As part of the West Virginia University Board of Governor’s Rule 2.2 Program Review process, the WVU Provost’s Office required that a single Program Review Self-Study Form be completed on behalf of all identified programs in the department or unit. This Program Review Self-Study Form was to be submitted to the Provost’s Office by end of day on August 1, 2023. The Provost’s Office reviewed the submitted Program Review Self-Study Forms in early August.

Self-Study content is unvetted by the Provost's Office. As such, the WVU Provost’s Office cannot attest to the accuracy of any data, analyses, or statements provided within. Also, redactions were made where warranted for the protection of individual identities around sensitive information.
Q1.1. BOG Program Review Self-Study Form

This is the self-study form that will be completed in support of the summer 2023 academic transformation program portfolio review.

Only one program review self-study is to be submitted per unit; all of the unit's programs will be covered by one self-study.

Q1.2. Select the appropriate academic unit under review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>College of Creative Arts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department or School</td>
<td>School of Music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.3. List all of the unit's programs.

Example:

BA Biology
BS Biology
MS Biology
PhD Biology
Q1.4. Name and Email of the person completing the self-study

Name

Kelly J Burke

Email Address

kelly.burke@mail.wvu.edu

Q1.5. How were faculty given the opportunity to contribute to, review and provide feedback on this self-study?

All faculty were mailed a copy of the July 10 “Academic Transformation Update: Programs Identified for Formal Review.” Faculty were asked to provide information to help frame the information requested for this self-study. As a new Director, I had already been in the process of meeting with all faculty in one-on-one meetings, and this provided a mechanism through which I was able to receive direct feedback from their personal points of view. A draft of this document was published to all faculty on July 24th for review and comment. Although faculty are not on contract in July, I nonetheless called a full faculty meeting; attendance was voluntary and enthusiastic. This was held on July 26, both in-person and via Zoom. After the faculty meeting, all faculty were again invited to comment. These final comments were given consideration on July 27, and the draft was then submitted to Dean Keith Jackson for review. Data were entered into the Academic Transformation Qualtrics Survey on August 1.

Q2.1. Explain how the unit and its programs contributes to WVU’s mission.

This response is limited to 7500 characters, approximately 2 single spaced pages.
Q3.1. Resources, Revenue, and Expenses

The purpose of this section is to ensure the accessibility and adequacy of the unit's infrastructure and resources and its financial viability.

Responses in this section are limited to 7500 characters or approximately 2 single spaced pages.

Q3.2. Has the unit experienced significant issues with any of the following during the past five years?

By “significant,” we mean issues that interfere with either the unit’s ability to deliver its programs to its students or the students’ ability to complete those programs in a timely manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to schedule required classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to adequate technological infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3.3. Describe the issues the program has faced in the area(s) identified above.

The College of Creative Arts has never had a dedicated ITS staff member in the building. Although help is available through Shared Services, it has proven cumbersome, and response time varies. Faculty spend a significant amount of time troubleshooting; that time could be put to better use. Furthermore, the software platforms used in the CCA are highly specialized. It is difficult to receive instructional technology consultation without someone in-house who is dedicated to our technologies. The School of Music has adequate space to deliver its programs in a timely manner. Clay Theatre was closed for renovation last year, but the School of Music was able to find creative ways to perform large ensemble concerts. Due to the specialized nature of the classrooms and performing spaces needed to deliver the curricula, the building itself caps our enrollment around 375.

Q3.4. Data have been provided on the unit's last three years of tuition revenue, expenses, and net revenue. Address any negative net revenue or any significant changes (positive or negative) to unit's net position.

Revenue by department is the actual tuition revenue, net of any discounting, paid by students taking courses in course subject codes affiliated with the department.

Expense by department is the actual unrestricted, operating expenditures by department within the functions of instruction and academic support.

Net revenue is the revenue minus the expense.
To satisfy the accrediting standards of the National Association of Schools of Music, music curricula require individualized instruction, smaller class sizes in specialized spaces required for experiential learning, and time for students to practice their craft in multiple performing ensembles. Most schools of music in public institutions of our stature on an RCM budget model require subventions to deliver their curricula. Therefore, it was not surprising to see that our School of Music functions in the red. Fortunately, there is much we can do moving forward to reduce the gap. (See Question 7.) The figures provided by the administration for this program review have been of concern to all. Regardless of how they were calculated, the upper administration has concluded that we have been in the red during the entire timeframe under examination. When the new budget guidelines are provided, the School of Music will then be able to address more ways to decrease the identified gap in addition to those identified in Question 7.

Q4.1.
Faculty Composition and Productivity

Responses should be concise but also specific and supported by evidence. Responses in this section are limited to 7500 characters or approximately 2 single spaced pages.

Specific data definitions for these metrics are available on the Academic Transformation webpage.

Q4.2. Data have been provided on the unit's faculty full-time equivalency (FTE) to the median of all majors for fall 18 to fall 22.

Address any differences in the unit's student to FTE ratio and the institution's student-to-faculty ratio of 18-to-1 per IPEDS reporting for academic year 2021-2022.
Q4.3. This question is optional and required only if a unit's doctoral programs are under review.

Data have been provided on the unit's tenure-track / tenured FTE to doctoral student headcount ratio across all of the unit's doctoral programs.

Address any differences in the unit's doctoral student to tenure-track and tenured faculty FTE ratio to the institutional expectation of 2-to-1.
Doctoral Student enrollment is primarily tied to the reputations of and recruiting efforts made by individual faculty and available student funding. The 1.7:1 faculty ratio for our DMA programs appears very close to the 2:1 average of all doctoral programs at WVU. Time-to-degree data supplied in Q5.1 indicates that this ratio does not create impediments to timely completion.

Q4.4. Data have been provided that show the changes to the unit's total number of faculty over the review period. Data have also been provided that show the total student headcount enrolled in all of the unit's programs over the same period of time as well as a three-year trend in student credit hour (SCH) production.

Explain the relationship between the change in the number of faculty in the unit and the change in the units total headcount enrollment and SCH production trends.
Supplied data has been provided by each major under review. Due to the interdependent nature of curricula in all Schools of Music, it is most appropriate to provide aggregate data. The data supplied for this review is as follows: • Total enrollment in all programs under review, Median of 2018 – 2021: 327 • Fall 2022 enrollment in all programs under review: 305 • Enrollment change of unduplicated headcount: -22 • Percentage change of unduplicated headcount: -6.7% Although unduplicated headcount slightly decreased during the 5-year period of review while faculty FTE has slightly increased, faculty productivity/efficiency has improved during the same period. Current student registration for Fall 2023 indicates that we should expect slight growth from Fall 2022. • Fall 2023 enrollment in all programs under review on 1 August 2023: 310 o Represents two years of continual growth.

Q4.5. Data have been provided that shows the unit's research expenditures per the Higher Education Research and Development Survey (HERD).

Does this data capture all of the unit's research expenditures? If not, explain the difference here and provide evidence of additional research expenditures below.
Q4.6. Upload evidence of research expenditures here.

Q5.1. Student Enrollment and Graduation History

Responses in this section are limited to 7500 characters (approximately 1.5 single spaced pages). Responses should be concise but also specific and supported by evidence.

Specific data definitions for these metrics are available on the Academic Transformation webpage.

Q5.2. Data have been provided on all of the unit's program's student enrollment trends.

That data includes:

- 4-year median fall enrollment (fall 18 through fall 21);
- Fall 2022 change from 4-year median (in headcount and in percentage).

Units should address any programs with enrollment below the median for the program level or which has experienced a negative change in enrollment.
Student Enrollment

A School of Music is best described as an ecosystem. When there are significant disruptions to an input factor, the entire ecosystem is put under stress. The challenges created by Covid caused significant disruption to our recruitment of new students and student success. The unavoidable adjustments that we made throughout the pandemic were detrimental to our school's musical ecosystem. We were unable to host some of our most important recruiting events such as Honor Band, Honor Orchestra, Choral Festival, and all summer music academies. Due to the necessarily collaborative requirements of our degree programs, students became discouraged by the necessary reduction of collaborative opportunities and either dropped out or paused their studies. We are actively returning to a balanced ecosystem. Some of these efforts include the reinstatement of our signature recruitment events, increased outreach and enrichment to public schools, and connecting with students who dropped out to encourage them to return. Although all degree programs in the School of Music were impacted by the pandemic, there are extenuating circumstances that help explain the larger decline in enrollment in the BM in Music Performance degree. All music students must audition on an instrument or voice to be accepted into any of our music majors. The audition threshold for acceptance into the professional BM in Performance degree needs to be as high as what is required by music conservatories because conservatory graduates will be their direct competition in the job market. Given that Covid and the hazards of airborne viral transmission did not allow most instrumentalists and singers to study their craft, it is therefore unsurprising to see that some incoming students exhibit lower levels of aptitude. It would be unethical of the faculty to reduce the entrance standards for this highly specialized major just to keep the headcount in the major at a predetermined number. Instead of simply denying admission into the performance major, we encourage those students to matriculate into one of our other majors. As future generations of students audition for acceptance into this highly specialized degree program, we expect performance levels in auditions to rise concomitantly with the reappearance of music in public schools. The exact same faculty members who recruit and retain students in the BM in Performance teach all students with instrumental/vocal performance proficiency requirements in their undergraduate degree programs as required by our external accrediting agency, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). Performance faculty also provide studio instruction to 50+ Master of Music in Performance students and all Doctor of Musical Arts students. Similarly, our academic faculty teach students in every degree program and major we offer, regardless of their research and creative agendas. Graduation History

Graduation metrics were pulled from the Argos report: Average Time to Degree Completion Fall 2018 to the present. Degree Average Time to Degree Action BA 4.45 Action already taken BM 5.11 Curriculum review required MA 3.04 Investigate new ways to offer dual degrees MM 3.15 Investigate new ways to offer dual degrees DMA 5.52 Investigate impediments to progress • BA programs have already submitted program changes that will improve time-to-degree. • BM programs are charged to review their curricula to ensure students can complete them within a 4-year time frame. The entire course and room schedule for the School of Music is currently being analyzed to optimize course/space availability to remove course bottlenecks. In lockstep curricula, which is very common in BM programs, any disruption to a student’s 4-year plan will impede progress to degree. Please note that the BM in Music Therapy is intentionally longer than 4 years. Their national accrediting agency requires an internship after all course requirements are completed. • Many MA and MM students are concurrently pursuing an additional degree in the School of Music. This inflates time-to-degree metrics. We are beginning to explore dual major options and embedded graduate certificates. Either approach will provide similar credentials to earning two different master's degrees. • The DMA time-to-degree measurement falls within expected norms. However, the faculty will investigate impediments to timely completion and will work to eliminate them.

Q5.3. Data have been provided on the unit's three-year trend in student credit hour (SCH) production. Units should address any programs with a negative trend in SCH production.
With a few exceptions, assessing SCH production by program/major does not provide information with enough nuance to make informed decisions. The interdependent curricula in a School of Music function like an ecosystem. The ecosystem is engineered by student interest, and their interests have a large impact. The WVU School of Music has demonstrated ecosystem resilience in that we have responded to the changing student demand by developing new majors such as Music Business & Industry, Music Therapy, and our newest program, Music and Health. Additionally, our Ph.D. in Music Education was put on hold as student interest waned. Student interest is growing in the area of commercial music; we have recently added that component to our jazz curriculum. Reminder: SCH/FTE has improved during the period of review.

Q6.1.
Assessment of Learning and Program Improvement

The Provost's Office will review the self-studies from the most recent Board of Governor's five-year program reviews for this section.

Units may provide updated information below if they so choose.

Q6.2. Provide the unit's plans or ideas to make significant changes to its operations, structure, offerings, or personnel in order to reduce its costs or improve its efficiency.

Provide any significant changes to the department's program curricula, its assessment of learning practices, or any other improvements that have been made since the department's programs completed their most recent Board of Governor's five-year review.
Assessment: As mentioned in Q5 above, the School of Music practices regular assessments so that we can always be conscious of continuous improvement. In addition to the KPIs presented in this Academic Transformation Review, Regular assessment in music also includes, but is not limited to assessing student demand, student learning outcomes, curricular relevancy, balanced enrollment, and our impact on improving the quality of life for all citizens of West Virginia and beyond. BOG response: The School of Music’s response to the directive to provide assessment plans for our MM programs was submitted and under revision. Action on this has been paused due to Academic Transformation activity. Per BOG directives, all other required responses have been resolved.

Q6.3. The program may provide additional evidence of program improvement here.

Q7.1. The unit may provide any additional context or information about the unit's programs here.
Q7.2. You may use this section to provide any additional evidence referenced in the program review.
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Q7.3. You may use this section to provide any additional evidence referenced in the program review.

1.1MB
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Q7.4. You may use this section to provide any additional evidence referenced in the program review.
Q8.1.
Thank you for completing your self-study for the West Virginia University Board of Governors program review. You may now submit the survey and your self-study will be passed on to the Provost's Office for review.