

Annual Assessment Report

Department: Music

Academic Year: 2016-2017

Date of Submission: September 2017

Department Chair: Michael Shasberger

I. Response to the previous year PRC's recommendations

<p>Item: In the future, we do recommend that you use the current annual assessment report template,</p>	<p>Response: We trust that this download from the Program Review website is the current version of the template!</p>
<p>Item: We appreciated the summary of your findings but would like to hear whether you are going to address any emerging issues in the future. It seems that Vocal Performance s not as strong as Orchestra Performance -- is this an issue for your department? Or the culprit is the acoustics in the First Presbyterian church? If the former is the case, we would like to hear what your plans for improvement are.</p>	<p>Response: The disparity between the level of sophistication between orchestral and choral performance is not really of significant concern. In a collegiate setting the orchestra has the potential to be far more advanced given the natural maturity of string players in particular vs. vocalists. However, our goal is to always improve the performance competence of all media! We would absolutely like to enhance the quality of vocal performance and have directed the efforts of this reporting year to enhance our recruitment effectiveness for more advance musicians of all types. However, given our commitment to the liberal arts and providing access to all students, we will always have a disparity of musical maturation throughout the program. We have also advocated for years for a full time voice position on the music faculty, but have not been able to engage that position.</p>

Item: Because of its NASM accreditation activities, the music department is one of a few departments at Westmont that is already deeply involved with assessment activities through an external “guild” organization. Liberal Studies and Chemistry are two other departments that are similarly involved with external accrediting and/or professional organizations, so we recommend that the heads of those three departments meet together (with a representative of the PRC) next semester to find common ground on for an approach to meeting Westmont’s own assessment requirements that is fair, consistent, logical not overly burdensome and respects the freedom and distinctive character of their respective disciplines. It would be ideal if such a meeting could yield a brief, tentative proposal in writing by March 1, 2017.

Response: Informal discussions were held around Faculty Forum on this topic with members of the Music, Chemistry and Liberal Studies faculty. This is something that we would like to continue to explore, particularly as we approach our formal NASM major review in 2018-2019. All departments involved acknowledge the extra burden of meeting two widely divergent assessment protocols, and note that the exterior agencies offer little room for deviation from their standardized practices. An ideal solution would be for these programs to be exempted from institutional program review and allow the external accreditation process to substitute for institutional protocols. The Program Review Committee could have complete access to all reporting practices. If a complete substitution of annual protocols is not possible, then at least a waiver of standard institutional review should be granted for the year of comprehensive external review. The next such review for the music department will be in 2018-2019.

Item: identification of “closing the loop” activities that fit the findings of your assessment activities	Response: Hopefully provided in this report.
Notes:	

II A. Program Learning Outcome (PLO) assessment

If your department participated in the ILO assessment you may use this section to report on your student learning in relation to the assessed ILO. The assessment data can be requested from the Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness.

Program Learning Outcome	
Who is in Charge /Involved?	
Direct Assessment Methods	
Indirect Assessment Methods	
Major Findings	
Closing the Loop Activities	
Collaboration and Communication	

or/and

II B. Key Questions

Key Question	How can we enhance the effectiveness of music student recruitment efforts, both for majors and non-majors?				
Who is in Charge/Involved ?	The entire department participated, led by Department Chair Michael Shasberger				
<u>Direct Assessment Methods</u>	Analysis of 12 years of enrollment yield and audition data				
	2017	2016	2015	2014	
	100	106 forms	96 forms	90 Forms	
	100 auditions	104 auditions	91 auditions	87 auditions	
	86 as of 3/7/17	97 as of 3/7/16	95 as of 3/7/15	86 as of 3/7/14	76 as of 3/3/13
	28	30 no awards	38 no awards	41 no awards	27 no awards
	66 awards offered	74 awards offered	70 Awards Offered	60 awards	63 Awards
	100 apps	106 apps	101 apps	95 Apps	90 Apps
	33	37 commitments	39 commitments	34 commitments	33 commitmen
	50%	50% Yield	55% yield	53% Yield	52% Yield
	29%	24% no award	36% no award	43% no award	33% no award

	2013	2012	2011	2010
90 Forms	131 forms		107 Forms	104 total contacts
87 auditions	120 auditions		95 auditioned	86 auditioned
	117 forms as of			
76 as of 3/3/13	3/3/12		76 as of 3/5/11	70 as of 3/5/10
27 no awards	60 no awards		47 no awards	30 no awards
63 Awards	71 Awards		71 awards	56 awards
90 Apps	131 apps		107 apps	103 appls
33 commitments	42 commitments		41 commitments	38 commitments
52% Yield	59% Yield		58% Yield	68% Yield
33% no award	45% no award		43% no award	45% no award
5,153 Average				
3 Guild				

	2009	2008	2007	2006
98 total contacts	92 total contacts	90 total contacts	64 total contacts	
84 auditioned	79 auditioned	76 auditioned	64 auditioned	
76 as of 3/2/09	61 as of 3/1/08	62 as of 3/1/07	NA	
24 no awards/11 inc.	31 no award 11 inc.	29 no awards 14 inc.	36 no awards	
55 awards made	48 awards made	47 Awards Offered	28 awards offered	
79 apps	79 apps	76 apps	NA	
35 commitments	29 commitments	28 commitments	18 commitments	
64% yield	60% yield	60% yield	64% yield	
33% no award	39% no award	38% no award	43% no award	

Which reveals a significant fall-off from 60%+ yields in the early years of the music scholarship program to barely 50% in recent years and falling. Our conclusion is that we need to restore the levels of music scholarship funding to the original percentage of tuition to restore our effectiveness.

Review of audition and recruitment practices

The department met weekly throughout the year to review auditions and planning for auditions.

Contacting over 1,200 prospective students to encourage auditions and music scholarship applications in an effort to increase the size of the applicant pool. Contact protocols included:

- a) initial email from music office when prospect is identified either from Admissions or music dept. outreach**
- b) prospect added to mailman prospect list and receives monthly emails from Department Chair**
- c) prospects receive individual phone, text or email (all attempted until successful contact made) to identify**

specific instrument or level of interest along with an invitation to schedule an audition

d) upon receipt of music scholarship application each prospect receives a personal email from the department chair and a follow up phone call from the music administrator to either confirm receipt of recorded audition or schedule an in person audition

e) following review of recorded audition or completion of personal audition applicants are sent personal letters of award, waiting list or no award notification by March 15

f) commencing April 1 prospects receive weekly messages from the department chair along with enticements for early commitment including special Westmont music T-shirts, early admission to special programs, and voting for tour destination selection.

g) on or about April 1 all scholarship recipients receive a personal music department post card from a current Westmont student on their instrument encouraging their journey here

h) all prospects not confirmed or declined by the last week of April receive personal phone calls and emails from the department chair and the specialists on the music faculty for their instrument.

At various times and for special cases earlier intervention by specialist music faculty is engaged.

4 lead faculty, one each in strings, winds, piano and voice, lead the effort to identify and encourage prospects from their areas with additional email and text outreach endeavors, particularly to encourage auditions. All efforts seek to establish personal relationships with prospective students. Dozens of personal follow up emails and phone calls are undertaken by the department chair and specialized faculty in response to student and parent inquiries.

Statistics show that our final audition numbers are relatively flat over that past dozen years, which

is similar to the overall institutional applicant pool plateau. Our conclusion is that we need to reach new prospective student groups in order to increase our audition numbers.

A renewed emphasis was placed on the "audition weekend" experience so that prospective students have enhanced access to faculty and have time to experience a sense of community in the department.

<p>Indirect Assessment Methods</p>	<p>Interviews with representatives of peer institutions</p> <p>Direct statistical information is highly guarded by peer institutions. Conversations with representatives from Vanguard, Oberlin Conservatory, Biola, Wheaton and Pacific Lutheran University, however, all revealed a movement toward full scholarship awards and higher average awards than are currently being offered by Westmont. Another significant factor is the premium charged for private music lessons. This fee adds an additional \$5,600 to \$7,200 to the expense of being a music major or minor at Westmont. Approximately 50% of c. 30 schools surveyed verbally reported that they either do not charge such fees or that they waive them for students who are required to take lessons in their major or minor. (Survey taken at a panel discussion on orchestral program in liberal arts settings of the College Orchestra Director’s Association national conference)</p> <p>Responses from individual students who chose to and not to attend Westmont over the past two years were solicited. In 6 cases scholarship awards were compared directly to Westmont awards and though in most instances the overall award was close to parity, the music awards were 30% to 50% less than competing institutions. Although other types aid often leveled the playing field, it was clear that the student’s sense of self worth was affirmed through the recognition of specific talent rather than unspecified institutional grants. Examples:</p> <p>Vocal Student #1: Westmont vocal scholarship \$3,000 Biola award \$11,000 Violin Student #1: Westmont violin scholarship \$4,000 Whitworth violin award \$7,000 Piano Student #1: Westmont Guild Finalist award \$10,000 Biola Award: Full Tuition Vocal Student #2: Overall gift aid was equivalent but the vocal award from Whitworth was \$1,000 higher than the vocal award from Westmont. The request from the family to have the academic or general grant aid changed to a vocal award was denied by the Office of Financial Aid and the student chose Whitworth Violin Student #2: Declined participation the Augustinian Competition because she sought recognition for her violin playing rather primarily and could not attend two weekends in a row (coming from Illinois). Was denied the Augustini: opportunity due to inability to attend, and her Wheaton music scholarship exceeded her Westmont Music Guild winners award. Student enrolled at Wheaton. Viola Student #1: Was prepared to confirm with Westmont when both Rice and USC offered more compelling full tuition and housing awards on April 28. Our final offer was \$1,000 short of full tuition with no funding toward housing, board or fees.</p>
<p>Major Findings</p>	<p>Music Scholarship funding has fallen 40% against the cost of tuition over the past 12 years</p>

	<p>New software in use by the Office of Admissions has significantly impeded the dissemination of information regarding potential music prospects to the music faculty. Reports were supposed to be shared weekly, but often a period of a month or more went by between reports. This resulted in a lack of timely information for reaching out to new prospects and following up with current prospects.</p> <p>The newly instituted early scholarship awarding practices did not contribute to higher enrollment yields and may have negatively impacted them. Multiple cases were reported of students waiting until late April to hear from other institutions so that they could compare Westmont awards with other schools and only 1 early confirmation was received following our awards in November through early March.</p> <p>The competition for musical talent between peer institutions continues to intensify. Markers of this include the rebranding of the music program at Biola from a department of music to the Biola Conservatory, the recent NASM accreditation of Vanguard University, and aggressive recruiting and faculty hiring at California Baptist University.</p> <p>Our yield of music scholarship awardees has fallen from a high of 68% in 2010 to just 50% in 2017 (lowest percentage in the last 12 years)</p> <p>Our Office of Admissions struggles to articulate the music program fully to prospective students and does not always track and report musical ability in its procedures and reviews. Information on the Augustinian award program was difficult to obtain and coordinate with music awards. The status of Augustinian awards was in flux through April and the music department was not informed in the case of at least one Guild Finalist that an Augustinian Award had been offered.</p>
<p>Recommendations</p>	<p>The following recommendations have been made and are being made through appropriate channels. Those that have been implemented or are in process are noted in italics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The publication of a Fine and Performing Arts specific admissions brochure (promised by September, still has not been completed)</i> 2. <i>Providing funding for adjunct music faculty to conduct 10 clinics with target high school music programs.</i> 3. <i>Participating in Fine and Performing Arts specific college fairs (scheduled for October 2017)</i> 4. Identifying a music specific Admissions Counselor to coordinate recruitment efforts of the Admissions Office for musicians (No Commitment for the implementation of this, though it was initially pledged by the Dean of Admissions)

5. Restoring music scholarship funding to its 2005 level in relation to tuition and indexing this level to future increases in tuition
(No action known to be pending)
6. *Providing direct access and training to Music Department staff and designated faculty for the new DOMO admissions software*
7. Partnering with the Augustinian selection to recognize musical intelligence in a consistent and meaningful way (informal progress and ongoing discussions in place)
8. *Delay music award announcements until March as was the practice until this year. New award practices did not seem to contribute to enhanced yields and may have adversely effected yield.*
9. *Encouraging faculty performances in public settings. Efforts this year include multiple performances on the Santa Barbara Music Club series, solo recital efforts by Han Soo Kim and Michael Shasberger, and concerts planned by the faculty wind quintet Sonos5.*

Collaboration and Communication

The music faculty met and discussed enrollment and recruitment issues weekly throughout the school year. We interviewed Peter Slowick from the Oberlin Conservatory of Music in October of 2016. A nationally known director of the string program at Oberlin, Peter was able to share his professional perspectives and findings with us. Multiple meetings with the Department Chair, the Provost, the Director of Financial Aid and the Dean of Admissions took place over the course of the year. Specific recommendations were developed by the Music Faculty and discussed with our Admissions colleagues.

All music faculty members participated in the process of auditioning the c. 100 prospective students this past academic year (as is our common practice annually). Additionally, all faculty members participated in campus visit interviews throughout the year, and the recruitment protocols sighted above.

Meetings to review our practices and challenges following this past year with the Director of Admissions and Financial Aid have been helpful in instituting the recommendations listed above.

III. Follow-ups

Program Learning Outcome or Key Question	
Who was involved in implementation?	
What was decided or addressed?	
How were the recommendations implemented?	
Collaboration and Communication	

IV. Other assessment or Key Questions related projects

Project	
Who is in Charge /Involved?	
Major Findings	
Action	
Collaboration and Communication	

--

V. Adjustments to the Multi-year Assessment Plan (optional)

Proposed adjustment	Rationale	Timing
NASM accreditation review in 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 to be substituted for regular program review cycle	Major external review by official guild accrediting agency	Comprehensive Self Study to be written in the summer and fall of 2018, visitation team scheduled in spring of 2019, likely national accrediting panel review in either summer or fall of 2019 with appropriate follow up as required in fall 2019 and/or spring 2020.

VI. Appendices

- A. Prompts or instruments used to collect the data
- B. Rubrics used to evaluate the data
- C. Relevant assessment-related documents (optional)