, A, A-, A-, A-	<b>A-</b>	3+	3+	4+
Knapp	Drew	BM	C-	Postponed	<b>I</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A
Viets	Garrett	BME	A	B-, A-, A-, A-, B+, A-, B	<b>A-</b>	3+	3+	4

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Suaste	Luis	MM	Piano	Performance	Bees	4	5	4	4	5	5
Riches	Luke	MM	Piano	Composition	Trechak	4	4	4	4	4	5
Pack	Alex	BM	Piano	Performance	Trechak	4	3	3	4	4	5
Luecke	Sara Jo	BME	Piano	Music Ed/Special Ed	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Karnes	Benjamin	BM	Piano	Performance	Trechak	5	3	4	4	4	5
Martin	Brenna	BM	Piano	Performance	Bees	4	4	3	4	4	5
Miller	Robert	BME	Piano	Music Ed	Trechak	4	5	4	4	5	5
Hamilton	Aiden	BM	Piano	Theory/Composition	Bees	4	5	4	4	5	5
McCullough	Ariel	BME	Piano	Music Ed	Bees	3	2	3	3	2	5

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level	
Hurd	Hannah	Soph	violin	Violin	Zvonnikov	5-	4+	4+	4+	5	5	28
Francis	Techental	Grad	viola	Performance	Vayner	5-	5-	5-	5-	5	5	29
Cavalcante	Ricardo	Junior	viola	Performance	Vayner	5-	5-	5-	5-	5	5	28.5
Day	Ralley	Grad	D.Bass	Performance	Foley	5-	5-	4-	5-	5-	5	28
Jahns	Alana	Junior	D.Bass	Performance	Foley	4+	4+	4-	4-	4+	4+	23
Hassar	Jordan	Junior	D.Bass	Music Ed.	Foley	4+	4+	4-	4-	4	4	23.5
Turgeon	Lane	Fresh	D.Bass	Performance	Foley	4+	5-	4	4	5	4	26
Jackson	Kiana	Fresh	D.Bass	Performance	Foley	5-	5-	4	4	5	4	26
Harder	Madeline	Soph	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	5-	5-	5-	5-	5	5	29
Austin	Caleb	Soph	viola	Education	Girav	3+	3+	4	3	4	3	21
Ortiz Moreno	Jorge	Grad	cello	Performance	Shukaev	5-	5-	4+	5-	4	5	28
Amstutz	Alina	Junior	violin	Art. in Music	Aranovskaya	3	3	3	3	3	4	19
Kozik	Nick	Fresh	viola	Performance	Vayner	4+	4+	4+	4+	4+	4	25
Schmidt	Caitin	Grad	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	4+	4+	4+	4+	5-	5-	26.5
Estambuli	Dima	Soph	violin	Performance	Aranovskaya	5-	4+	5-	5-	5	5	28
Power	Alexis	Senior	violin	Performance	Aranovskaya	5-	4+	5-	5-	5	4+	27
Oviedo	Pedro	Junior	viola	Performance	Girav	5-	5-	5-	4+	5	5	21
McPherson	Deja	Soph	violin	Music Ed.	Girav	3+	3+	3	3	3	3	19
Sheldon	Stephanie	Soph	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	4+	5-	5-	4+	5-	4+	26.5
Begacheva	Iwanta	Senior	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	5-	5-	4	5	5	5	29
Nallon	Sarah-Jane		Violin	Girav		4-	4	4	4	4+	4	24





## Scholl Juries Sp15

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Flurry	Daniel	Fresh	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graham	Jackson	Fresh	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	4	3.5	4	3.5	3.5	3
Teufel	Christian	Fresh	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	4.5	5	4.5	4.5	5	5
Weaver	Spencer	Fresh	Percussion	Mus Ed	Scholl	3.5	3.5	4	3	3.5	3
Sipes	Ember	Fresh	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	2	2	2	2	2	2
Gravesen	Claire	Soph	Percussion	Mus Ed	Scholl	4.5	4.5	3.5	3.5	4.5	4.5
Spaulding	Nelson	Soph	Percussion	Mus Ed	Scholl	3	5	3.5	3.5	3.5	4
Karnes	Ben	Senior	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	4.5	5	5	4.5	5	5
Carp	Michael	Grad	Percussion	Mus Perf	Scholl	5	5	5	5	5	5

**Patterson** **Reviews** **Spring 2015**

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instr.	Major	Professor	Tone	Inton.	Interp.	Techn.	Rhythm/Notes	Material level
Denton	Lindsay	1 MM	Flute	Conducting	Shelly	4	3	3.5	3	4	3
Wei	Jian	1	Flute	Perf	Shelly	4	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.5
Brock	Darren	5	Flute	Ed	Shelly	4	3	4	3.5	3	3.5
McPeck	Anastasia	2	Oboe	Perf	Banke	4.5	3.5	3	4	4.5	4
Tape	Alica	2 MM	Oboe	Perf	Banke	4.5	4.5	4	4	4	5
Garden	Janelle	2	Sax	Perf	Deibel	4	3.5	3	4	4	4
Turanosoff	Vadim	1 MM	Cl	Perf	Jankauskas	3.5	3	4	3.5	4	4
Vaughn	James	2	Cl	Ed	Jankauskas	4	4	3	3	4	3.5
Wells	Jordan	4	Cl	Perf	Jankauskas	3	3	3	3	4	4
Chen	Athens	2	Fl	Perf	Shelly	3	3	2	4	4	3
Vanek	Gabi	1	Bsn	Perf	Patterson	2	1	2	3	3	3
Burgess	Tyler	2	Sax	Ed	Deibel	3	2	3	3	3.5	3
Summers	Justin		Sax	Ed	Deibel	2	2	3	2	3	3
Avila	Robby	2 MM	Sax	Perf	Deibel	4	4	3	4	3	4
Riffel	Tyler	3	Sax	Perf	Deibel	3	3	3	3	3	3
Jensen	Jimmy	1 MM	Sax	Perf	Deibel	4	4	5	5	5	4.5
Morrell	Karen		Sax	-	Deibel	3	3	4	3.5	4	4

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Wensley	Diana	Gr	Trumpet	Perf	Hunsicker		5	5	5	5	5
Davis	Cameron	Fr	Trumpet	Nursing	Hunsicker		4	4	4	4	4
Nuest	Ben	Fr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Widener		4	4	3	4	3
Reynolds	Matt	Gr	Horn	Perf	Smith		5	5	5	5	5
Burgess	Christian	Jr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer		4	4	4	3	4
Fugate	Alex	So	Trumpet	Accounting	Hunsicker		4	3	4	4	4
Northern	Jordan	Gr	Trombone	Cond	Widener		4	5	4	4	4
Amend	Derrick	Fr	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker		2	2	1	2	1
Hatfield	Scott	Jr	Euphonium	Mus Ed	Black		4	3	3	4	4
Garber	Jon	Fr	Tuba	Jazz Bass	Black		2	3	1	2	1
Stuewe	Eric	Sr	Euphonium	Mus Ed	Black		3	3	3	3	4
Rucker	Johannon	Fr	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black		3	3	4	4	3
Goetz	Harrison	Fr	Horn	Perf	Smith		3	3	3	4	3
Kary	Joshua	Fr	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black		2	2	3	2	2
Daly	Emma	Gr	Horn	Perf	Smith		5	5	5	5	5
Adamek	Mathew	Sr	Trombone	BA Mus	Blauer		3	4	3	3	4
Brake	Jeremy	Fr	Trumpet	Perf	Hunsicker		1	3	2	2	1
Schlosser	Anthony	So	Tuba	Perf	Black		4	3	3	4	4
Simmons	Jake	Sr	Trombone	Comp	Blauer		3	4	4	3	4
Pauley	Brandon	Gr	Trumpet	Perf	Hunsicker		4	4	4	4	5
Axe	Tyler	So	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker		2	2	2	2	2
Williams	Dalton	Gr	Trumpet	Cons	Hunsicker		3	4	5	4	4





Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Zvonnikov	Evgeny	grad	violin	Music	Krinke	4	4	4	5	5	5
Mallett	Caleb	grad	violin	Music	Krinke	3	3	3	4	4	4
Austin	Caleb	junior	viola	M. Ed	Consiglio	3	3	3	3	3	3
Gabel	Hannah	junior	violin	M. Ed	Krinke	3	3	3	3	3	3
Wallace	Daljana	soph	cello	Music	Shukaev	3	3	3	2	3	3
Prugar	Marta	grad	violin	Music	Krinke	4	4	4	4	4	4
Eilert	Patrick	freshm	guitar	Music	Brody	3	3	3	3	3	3
Bond	Isabella	freshm	cello	Music	Shukaev	2	3	3	2	3	3
Hund	Hannah	junior	violin	Music	Zvonnikov	4	4	4	4	4	4
Schmidt	Caitlin	grad	cello	Music	Shukaev	4	4	4	4	4	4
Estanbuli	Dima	junior	violin	Music	Krinke	3	4	4	4	4	4
McPherson	Deja	junior	violin	M. Ed	Krinke	3	2	3	3	3	3
Harder	Madelline	junior	cello	Music	Shukaev	4	4	4	4	4	4
Magee	Jasmine	senior	cello	Music	Shukaev	4	4	3	3	3	3
Turgeon	Lane	freshm	bass	Music	Foley	4	3	3	3	3	3
Schmitt	Joseph	freshm	viola	PreMed	Consiglio	3	3	3	3	3	3
Oviedo	Pedro	junior	viola	Music	Consiglio	3	3	3	4	3	4
Sheldon	Stephanie	junior	cello	Music	Shukaev	3	3	3	4	3	3
Klozik	Nichole	soph	viola	Music	Consiglio	3	4	4	4	4	4
Amstutz	Alina	senior	violin	BFA	Zvonnikov	3	3	3	3	3	3
Jackson	Kiana	soph	bass	Music	Foley	4	4	4	3	3	3
Reid	Piper	freshm	viola	Music	Consiglio	3	2	3	2	3	3
Graber	Jon	soph	bass	Music	Foley	3	2	2	3	3	3
Villar	Gabrielle	freshm	viola	Minor	Consiglio	3	2	2	3	3	3
Treas	Hailey	grad	viola	Music	Consiglio	4	4	4	3	4	4
Moseley	Taylor	soph	violin	BFA	Krinke	2	2	2	3	3	2
Markel	Jason	grad	cello	Music	Shukaev	3	3	3	3	3	3
Vermilyea	Evan	senior	bass	Music	Foley	4	4	4	4	4	4
Naillon	Sarah J	senior	violin	Music	Krinke	3	3	3	3	3	3
Begacheva	Maria	senior	cello	Music	Shukaev	4	4	4	4	4	4
Johns	Alana	junior	bass	Music	Foley	3	4	4	3	3	3
Salazar	Luis	senior	violin	Music	Zvonnikov	4	4	4	4	4	4
Tennant	Gabby	freshm	viola	Music	Consiglio	3	3	3	3	2	3
Cavalcante	Ricardo	senior	viola	Music	Vaynor	3	4	4	4	4	4
Francis	Zeke	grad	viola	Music	Vaynor	4	4	4	4	4	4

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Suaste	Luis	M.M.	Piano	Performance	Bees	pedaling, voicing	5	5	5	5	5
Wise	Kelsey	M.M.	Piano	Pedagogy	Bees		4	5	4	4	5
Hephner	Sean	M.M.	Piano	Performance	Trechak		4	2	4	4	3
Riches	Luke	M.M.	Piano	Pedagogy	Trechak		3	4	4	4	4
Guo	AI	M.M.	Piano	Pedagogy	Bees		4	4	4	3	4
Teh	Jia Win	sophom	Piano	Pedagogy	Bees		5	5	4	4	5
Karnes	Ben	senior	Piano	Performance	Trechak		5	4	4	4	5
Pack	Alex	senior	Piano	Performance	Trechak		4	4	4	4	4
Jones	Colton	sophom	Piano	Performance	Trechak		5	4	4	4	5
Albu	Nathan	freshma	Piano	Engineering,			4	5	4	4	5
				Music minor							
Luecke	Sara Jo	senior	Piano	SpecialMusEd	Trechak		4	5	5	5	5
Miller	Robert	senior	Piano	B.M.E. choral/keyboard	Trechak		4	4	4	4	5
Mick	Kylie	freshma	Piano	B.M.E.	Bees		4	5	4	4	5
Shipley	Lucy	junior	Piano	SpecialMusEd	Trechak		4	3	4	4	4
Hamilton	Aiden	junior	Piano	theory/comp	Bees		4	4	3	4	3
Spaulding	Nelson	junior	Piano	theory/comp	Bees		4	5	4	4	4
Stephen	Colin	freshma	Piano	theory/comp	Trechak		5	5	4	4	5



## Blauer Juries F15

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Schlusser	Anthony	Jr	Tuba	Perf/Mus Ed	Black	4	4	4	3	4	4
Burgess	Christian	Sr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer	5	5	5	5	5	5
Hatfield	Scott	Sr	Euph	Mus Ed	Black	4	4	4	3	4	4
Simmons	Jake	Sr	Trombone	Mus Comp	Blauer	4	4	4	4	4	4
Adamek	Mathew	Sr	Trombone	B of Arts	Blauer	4	4	4	4	4	4
Fugate	Alex	Jr	Trumpet	Nursing	Hunsicker	3	3	3	3	3	3
Graber	Jon	So	Tuba	Jazz/Perf	Black	2	4	4	3	3	3
Northern	Jordan	Gr	Trombone	Cond	Widener	5	4	4	4	4	5
Williams	Dalton	Gr	Trumpet	Cond	Hunsicker	5	5	5	5	5	5
Stacey	Bryonna	Fr	Trumpet	Sp Mus Ed	Hunsicker	2	3	2	2	2	2
Kary	Joshua	So	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black	4	4	4	3	4	4
Nelson	Stephanie	Gr	Horn	Perf	Smith	5	5	5	5	5	5
Smith	Zach	Sr	Trumpet	Comp Sci	Hunsicker	2	2	2	2	2	4
Izard	Khail	Fr	Trumpet	Pre Pharm	Hunsicker	3	3	3	2	3	3
Brown	Ethan	Fr	Trumpet	Sports Mgmt	Hunsicker	1	2	2	2	2	2
Rucker	Johannon	So	Tuba	Mus Ed	Black	3	4	4	5	4	4
Dawson	Mike	Fr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Widener	3	3	3	3	3	3
Houston	Courtney	Fr	Horn	Mus Ed	Smith	2	2	2	2	2	2
Davis	Cameron	So	Trumpet	Nursing	Hunsicker	2	3	3	2	2	4
Morrison	Justis	Jr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer	2	2	2	2	2	3
Goertz	Harrison	So	Horn	Perf	Smith	3	3	3	3	3	4
Eilert	Patrick	Fr	Trombone	Mus Ed	Blauer	2	2	2	2	2	2
Basic	Adrianna	Fr	Horn	Perf	Smith	2	2	2	2	2	2
Amend	Derrick	So	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker	2	2	2	2	2	3
Axe	Tyler	So	Trumpet	Mus Ed	Hunsicker	2	2	2	2	2	4

uries F15

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Registration	Command at	Interpretatio	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Nelson	Amanda	Non-deg	Organ	non-degree	Davis	5	5	5	5	5	5
Jones	Colton	Sophom	Organ	Piano	Davis	5	4	4	5	4	5
Stephens	Colin	Freshma	Organ	Piano	Davis	5	4	4	5	5	5

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instr.	Major	Professor	Tone	Inton.	Interp.	Techn.	Rhythm/Notes	Material level
Graham	Jackson	sophomore	drums	Percussion Perf.	Hatfield	3	5	3	4	4	5
Engdahl	Michael	graduate	guitar	Music Perf.	Flynn	5	5	3	4	3	5
Ogborn	Evan	senior	bass	Jazz	Foley	4	4	4	4	3	5
Watkins	Britney	graduate	bassoon	Music Perf.	Patterson	5	5	3	5	3	5
Bonner	Thor	senior	guitar	Jazz	Flynn	3	4	4	4	4	4
Nisly	Jeff	junior	guitar	Jazz	Flynn	3	3	3	3	3	4
Graber	Jon	sophomore	bass	Jazz	Foley	3	4	4	3	3	4
Sipes	Ember	junior	drums	Percussion Perf.	Hatfield	3	4	3	3	3	4
Potts	Michael	freshman	saxophone	Jazz	Deibel	5	5	4	4	4	5
White	Micah	junior	guitar	Jazz	Flynn	5	5	5	5	4	5
Carrithers	Seth	graduate	bass	Music Perf.	Foley	5	5	5	5	5	5
Bollig	Phil	graduate	guitar	Music Perf.	Flynn	5	5	3	4	4	5
Plantz	Megan	freshman	guitar	Jazz	Flynn	4	4	3	4	3	4
Lind	Toby	freshman	guitar	Jazz	Flynn	3	3	2	2	2	2
McNolty	Christian	junior	guitar	Jazz	Flynn	4	4	4	3	3	4
Hooper	Zach	sophomore	saxophone	Jazz	Deibel	4	4	4	3	3	4
Tuefel	Christian	sophomore	drums	Percussion Perf.	Hatfield	4	4	4	3	3	4
Trechak	Greg	freshman	guitar	Undecided	Flynn	5	4	4	3	3	4

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
	String		Juries								
Eilert	Patrick	Fr	Gtr (Classical)	BME	Brody		5	5	5	4	5
Bond	Isabella	Fr	cello	BME	Shukaev		4	2	2	2	4
Hund	Hannah	Jr	violin	BM	Zvonikov		4	4	5	5	5
Schmidt	Caitlin	Gr	cello	MM	Shukaev		5	4	5	5	5
Estanbuli	Dima	Jr	violin	BVI	Krinke		4	5	5	5	5
McPherson	Deja	Jr	violin	BME	Krinke		3	2	4	4	4
Harder	Madeline	So	cello	BM	Shukaev		4	5	5	5	5
McGee	Jasmine	Sr	cello	BM	Shukaev		5	4	4	4	5
Turgeon	Lane	Fr	bass	BM	Foley		5	5	5	5	5
Schmitt	Joseph	Fr	viola	Pre-med	Consiglio		3	4	3	3	5
Oviedo	Pedro	Jr	viola	BM	Consiglio		5	4	4	4	5
Sheldon	Stephanie	Jr	cello	BM	Shukaev		4	4	4	4	5
Klozik	Nichole	So	viola	BM	Consiglio		4	3	4	4	5
Amstutz	Alina	Sr	violin	BFA	Zvonikov		4	2	4	4	5
Jackson	Kiana	So	bass	BM	Foley		4	4	4	4	5
Reid	Piper	Fr	viola	BME	Consiglio		3	1	3	3	4
Graber	Jon	So	bass	BM	Foley		3	1	3	3	5
Villar	Gabrielle	Fr	viola	minor	Consiglio		4	3	3	3	5
Treas	Hailey	Gr	viola	MM	Consiglio		3	3	4	4	5
Mosley	Taylor	So	violin	BA	Krinke		4	4	3	3	5
Markel	Jason	Gr	cello	MM	Shukaev		5	3	4	4	5
Vermilyea	Evan	Sr	bass	BM	Foley		4	5	4	4	5
Nailon	Sarah	Sr	violin	BM	Krinke		4	4	4	4	5
Beposheva	Maria	Jr	cello	BM	Shukaev		5	5	5	5	5
Johns	Alana	Jr	bass	BM	Foley		5	4	4	4	5
Salazar	Luis	Sr	violin	BM	Zvonikov		5	5	5	5	5
Tennant	Gabby	Fr	viola	Part-time	Consiglio		4	3	3	3	5
Cavalcante	Ridardo	Jr	viola	BM	Vaynor		5	4	5	5	5
Francis	Yechezkel	Gr	viola	MM	Vaynor		5	5	5	5	5
	Jazz		Juries:	Compos	and	applied					
Graham	Jackson	So	Perc	BM	Hatfield		5	5	3	4	5
Engdahl	Michael	Gr	Gtr	MM	Flynn		5	5	4	5	5
Watkins	Britany	Gr	Bsn	MM	Patterson		5	5	4	5	5
Ogborn	Evan	Sr	bass	BM	Foley		5	4	4	4	5
Graber	Jon	So	bass	BM	Foley		5	4	4	4	5
Nisly	Jeff	Jr	Gtr	BM	Flynn		5	5	3	4	5
Sipes	Ember	Jr	Perc	BM	Hatfield		5	5	3	4	5
Bonner	Thor	Sr	Gtr	BM	Flynn		5	5	3	4	5
Potts	Mickhael	Fr	Sax	BM	Deibel		5	5	4	5	5
White	Micah	So	Gtr	BM	Flynn		5	5	5	5	5
Carrithers	Seth	Gr	Elec. Bs	Gr.	Foley		5	5	5	4	5
Hooper	Zac	So	Sax	BM	Deibel		5	5	5	5	5
Teufel	Christian	So	Drums	BM	Schall		5	5	5	5	5
Bollig	Phil	Gr	Gtr	Gr.	Flynn		5	5	4	5	5
Plantz	Megan	Fr	Gtr	BM	Flynn		5	5	4	4	5
Lind	Toby	Fr	Gtr	BM	Flynn		4	5	3	2	3
McNolty	Christian	Jr	Gtr	BM	Flynn		4	5	4	4	5
Trechak	Greg	Fr	Gtr	BM	Flynn		5	5	4	2	4

Goering Juries F15

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Engdahl	Michael	Graduate	Guitar	Jazz	Flynn	5	5	3	4	2	4
Ogborn	Evan	Senior	Bass	Jazz	Foley	4	3	4	3	3	4
Watkins	Brittany	Graduate	Bassoon	Bassoon Perf	Patterson	4	4	3	4	3	4
Browne	Jackson	Sophomore	Drums	BM Perc Perf	Hatfield/Scholl	2	3	2	2	2	4
Nisly	Jeff	Junior	Guitar	Jazz	Flynn	3	3	2	2	1	2
Bonner	Thor	Senior	Guitar	Jazz	Flynn	4	3	2	3	1	2
Sikes	Ember	Junior	Drums	?	Hatfield	2	3	2	2	1	2
Graber	Jon	Sophomore	Bass	BM Bass Perf/Jazz	Foley	3	2	3	4	2	2
Carrithers	Seth	Graduate	Bass	Jazz	Foley	4	5	4	5	5	5
White	Micah	Junior	Guitar	Jazz	Flynn	5	5	5	4	4	5
Potts	Michael	Freshman	Sax	Bm Sax Perf/ Jazz	Deibel	3	3	2	3	2	5
Hooper	Zac	Sophomore	Sax	Jazz Studies	Deibel	2	2	3	3	3	3
Teufel	Christian	Sophomore	Drums	BM Perc Perf	Hatfield/Scholl	4	4	3	4	4	3
Bollig	Phil	Graduate	Guitar	Jazz	Flynn	4	4	3	5	3	4
Plantz	Megan	Freshman	Guitar	Jazz	Flynn	3	3	1	2	2	2
Lind	Toby	Freshman	Guitar	Jazz	Flynn	1	2	1	1	1	1
McNolty	Christian	Senior	Guitar	Jazz	Flynn	3	3	3	4	3	3
Trechak	Greg	Sophomore	Guitar	Jazz	Flynn	3	3	2	2	2	3

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instr.	Major	Professor	Tone	In-ton.	Interp.	Techn.	Rhythm/N otes	Material level
Stucky	Taylor	MM I	Flute	Perf.	Shelly	4	4	4	3	3	4
Feryok	Kathy	Sen.	Flute	Ed.	Shelly	3	4	4	3	3	3
Reilly	Ben	MME I	Sax.	Cond.	Deibel	3	4	4	3	2	2, 3
Riffel	Tyler	Sen.	Sax.	Mus. Ed.	Deibel	1	2	2	3	2	3
Tape	Alica	MM III	Oboe	Perf.	Banke	5	4+	5	5	5	5
Lim	Ilan Wei	Soph.	Flute	Perf.	Shelly	4	5	4	4	4	3
Denton	Lindsay	MME II	Flute	Cond.	Shelly	3	2	2	4	3	5
Barnes	Tarin	Fresh.	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel	2	2	2	1	1	1
Hooper	Zac	Soph.	Sax.	Jazz St.	Deibel	2	3	3	2	2	3
Naveed	Aadil	Fresh.	Sax.	Mus. Min.	Deibel	4	3	3	3	3	4
Thomas	Jeremy	Jun.	Sax.	Mus. Ed.	Deibel	2	2	2	3	2	3, 4
Burgess	Tyler	Jun.	Sax.	Mus. Ed.	Deibel	3	3	3	3	3	3
Eberly	Anna	MM II	Flute	Perf.	Shelly	5	5	5	5	5	5
Brock	Darren	Sen.	Flute	Ed.	Shelly	5	4	4	4	4	5
Avila	Robby	MM II	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel	4, 5	4	4	3	3	4
Potts	Michael	Fresh.	Sax.	Jazz St.	Deibel	1	2	2	2	2	2
McPeek	Anastasia	Jun.	Oboe	Perf.	Banke	4	4	4	3	4	5
Turgeon	Lisa	Sen.	Flute	Perf.	Shelly	4	4	4	3	3	4
Jensen	Jimmy	MM II	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel	4	4	4	3	3	4
Erickson	Matt	MM I	Clar.	Perf.	Jankauskas	4	3	3	4	4	5
Watkins	Britney	MM I	Bassoon	Perf.	Patterson	3	3	3	4	4	4
Wells	Jordan	Sen.	Clar.	Perf.	Jankauskas	4	3	3	3	4	4
Katelyn	Voge	Fresh.	Clar.	Perf.	Jankauskas	3	2	2	2	3	4
Vanek	Gabi	MM II	Bassoon	Perf.	Patterson	3	3	3	4	3	4
Morrell	Karen	Non Deg.	Sax.	Certificate	Deibel	3	3	3	3	3	4
Cline	Bryan	Fresh.	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel	1	2	2	2	3	3
Guzman	Alex	Fresh.	Sax.	Perf.	Deibel	1	2	2	2	3	3

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Zvonnikov	Evgeny	Grad	Violin	Music Perf.	Krinke	5	5	5	5	5	5
Mallett	Caleb	Grad	Violin	Music perf.	Krinke	5	3.5	4	4	4	4
Austin	Caleb	Junior	Viola	Music Ed	Consiglio	4	2.5	4	3	3	3
Gabel	Hannah	Junior	Violin	Music Ed.	Krinke	3.5	3	3	3.5	4	3.5
Wallace	Daijana	Soph	cello	Theory	Shukaev	3	3	3	3	3.5	3
Prugar	Marta	Grad	Violin	Chamber	Krinke	4	4	4	4	4	4.5
Eilert	Patrick	Fr	Guitar	Music Ed	Brody	4	3	3	3	4	3
Bond	Isabella	Fr	Cello	Special Ed	Shukaev	3	3	3	2.5	2	2.5
Hund	Hannah	Junior	Violin	Perf.	Zvonnikov	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	5	5
Schmidt	Caitlin	Grad	Cello	Perf.	Shukaev	4.5	4	4	5	5	5
Estanbuli	Dima	Junior	Violin	Perf.	Krinke	4	3.5	4	3.5	4	4
McPherson	Deja	Junior	Violin	Music Ed.	Krinke	3	2.5	3	3	2	3
Harder	Madelaine	Senior	cello	Ed./Perf.	Shukaev	4	4	4	5	5	5
Magee	Jasmine	Senior	Cello	Perf.	Shukaev	4	3	3	4	4	4
Turgeon	Lane	Fr.	Bass	Bass/Jazz pe	Foley	5	5	5	5	5	5
Schmitt	Joseph	Fr.	Viola	PreMed.	Consiglio	3.5	3	3	4	4	4
Oviedo	Pedro	Jr.	Viola	Perf.	Consiglio	4	4	4	5	5	5
Shelder	Stephanie	Jr.	Cello	Cello/Vocal	Shukaev	4	3.5	4	4	4	4
Klozik	Nicole	Soph.	Viola	Perf. Compol	Consiglio	4	4	4	4	5	5
Amstutz	Alina	Senior	Violin	Music	Zvonnikov	3	3	3	3	2	3
Jackson	Kiana	Fr.	Bass	Perf./Ed.	Foley	4	4	4	4	4	5
Reid	Piper	Fr.	Viola	Ed.	Consiglio	3	3	3	2.5	3	3
Graber	Jon	So.	Bass	Perf.	Foley	4	2.5	3	3	2.5	3
Villar	Gabrielle	Fr.	Viola	Minor	Consiglio	4	3	3	3	3	3
Treas	Hailey	Grad.	Viola	Music	Consiglio	4	4	4	4	4	4
Moseley	Taylor	Soph.	Violin	Music	Krinke	3.5	3	3	3	3	3
Merkel	Jason	Grad.	Cello	Chamber	Shukaev	4	3	3	3	3	4
Verrilyea	Evan	Sr.	Bass	Perf.	Foley	4	4	5	5	4	5
Naillon	Sarah Jane	Sr.	Violin	Perf.	Krinke	4	3.5	4	4	4	5
Begocheva	Maria	Jr.	Cello	Perf.	Shukaev	5	4	4	4	5	5
Johns	Alana	Jr.	Bass	Perf.	Foley	5	4	4	5	4	5
Salazar	Luis	Sr.	Violin	Perf.	Zvonnikov	5	5	5	5	5	5
Tennant	Gabby	Fr.	Viola	Ed.	Consiglio	3	2.5	2	3	3	2
Covaleante	Ricardo	Jr.	Viola	Perf.	Vayner	4	5	5	4	5	5
Francis	Yecheskel	Grad	Viola	Perf.	Vayner	5	4	4	5	5	5

Juries F15

Last Name	First Name	Class	Instrument	Major	Professor	Tone	Memory	Interpret.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Suaste	Luis	MM	Piano	Performance	Bees	4	5	4	5	5	5
Wise	Kelsey	MM	Piano	Pedagogy	Bees	4	4	4	4	5	4
Hephner	Sean	MM	Piano	Performance	Trechak	4	4	4	4	4	5
Riches	Luke	MM	Piano	Pedagogy	Trechak	4	5	4	4	4	5
Guo	Ai	MM	Piano	Pedagogy	Trechak	4	4	4	4	5	5
Teh	Jia Win	BM	Piano	Pedagogy	Bees	5	5	5	5	5	5
Pack	Alex	BM	Piano	Performance	Trechak	4	4	4	4	4	5
Luecke	Sara Jo	BME	Piano	Music Ed/Special Ed	Trechak	5	5	5	5	5	5
Karnes	Benjamin	BM	Piano	Performance	Trechak	5	3	4	4	4	5
Miller	Robert	BME	Piano	Music Ed	Trechak	4	4	4	4	4	4
Hamilton	Aiden	BM	Piano	Theory/Composition	Bees	didn't hear him perform....					
Jones	Colton	BM	Piano	Performance	Trechak	4	3	4	4	4	5
Albu	Nathan	BA	Piano	Engineering	Bees	4	4	4	4	5	5
Mick	Kylie	BA	Piano	Pre-law	Bees	4	5	4	4	5	5
Shipley	Lucy	BME	Piano	Music Ed/Special Ed	Trechak	4	5	4	4	5	5
Spaulding	Nelson	BM	Piano	Theory/Composition	Bees	4	4	4	4	5	5
Stephens	Colin	BM	Piano	Theory/Composition	Trechak	4	5	4	4	5	5





Juries F15

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level	
Zvonnikov	Evgeny	Grad	violin	Performance	Krinke	5	5	5	5	5	5	30
Mallett	Caleb	Grad	violin	Performance	Krinke	4+	4+	4+	4+	5	5	26
Austin	Caleb	Jr	Viola	Edu	Consiglio	4-	4-	3 4-	4-	4	4	25
Gabel	Hannah	Jr	Violin	Edu	Krinke	4-	4-	4-	4-	4 4+	4	23
Wallace	Dajana	So	Cello	Theory	Shukaev	4-	4-	4-	4-	4-	4-	24
Pruga	Marta	Grad	violin	Performance	Krinke	4+	4 4+	4 4+	4+	5	5	26
Eilert	Patrick	Fr	Guitar	Edu	Brody	4 4+	4 4+	4+	4+	5 4+	5 4+	25
Bond	Isabella	Fr	Cello	Edu	Shukaev	4-	3-	3-	3-	3-	4-	20
Hund	Hannah	Jr	Violin	Performance	Zvonnikov	4+	4+	4+	4+	5-	5	26
Shmidt	Cattlin	Grad	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	5-	4+	4+	4+	5-	5	27
Estanbuli	Dima	Jr	Violin	Performance	Krinke	4	4 4+	4 4+	4 4+	4 5-	5	
McPherson	Deja	Jr	Violin	Edu	Krinke	4-	3-	3-	3-	3	4	20
Harder	Madeline	Jr	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	4+	4 4+	4 4+	4	4	5	25
Magee	Jasmine	Sr	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	5-	4+	4	4 4+	4 4+	5	26
Turgeon	Lune	Fr	Bass	Performance	Foley	4 5-	4 5-	4+	4+	4+	5	26
Schmitt	Joseph	Fr	Viola	Pre Med	Consiglio	4 4+	4 4+	4+	4	4	5	25
Oviedo	Pedro	Jr	Viola	Performance	Consiglio	4+	4+	4+	4	4	5	25
Shelden	Stephanie	Jr	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	4	4	4	4 4+	4 4+	5	25
Klozik	Nichole	So	Viola	Performance	Consiglio	4+	4 4+	4 4+	4 4+	4 4+	5	25
Amstuts	Alina	Sr	Violin	BFA	Zvonnikov	3+	4-	4-	4-	4	4	23
Jackson	Kiana	So	Bass	Per+Edu	Foley	4	4	4	4	4	5	25
Reid	Piper	Fr	Viola	Edu	Consiglio	4-	3 4-	3 4-	4-	3	4	22
Graber	Jon	So	Bass	Performance	Foley	4-	4-	4-	4-	4	4	24
Villar	Gabrielle	Fr	Viola	Minor	Consiglio	4	3 4-	3 4-	4-	3	4	22
Haiky	Treas	Grad	Viola	Performance	Consiglio	4 4-	4 4-	4	4	4	5	25
Moseley	Taylor	So	Violin	BA	Krinke	4-	3+	4-	4-	4-	4	23
Markel	Jason	Grad	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	4 3+	4 3+	4-	4-	3	5	23
Vermilyer	Evan	Sr	Bass	Performance	Foley	5-	4+	5-	5-	5	5	29
Naillon	Sarah	Sr	Violin	Performance	Krinke	4	4	4	4	4	5	25
Begacheva	Maria	Jr	Cello	Performance	Shukaev	5-	5-	5	5-	5	5	30
Johns	Alana	Jr	Bass	Performance	Foley	5-	4+	4	4 4+	4 4+	5	26
Salazar	Luis	Sr	Violin	Performance	Zvonnikov	5 5-	5 5-	5	5	5 5-	5	30
Tennant	Gabby	Fr	Viola	Edu	Consiglio	4-	4	4	3 3+	4-	4	22
Cavalcante	Ricardo	Jr	Viola	Performance	Vayner	5-	5 5-	5 5-	5-	5-	5	30
Francis	Iecheskel	Grad	Viola	Performance	Vayner	5	5	5	5 5-	5	5	30



Last name	First name	class	major	professor	tone	technique	interpretation
Gaddis	Shontel	Fresh	MusEd	ESD	3	3	3
McCorkle	Stacy	Junior	Perf	ESD	3	3	3
McGee	Kristin	Fresh	MusEd	ESD	3	3	3
Miles	Tyler	Junior	MusEd	ESD	3	3	4
Thompson	Cassandra	Fresh	MusEd	ESD	2.5	2.5	2.5
Witcher	Lexy	Fresh	Perf	ESD	3	3	3

Zvonimir Jurics F15

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Hund	Hannah	434W	Violin	Music	Evgeny Zv.	5	5-	5	5	5	5
Luis	Salazar-Avila	434W	Violin	Music	Evgeny Zv.	5	5	5	5	5	5
Amstutz	Alina	432W	Violin	Music	Evgeny Zv.	4	4	4	4	4	4

Held Studio	Semester	DB	MH	MAK	RAL	PM	ESD	Held	Studio	Tone (1-5)	Technic (1-5)	Interpretation (1-5)
Bothwell, Morgan	734Y A-	B+	A-	A-	A	B+	A	B+	A	3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3	3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 5	3, 3, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 2, 6
Bowen, Mitchell	734Y A-	B+	B-	B	B+	B	B+	A-	A	3, 5, 4, 3, 5, 3, 4	3, 3, 4, 3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 3	3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3
Fink, Aaron	232Y C+	B+	B+	B+	B+	B	B+	B+	C-	3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 4	3, 3, 3, 2, 8, 3, 3, 3	2, 7, 5, 3, 2, 7, 5, 2, 8, 3, 3, 3
Hernandez, Andrew	734Y A	A-	-	A-	A-	A-	A-	A	A	4, 5, 3, 7, 5, 4, 3, 3, 3, 7, 5, 3, 1, 4	3, 3, 3, 5, 4, 3, 3, 2, 9, 3	4, 6, 7, 3, 5, 3, 7, 5, 3, 3, 7, 5, 3, 3, 4
Parks, Alyssa	434Y A-	A-	A-	B+	B+	B	B	B+	A	3, 5, 2, 2, 7, 5, 3, 4, 3, 3, 5	3, 2, 5, 3, 3, 6, 7, 3, 4, 2, 8, 4	2, 7, 5, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 6, 7, 2, 9, 3
Perkins, Anthony	432Y A-	-	B	B+	B	B	B+	A-	A	4, 3, 3, 4, 6, 7, 3, 4, 3, 3, 3, 2, 7, 5, 3, 3	4, 3, 2, 3, 3, 3, 2, 5, 2, 8	3, 6, 7, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3
Rogier, Joel	734Y A	A	A	-	A-	A	A	A	A	3, 4, 3, 7, 5, 4, 4, 3, 3	3, 4, 3, 5, 5, 4, 3	4, 4, 3, 2, 5, 5, 4, 3, 5
Stepanek, Aaron	734Y A	A-	B+	A-	A-	-	-	A-	A	3, 3, 5, 3, 4, 3, 1, 3	3, 3, 5, 3, 6, 7, 4, 3, 4	3, 3, 3, 4, 3, 4
Tholl, Carter	734Y A	A-	A	A-	A-	A	A-	A	A	4, 3, 4, 3, 1, 3, 3, 6, 7, 2	4, 2, 7, 5, 4, 3, 4, 4, 3	4, 3, 2, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4, 3
Viets, Garrett	432Y A	B+	A	A-	A-	A-	A-	A-	A	3, 3, 6, 7, 3, 4, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3	3, 3, 3, 3, 2, 4, 3, 3, 2, 6, 7, 3, 4, 3	3, 4, 3, 4, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3
Yehling, Georgeanne	734Y A-	B+	B+	A-	B+	-	A-	B+	A	3, 3, 1, 4, 4, 3, 2, 5, 3, 5	2, 5, 3, 2, 2, 6, 7, 3, 3	3, 5, 3, 3, 4, 3, 4

Juries F15

Last Name	First Name	Class	Inst	Major	Professor	Tone	Intonation	Interp.	Technique	Rhy/Notes	Material Level
Zvonnikov	Evgeny	grad	violin	Music	Krinke	4	4	4	5	5	5
Mallett	Caleb	grad	violin	Music	Krinke	3	3	3	4	4	4
Austin	Caleb	junior	viola	M. Ed	Consiglio	3	3	3	3	3	3
Gabel	Hannah	junior	violin	M. Ed	Krinke	3	3	3	3	3	3
Wallace	Daljana	soph	cello	Music	Shukaev	3	3	2	3	3	3
Prugar	Martha	grad	violin	Music	Krinke	4	4	4	4	4	4
Eliert	Patrick	freshm	guitar	Music	Brody	3	3	3	3	3	3
Bond	Isabella	freshm	cello	Music	Shukaev	2	2	3	3	3	3
Hund	Hannah	junior	violin	Music	Zvonnikov	4	4	4	4	4	4
Schmidt	Caitlin	grad	cello	Music	Shukaev	4	4	4	4	4	4
Estanbuli	Dima	junior	violin	Music	Krinke	3	3	4	4	4	4
McPherson	Deja	junior	violin	M. Ed	Krinke	3	2	3	3	3	3
Harder	Madelline	junior	cello	Music	Shukaev	4	4	4	4	4	4
Magee	Jasmine	senior	cello	Music	Shukaev	4	3	3	3	3	3
Turgeon	Lane	freshm	bass	Music	Foley	4	3	3	3	3	3
Schmitt	Joseph	freshm	viola	PreMed	Consiglio	3	3	3	3	3	3
Oviedo	Pedro	junior	viola	Music	Consiglio	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sheldon	Stephanie	junior	cello	Music	Shukaev	3	3	3	3	3	3
Klozik	Nichole	soph	viola	Music	Consiglio	3	4	4	4	4	4
Amstutz	Alina	senior	violin	BFA	Zvonnikov	3	3	3	3	3	3
Jackson	Kiana	soph	bass	Music	Foley	4	4	4	3	3	3
Reid	Piper	freshm	viola	Music	Consiglio	3	2	3	2	3	3
Graber	Jon	soph	bass	Music	Foley	3	2	2	3	3	3
Villar	Gabrielle	freshm	viola	Minor	Consiglio	3	2	3	3	3	3
Treas	Hailey	grad	viola	Music	Consiglio	4	4	4	3	3	3
Moseley	Taylor	soph	violin	BFA	Krinke	2	2	2	3	3	2
Markel	Jason	grad	cello	Music	Shukaev	3	3	3	3	3	3
Vermilyea	Evan	senior	bass	Music	Foley	4	4	4	4	4	4
Naillon	Sarah J	senior	violin	Music	Krinke	3	3	3	3	3	3
Begacheva	Maria	senior	cello	Music	Shukaev	4	4	4	4	4	4
Johns	Alana	junior	bass	Music	Foley	3	3	3	3	3	3
Salazar	Luis	senior	violin	Music	Zvonnikov	4	4	4	4	4	4
Tennant	Gabby	freshm	viola	Music	Consiglio	3	3	3	3	3	3
Cavalcante	Ricardo	senior	viola	Music	Vaynor	3	3	4	4	4	4
Francis	Zeke	grad	viola	Music	Vaynor	4	4	4	4	4	4





