Dear Professor Goeke and Dean Weller-Stilson:

The NASM Commission on Accreditation, at its June 2012 meetings, voted to continue Southeast Missouri State University in good standing. The enclosed Commission Action Report provides the official description of this action and, if applicable, any requests for additional information. A copy of the Commission Action Report is being sent to the individuals listed below, along with a notice of NASM policies regarding strict confidentiality.

This action is taken upon review of Southeast Missouri State University according to accreditation standards in effect in June of 2012. As a member of NASM, the institution is responsible for participating in all revisions and additions to the standards as well as maintaining its curricular programs in music current with NASM standards as these are developed.

Please accept our congratulations on behalf of the Association.

With best regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

Samuel Hope
Executive Director
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Enclosure

cc: Kenneth W. Dobbins, President
    Southeast Missouri State University
✓ Ronald Rosati, Provost
    Southeast Missouri State University
Francisco Barrios, Dean, College of Liberal Arts
    Southeast Missouri State University
National Association of Schools of Music  
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 21  
Reston, Virginia 20190-5248

COMMISSION ACTION REPORT

This document provides the official action of the Commission as indicated in the cover letter of the same date.

July 3, 2012

SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY  
Department of Music

Action:

The Commission voted to accept the response and continue the institution in good standing with the degree and program listing indicated below.

The Commission requests a progress report addressing the issues cited below.

NASM Degree and Program Listing:

- Bachelor of Arts in Music (Instrumental, Vocal).
- Bachelor of Music Education (Instrumental, Vocal).
- Bachelor of Music in Composition.
- Bachelor of Music in Performance (Instrumental, Keyboard, Vocal).
- Music Academy.

Next Full Review:

2020-2021 Academic Year

Items for Progress Report:

1. To complete the record associated with the present accreditation review, the Commission requests completion of the enclosed questionnaire regarding the institution's current credit and time formulas and policies (see NASM Handbook 2011-12, items III.A.2., 3., 4., and 6.). Information must be current at the time of the progress report irrespective of any previous information that may have been provided in the Self-Study. Please note: this questionnaire is only being sent to the primary representative from each member institution. Only one questionnaire should be returned from each school.

2. The Commission requests information documenting how the music unit is in compliance with Health and Safety Standard II.F.1.i. The text of the standard itself should be the basis for providing this
information. Please note that the standard addresses two issues. First, how students are being provided with basic information regarding hearing, vocal, and musculoskeletal health and injury prevention, and the use, proper handling, and operation of potentially dangerous materials, equipment. Second, how the music unit addresses injury prevention in various aspects of its program. This Commission request is in reference to a standard approved by vote of the NASM Membership in November 2011 and now in effect. In responding to the Commission's request it is not necessary to include information addressing the explanatory note following the text of II.F.1.i. that provides important policy statements and clarifications primarily regarding the relationship of the standard to individual responsibility (see NASM Handbook 2011-12, item II.F.1.i).

3. The Commission requests information concerning the institution’s progress in assessing results of recent changes to class piano instruction (see Response received April 30, 2012, to Commission Action Report of July 6, 2011, page 1).

4. The Commission requests information concerning the continuing efforts to obtain or construct a suitable facility for choral rehearsals (see Response received April 30, 2012, to Commission Action Report of July 6, 2011, page 4; NASM Handbook 2011-12, item II.F.1.a.).

5. The Commission requests clarification of the continuing efforts to secure staffing and funding for the Arts Resource Center (Library) (see NASM Handbook 2011-12, items II.G.4.a. and 7.a.).

Due Date for Progress Report:

October 1 for consideration at the Commission meetings of November 2012.

The Procedures for Submitting Responses and Progress Reports may be downloaded from the NASM Website at http://nasm.arts-accredit.org (see “Publications,” “Accreditation Procedures and Documents,” and beneath that “Other Procedures Related to the Accreditation Process”).

Notes:

1. In November 2011, NASM members voted to amend long-standing NASM Handbook statements regarding credit and time requirements. These changes retained previous content and concepts while adjusting and adding language to be consistent with current accreditation practice. The amended NASM statements are also consistent with recently enacted USDE regulatory requirements for institutions participating in Title IV grant and loan programs. Failure to meet these federal requirements can result in loss of institutional eligibility for Title IV funding. As has been historically the case, institutional and specialized accrediting organizations are the entities responsible for reviewing credit hour policies and their applications in institutions and programs.
2. The Commission wishes to remind the institution that the membership of NASM will be considering revisions to the NASM Handbook 2011-12 in November of 2012. The first draft of the proposed changes will be posted at http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/index.jsp?page=Standards-Handbook during the month of July. It is recommended that the institution review with care and respond on the basis of any revisions to the Handbook passed in November of 2012, as it prepares its reply to this Commission Action Report.

Commendation:

The Commission commends the institution for a clear and coherent response.

Samuel Hope
Executive Director
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NASM Handbook

RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

ARTICLE XIII

DISCLOSURE AND CONFIDENTIALITY

Section 1. NASM provides numerous services that include the publication of policy statements, reports, and surveys. These are available to the public for a fee. Upon request, NASM will provide the academic and professional qualifications of the members of its policy and decision-making bodies and its administrative personnel.

Section 2. Upon request, NASM will make publicly available all information about an institution that is published in the NASM Directory (see Article X., Section 3.). NASM will also indicate whether or not an institution holds or has held accredited Membership.

Section 3. NASM will not make publicly available any information supplied by the institution or by representatives of NASM in the course of the accreditation process. This includes Self-Studies, Visitors’ Reports, and correspondence. While NASM encourages institutions to make publicly available information about their accredited status and to share accreditation materials with individuals and agencies having legitimate claim to information beyond that available to the general public, the Association regards all accreditation materials as the property of the institution. Therefore, release of these materials is either through the institution or by its permission.

Section 4. If an institution releases information that misrepresents or distorts any action by NASM with respect to any aspect of the accreditation process, or the status of affiliation with NASM, the chief executive officer of the institution and the program director, where applicable, will be notified by the NASM Executive Director and informed that corrective action must be taken. If the misrepresentation or distortion is not promptly corrected, NASM, at its discretion, may release a public statement in such a form and content as it deems necessary to provide the correct information.

Section 5. Certain relationships yield information which legally cannot be disclosed without the consent of the person who provides it—for example, the relationship between physician and patient, between attorney and client, between clergy and penitent, etc. Should such information, or other information that is protected under law by a comparable privilege or safeguard, come into the hands of NASM or an NASM evaluation team, its disclosure to persons other than the immediate recipients is forbidden.