September 24, 2004

TO: Richard Kennell
Dean, College of Musical Arts

FROM: Elaine Colprit
Chair, Department of Music Education

RE: Program Review Response

Recommendations made by the Program Review Committee appear in italics in this document.

I. College Admission Process

Recommendation: In light of the College’s admission requirements, the Dean should meet with faculty from all three departments to review and revise the College undergraduate student admission process. A revised process, which includes the Department of Music Education, should be implemented in time for screening of the 2005 entering class. (p. 11)

A. Undergraduate Admissions

In 2003-2004 the Department discussed creating criteria for entry into the music education program. The current proposal under discussion, which we will revisit, revise, and act on in Fall 2004, includes:

- Entry into the College
  - Minimum Audition score of 51 (on principal instrument)

- Entry into MUED 240
  - (1) Minimum ACT 21/SAT 980 score
  - (2) Minimum “Advanced Measures of Music Audiation” scores (at or above 50th percentile for HS students)
  - (3) Minimum GPA of 3.00 earned in music Core Courses
  - (4) Minimum GPA of 3.00 earned in MuED courses

- Entry into MUED 3xx
  - Minimum grade of “B” earned in MuEd 240

The chair will review admission criteria with the Dean and the chairs of MUCT and MUSP. The Department will submit appropriate bluesheets by November 30, 2004 for implementation in Fall 2005.

B. Graduate Admissions

In 2003-2004 the Department revised Admissions Procedures for entry into the graduate program. Applicants for the music education degree program (2005) must submit the following: (1) a 10-minute videotaped performance on an instrument or voice, (2) a continuous 15-minute videotaped teaching or rehearsal segment, and (3) a writing sample on a topic of the faculty's choice.

In 2003 the chair of music education appointed a graduate advisor for the Department. In 2004, the graduate advisor assumed additional duties, which include graduate development. Under his direction, a departmental graduate committee will (1) re-examine the current summer graduate program (2) develop a process whereby the
graduate faculty guides students in choosing a degree option (Thesis (Plan I) or Comprehensive Exam (Plan II)).

II. Degree/major option

Recommendation: To provide undergraduate students majoring in music with more choices for completing a general degree in music within the College, the following possibilities are advanced.

A.) Create a new Bachelor of Musical Arts degree in which there are two majors:
   a.) Music Technology
   b.) General Music Studies (with ethnomusicology/jazz, music history, or performance specializations)
   This new degree would be supported by all three departments in the College of Musical Arts as is the current Bachelor of Arts with a major in music in the College of Arts and Sciences. (p. 11)

At the request of the Dean, the Music Education Department advisor is working on the first draft of a Bachelor of Musical Arts degree program. The Department plans to submit the appropriate bluesheet for a Bachelor of Musical Arts degree program by November 30, 2004.

III. Faculty Workload Policy

Recommendation: The Department should write a workload policy that gives appropriate credit to all teaching activities, to be reviewed and approved by the Dean before the end of fall semester 2004.

If the new workload policy results in a discrepancy between teaching obligations to be covered and teaching resources available, then the Department should either:
   A. Make that discrepancy the basis of an argument for faculty lines, or
   B. Prioritize programs and teaching obligations, and eliminate low priority obligations. (p. 12)

The Department recognizes the challenges of writing a workload policy for a faculty whose work comprises a variety of activities, but we also deem it to be an important step in examining the quality of our program. Our investigation will be guided by the following principles.

1. Every MuED course ought to be taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty members in music education with an expectation of research/creative work in order to assure that the pedagogical practice modeled and taught is based on the most recent research and best practice in music education. Although we realize that we will have to use some part-time faculty to meet demands, we want to minimize our dependence on part-time and fulltime instructor teaching.

2. Faculty loads need to be at 9 hours, with sufficient time for research and creative work. Graduate research in music education requires research-active advisors.

In 2004-2005 the chair of music education, with the assistance of a departmental committee, will:
   (1) review current and past practices in determining faculty workload
   (2) create a written policy that includes principles for determining faculty workloads
across classes, ensembles, field site supervision, and graduate student supervision. 
(3) create an argument for additional faculty lines based on program needs 
The chair will consult with the Dean and seek his approval prior to implementation of a revised workload policy.

IV. Faculty Development  
Recommendation: Resources from outside the College (e.g., SPAR) for travel and research experiences should be continued, but resources within the college should be reviewed as well (e.g., full-time secretary and increased money for travel) if the Department’s standards for scholarly excellence are to be maintained. (p. 12)

The area of funding for research and travel to national and international research conferences is one of the bigger challenges we face. While we will continue to seek external monies for faculty development, the chair will review the availability of additional support from the college. The Department recognizes that state funding for higher education has diminished and additional funds may not be available in the near term.

V. Tracking of Alumni  
Recommendation: The Department should begin tracking its graduates immediately, and should create a comprehensive database for this purpose. For example, an alumni board could be created with the mission of finding and recording alum’s professional activities. Tracking can begin right away without placing heavy time demands on the Department. (p. 13)

The Department will create a database for tracking graduates. We will consult with the university alumni association to review their current procedures and find out if information on music education alumni already exists in their database. We will determine what information we would like from alumni and how to collect that information. If we create a website for student teachers and alumni, then graduating students will already be familiar with the website and they will be more likely to return to it to update their personal information.

The Department secretary will set up a model of a database. Graduate assistants who monitor the Curriculum Lab will enter data during working hours in the lab.

Errata: The Department notes the following corrections to the Program Review Committee’s Report:

(1) The music education faculty currently receives load credit for supervision of student teachers (pp. 12, Faculty Workload Policy).

(2) The Department’s assessment of learning outcomes is described in the report as “rigorous” (p. 5 ¶6). While we aspire to engage in systematic assessment of learning outcomes at both undergraduate and graduate levels, we think that our current practice is in the formative stages and cannot accurately be described as rigorous.