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The following report and any statements therein regarding compliance with NASM accreditation standards represent only the considered opinion of the visitors at the time of the visit. Definitive evaluation of compliance and the accreditation decision will be made by the appropriate Commission following a complete review of the application, including the Self-Study, the Visitors Report, and any Optional Response to the Visitors’ Report submitted by the institution.

PART ONE

A. Mission, Goals, and Objectives

Wright State University, the College of Liberal Arts, and the Department of Music have clearly articulated mission statements that are published and publicly accessible (website and Self-Study Appendix A). The Department of Music completed a Strategic Plan (Self-Study Appendix B) in 1999, and it is reviewed annually. Several goals and subordinate objectives for each goal have been established as part of WSU’s 2003 Strategic Plan (Self-Study Appendix B). The Self-Study presents goals and objectives for the music unit that are consistent with the mission statements and strategic plan goals and objectives. These institutional statements, when taken together, would appear to provide a good foundation on which educational, artistic, long-range planning, and operational decisions can be based. Therefore Department of Music appears to have an ongoing review of mission, goals, and objectives.

B. Size and Scope

The music unit appears to have sufficient enrollment to have a community of learners appropriate for the degrees offered at the undergraduate (B.A. and B.M.) level. While the enrollment numbers are not large for the graduate degree (M.M & M.Hum.) level, the graduate enrollment during the five years of the data presented below represent only two of the three graduate programs. The unit’s third graduate degree, Master of Music in Performance received Plan Approval from NASM less than one year ago, and one could assume the addition of this third degree will generate increased graduate enrollment in the future. Furthermore, there have been 20 graduates in the past five years from the two graduate degree programs. Therefore the music unit also appears to have sufficient enrollment for the graduate degrees. The Self-Study did not provide enrollment or degrees granted in a concise format, and the enrollment/degrees granted data in the three HEADS Data Surveys (Appendix I) was confirmed to be not accurate enough for the purposes of this report. Therefore, the following data was requested by the visitors and provided by WSU for the Visitors’ Report.
### Five Year Overview - Department of Music

#### Number of Majors/Degrees Granted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University College</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1999</td>
<td>1.5²</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>175.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2000</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>161.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>158.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>174.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2002</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2003</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2004</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>189.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>216.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University College + Undergraduate = Total Undergraduates

#### Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bacc</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005³</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Undergraduate students by major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BM Mus Ed</th>
<th>BM Perf</th>
<th>BM H/L</th>
<th>total(undergrad)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2002</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2003</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2004</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. University College is the general entity on campus for incoming freshmen. Once a student declares and changes major number they are assigned to a Department. See p.61 of the 2003-05 Undergraduate Catalog. The total of undergraduates is: University College + Undergraduate = Total Undergraduates.

2. Fractional numbers indicate a student has a double major.

3. Does not include Summer, 2005.
C. Finances

The financial condition of the Department of Music is described generally in the Self-Study on pp. 1-2 with additional detailed financial information provided in WSU’s Higher Education Arts Data Services (HEADS) Annual Data Surveys for the past three years (Self-Study - Appendix I).

The budget of the Department of Music has remained relatively flat over at least the past three years as revealed in WSU’s HEADS surveys (Appendix I). Recent special allocations have been received to purchase new musical instruments, assist with concert touring and travel, and to add three new faculty lines in 2002. The visitors learned from the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts that other special requests have been addressed from time to time including an addition of salary dollars in Fall 2004 to support the hiring of part-time instructional faculty.

In comparing the department’s most recent budget data from their 2004-2005 HEADS Data Survey with the 2004-05 HEADS Music Data Summaries (available from NASM), the financial figures compared to seventy-seven NASM peer institutions (public institutions with 201-400 music majors) indicates that their overall total budget is significantly below the 50th percentile and is closer to the 25th percentile than the 50th percentile. It appears to be a minimal budget to support the stated mission, goals, and objectives of the unit.

It should also be noted that the hourly rates currently paid to part-time applied music faculty are low and problematic in retaining highly qualified teachers. The average current rate used at Wright State University is $27 per contact hour, well below the average of $38 reported by colleges and universities from a survey of schools across Ohio (data provided by music unit executive), and certainly below the average hourly rate reported in the 2004-05 HEADS Music Data Summaries of $44.19 reported by fifty-four public institutions with between 201-400 music majors, placing WSU below the 25th percentile ($31).

Another financial concern expressed by faculty related to available scholarship resources. Following a review of 2004-05 HEADS Music Data Summaries, WSU’s allocation of $150,000 to undergraduate scholarships is significantly below the average amount of $255,147 for seventy-one peer institutions reporting (public institutions with 201-400 music majors).

The visitors commend the current Chair of the Department of Music for both his prudent management of departmental resources and understanding of the need for continued advocacy, on and off campus, for the needs of the music unit.
D. Governance and Administration

1. Overall Effectiveness

The overall governance of the Department of Music at Wright State University appears to be effective and in compliance with NASM standards. The governance structure of the Department and its role within the University is clearly delineated. The Department of Music has experienced quite a few years of stability in leadership from the current Chair. He appears to possess excellent analytical and administrative skills. The faculty and administration expressed confidence in the chair, and also noted his strong and active advocacy, his ability to follow through on projects, and his growing strength and abilities in development and cultivation work. There seems to be strong support from the department and university administration for his continued leadership.

2. Policy Making

The current organization of faculty governance in music and the university is described in the Self-Study, pp. 2-3 and 5-6. The Department of Music has in place a substantial committee structure that seems to function effectively. There is ample evidence that all significant decisions are made through a process of shared governance. The Department of Music Bylaws (Appendix D) in the Self-Study provides further information and details concerning the function and responsibilities of departmental committees and processes.

3. Music Executive’s Load and Responsibilities

The music executive indicates in WSU’s 2004-05 HEADS Data Survey (Appendix I) that 50% of his time is devoted to administrative matters, 30% to fundraising efforts, and the remaining 20% is devoted to teaching, creative endeavors, and service. On average, he teaches two courses per year and continues to perform and conduct regularly although on a limited basis. This appears to be adequate load relief for a unit of this size and complexity. The daily leadership and administration is made possible, in part, because the department enjoys the services of two full-time administrative staff members who seem very dedicated and possess excellent skills as well as an associate chair and a director of graduate studies.

4. Communication

The current music executive seems to communicate with the faculty in an easy, friendly, and effective manner. The department holds regular faculty meetings, and communication with the chair, faculty, students, and central administration appears to be quite good.
E. Faculty and Staff

Faculty

The faculty appear to be quite appropriately skilled and highly dedicated to serving the needs of the students and degree programs. This perspective is supported by the review of the Faculty Record Reports (Appendix III) and classroom visitation. The 22 FTE faculty provide for a student/faculty ratio of 9.0, which compares well to the 8.8 average of the seventy-seven peer institutions (public institution with 201-400 music majors) in the 2004-05 HEADS Music Data Summaries. Compared to the same data source, the gender breakdown of the 14 tenured/tenure-track faculty 29% female/71% male mirrors the national average of 29%/65% respectively. (Some institutions do not report gender information in the HEADS Data Surveys, so total is less than 100%.) For the same pool of WSU faculty, the percentages of Black/African American 7% and Asian 14% exceed the 2004-05 HEADS Music Data Summaries respective percentages of 5% and 3%. Nationally 3% of music faculty are Hispanic to WSU’s 0%. Of the 14 tenured/tenure-track faculty, two are tenured professors, eight are tenured associate professors, two are tenure-track assistant professors, and two are tenure-track instructors. Five have been at WSU less than 10 years and nine have been at WSU 10 years or longer. Additional non-tenure-track faculty include two full-time and five FTE faculty comprised of 16 temporary part-time faculty. While the distribution of the tenured/tenure-track faculty by several measures is in good balance, there is concern by the music executive and tenured/tenure-track faculty on the increased reliance on part-time faculty with a high turnover rate. Most of these are applied faculty who are doctoral students from larger institutions such as the University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music. The modest hourly applied instruction compensation (detailed in C. Finances above) is a deterrent to longer-term commitment by highly qualified part-time applied faculty.

The current number of faculty fundamentally support the institution’s mission, goals, and objectives, as well as the curriculum of the various degree programs, but heavy teaching loads hinder music faculty from pursuing research and artistry activities and the funding provided by the university for such purposes. Interestingly, faculty teaching loads were confirmed with Dean of the College of Liberal Arts to be greater than non-music arts faculty in the same college. Since the faculty are all members of a collective bargaining unit, it would seem that loads should be uniform. Also NASM Handbook 2005-06, p. 56 item II.E.4., ¶ 3 states, “Classroom instruction in lecture/seminar format is commonly weighted with studio private lessons on a 2:3 ratio, that is, two hours of classroom instruction is equated with three hours of private instruction. Music faculty teaching only classroom/seminar courses should have their load determined in the same way as faculty in other departments of the institution.” Although the NASM standards use the word “should,” the visitors feel this matter is of real importance for consideration by administrators and the NASM commission.

It may be important to note that without the addition of music faculty positions over the past several years by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, the heavy teaching load situation would be an even greater problem.
Faculty morale appears to be good. They state that collegiality is valued, and they noted increased recognition and rising reputation of the institution in the city and region.

Faculty state that appointment, evaluation, and advancement policies and procedures are clearly understood and applied fairly.

**Staff**

The support staff appears to be minimal to support the activities of the music unit. The average secretarial/clerical staff for peer institutions (public institutions with 201-400 music majors) is 3.3 FTE (2004-05 *HEADS Music Data Summaries*), and WSU staffing is 2.0 FTE. Peer institutions average an additional 6 FTE in Technical, Professional and Miscellaneous staff and WSU appears to have an additional 3 FTE. It is not clear that support staff are provided commensurate with the music unit’s mission, goals, objectives, size, and scope. (NASM *Handbook* 2005-06, p. 57 item II.E.8.)

**F. Facilities, Equipment, and Safety**

The Wright State University Music Department is housed in the Creative Arts Center, constructed in 1973. Since that time, the facility received an addition in 1990 and a renovation of the 1973 area in 1991. The facility is shared with the Department of Theatre Arts with a portion of the lower level housing faculty from the College of Education and Human Services.

The *Self-Study* document, pages 16-19, accurately reports an inventory of the facilities as verified by the on-site visit. The building contains a 360-seat concert hall that appeared to have several inadequacies including a small stage, poor lighting, and poor acoustics; a 100-seat recital hall with poor acoustical properties, modest lighting, and poor sound isolation properties; choral and instrumental rehearsal halls which seemed to work well during the ensemble rehearsals observed although the instrumental room is immediately below a large dance studio with inadequate sound isolation properties; access to at least six classrooms in the building (including one equipped with 25 electronic pianos and a computer laboratory with 17 workstations); 15 practice rooms; and at least 25 studio/offices for the faculty. In addition, there appeared to be several storage spaces available.

The facilities were accurately described in the *Self-Study* as having inadequate acoustical properties, practically nonexistent sound isolation properties, and seriously poor climate control HVAC systems (both temperature and humidity controls) throughout the facility. The visitors would agree that these are indeed significant problems; however, since the writing of the *Self-Study*, numerous efforts have taken place to begin planning for making improvements in these issues in the coming months and years. More information from the institution may be warranted in regard to several items in NASM Standards including the following: (NASM *Handbook* 2005-06, p. 57 item II.F., ¶ 1, 4, & 6) “Space allotted to any music unit function must be adequate for the effective conduct of that function. …Acoustical treatments appropriate to music facilities shall be provided….All facilities and equipment should produce an environment conducive to learning and be sufficient to enable faculty and
students to focus on artistic and academic endeavors.” It is not clear that these standards are met in regard to the two performance spaces and some rehearsal and instructional spaces.

Through the efforts of the Department Chair, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, and the Provost, a multi-phased plan has been developed, funded, and is to be implemented beginning by next fall to address the Creative Arts Center’s air handling equipment and temperature controls. A second phase will replace piping and fan coil units serving the Music wing practice rooms and offices, and replacement of ductwork will follow to achieve better air distribution and sound control. The final steps will address humidity and sound control (noise created by fans and air handling units). The institution has made addressing and hopefully correcting the Creative Arts Center’s HVAC system problems a high priority.

A space programming study has also just been completed and the report arrived during the time of the visit. It is hoped that the results of the study will assist the department and university administration in determining possibilities and justification for addressing the music faculties’ concerns for additional space. The visitors also learned during the visit that plans are being formulated to move Education and Human Services faculty from CAC to other facilities over the next two years making additional spaces available to the three arts units in the near future.

An additional update to the Self-Study was made known to the visitors during the visit. The Provost and Dean have supplied funding to equip a space to be used as both a daytime Student Lounge and an evening or pre-concert Green Room space.

The Self-Study document supplied a thorough listing of instrumental equipment and computer equipment. The Self-Study indicated that recording equipment needed updating and that available video equipment was limited. The visitors found this to be an accurate assessment. The unit does not currently have on staff a regular or permanent piano technician, but contracts out for piano servicing. Equipment found in the electronic keyboard laboratory and the computer lab appeared up-to-date and adequate for the needs of the program offerings, except there is a need and desire to expand the size of the computer facility when a larger space becomes available. The Self-Study page 21 explains that there is no plan for regular maintenance of the physical plant and equipment. (NASM Handbook 2005-06, p. 57 item II.F., ¶ 4) “Budget provisions shall be made for adequate maintenance of the physical plant and equipment.” The visitors recommend that a regular repair and maintenance plan be established for instruments and equipment.

Some concerns were expressed about building and equipment security and a closed-circuit video monitoring system has recently been installed to assist and regular security patrols are conducted during evening and weekend hours. It is recommended that further measures be explored with campus security or police officials to help ensure greater safety and security throughout the building.

Contrary to comments on page 26 of the Self-Study, the music building is readily accessible to those with disabilities and appears to be fully ADA compliant.
G. Library and Learning Resources

The *Self-Study*, pp. 27-30, accurately describes library administration, acquisition policies, music library financial resources, outside resources, staffing, access, instruction, and facilities. The library holdings were carefully reviewed. The reference materials, collection of circulating books, scores, collected editions, periodicals, media, and a collection of CDs and LPs are housed in the Paul Laurence Dunbar Library, which is in reasonably close proximity to the music facilities in an adjacent building. It is large, spacious, attractive, and appears actively utilized by university students, faculty, and some members of the community.

The music holdings of the library are extensive and are good in both breadth and depth. The collection of scores, books, serials, and circulating collected editions are very good. The library resources are able to support all current degree programs.

The library currently provides several individual listening stations and has an additional room that could provide group listening. The Dunbar Library is technologically well equipped. It has substantial numbers of open access computers and the accessibility of all technology seems to be actively utilized.

In addition to following a systematic acquisitions policy, the librarian responsible for music holdings also relies on the recommendations of the Department of Music library liaison to communicate the curricular needs of the music faculty and individual faculty and students may also make requests directly to the music collection development librarian. The allocation for books, scores, periodicals, CDs and other media appears to be adequate to meet all instructional needs of the music unit.

The Dunbar Library maintains cooperative relationships with the other libraries in Ohio through the statewide library and information network, OhioLINK, as well as the Library Division of the Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education, SOCHE.

The faculty expressed wide satisfaction with the quality of the library collection and its accessibility.

H. Recruitment, Admission-Retention, Record Keeping, and Advisement

Admission processes and policies as outlined on pp.32-34 of the *Self-Study* seem to be clear and effective. The music faculty and department staff members appear pleased with the current admission processes. The faculty are each assigned advisees and they work closely with the department head, area coordinators, and office staff to coordinate access to appropriate advising materials which include individual degree program checklists and a university-wide degree audit program for each student (DARS). The visitors did note in their meeting with the student body that it does appear there are some inconsistencies in advising and with the adequacy of information that all advisors receive and communicate to their advisees. It was also noted that advising in regards to teacher education programs lacked accuracy and clarity due to a perceived lack of communication between the Department of
Music and the College of Education.

The Department has recently developed a Recruiting Plan that is being implemented as discussed in the *Self-Study* on pages 31-32. Retention is discussed in the *Self-Study* on page 34 as an outcome of good advising, but no information on retention rates was provided. It appears to the observers that tracking of retention data would be an additional appropriate goal for the program. It does appear that the College of Liberal Arts office tracks this sort of information and it would be useful for the department to obtain and review this data.

Student files and records that were reviewed appeared up to date and complete. The institution utilizes an electronic, degree audit program (DARS) that seems to assist with monitoring and tracking student progress in their degree programs. Transcripts that were provided and audited appeared to accurately reflect the stated degree program requirements found in the official catalog as well as on degree checklists.

In general, faculty seem pleased with the current advising model as outlined on p. 35 of the *Self-Study* and student concerns were noted above. It should also be added that many students expressed great satisfaction with their advising situations, emphasizing the need to improve consistency and perhaps advisor training opportunities.

I. Published Materials – Web Sites

The School of Music Web site and published materials are clear and attractive. On page 138, in the first paragraph under “Music” of the 2003-05 Undergraduate Catalog, the following statement appears:

“As a full member of the National Association of Schools of Music, the department has designed the requirements for entrance and graduation according to the published regulations of that association.”

To more precisely follow the Rules of Practice and Procedure under Printed Recognition of Membership (*NASM Handbook, 2005-06*, p. 43, XII, Section 1, C.), it would appear that the statement should substitute the word “accredited” for “full.”. Also, the use of the word “standards” may be more accurate and appropriate than “regulations” in that statement.

Otherwise, it appears that the University’s and School of Music published materials and Web site are in compliance with NASM standards.

J. Branch Campuses, External Programs, Use of the Institution’s Name for

The university offers only two courses, MUS 365, Methods and Materials for the Elementary Teacher and MUS 190, Lake Campus Chorale at the WSU Lake Campus, located near Celina, Ohio. The branch campus does offer a complete music curriculum leading to a degree in music.
K. Community Involvement and Articulation With Other Schools

Appropriate outreach activities appear to be in place with a long established record of cooperation with the community. As stated on pages 38, 62 and 67-69 of the Self-Study, the department’s faculty is actively involved in a variety of university, community, regional, and statewide organizations that are music and arts related. Music faculty are active as adjudicators, clinicians, moderators, and presenters within the state. Several faculty perform professionally in regional ensembles. Faculty members participate in or with the Dayton Philharmonic Chorus, Dayton Philharmonic Orchestra, Dayton Opera, Columbus Opera, Dayton Boys Choir, Kettering Children’s Choir, Ohio Valley British Brass Band, Dayton Playhouse, Playhouse South, and the Hayner Center Concert Series in Troy, Ohio. Additional outreach efforts include hosting festivals for area secondary schools including the Mad River Vocal Arts Festival and the Tri-State Honor Band. Other workshops and special programming efforts are offered to attract community members to campus including the WSU Artist Series. The department has established an articulation agreement with the music department at Sinclair Community College and has participated in collaborative efforts with the University of Dayton music program, the Stivers School for the Arts of the Dayton City Schools, and the Dayton Contemporary Dance Company.

L. Non-Degree-Granting Programs for the Community (if applicable)

The Wright State University Department of Music includes a Community Music Division. According to the Self-Study, p. 39, on average, it serves twenty-five students per quarter and the instructional faculty includes ten instructors. It seems that not only applied music instruction is being offered at this time through the CMD program, but that music theory has also been successfully taught. It appears that the department is struggling to sustain the program due to financial matters and lack of profitability since this must be a self-supporting program.

M. Standards for (A) Independent Postsecondary Music Units Without Regional or Other Institutional Accreditation and/or (B) Proprietary Institutions (if applicable)

Not Applicable

N. Programs, Degrees, and Curricula

Student Work - The visitors observed students in undergraduate and graduate classes and in rehearsals, lessons and the Student Recital. They also examined video of student teachers and final projects submitted in partial fulfillment of degree requirements. In all cases the work was of a quality appropriate for the purpose and level of the specific credential to be awarded.

Student Evaluation - The Department implements appropriate review of competencies at
entrance and exit for the undergraduate and graduate degree programs and mid-point for the undergraduate degree programs.

Overall Effectiveness - Faculty exhibit an interest in maintaining rigorous programs and attracting increasingly talented students. Information about alumni achievements could provide effective evidence of overall effectiveness.

1a. Specific Curricula — Undergraduate

Enrollments and course offerings in the Department of Music undergraduate majors appear to be appropriate to the unit’s scope, and the core-based structure of all undergraduate programs ensures that upper-level offerings provide suitably advanced instruction.

It is not clear that all undergraduate students are informed in regard to performance health. (NASM Handbook 2005-06, p. 71 item V. B.) “Institutions should assist students to acquire knowledge from qualified professionals regarding the prevention of performance injuries.”

Bachelor of Arts in Music: Submitted for renewal of Final Approval

General Education requirements appear to meet NASM curricular standards.

Musicianship requirements appear to meet NASM curricular standards.

Performance and Music Electives requirements appear to meet NASM curricular standards, except in regard to performance health..

The degree title appears to be appropriate for the curricular content.

General Standards and Competencies for professional (B.M.) undergraduate degrees

The following discussion concerns all undergraduate professional degree curricula.

Performance

Applied study, conducting, ensemble and keyboard requirements appear to meet NASM curricular standards.

Aural Skills and Analysis

Aural skills and analysis skills requirements appear to meet NASM curricular standards. These are covered in the aural skills (Sight-Singing MUS151, 152, 153, 252, 252, 253) and music theory/analysis (Form and Analysis MUS 342) courses.
Composition and Improvisation

Composition and improvisation skills requirements appear to meet NASM curricular standards. Composition exercises are included within required core music theory (MUS 101, 102, 103, 201, 202, 203) and computer applications (MUS 465) courses. Creating music extemporaneously and improvisation are included within the class piano courses (MUS 155, 156, 157).

History and Repertory

History and repertory requirements appear to meet NASM curricular standards. The core undergraduate music history curriculum includes a systematic presentation of Western music history (MUS 311, 312, 313). Students are exposed to music of other cultures through a Music in Non-Western Cultures course (CST 242).

Technology

It appears that students acquire a basic overview of how technology serves the field of music as a whole. All undergraduate music majors complete Computer Applications (MUS 465). However, it is not clear that all undergraduate B.M. majors acquire a working knowledge of the technological developments applicable to their area of specialization. (NASM Handbook, 2005-06, p. 74, item VII, E. 2).

Synthesis

Synthesis is achieved through a variety of experiences, including student teaching and required recitals.

Bachelor of Music in Music Education: Submitted for renewal of Final Approval

This degree appears to meet NASM standards, except for the competencies in performance health and technology cited above.

The degree title appears to be appropriate for the curricular content.

Bachelor of Music in Music History and Literature: Submitted for renewal of Final Approval

At 58-61% of the curriculum (Self-Study Bachelor of Music History and Literature curricular table - Appendix IV), it appears that studies in the major area and
supportive courses in music do not meet minimum standards. (NASM *Handbook 2005-06*, p. 79 item VIII. D.1.) “…Studies in the major area and supportive courses in music normally total at least 65% of the curriculum.”

This degree appears to meet NASM standards, except for the percentage of music curricular content and competencies in performance health and technology cited above.

The degree title appears to be appropriate for the curricular content.

**Bachelor of Music in Performance: Submitted for renewal of Final Approval**

This degree appears to meet NASM standards, except for the competencies in performance health and technology cited above.

The degree title appears to be appropriate for the curricular content.

1b. Specific Curricula — Graduate

It would appear that the cover page of the *Self-Study* should be changed in regard to the reference to the Master of Music in Performance degree. The NASM office confirms that the degree should be submitted for renewal of Plan Approval, not pursuit of Final Approval. The cover page of the Visitors’ Report includes the correct statement.

**General Standards for Graduate Programs in Music**

Admission policies are clearly stated and admission standards appear to meet NASM standards. A comprehensive review is part of each graduate degree’s requirements.

**Master of Music in Music Education: Submitted for renewal of Final Approval**

This degree appears to meet NASM standards.

The degree title appears to be appropriate for the curricular content.

**Master of Humanities in Music: Submitted for renewal of Final Approval**

This degree appears to meet NASM standards.

The degree title appears to be appropriate for the curricular content.
Master of Music in Performance: Submitted for renewal of Plan Approval

This degree appears to meet NASM standards.

The degree title appears to be appropriate for the curricular content.

2. Study of the Transcripts of Recent Graduates and Comparison with Catalogue

Official degree audits were presented by the department and university for all degree programs. The transcripts corresponded to curricular requirements in all instances.


The School of Music’s strong support for and coordination of solo, chamber, and large ensemble performances is described in the Self-Study, pages 63-67, and these activities appear to support the standards related to performance for the various degrees. The School takes pride in the growing quality of its large performance ensembles.

Exposure to many high school guests and community members who attend concerts and festivals, such as the Mad River Vocal Arts Festival and the Tri-State Honor Band, as well as active faculty performers, enrich the performance environment at WSU.


The music curriculum is designed to offer the general college students a variety of musical experiences. The department serves as many as 750-1,700 non-majors annually in a variety of course offerings per the most three recent HEADS Data Surveys (Appendix I). A 34-37 credit quarter hour music minor program is available. Applied lessons and performance ensemble courses are available to non-majors with an audition and/or permission of the instructor as space allows. The University Chorus and Concert Band have open enrollment with no audition. Three courses are specifically designed to fulfill university-wide general education requirements in the Human Expression and Comparative Non-Western Cultures categories and include the following: MUS 214, Music in Western Culture; MUS 290, African-American Music: America and Beyond; CST 242, Comparative Nonwestern Cultures: Music. Other courses designed for the non-music majors include: MUS 131, Guitar Class, MUS 117, Music Listening: Jazz, and MUS 118, Popular Musical Theater. Additionally, MUS 365, Methods and Materials for Teaching General Music in Grades K-6, is provided for elementary education majors. It appears that the department is doing their part to encourage participation by the general college student and providing a number of opportunities to enrich the general education program at Wright State University. See pp. 61-62 of the Self-Study for further details.
O. Music Unit Evaluation, Planning, and Projections

The institution and Department of Music have undergone two strategic planning processes during the past five years, as well as thorough faculty involvement in the completion of the Self-Study. These projects have provided ample opportunity for administrative and faculty reflection as to the future direction for the institution and school. The visitors learned that the institution as a whole is making plans for controlled growth over the next several years, and there is some expectation that targets will be established. It was noted that graduate student enrollment/credit hour production generates more fiscal support from the state, so it would appear that growth of the graduate program and the addition of the new MM. in Performance degree might be considered beneficial to the institution.

The Self-Study document appears to have been a project that allowed for input by a majority of the faculty, delegated by the music executive. It was comprehensive and provided excellent supplementary programmatic review documents. While the tone of the Self-Study sometimes projects what might be construed as a provocative demeanor by administrators, the Visitors attribute that to the writing style of authors other than the music executive. The music executive consistently projected a positive attitude and healthy relationships with administrators on campus.

P. Standards Summary

? Faculty teaching loads are greater than non-music arts faculty in the same college. (NASM Handbook 2005-06, p. 56 item I.I.E.4., ¶ 3) “Music faculty teaching only classroom/seminar courses should have their load determined in the same way as faculty in other departments of the institution.” (See E. Faculty and Staff above.)

? It is not clear that support staff are provided commensurate with the music unit’s mission, goals, objectives, size, and scope. (NASM Handbook 2005-06, p. 57 item I.I.E.8.) (See E. Faculty and Staff above.)

? The Self-Study page 21 explains that there is no plan for regular maintenance of the physical plant and equipment. (NASM Handbook 2005-06, p. 57 item II.F., ¶ 4) “Budget provisions shall be made for adequate maintenance of the physical plant and equipment.” (See F. Facilities, Equipment, and Safety above.)

? (NASM Handbook 2005-06, p. 57 item II.F., ¶ 1, 4, & 6) “Space allotted to any music unit function must be adequate for the effective conduct of that function. ...Acoustical treatments appropriate to music facilities shall be provided....All facilities and equipment should produce an environment conducive to learning and be sufficient to enable faculty and students to focus on artistic and academic endeavors.” It is not clear that these standards are met in regard to the two performance spaces and some rehearsal and instructional spaces. (See F. Facilities, Equipment, and Safety above.)
It is not clear that all undergraduate students are informed in regard to performance health. (NASM Handbook 2005-06, p. 71 item V. B.) “Institutions should assist students to acquire knowledge from qualified professionals regarding the prevention of performance injuries.” (See N. Programs, Degrees, and Curricula above.)

It is not clear that all undergraduate B.M. majors acquire a working knowledge of the technological developments applicable to their area of specialization. (NASM Handbook, 2005-06, p. 74, item VII, E, 2). (See N. Programs, Degrees, and Curricula above.)

Bachelor of Music in Music History and Literature (NASM Handbook 2005-06, p. 79 item VIII. D.1.) “…Studies in the major area and supportive courses in music normally total at least 65% of the curriculum.” (See N. Programs, Degrees, and Curricula above.)

On page 138, in the first paragraph under “Music” of the 2003-05 Undergraduate Catalog, it would appear that the statement should substitute the word “accredited” for “full.” Also, the use of the word “standards” may be more accurate and appropriate than “regulations” in that statement. (NASM Handbook, 2005-06, p. 43, XII, Section 1, C.) (See I. Published Materials above.)

Q. Overview, Summary Assessment, and Recommendations for the Program

STRENGTHS (listed in no particular order)

Qualified faculty who are committed to teaching; a strong, committed, and dedicated faculty, willing to work hard to achieve the best outcome for students

A quality and hardworking student body, with considerable promise

Community and regional outreach services and the involvement of many faculty members in local arts activities; increased visibility

A very active and competent chair willing to work closely with the faculty and serve as a strong advocate for the department

Good faculty to student ratio

A very knowledgeable and supportive administration that has been generous with resources

Generous campus-wide program to support faculty travel and other development activities

A fine library collection to support the needs of the programs
A highly qualified and professional support staff

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT (listed in no particular order)

- Severe inconsistency in HVAC systems especially in humidity and cooling
- Non-existent sound isolation properties throughout the music wing of the Fine Arts Center
- Need for additional space for classes, rehearsals, practice rooms, and studios
- Inconsistent applied music syllabi, often with no evidence of pedagogical or health content
- Faculty workloads inconsistent with faculty in other units
- Heavy reliance on part-time applied music faculty who receive inadequate salaries to ensure continuity and quality of instruction

Aggressive attention to acoustical problems in performance, rehearsal and teaching spaces in the facility is necessary. Issues related to instructional staffing will require careful examination for the future in regard to a growing student population, continuity and quality of part-time faculty, and teaching loads. The necessary services provided by a support staff for a music unit growing in student population and quality will become more essential for success, especially as technology progresses. An increased focus on recruiting issues has begun and will become more critical as student quality rises and the institution becomes more competitive for the best and brightest students.

Assuming acoustical problems can be improved sufficiently in the near term, long-term planning in regard to student population and instructional staffing goals should provide clear direction for the music unit’s future.
PART TWO

The visiting evaluators note that all issues have been addressed in PART ONE.