

10-29-2007

Academic Planning Council Minutes of October 29, 2007

Carolyn A. Craddock
Northern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-acadplancouncil>

Recommended Citation

Craddock, Carolyn A., "Academic Planning Council Minutes of October 29, 2007" (2007). *Academic Planning Council Archives*. 5.
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/ua-acadplancouncil/5>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Administration & Leadership Archives at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Planning Council Archives by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

APPROVED

ACADEMIC PLANNING COUNCIL
Minutes of October 29, 2007
3 p.m., Holmes Student Center – HSC 505

Present: Alden, Anderson, Bose, Cassidy, Gorman, Gough, House, Jeris, Marcellus, Marsh, Molnar, Reynolds, Singh

Guests: Paul Bauer, Chair, School of Music; Carolinda Douglass, Director, Assessment Services; Rich Holly, Associate Dean, College of Visual and Performing Arts; Harold Kafer, Dean, College of Visual and Performing Arts

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of October 15, 2007, and the motion passed unanimously.

Harold Kafer, Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts; Rich Holly, Associate Dean of the College of Visual and Performing Arts; and Paul Bauer, Chair of the School of Music were introduced.

Reynolds pointed out that the subcommittee learned a great deal about the programs in the School of Music. A strength of the departmental context section is that the faculty is very engaged and reflective in what they are doing and want to do. Another strength is that the school has come through a less than desirable fiscal environment and has done a very good job of extending the useful life of its unique equipment. The school has also recently made some new hires, and it is a significant contributor to the undergraduate credit hour production across the university and the University Honors Program.

One of the discussion points is that the school should emphasize more in the review the contribution it makes to teacher education. The school should consider including information about its success in generating philanthropic opportunities in the review. This information could be placed in the alumni section if the gifts are made from alumni or in the departmental context section in the discussion of resources that support the school and its programs. It was pointed out that the most visible success is an endowed chair. Over the review period, the school has received consistent contributions that have seen steady growth, and the school has about 30 endowed scholarships. The school is able to identify individuals who have played key roles in obtaining these scholarships. For the most part, these gifts are from folks who enjoy the quality of the programs presented by the school. It was also noted that extending the useful life of the equipment may be reaching a point of no return.

The recommendations for the future are for the school to keep doing what it has been doing and continue its effort at addressing the communication and loyalty building with alumni. The school has more antedoctal than formal communication with alumni on a regular basis. The school publishes *Alum Notes* annually, and sends out a monthly email newsletter that includes information on time sensitive issues, faculty and student accomplishments, future performances, etc. Alumni can respond to the school immediately, which gives the school a good sampling of alumni accomplishments and news.

The B.S. in Music and the B.M. in Music have considerable overlap, and there is repetition in the report; can this issue be addressed? The report on the degree program needs to be free-standing. The program review format was revised several years ago to try and eliminate repetition. This was done by creating the departmental context section. The programs in the College of Visual and Performing Arts are different than the programs, for example, in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences because they have one accrediting agency that reviews the school. It is important that this is included in all the reviews in case questions are raised about one program. The differences between the B.A. and B.M. are not immediately clear, and maybe this information should be in the departmental context section. The B.M. is a professional degree, which requires that at least 2/3 of the course work is specific to music. In the B.A. program, less than 1/2 of the requirements are in music.

The APC turned to the B.A. in Music program review section. One of the strengths of the program is the flexibility that it provides to students. A discussion point is the attrition and persistence rate in this program. Changes are being implemented to help reduce attrition and improve persistence, but the program will have to wait and see if these changes make a difference. The subcommittee had a discussion about the characteristics of students from secondary schools who choose to study music, and you might want to incorporate some of this information into the review. The school is following its accreditation mandate of evaluating students before being admitted into the school. Students have to be focused, dedicated, and have some skill development before being admitted. The school is trying to find students who will succeed. It is not enough for the students to have the skills, there are other factors that come into play that factor into why students persist or stay here. University-wide, 80 percent of our students change majors before graduating. Students who are not successful in our program go somewhere else because they want to remain music majors. Individuals who want to enter the program must audition, provide a personal statement about their career goals, and submit two letters of recommendation. There is also a theory diagnostic evaluation and a music literacy evaluation, which tells us if an individual can read music. If a student does not do well after being admitted, extra attention is provided. The school also has contracts with specially-admitted students, peer tutoring is available to them, and faculty take extra time to assist these students. The school tries to maintain a 40 percent persistence rate, and the university's rate is only 18-20 percent. This is the norm nationally for music schools (40 percent). In a couple more years we will be able to see how this cohort is doing.

Everything that was mentioned in the review of the B.A. program is applicable to the B.M. program. The B.M. provides almost half of the credit hours in undergraduate professional music programs in the same CIP code statewide.

The M.M. program provides about 1/4 of the statewide credit hour production for programs in the same CIP code. The program might want to treat the data on the summer cohorts separately from the other data because this is a little confusing. This is probably a unique feature of the program. The data on these students will show up in the degrees awarded data in a couple of years. The data are confusing because the state uses the fall numbers, and the summer cohort is not included in these data. There are currently 50 students completing this degree in the summer, and most of these are teachers in the public school system. The total summer budget is devoted to serving this audience. The summer program is a three-year summer master's program. The costs and the three-year timeframe are attractive, and the students are highly motivated. These students do not show up in the fall count of majors, but they show up in the degrees awarded and credit hours data. It is

important that this point be clarified; talk about the two populations (professional development and those seeking initial teacher certification). One weakness that was found due to assessment was students' understanding of research methodology in regard to the master's thesis. Is there a course that helps students understand research methodology? It was noted that all students in this program take a research course (584 – techniques of research in music). It is also necessary for students to understand policy. Just this week the faculty had a discussion about the process of completing a thesis, and we are hoping this will improve. Is there anything that could be done in the course to see if students understand methodology prior to their beginning to write their theses? One option is to look at the syllabi and ask faculty to verify that this process is actually happening in the course.

A strength of the Performer's Certificate in Music is that it is a small, intense, and highly selective program. The benchmarks used are the Julliard School and the Peabody Conservatory.

A discussion point is that prior to 2006 NIU was the only program in this CIP code. In 2006 another institution reported data in this CIP code. Should this be explained in the review? It was suggested that another institution was probably reclassified. It was noted that NIU is a 100 percent of the degrees awarded. There are probably other programs in the state that fall under another CIP code. When these data are reported, you should talk about these data being in the same CIP code as our program. Another discussion point is the lack of data from the university alumni survey. The individual contact that faculty have with the alumni is a rich data mine for the program.

This program has been in existence for more than 20 years. The program is designed to have a small enrollment that provides opportunities to acquire some unique students from all over the world. Some of these students are involved in the Graduate String Quartet. The Graduate String Quartet is a mix of master's students and performance students. The program is designed as a purely performance program, which allows us to accept students that other institutions can not accept. It also provides students the chance to hone their skills. This program can be either a post-baccalaureate or post-master's program. Most of the major conservatories have a program like this. Northwestern is the only other institution in the state that has a similar program. Don't other institutions require more credit hours? This varies by institution; the range of credit hours required is 12-52 (Peabody Conservation, 36 hours; Julliard, 52 hours; Indiana University, 36 hours; Ball State University, 24 hours; University of Connecticut, 12 hours), and the average range is 24-36. When the program was first put together in the 1970s, the thinking was that it should be about ½ of the credit hours required for a doctoral degree. Do these credit hour assignments have anything to do with the thinking about laboratories that are two hours in the lab that provide students with one credit hour? Do you have this kind of ratio? The ensembles are undervalued, but the one-on-one instruction might be more highly valued. Students are expected to practice five hours a day in relation to the one-on-one instruction. The Performer's Certificate in Music is the icing on the cake, a very productive contribution to the university, and it is certainly one of the most visible programs offered at NIU locally, regionally, and nationally.

There is no request for resources needed for upgrading technology. The school has been investing in technology and places a high priority on technology tools in the laboratory. The school does receive some student fee money to help fund replacements for technology. In the type two lab there is some very up-to-date software, and for individual faculty we have been providing computers and software on a regular basis. Some other things have not been funded because technology is our priority. This information should come through in the review; it is a bragging point.

You might want to mention in the review the grant that you recently received. Paul Bauer just received a Venture Grant and money was also requested from the Graduate School. This was close to \$45,000 and it was used to purchase equipment to make productive use of Internet2 (IP video conferencing equipment). There will be two stations, one that can be moved within the building and one remote system that will be used at public schools, community colleges, etc. This system provides instant connectivity for instruction. For \$5,000 you can have computer-based state-of-the-art technology (uncompressed CDs, camera, audio, and video), and this allows for high-quality connectivity internationally. Having this system gives the school a real opportunity to be a leader in the country in this endeavor. The program will make use of this by the end of the semester. NSF is awarding grants for Internet2 initiatives if extra funding is needed. The school currently has a \$120,000 grant for this initiative.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn A. Craddock

U\Planning\APC\Minutes\2007-2008\Oct29