School of Music and Dance

This report includes, in this order:

Response Rate. A list of all programs represented in the report and their survey response rates.

Program Satisfaction. A table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who rated 17 different aspects of their program (e.g., quality of the faculty; financial support for graduate students) as "excellent"; a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who rated these aspects as "excellent" or "very good;" a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who rated these aspects as "fair" or "poor."

Advisor Traits. A table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who "strongly agreed" with each of 13 descriptive statements typically associated with academic advisors (e.g., encourages me in my scholarly pursuits; treats my ideas with respect); a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each program who "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with each of the 13 descriptive statements.

Departmental Climate. A table that shows the percentage of respondents in each academic program who "strongly agreed" that their program is like each of 10 descriptive statements (e.g., collegial; encouraging; supportive); a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each program who "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that their program is like the description; a table that shows the percentage of respondents in each program who "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" that their program is like the description.

Historical Comparisons by Program. For each program represented in the school/college or divisional report, shown in alphabetical order, we present a series of eight tables-- three for program satisfaction, two for advisor traits, and three for departmental climate-- that compares the responses from the 2015 survey to those from the 2009 and 2012 surveys.

A Note about Results with Small Respondent Numbers:

In order to preserve confidentiality, programs in which there were 8 or fewer respondents have been grouped with another similar unit, when possible, or suppressed in the program reports that follow. In this report: Dance is suppressed for low numbers.

GRADUATE EXPERIENCE SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY DEPARTMENT

Music & Dance	Number of	Number of	Response
	Respondents	Students Surveyed	Rate
Total for all Graduate Programs	1302	2622	49.7
Music & Dance	50	125	40.0
Dance	7	8	87.5
Music	43	117	36.8

Program Satisfaction Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Excellent."

Program Sausiaction	Percentage of re
	Music
	(N = 36)
Quality of the faculty	38.9%
Overall Program quality	27.8%
Financial support for graduate students	22.2%
Program's performance in keeping pace with	35.00/
recent developments in my field	25.0%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	25.0%
Intellectual community in Program	38.9%
Training/ assistance about career and professional	16.7%
development	
Space, facilities and equipment	27.8%
Process for involving students in Program	8.6%
decisions that affect graduate students	
Research opportunities in my program	13.9%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess	17.6%
graduate students	27.1070
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive	28.6%
community	20.070
Training/assistance about grants and other	2.8%
external funding	
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	22.2%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess	11.1%
graduate students	
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	13.9%
Training about professional ethics/academic	20.6%
integrity	
33.3% of students or more rated the program as	2
"Excellent".*	
50% of students or more rated the program as "Excellent".**	0

^{*}light green shading indicates that 33.3% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent."

^{**}dark green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent."

Program Satisfaction

Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Excellent" or "Very Good."

	Music
	(N = 36)
Quality of the faculty	80.6%
Overall Program quality	72.2%
Financial support for graduate students	41.7%
Program's performance in keeping pace with	69.4%
recent developments in my field	09.470
Quality of academic guidance and advising	47.2%
Intellectual community in Program	72.2%
Training/ assistance about career and	47.2%
professional development	47.270
Space, facilities and equipment	52.8%
Process for involving students in Program	31.4%
decisions that affect graduate students	31.470
Research opportunities in my program	50.0%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess	50.0%
graduate students	30.0%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive	45.7%
community	45.770
Training/assistance about grants and other	11.1%
external funding	11.170
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	63.9%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess	38.9%
graduate students	38.970
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	38.9%
Training about professional ethics/academic	47.1%
integrity	47.170
50% of students or more rated the program as	8
"Excellent" or "Very Good".*	0
75% of students or more rated the program as	1
"Excellent" or "Very Good".**	1
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

^{*}light green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent" or "Very Good."

^{**}dark green shading indicates that 75% or more of respondents rated their program as "Excellent" or "Very Good."

Music & Dance

Program Satisfaction

Percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as "Fair" or "Poor."

6	
	Music
	(N = 36)
Quality of the faculty	11.1%
Overall Program quality	8.3%
Financial support for graduate students	47.2%
Program's performance in keeping pace with	42.00/
recent developments in my field	13.9%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	22.2%
Intellectual community in Program	13.9%
Training/ assistance about career and	19.4%
professional development	19.4%
Space, facilities and equipment	22.2%
Process for involving students in Program	25.7%
decisions that affect graduate students	23.770
Research opportunities in my program	16.7%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess	20.6%
graduate students	20.070
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive	28.6%
community	20.070
Training/assistance about grants and other	63.9%
external funding	03.370
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	25.0%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess	33.3%
graduate students	33.370
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	27.8%
Training about professional ethics/academic	29.4%
integrity	231170
20% of students or more rated the program as "Fair" or "Poor".*	11

^{*}shading indicates that 20% or more of respondents rated their program as "Fair" or "Poor."

Advisor Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	rercentage of re
	Music
	(N = 36)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	65.7%
Treats my ideas with respect	68.6%
Provides constructive feedback on my work	71.4%
Provides timely feedback on my work	60.0%
Is available when I need help or advice	65.7%
Would support me in any career path I choose	74.3%
(academic or a career outside the academy)	74.5%
Treats students in the department equitably	74.3%
regardless of their backgrounds	74.5%
Has emphasized the importance of professional	54.3%
ethics in our field	34.370
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my graduate studies, research or creative work	28.6%
Helps me develop professional relationships with others in the field	45.7%
Advises me about how to get my work published, performed or shown	48.6%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences or disagreements	51.4%
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am facing in graduate school	60.0%
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.*	10
75% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.**	0

^{*}light green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.

^{**}dark green shading indicates that 75% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" with the above dimensions about their advisor.

Advisor Percentage of respondents who "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with each of the following statements about their advisor.

	·
	Music
	(N = 36)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	14.3%
Treats my ideas with respect	14.3%
Provides constructive feedback on my work	17.1%
Provides timely feedback on my work	14.3%
Is available when I need help or advice	11.4%
Would support me in any career path I choose	20.0%
(academic or a career outside the academy)	20.0%
Treats students in the department equitably	14.3%
regardless of their backgrounds	14.5%
Has emphasized the importance of professional	17.1%
ethics in our field	17.170
Helps me secure external or internal funding for	20.09/
my graduate studies, research or creative work	20.0%
Helps me develop professional relationships with	17.1%
others in the field	17.170
Advises me about how to get my work published,	14.3%
performed or shown	14.570
Encourages the expression of intellectual	17.1%
differences or disagreements	17.170
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I	20.0%
am facing in graduate school	20.070
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly	
Disagreed" with the statements above about their	3
advisor.*	
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or	
"Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above	0
about their advisor.**	

^{*}shading indicates that 20% or more of respondents "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" with the statements above about their advisor.

Climate Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" that their program is like the description.

Cilillate	reiteillage of re
	Music (N = 36)
Collegial	30.6%
Encouraging	36.1%
Supportive	47.2%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	36.1%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	27.8%
Inclusive of students of color	48.6%
Inclusive by gender	55.6%
Inclusive of international students	55.6%
Inclusive of students with disabilities	42.9%
Inclusive of first generation students	38.9%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	55.6%
33.3% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program*	9
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" that the description fit their program**	3

^{*}light green shading indicates that 33.3% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" that their program was very much like the description.

^{**}dark green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" that their program was very much like the description.

Climate Percentage of respondents who "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that their program is like the description.

Cilifate	rercentage of re
	Music (N = 36)
Collegial	80.6%
Encouraging	77.8%
Supportive	80.6%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches	80.6%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	61.1%
Inclusive of students of color	71.4%
Inclusive by gender	86.1%
Inclusive of international students	86.1%
Inclusive of students with disabilities	68.6%
Inclusive of first generation students	77.8%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	91.7%
50% of students or more "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.*	11
75% of students or more "Strong Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.**	8

^{*}light green shading indicates that 50% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.

^{**}dark green shading indicates that 75% or more of respondents "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" that the description fit their program.

Climate Percentage of respondents who "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that their program is like the description.

Cilinate	Percentage of re
	Music
	(N = 36)
Collegial	5.6%
Encouraging	11.1%
Supportive	11.1%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical,	11.1%
methodological or creative approaches	11.170
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	5.6%
Inclusive of students of color	8.6%
Inclusive by gender	2.8%
Inclusive of international students	5.6%
Inclusive of students with disabilities	8.6%
Inclusive of first generation students	8.3%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	0.0%
20% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0
33.3% of students or more "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.*	0

^{*}shading indicates that 20% or more of respondents "Disagreed" or "Strongly Disagreed" that the description fit their program.

Program Satisfaction: percentage of respondents who rated the following features of their program as...

	PIO	granı satisjat	tion: percent
	Excellent		
	2009	2012	2015
	(N = 54)	(N = 50)	(N = 36)
Quality of the faculty	55.6%	50.0%	38.9%
Overall Program quality	35.2%	26.0%	27.8%
Financial support for graduate students	25.9%	16.0%	22.2%
Program's performance in keeping pace with recent developments in my field*	40.7%	26.0%	25.0%
Quality of academic guidance and advising	20.4%	26.0%	25.0%
Intellectual community in Program	37.0%	38.0%	38.9%
Training/ assistance about career and professional development	N/A	16.0%	16.7%
Space, facilities and equipment	22.2%	20.0%	27.8%
Process for involving students in Program decisions that affect graduate students*	14.8%	18.0%	8.6%
Research opportunities in my program*	33.3%	22.4%	13.9%
Fairness of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	24.1%	18.8%	17.6%
Program's efforts to promote a diverse, inclusive community*	18.5%	14.0%	28.6%
Training/assistance about grants and other external funding	N/A	4.0%	2.8%
Adequacy of preparation for teaching	31.5%	34.0%	22.2%
Clarity of the evaluation criteria used to assess graduate students	22.2%	20.4%	11.1%
Support for interdisciplinary inquiry	27.8%	20.0%	13.9%
Training about professional ethics/academic integrity*	26.4%	16.3%	20.6%
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	2 foaturo(s) ra	tod as 'Evcollo	nt' by at least

2 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 33.3% of students in 2015, compared to 5 in 2009 and 3 in 2012.

0 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 1 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.

Excellent or Very Good		
2009	2012	2015
(N = 54)	(N = 50)	(N = 36)
88.9%	82.0%	80.6%
75.9%	68.0%	72.2%
50.0%	44.0%	41.7%
75.9%	66.0%	69.4%
46.3%	54.0%	47.2%
72.2%	60.0%	72.2%
N/A	36.0%	47.2%
61.1%	68.0%	52.8%
42.6%	40.0%	31.4%
63.0%	51.0%	50.0%
66.7%	60.4%	50.0%
50.0%	52.0%	45.7%
N/A	18.0%	11.1%
68.5%	72.0%	63.9%
61.1%	57.1%	38.9%
53.7%	48.0%	38.9%
60.4%	49.0%	47.1%

8 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 50% of students in 2015, compared to 13 in 2009 and 11 in 2012.

1 feature(s) rated as 'Excellent' or 'Very Good' by at least 75% of students in 2015, compared to 3 in 2009 and 1 in 2012.

eutures of their program us			
Fair or Poor			
2009	2012	2015	
(N = 54)	(N = 50)	(N = 36)	
1.9%	4.0%	11.1%	
9.3%	12.0%	8.3%	
37.0%	34.0%	47.2%	
9.3%	20.0%	13.9%	
14.8%	32.0%	22.2%	
9.3%	18.0%	13.9%	
N/A	36.0%	19.4%	
13.0%	6.0%	22.2%	
31.5%	36.0%	25.7%	
5.6%	24.5%	16.7%	
3.7%	14.6%	20.6%	
9.3%	16.0%	28.6%	
N/A	54.0%	63.9%	
9.3%	14.0%	25.0%	
5.6%	22.4%	33.3%	
20.4%	42.0%	27.8%	
7.5%	12.2%	29.4%	
11 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Boor' by at			

11 feature(s) rated as 'Fair' or 'Poor' by at least 20% of students in 2015, compared to 3 in 2009 and 9 in 2012.

Advisor: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed with each of the following statements about their advisor.

,	Strongly Agreed		
	2009	2012	2015
	(N = 53)	(N = 49)	(N = 35)
Encourages me in my scholarly pursuits	64.2%	59.2%	65.7%
Treats my ideas with respect	64.2%	61.2%	68.6%
Provides constructive feedback on my work*	61.5%	58.3%	71.4%
Provides timely feedback on my work	49.1%	49.0%	60.0%
Is available when I need help or advice	49.1%	51.0%	65.7%
Would support me in any career path I choose	N/A	59.2%	74.3%
(academic or a career outside the academy)	14/71	33.270	74.370
Treats students in the department equitably	49.1%	69.4%	74.3%
regardless of their backgrounds*			
Has emphasized the importance of professional ethics in our field*	56.6%	51.0%	54.3%
Helps me secure external or internal funding for my	37.7%	44.9%	28.6%
graduate studies, research or creative work* Helps me develop professional relationships with			
others in the field	49.1%	36.7%	45.7%
Advises me about how to get my work published,	F2 00/	26.70/	40.60/
performed or shown	52.8%	36.7%	48.6%
Encourages the expression of intellectual differences	54.7%	44.9%	51.4%
or disagreements*	34.770	77.570	31.7/0
Makes me feel comfortable talking about issues I am	52.8%	51.0%	60.0%
facing in graduate school		0.2.077	
* 2012 survey included minor edits to question text	IAt least 50% o	of respondents	'Strongly

^{* 2012} survey included minor edits to question text

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 10 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 7 statement(s) in 2009 and 8 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 0 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 0 statement(s) in 2012

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed			
2009	2012	2015	
(N = 53)	(N = 49)	(N = 35)	
1.9%	8.2%	14.3%	
1.9%	8.2%	14.3%	
1.9%	10.4%	17.1%	
7.5%	12.2%	14.3%	
9.4%	12.2%	11.4%	
N/A	8.2%	20.0%	
0.0%	4.1%	14.3%	
1.9%	4.1%	17.1%	
20.8%	20.4%	20.0%	
13.2%	14.3%	17.1%	
11.3%	18.4%	14.3%	
3.8%	10.2%	17.1%	
9.4%	18.4%	20.0%	

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 3 statement(s) about their advisors in 2015, compared to 1 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.

Climate: percentage of respondents who Agreed/Disagreed that their program is like the description

	Strongly Agreed		
	2009	2012	2015
	(N = 54)	(N = 50)	(N = 36)
Collegial	N/A	42.0%	30.6%
Encouraging	44.4%	46.0%	36.1%
Supportive	50.0%	49.0%	47.2%
Intellectually open to multiple theoretical, methodological or creative approaches*	44.4%	42.0%	36.1%
Open to interdisciplinary inquiry	42.6%	38.0%	27.8%
Inclusive of students of color*	46.3%	58.0%	48.6%
Inclusive by gender*	51.9%	62.0%	55.6%
Inclusive of international students	N/A	66.0%	55.6%
Inclusive of students with disabilities*	50.0%	46.0%	42.9%
Inclusive of first generation students	N/A	56.0%	38.9%
Inclusive of students of all sexual orientations	55.6%	70.0%	55.6%

^{* 2012} survey included minor edits to question text

At least 33.3% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 9 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' with 3 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 4 statement(s) in 2009 and 5 statement(s) in 2012.

Strongly Agreed or Agreed			
2009	2012	2015	
(N = 54)	(N = 50)	(N = 36)	
N/A	84.0%	80.6%	
75.9%	80.0%	77.8%	
79.6%	79.6%	80.6%	
75.9%	68.0%	80.6%	
72.2%	58.0%	61.1%	
70.4%	86.0%	71.4%	
77.8%	88.0%	86.1%	
N/A	88.0%	86.1%	
88.9%	80.0%	68.6%	
N/A	84.0%	77.8%	
88.9%	96.0%	91.7%	

At least 50% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 11 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 8 statement(s) in 2009 and 11 statement(s) in 2012.

At least 75% of respondents 'Strongly Agreed' or 'Agreed' with 8 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 6 statement(s) in 2009 and 9 statement(s) in 2012.

Disagreed or Strongly Disagreed			
2009	2012	2015	
(N = 54)	(N = 50)	(N = 36)	
N/A	2.0%	5.6%	
1.9%	8.0%	11.1%	
5.6%	10.2%	11.1%	
7.4%	14.0%	11.1%	
7.4%	22.0%	5.6%	
3.7%	2.0%	8.6%	
3.7%	0.0%	2.8%	
N/A	0.0%	5.6%	
0.0%	4.0%	8.6%	
N/A	4.0%	8.3%	
0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	

At least 20% of respondents 'Disagreed' or 'Strongly Disagreed' with 0 statement(s) about the climate of their program in 2015, compared to 0 statement(s) in 2009 and 1 statement(s) in 2012.