

**Final Assessment Report**  
Submitted by SUPR-G to SCAPA

<b>Program:</b>	Faculty of Music	
<b>Degrees Offered:</b>	MMus, MA, DMA, PhD	
<b>Approved Fields:</b>	MMus Music Education Literature and Performance Composition	DMA Voice Piano Orchestral Instruments Conducting
	MA Music Theory Musicology	PhD Music Theory Musicology Composition Music Education
<b>External Consultants:</b>	Professor Gillian MacKay University of Toronto	Professor Peter Webster University of Southern California
<b>Internal Reviewers:</b>	Professor Margaret McGlynn Social Science	Ms. Nicole Westlund Kinesiology
<b>Date of Site Visit:</b>	April 1-2, 2015	
<b>Evaluation:</b>	<i>Good Quality with Report due June 2016</i>	
<b>Approved by:</b>	<i>SUPR-G on June 1, 2015</i> <i>SCAPA on September 9, 2015</i>	

**Executive Summary**

The reviewers met with full-time faculty from every field except music composition, with the associate dean (graduate) and the dean, and with students, staff, and the music librarian. The reviewers were generally pleased with the range of faculty they met, but they would have liked to meet with a greater number of students and faculty, and particularly with part-time faculty, who do a lot of performance teaching in the faculty. It was noted that the review was scheduled at a particularly busy time, perhaps SGPS could take this into consideration for future reviews.

The reviewers were generally impressed with the quality of the faculty in the program and with the commitment they demonstrated to graduate education. They were surprised and impressed by the level of commitment to interdisciplinarity across the programs and felt that this should be highlighted in recruitment and promotional materials. They noted that there has been increased administrative activity in recent years to clarify processes and expectations associated with timely program completion. The reviewers were also particularly impressed by the “21<sup>st</sup> Century Musician” course in the Performance field, and encourage the Faculty to continue working on professional development and support for students, including a musician’s health course.

The reviewers perceived that faculty had not been extensively engaged in the development of the review brief.. They felt that this lack of engagement was reflected in the learning outcomes for the various programs, which do not currently express the different emphases and needs of the performance and academically oriented programs. Conversations with both faculty and students filled in some of their gaps in understanding how the programs actually worked, but there remained some concern that it is not clear how class instruction and individual instruction work together in a way that balances pedagogical excellence with the available resources.

The reviewers were also concerned that both faculty and students expressed some confusion over the expected timelines for completion of the programs and in particular the role of the DRP in the PhD programs. It became apparent that timelines had been developed and were available, but this did

not seem to be widely known. There was also some disagreement about the value of the DRP, with some students and faculty identifying it as a valuable process in developing PhD ideas and skills, while others saw it as a stumbling block to progress.

There appear to be some communication challenges in the context of some issues. These issues ranged widely, from the allocation of space (both individual and group) for graduate students in the new building and methods for providing input on such allocation, access to masterclasses for performance students, expected program timelines, consultation on the preparation of the brief and communication concerning the reviewers' visit. There was no evidence of ill-feeling, but there did seem to be a lack of connection between students and faculty in different programs, and between faculty, students and administration. The reviewers urge the Faculty to prioritize both physical spaces and activities which will give all elements of the community a range of opportunities to interact and communicate.

The reviewers were excited by the new DMA program, but had some concerns about its future development. They noted that the program has accepted cohorts based on area (voice, piano) and that policies and structures which work for those groups might be less effective for others: they recommend a stringent review of the current program and of the options for moving forward before making any further resource allocation. They also noted that some students expressed concerns about access to performance opportunities and to masterclasses, indicating that undergraduate students get priority, a concern shared by the MMus Performance students, the single largest group in the grad cohort.

**Significant Strengths of Program:**

- Quality of the faculty, especially the new faculty who bring with them creative ideas
- Commitment to interdisciplinary work
- Innovative approach to professional development

**Suggestions for improvement & Enhancement:**

- Greater communication with faculty concerning program development. The reviewers did not think that the faculty had been as engaged in the development of either learning outcomes or the program brief as would be desirable and felt that this translated to less coherent programs across the faculty.
- Greater supervision / mentorship around the DRP. Some faculty and students felt that this was a valuable training experience while others found it had become an obstacle to progress.
- Further professional development along the lines of the "21<sup>st</sup> Century Musician" course.
- Development and /or communication of a space plan for the new building which emphasizes graduate student space designed to promote connections between different programs, as well as individual workspace.
- Development of better communication strategies within the faculty, particularly between the graduate students and the deans, but also between the various programs.

<b>Recommendations required for Program sustainability:</b>	Responsibility	Resources	Timeline
Create clearer expression and definition of learning outcomes for each field	Faculty, chairs and deans	Time	June 2016
Clarification of the purpose and timelines for the DRP in the PhD program	Dean and chairs	Time	December 2015
Discipline-specific professional development	Faculty	Time, teaching resources	June 2016
Development of clearer channels of communication	Dean, Associate Dean - Graduate	Space, time	June 2016