

E-Publishing in the Undergraduate Music History Classroom: The University of Guelph Book Review Project

KIMBERLY FRANCIS AND TRAVIS STIMELING

Contributing to and editing a pedagogically oriented e-journal can offer numerous benefits for undergraduates. E-journals offer valuable para- and protoprofessional experiences for undergraduate music history students, allowing them to develop important professional skills in an artificial and controlled environment.¹ In musicology, published e-journals have already been deployed in many graduate programs, but they have been underused in the undergraduate classroom, despite the availability of low-cost technologies.² Yet when used in conjunction with more traditional methods (such as lectures, labs, and term papers), such projects offer numerous benefits for student learning at both the graduate and undergraduate level. Over the past three years, *Critical Voices: The University of Guelph Book Review Project*, a project that combines open-access journal technology with the dynamics of peer-review publication, has successfully engaged students at four universities in Canada and the United States in critical thinking, writing, and editing.

A previous version of this paper was presented at the Canadian University Music Society/Société de musique des universités canadiennes, Wilfrid Laurier University, June 2012.

1. Karen A. Gresty and Andrew Edwards-Jones, "Experiencing Research-Informed Teaching from the Student Perspective: Insights from Developing an Undergraduate E-Journal," *British Journal of Educational Technology* 43, no. 1 (2012): 153–62.

2. Several musicology and music theory graduate programs and courses host online journals. See, for example, the University of California at Los Angeles's *ECHO: A Music-Centered Journal* (<http://www.echo.ucla.edu/content/>), the University of Buffalo—SUNY's *Mosaic: Journal of Music Research* (<http://mosaicjournal.org/index.php/mosaic>), and Brown University's *Technomusicology: A Sandbox Journal* (<http://library.brown.edu/OJS/index.php/MusicGrads>).

Journal of Music History Pedagogy, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–22. ISSN 2155-1099X (online)

© 2013, *Journal of Music History Pedagogy*, licensed under CC BY 3.0

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>)

2 *Journal of Music History Pedagogy*

Using the *Critical Voices* project as an example, this essay explores the pedagogical value of requiring undergraduate students in music history courses—broadly defined—to write and edit for a public audience. The essay begins by presenting literature from external disciplines where similar projects have reaped numerous benefits. We then present the *Critical Voices* project itself and consider the myriad ways it has been modified in the little time it has been operating. Finally, we suggest how this project could continue to expand its reach, inviting additional institutions to partner with the University of Guelph in this review essay endeavor. Overall, we argue for the incorporation of paraprofessional activities into the music classroom, projects which stand to improve the pedagogical efforts of many interested in inspiring students to engage actively in writing assignments and variety of music-academic fields in general.

The E-journal as Pedagogical Tool

Although research on music history pedagogy is still in its infancy, it is clear instructors in the undergraduate music history classroom frequently struggle to balance the diverse and sometimes competing pedagogical imperatives of their courses. J. Peter Burkholder, for example, recently observed that, “in a music history class, we are teaching not just a pile of information, but how to think like music historians. Yet we rarely make explicit that goal, or how to master the particular ways of thinking and disciplinary skills that underlie an understanding of music history.”³ Drawing upon the “Decoding the Disciplines” methods developed by David Pace and Joan Middendorf, Burkholder discusses a seven-step process through which the instructor identifies the “bottleneck or obstacle to learning” in their course, provides step-by-step instructions to help students develop discipline-specific methodologies, offers ongoing feedback and assessment of student learning, and shares pedagogical insights with the broader teaching community.⁴ Jennifer L. Hund, too, has pointed to the efficacy of the “Decoding the Disciplines” model for non-major music appreciation courses as well as upper-division courses for music majors, noting of the latter that “instructors cannot assume that students

3. J. Peter Burkholder, “Decoding the Discipline of Music History for Our Students,” *Journal of Music History Pedagogy* 1, no. 2 (Spring 2011): 94, <http://www.ams-net.org/ojs/index.php/jmhp/article/view/22/46>.

4. Burkholder, “Decoding the Discipline,” 96–109. Burkholder draws upon Joan Middendorf and David Pace, “Decoding the Disciplines: A Model for Helping Students Learn Disciplinary Ways of Thinking,” in David Pace and Joan Middendorf, eds., *Decoding the Disciplines: Helping Students Learn Disciplinary Ways of Thinking*, New Directions for Teaching and Learning 98 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004), 4–11, and David Pace, “Decoding the Reading of History: An Example of the Process,” in Pace and Middendorf, eds., *Decoding the Disciplines*, 13–20.

with . . . extensive practice in basic musical skills over several semesters will automatically have a more sophisticated level of factual knowledge, analytical skill, and critical thinking and listening than the general student.”⁵ In addition to guiding students through a rigorous training in basic musicological methodologies and providing extensive feedback and encouragement, therefore, Hund argues for the development of a focused, systematic peer review mechanism that challenges students not only to offer their colleagues helpful suggestions for revision but to engage them in the process of evaluation itself.⁶

Extending the models for student engagement and discipline-specific pedagogical methods outlined by Burkholder and Hund, *Critical Voices: The University of Guelph Book Review Project* raises the stakes for undergraduate music courses by creating a venue for the public display of student learning through an e-journal platform. Unlike many of the leading student-produced e-journals in musicology and music theory, *Critical Voices* is unique in its dual focus on undergraduate writing and critical engagement with contemporary scholarship in the field. Although numerous studies demonstrate journal clubs and guided reading assignments can be useful in helping students to develop critical reading and writing skills,⁷ research suggests paraprofessional and protoprofessional writing projects frequently yield a higher level of student engagement than is normally generated through the use of more traditional delivery models alone and tend to encourage students to develop their own research interests.⁸ Para- and protoprofessional research and writing

5. Jennifer L. Hund, “Writing about Music in Large Music Appreciation Classrooms Using Active Learning, Discipline-Specific Skills, and Peer Review,” *Journal of Music History Pedagogy* 2, no. 2 (Spring 2012): 125, <http://www.ams-net.org/ojs/index.php/jmhp/article/view/41/88>.

6. Hund, “Writing in Large Classrooms,” 123–26.

7. William H. Peck, “Teaching Metastability in Petrology Using a Guided Reading from the Primary Literature,” *Journal of Geoscience Education* 52, no. 3 (May 2004): 284–88; J. D. Wallace, “Accelerated Peer-Review Journal Usage for Undergraduates,” *Communication Teacher* 22, no. 3 (July 2008): 80–83; Alex J. Bowers and Elizabeth Murakami-Ramalho, “The Research Journal Club: Pedagogy of Research in the Preparation of Students in Educational Leadership,” *Journal of Research on Leadership Education* 5, no. 10 (August 2010): 335–56; Ana A. Kitazono, “A Journal-Club-Based Class That Promotes Active and Cooperative Learning of Biology,” *Journal of College Science Teaching* 40, no. 1 (September-October 2010): 20–27; Adrienne R. Minerick, “Journal Club: A Forum to Encourage Graduate and Undergraduate Research Students to Critically Review the Literature,” *Chemical Engineering Education* 45, no. 1 (Winter 2011): 73–82; and Susan B. Fowler, Kim A. Druist, and Lisa Dillon-Zwerdling, “Journal Club: An Opportunity to Advance the Art and Science of Home Health Practice,” *Home Healthcare Nurse* 29, no. 10 (November-December 2011): 595–98.

8. Ningfeng Zhao and Jeffrey G. Wardeska, “Mini-Journal Inquiry Laboratory: A Case Study in a General Chemistry Kinetics Experiment,” *Journal of Chemical Education* 88, no. 4 (April 2011): 455; Daniel Antonius, Adam D. Brown, McWelling Todman, and Jeremy D. Safran, “Integrating Science in Applied Psychology Programs: A Student-Operated Journal,”

projects also offer venues in which faculty can more effectively model professional methods, behaviors, and attitudes and teach professional writing skills.⁹ A further consequence of the collaborative efforts required of students and faculty in the successful implementation and completion of paraprofessional and protoprofessional research and writing is the formation of strong mentor relationships between faculty and students.¹⁰ Finally, because, as Peter Williams, *et al.* have noted, “e-journals are now a fundamental part of a researcher’s tools,”¹¹ e-journals and similar public performances of scholarship create low-cost venues for the publication of “emerging scholars” work.¹²

Using the *Critical Voices* project as an example, this essay explores the pedagogical value of requiring undergraduate students in music history courses to write for a public audience, a more common occurrence in the social and natural sciences than in the humanities. Furthermore, by describing the process by which the project was established and the guidelines that participating institutions follow throughout the semester-long publication cycle, we outline the potential challenges instructors might face when attempting to integrate such projects into their own courses. Finally, through a discussion of the ways in which external institutions have engaged with the *Critical Voices* project, we suggest that collaborative, student-driven projects such as this offer valuable, low-cost opportunities for music students to engage in international collaboration, an increasing need in an era of decreasing resources. We would like to consider the innovative potential this project holds for the musicological discipline as a whole. Indeed, in drawing our observations and methodologies into dialogue, we argue our work presents a cost-effective means of introducing currently uncommon para- and

Teaching of Psychology 34, no. 1 (2007): 33; and Gresty and Edwards-Jones, “Experiencing Research-Informed Teaching from the Student Perspective.”

9. Nick Hopwood, “Doctoral Students as Journal Editors: Non-Formal Learning through Academic Work,” *Higher Education Research & Development* 29, no. 3 (June 2010): 319–31; Zhao and Wardeska, “Mini-Journal Inquiry Laboratory,” 452–53; Jacoby Boles and Julianne Newmark, “Xchanges Journal: Web Journal as the Writing Classroom: On Building an Academic Web Journal in a Collaborative Classroom,” *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy* 16, no. 1 (Fall 2011), <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/16.1/praxis/boles/> (accessed 21 February 2012); and Aleksandra Mišak, Matko Marušić, and Ana Marušić, “Manuscript Editing as a Way of Teaching Academic Writing: Experience from a Small Scientific Journal,” *Journal of Second Language Writing* 14 (2005): 122–31.

10. Joseph R. Ferrari and Vanessa B. Hemovich, “Student-Based Psychology Journals: Perceptions by Graduate Program Directors,” *Teaching of Psychology* 31, no. 4 (2004): 274 and Antonius, *et al.*, “Integrating Science in Applied Psychology Programs,” 33.

11. Peter Williams, David Nicholas, and Ian Rowlands, “E-journal Usage and Impact in Scholarly Research: A Review of the Literature,” *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 16 (2010): 205.

12. Boles and Newmark, “Xchanges Journal,” para. 3. See also: Ferrari and Hemovich, “Student-Based Psychology Journals,” 272.

prototypical training into the humanities classroom, the results of which would also have an impact on musicological research in general.

Critical Voices: Conception, Design, Implementation

The final core music history course at the University of Guelph is a semester-long examination of the history of twentieth- and twenty-first-century music. To meet the University of Guelph's Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations (UDLES)—overarching goals curriculum in any program strives to reach—the learning outcomes for the course were designed so that students would also exit with an understanding of musicology as a discipline; the context in which scholarly literature is produced; and the ability to synthesize a variety of research resources and analytical strategies to produce a robust writing sample. Concurrent with this goal was a desire to inspire students to write assertively and to evaluate their peers constructively. *Critical Voices: The University of Guelph Book Review Project* both grew out of and helped refine these interests.

Critical Voices is a collaborative peer-reviewed e-journal that features student-written reviews of recent books published on musicological topics. The pilot project version was launched in the Winter 2011 semester, working with the Open Journal System (OJS), a free, online template developed as part of the Public Knowledge Project (and of which the *Journal of Music History Pedagogy* is also a member).¹³ *Critical Voices* built upon and continues to receive technical support for the journal system from the University of Guelph.¹⁴ Students were asked to select a text from a list provided them of books published in the last five years in the fields of musicology, ethnomusicology, and music analysis whose central focus was modern or postmodern music. Students then participated in several rounds of review as both authors and reviewers, using the online interface just as they would if they were to submit an article as a professional.

Given the infinitely expandable and cost-effective nature of the project, collaborations with other institutions were possible. The first to adopt the technology was Millikin University, which pursued its own peer-review project in house (see below). The following semester, the peer review process was expanded intra-institutionally with Friedemann Sallis and students at the University of Calgary (see below). To date, the journal has welcomed four institutions as collaborative partners: Millikin, Calgary, the University of

13. For more on the Open Journal System and the Public Knowledge Project, see: <http://pkp.sfu.ca/?q=ojs>.

14. Peggy Pritchard and Wayne Johnston at the University of Guelph offered invaluable technological and pedagogical mentorship throughout the development and implementation of the *Critical Voices* project.

Ottawa, and Mount Allison University (New Brunswick, Canada). Since the first publication in Winter 2011, a total of four editions of the journal have appeared with another expected Fall 2013 and at least two more under preparation for the Winter 2013 semester. New partners are always welcome, as are new courses and repertoires of reviewed literature.

The Project

The University of Guelph Book Review Project consists of four-rounds of peer-reviewed writing assignments. In its current iteration, it consists of 50% of the entire course grade, with the other 50% allotted for group seminar presentations and exams (see Appendix A).

To begin the process, students are presented with a list of recently-published monographs—to have them avoid overt dependence on already-published reviews written by established scholars—from which to select a text that then becomes their responsibility to review. In the first round, in the interest of easing students' exposure to the online interface and facilitating thoughtful engagement with their text, students are asked to submit an abstract of their book (see Appendix B) and compile an annotated bibliography of eight secondary sources they intend to use to contextualize their evaluation.

Participants are encouraged throughout to allow their own reactions to work in tandem with those of other scholars and for their list of secondary sources to evolve as do their questions concerning their book. Abstracts and annotated bibliographies are evaluated in a double-blind manner by an editor and at least two peers, who assess the professionalism of the writing style, the efficacy and clarity of the abstract, and the implementation of *Chicago Manual of Style* formatting (see Appendix C). At each stage, students receive a review rubric via which to evaluate the quality of prose, use of secondary sources, analytical treatment of the book in question, and formatting of secondary sources.

Students proceed from this first stage to drafting a review essay limited in length to 7–10 pages. They are carefully guided at this point through the typical format and function of a book review essay and the mechanics of the scholarly debate, within which book reviews perform an important role. Students are provided with a video that describes the various elements of a book review essay and with a thorough prompt with even more specific instructions about the usual format of a review (see Appendix D). At this stage, students are encouraged to incorporate quotes from their amassed secondary literature and to use properly formatted footnotes to cite additional sources. This draft and its subsequent two versions are evaluated just as the abstract and annotated bibliography were.

The supervising course professor typically acts as editor in each round, and in the event that two or more institutions participate simultaneously, editorial duties rotate amongst the different professors involved. An example of comments provided by the professor to a sample student review is provided in Appendix D. Grades assigned by peers play a role in the overall mark a student receives, though this is staggered to allow students to hone their reviewing skills alongside their writing skills. For the abstract/annotated bibliography stage, peer grades account for 20% of the overall mark and editorial marks for the remaining 80%. By the final of the three full drafts, peer evaluations are weighted at 45% of the overall grade. Students consistently report that the process of criticizing something in the work of others not only teaches them to take their own critical capacity seriously, but also makes them far less likely to repeat similar errors in their own work. Their evaluations of each other subsequently improve dramatically from beginning to end of semester. All peer review comments are uploaded and circulated by way of the online website, just as they would be in a professional environment (see **Example 1.**) Correspondence concerning the journal is mediated by student journal managers—positions filled by outstanding previous participants.

Example 1: Screen shot of author submission screen.

CRITICAL VOICES
The University of Guelph Book Review Project

UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH
CHANGING LIVES
IMPROVING LIFE

HOME ABOUT CONTACT USER HOME SEARCH CURRENT ARCHIVES

Home > User > Author > Submissions > **New Submission**

Step 1. Starting the Submission

1. START 2. ENTER METADATA 3. UPLOAD SUBMISSION 4. UPLOAD SUPPLEMENTARY FILES 5. CONFIRMATION

Encountering difficulties? Contact [Kimberly Francis](#) for assistance ((519) 824-4120).

Journal Section

Select the appropriate section for this submission (see Sections and Policies in [About the Journal](#)).

Section*

Submission Checklist

Indicate that this submission is ready to be considered by this journal by checking off the following (comments to the editor can be added below).

- The submission has not been previously published, nor is it before another journal for consideration (or an explanation has been provided in Comments to the Editor).
- The submission file is in Microsoft Word or RTF file format.
- Where available, URLs for the references have been provided.
- The text is double-spaced; uses a 12-point font; employs italics, rather than underlining (except with URL addresses); and all illustrations, figures, and tables are placed within the text at the appropriate points, rather than at the end.
- The text adheres to the stylistic and bibliographic requirements outlined in the [Author Guidelines](#), which is found in [About the Journal](#).
- If submitting to a peer-reviewed section of the journal, the instructions in [Ensuring a Blind Review](#) have been followed.

In general, the processing of peer review feedback requires the greatest oversight by the professor. It is easy to find time and anticipate the need to explain the structure of a book review and the appropriateness of tone, for example. But class time also needs to be set aside—the amount of which is entirely up to the instructor and often the class climate—for digesting peer feedback. Typically, fifteen minutes set aside after each round of comments

has been returned allows students to reflect on what constitutes effective feedback; what undercuts or devalues the act of peer review; and then how to appropriately *react* to what others have suggested you change about your writing. It is this portion of the project that often sees students begin to learn how to assert their own authorial voice and reconcile themselves to the realities that positive feedback is not always productive feedback, nor is it always easy to provide a “bad grade,” though it might be the fairest choice.

Throughout it all, students receive careful guidance about the scholarly peer-review process in general (what it means and who it involves), the concept of “reviewing” a book in particular, and the daunting task of giving critical feedback as an anonymous reviewer. All of this in addition to maintaining the most stringent care concerning prose and authorial voice. In essence, the goal is to motivate students to care about style, craft, and citations by framing it in a competitive and—albeit artificial—professional context. At the end of the semester, those essays deemed most outstanding are published and those students judged the best reviewers are invited to remain with the journal and serve as the subsequent year’s editorial board. **Example 2** presents the cover from the inaugural edition.

Trouble-shooting, Innovations, and Adaptations

Because it is an open-source e-journal, *Critical Voices* is a tremendously flexible platform that can be adapted for a variety of courses, but not without some logistical and pedagogical complications. It is essential to appropriately pace each of the elements involved in the production of *Critical Voices*, even when considering the many academic schedules that the partner institutions operate under. It is imperative that students have time to digest their original text, synthesize material learned through their secondary literature, and absorb critical feedback at each point in the semester. Depending on the class, students may need more or less time to orally digest their experiences through what—due to the online interface—is primarily a disembodied and silent process. Anxieties over evaluating established, published scholars, not to mention other, anonymous peers must be dealt with, a reality that also falls to the professor directing the project. Almost to a class, anecdotal evidence has suggested it tremendously efficacious to devote class time to verbal reflection about the *Critical Voices* process in general, particularly at the outset of the assignment and after the first draft has been returned to students.

Consider that, although many music history courses include peer review and paraprofessional writing as key components of the curriculum, seldom does that work move into a public forum such as an online journal, and students’ openness to such a process can differ depending on exposure and enthusiasm.

Example 2: Cover page for inaugural edition of *Critical Voices*, Winter 2011.

Rarer still are efforts to bring undergraduate students from different institutions together to collaborate in the production of musicological scholarship. Because the *Critical Voices* platform allows participants to transcend place, it invites the extension of the project beyond the confines of a single university or, in fact, a single nation. Various professorial and editorial solutions to this project have been found during the five semesters of the journal's existence, and we turn to these now as a means of offering those interested with additional strategies for incorporating this project into their own classroom.

Expansion, Part 1: Millikin, Fall 2011

Shortly after the launch of *Critical Voices*, upper-level music majors participating in Millikin University's "Music and the Environment" course

joined the student editorial staff at the University of Guelph to produce a special issue of the journal exploring recent scholarship in ecomusicology.¹⁵ The past decade has witnessed a significant growth in the number of monograph-length studies using ecomusicological methods, much of which has not yet received significant treatment in the book review sections of major musicological journals. Consequently, *Critical Voices* offered both a significant pedagogical opportunity and a rare chance for the students of Millikin University to contribute to the development of this new field of musicological study.

In addition to seizing an opportunity to contribute to the development of discourse in an emerging musicological subdiscipline, the *Critical Voices* project challenged students to write in new and often intimidating ways. Like undergraduate students in music departments and schools of music around the United States and Canada, Millikin's music majors are presented frequent opportunities to share their creative work with their peers, mentors, and the community through numerous concerts and recitals, but their academic work seldom sees a readership any larger than a handful of peers who review the work during in-class peer review workshops and the instructor. Moreover, because Millikin music majors often pursue graduate study in performance, composition, conducting, and music education, they anecdotally demonstrate confidence in those areas while expressing anxieties about their abilities to pursue advanced studies in musicology, ethnomusicology, and music theory. Consequently, the "Music and the Environment" course, with an enrollment of only nine upper-level music majors, offered an ideal opportunity for students to learn how to read monograph-length musicological studies, dissect and critique the arguments made therein, improve their professional writing skills, develop an understanding of and appreciation for rigorous peer review, and present their work to an international audience.

The instructor developed a reading list of fourteen recent monographs taking into account the students' limited background in musicology. Working independently of the University of Guelph's initial five-step process, the students in the "Music and the Environment" course selected one of these essays and undertook a six-step process comprising a project proposal, three paper drafts, and two peer review reports. Along the way, students received

15. For the *Critical Voices* issue, see: <https://journal.lib.uoguelph.ca/index.php/sofammj/issue/view/131>. For an introduction to ecomusicology, consult, among others: Aaron S. Allen, "Ecomusicology: Ecocriticism and Musicology," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 64, no. 2 (Summer 2011): 392; *idem*, "Ecomusicology," in *The New Grove Dictionary of American Music*, 2nd ed., ed. Charles Hiroshi Garrett (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming), reprinted at <http://www.ams-esg.org/ecomusicology> (accessed 27 November 2011); and Nancy Guy, "Flowing Down Taiwan's Tamsui River: Towards an Ecomusicology of the Environmental Imagination," *Ethnomusicology* 53, no. 2 (Spring/Summer 2009): 219.

instructor comments and a mark that contributed to their final grade for the course. At the conclusion of this process, the students read and ranked all of the final drafts, and the six highest-ranked reviews were selected for further revision and potential publication in *Critical Voices* (with the important caveat that the instructor could override the democratic vote in the event undue student favoritism crept into the process). At that point, the six students whose papers were selected for potential publication met one-on-one with the instructor to work through multiple subsequent drafts. When the essays reached a near-publishable state, they were submitted to the *Critical Voices* editorial board, which offered still more suggestions for revision; when their suggestions had been addressed, the editorial board approved them and sent them along to the student copyeditor at the University of Guelph, who produced page proofs that Millikin students approved for final publication. With the addition of a brief critical introduction, the journal issue went live in early January 2012, just a few weeks following the conclusion of the fall term. **Example 3** presents the cover page for the Ecomusicology edition, Fall 2012. Although some scheduling difficulties arose due to the dramatically different academic calendars of the two partner institutions, clear and frequent communication via email and Skype between the faculty coordinators at both institutions allowed for a generally smooth production process.

Expansion, Part 2: University of Calgary, Winter 2012

Whereas Millikin University students participated in the journal independent of the University of Guelph's pedagogical structure, the University of Calgary class, run by Friedemann Sallis, ran concurrent to and adopted the same grade scheme, deadlines, and format of the University of Guelph's 20th-Century Music class. Double-blind reviews occurred across classes; students did not know if they were evaluating someone from their university or not, and students received consistent feedback from their instructor as their editor. Time differences generated some difficulties, since Calgary and Guelph are located in different time zones. Among the questions raised in this collaboration were: "At what time to make assignments due?" and "How can we link the two classes and provide them with a real sense of collaboration?" The solution to the first problem lay in simply allowing the Calgary students two extra hours to complete assignments. The second problem was solved through sharing videoconferences at the beginning and end of the semester and the creation of some instructional videos, shared via the webshare program Dropbox and circulated throughout the semester to provide feedback and consistent reinforcement. At the end of the semester, those students whose reviews were selected for publication met in a small videoconference and read their winning essays to one another. The richest exchange of ideas

and the opportunity for instilling student pride in their writing was maximized through this intra-institutional competition.

Example 3: Cover page for special edition on ecomusicology, Fall 2012.



Moving Forward

This project has proven most successful—and most entertaining and educational for the students—when done intra-institutionally. In the coming years, *Critical Voices* hopes to welcome new collaborating institutions and to expand to include non-major students, as well. We also hope to broaden the scope of topics and periods covered by the journal. In the winter 2013 semester, the journal has engaged four institutions concurrently, seeing courses from the University of Guelph, Mount Allison University (New Brunswick), the

University of Ottawa, and Milikin University compete simultaneously. Sustaining this sort of inter-institutional traffic has required the solidification of the production infrastructure. Two undergraduate assistants receive mentoring throughout the winter semester and act as journal managers during the project. They handle the bulk of the logistical issues the project presents and receive course credit for their efforts. The curriculum itself, including prompts and review rubrics, has since been formalized and is provided to participating institutions in packet format before the semester opens.

Additional materials were developed in summer 2012 with the help of funding from the American Musicological Society's Teaching Fund Award. The result has been the development of instructional videos detailing how to navigate the online interface as an author, reviewer, and editor, as well as videos describing the academic peer-review process in general and the basic structure and function of a book review. One of the journal's first authors and recent University of Guelph graduate, Mark Onderwater, helped complete a manual for both editors and journal managers. Finally, the journal now has its own style guide, developed in large part by another of the project's alumni, David Riedstra. In a manner both amusing and accessible, this twelve-page text summarizes common writing peccadillos; provides a comparison of Canadian, British, and American English spellings; and presents pointers for crafting compelling writing. The journal has also recently rolled out a new web design.

The creation of these materials means the journal is now easily transferable to other host institutions. During the semester the journal is not being used by University of Guelph students, other guest editors, such as Friedemann Sallis at the University of Calgary, have used the same curriculum in their own courses. This has resulted in special editions on Glenn Gould (Fall 2012) and Arnold Schoenberg (Winter 2013).

Overall, for the University of Guelph, this journal means that every graduating music major will go through the *Critical Voices* process. Regardless of whether they proceed to careers as performers, educators, composers, therapists, musicologists, or in fields completely unrelated to music, University of Guelph students know what it means to participate in the peer-reviewed publication process. This project both demystifies and to a certain degree removes the stigma of elitism about publication that can intimidate students. It also teaches undergraduates that scholarship is about people, communication, and, ideally, a scholarly "community."

Furthermore, in each edition, *Critical Voices* has published the work of at least one student who entered the class thinking publishing was beyond their reach. Because of the volume of feedback and the incremental demands of the project, students can build their skills slowly and effectively without the pressure of throwing it all into one final essay at the end of the semester. Although

the project has engaged an admittedly small sample of students, it seems the act of actual peer review reaches many of the women participants in a different way than the majority of the men. Most often, and to our continued concern, even with the veil of anonymity, it is the women who are wary of providing critical feedback to their peers more so than their male classmates. At the end of the project, women students continue to take away much more than how to properly format footnotes or knowing when to use an em-dash; they learn assertiveness, that there is a productive way to be outwardly critical, and that their opinion counts. Finally, students claim ownership and pride in what they now see as “their journal.” Many students see this process as something more than enduring music history lectures and digging through some online article databases—they see themselves as taking part in a larger project. The exiting editorial board trains the incoming board and the standard the students demand of each other and of the work vetted from outside institutions manifests itself in the pride the board members take in their accomplishments. In many ways, it is the students’ vision that has helped to define this project, especially as its reach continues to expand. It has taught them to take pride in what they are learning and what they can accomplish as writers and participants in the academic conversation.

On a larger level, both authors of this article consider the potential implications of this journal reaching both students and researchers. The benefits to the students are more obvious, while for researchers, in addition to added authorial exposure received through the review format, each essay is accompanied by a “For Further Reading” section, a summary of some of the most recent musicological literature on the topic in question. Thus, the articles serve as a bibliographic tool as well as a fresh critical take on the literature in question. Thanks to the open-journal format, the interface for this project is entirely cost effective, the technology costing collaborating institutions nothing, and the interface accessible to anyone with an internet connection. The time commitment for professors continues to become more streamlined and manageable, particularly as intra-institutional projects see professors share editorial responsibilities and therefore divide a semester’s grading amongst themselves. It is our hope that those articles published and those students trained through the mechanism will only be the first of many critical voices raised through this undergraduate writing project.

Appendix A: Overall Grade Breakdown and Sample Schedule of Due Dates for the University of Guelph—School of Fine Art and Music, Twentieth-Century Music (MUSC *3630-01) Winter Semester¹⁶

Method of Evaluation

Seminar Presentations.....	20%
Leading of Class Discussion, 10%	
Participation in colleagues' presentations, 10%	
Peer Review Project.....	50%
250-word Abstract/Annotated Bibliography, 5 %	
First Draft, 10%	
Second Draft, 15%	
Final Draft and presentation, 20%	
Final Exam.....	30%

Due Dates (Winter 2011)

*** Choice of book due by 10 January 2011

Item Due to Peers	Due to Peers	Date for Peer-review comments
Abstract (250 words) and Annotated Bibliography (8 sources)	25 January	30 January
First Draft of Book Review (7 pages)	15 February	20 February
Revised Draft of Book Review (7 pages)	8 March	13 March
Final Draft of Book Review (7 pages)	29 March	3 April

Results of Competition Announced 4 April

Appendix B: Prompt for Abstract and Bibliography

Part One: What is an Abstract? (Length: 250 words.)

There are two types of academic “abstracts”: the kind you craft when proposing to speak at a conference and the kind that summarizes a piece of academic writing. For this assignment you will be composing the latter.

A summary abstract is usually around 250 or 350 words (never more than 500). Yours need only be 250 words long. Its purpose is to give a quick and

16. The University of Guelph uses twelve-week semesters.

exact description of the piece it is summarizing. The abstract you craft should allow your reader to know:

1. Which book did you read?
2. What was the book about?
3. What type of big question ideas does your book address?
4. What is the length (in pages), general format and layout (collection of essays, scholarly monograph), and anticipated audience of the book?

Avoid ambiguity in your abstract. Poor grammar, sentence structure, or unclear prose can only frustrate readers and undermine their confidence that the author of the abstract will be worth engaging with. Excellent grammar, sentence structure, and clear prose will captivate readers and draw them in to your larger work. It is worth putting some effort into an abstract: it's where many people go first.

Remember: You are joining in the academic conversation in writing this. Do not write anything inflammatory or insulting. This does not mean to avoid being provocative. Indeed, the best abstracts will provoke while also engaging the reader. But tread elegantly. Don't write something that you would be uncomfortable repeating in person. Critical discourse is only as successful as it adds to the overall conversation. The better an abstract is written, the more it will entice your reader and, in the case of book reviews, the more the author being examined can learn from your viewpoint to improve upon her or his publication.

Evaluation: You will all be evaluated by myself and your peer-evaluators based upon

1. How well you address the above questions (5 marks each, total of 20)
 2. How well you craft a professional tone (10 marks)
 3. The general affect of your work (20 marks)
- For an overall total of 50 marks.

Part Two: The Annotated Bibliography

Instructions (Length: 8 entries [2–4 pages])

Annotated bibliographies help you envision how you will bring together your resources to write a larger book review essay. Think of this process as essential to building a strong foundation for your final project. You may include books, articles, review essays, documentary/audio-visual resources, or other scholarly texts.

Your annotated bibliography will need to contain a proper citation for each source (using the *Chicago Manual of Style*), a summary of the resource, and then a clear statement (or statements) explaining why or how that resource will be useful for your book review. You do not have to evaluate the

resource in the same way as you did your book, but describing its value to your final essay is of the utmost importance.

Evaluation

1. Completeness of the bibliography (are there eight resources listed?) (10%)
2. Correct use of *Chicago Manual of Style* formatting (20%)
3. Clear connection drawn by author to book review (20%)
4. Compelling collection of sources (do you feel, even if the author drew the connection, that the author has selected a strong collection of resources here for use in their review?) (Comments)
5. Professional tone/grammar (Comments)

Your evaluation is worth 20% of the reviewer's grade

Review Instructions

Please follow the following steps to complete the review of your abstracts for *Critical Voices*. Remember: when you write a review, you are acting as an extension of the journal editor. Please direct your comments to the editor and not to the author. e.g., "This statement is unclear, author should consider rephrasing."

When you log onto the *Critical Voices* website as a reviewer, you will be prompted through the following 5-step process:

Step 1: Respond by clicking on the appropriate hyperlink that you have accepted to complete the review.

Step 2: Click on the link provided to download your review to your computer. Once the file has downloaded, do the following using your word processor:

1. Using the Track Changes function, document any changes you would suggest your author make in the document. Use comment bubbles only if you have removed the identifying information from your word processor's default settings.
2. Answer the following questions at the bottom of your file and assign a numerical value for each:

Abstract. How well did the author address the following questions:

- Which book is the author reviewing? (/5)
- What was the book about? (/5)
- What type of big question ideas does the book address? (/5)
- What is the length (in pages), general format and layout, and anticipated audience of the book? (/5)

- How well does the author establish a professional tone? (10 marks)
- What is the overall quality/affect of the work? (20 marks)

Bibliography

- Completeness of the bibliography (are there eight resources listed?) (10%)
- Correct use of *Chicago Manual of Style* formatting (20%)
- Clear connection drawn by author to book review (20%)
- Compelling collection of sources (do you feel, even if the author drew the connection, that the author has selected a strong collection of resources here for use in their review?) (Comments)
- Professional tone/grammar (Comments)

Save your comments as AB_BIB_Reviewed.

Step 3: Return to the Critical Voices website and begin as a reviewer

1. Click on the green hyperlink and type into the given box “see attached file for comments.”
2. Save and Close

Step 4: Upload your file (AB_BIB_Reviewed) to the website.

Step 5: Recommendation. If you were actually submitting this for publication, this would be the section where you would indicate to the editor whether or not you feel your submission is ready for publication. Options typically range from “Accept,” “Accept with Revisions,” “Revise and resubmit,” “Do not accept for publication at this time.” Because we are in a preliminary stage, no portion of this is directly ready for publication, so please select “Revise and resubmit” as the default.

Grading Rubric

Qualitative Criteria:	Out of 50
Excellent! Covers all parts of the assignment in an elegant and impressive manner. The reader is left with a clear idea of what the book intends to cover and what the reviewer's opinion of its success is. The book is contextualized by the eight or more external sources; the reader is enriched by reading the review. The review is organized well, no grammar or prose errors are found, the document (including footnotes) is formatted correctly.	45–50
Very Good! Covers all parts of the question in a thorough manner with perhaps the occasional blip. The reader is left with an idea of what the book intends to cover and what the reviewer's opinion of its success is. The reviewer included the eight external sources to good effect. The review is organized and there are few grammar, prose, or formatting errors.	43–44
Very good. Covers all parts of the question, though some not as thoroughly as one would have liked. Few high-level errors can be found (e.g., organization) among errors in grammar or formatting. Potential ideas for improvement include stronger authorial voice, more effective use of sources, and more evaluative engagement with the subject book.	40–42
Good. Covers most of the questions in a solid fashion, though there are some gaps. Some high level flaws are present; organization, voice, or engagement may be lacking. Use of sources borders on superficial. Grammar and prose errors are present. Sections of the review need rewriting but it is otherwise useable.	38–39
Somewhat good. High level flaws are present. Sources are generally used poorly or incorrectly. There are sections that could be trimmed down or removed due to inefficient writing or excessive summary. Authorial voice is almost present. Grammar, prose, and formatting errors abound, but the piece is a good start.	35–37
Weak. Fewer than eight sources are used; footnotes are incorrectly formatted. Serious high level issues impair the effectiveness of the review. Voice and evaluation are outweighed by summary. Inefficient or incorrect use of language. Substantial rewriting in order.	30–34
Problematic. The review does not engage with the text on a deep or evaluative level. Few or no external sources are used or used correctly. The review is aimless summary. Little of it is useable.	25–29
Incomplete. The piece is shorter than the required length, no sources are used, or the language is extremely inadequate. The piece is not salvageable. Fail.	Below 25

Appendix C: Prompt for First Draft Round of the Book Review Project

Qualities of a Good Review (Length: 6–7 pages)

Now that you have assembled all the necessary resources and prepared your abstract, it is time to construct your review. A good review will tell the reader what the book was about and summarize its key points, its organization, and its contribution to the scholarly literature. Basically, what did your author/editor do and how did s/he do it?

When your reader finishes reading the first portion of your review, s/he should know exactly what the book was about, how it was organized, who contributed what, and how s/he did so. This is the “book report” portion of the review. Remember though, there are ways to do so that are more analytical than descriptive, and you’re aiming for the former. When in doubt, refer to the notes from the instructional YouTube video.

Tell your reader what you thought about this. Was it effective? Specialized? Require background knowledge? Draw from interesting/unique sources? Organize itself in interesting ways? Suggest (stunning/limited/basic) directions for the field, or not?

When your reviewer finishes reading this section s/he should know what was both good and bad about this book. Remember here to enter into the conversation gracefully—don’t say anything you wouldn’t necessarily say to the author in person. That said, no author expects there to be an absence of critical debate in a review. So ask yourself: How can I comment on this book in such a way that the next book on this topic or by this author will be even better? Reviewers are key to helping the discipline expand and improve.

Throughout both of these sections, use your secondary literature to bolster your claims. Another author might do things better than yours, or another book might be tremendously enhanced when used in tandem with your resource. Draw your secondary literature into dialogue with the text you’re reviewing, thereby contributing to the discourse.

Your first draft should have proper footnote citations (*Chicago Manual of Style*). Be aware that footnotes are formatted differently than bibliographies, so make sure you pay attention when completing them. Please do not include a bibliography; it isn’t necessary at this point. Also, don’t worry about formatting your review title; that will be part of the second draft.

Evaluation

Reviewers will be asked to comment on the author’s ability to critically appraise the following:

1. What is the book about—content, layout, methodology, authorial tone/position?

2. What does the book do that is new and unique, and how does it stand in dialogue with other literature on the same subject?
3. What are the assets and drawbacks of the book?

APPENDIX D: Sample Abstract (with Instructor's Comments)

Ecomusicology: Rock, Folk, and the Environment, by Mark Pedelty. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2012. [xi, 229 p., ISBN 9781439907122, \$28.95]. Bibliography, index.

Student Submission	Instructor Comments
<p>Anthropologist Mark Pedelty, in his most recent book, <i>Ecomusicology: Folk, Rock, and the Environment</i>, interrogates the impacts (1) of Euro-American popular and folk music on the mounting ecological crises facing all people on Earth. (2) Pedelty's case studies and methodologies are particularly diverse. Following a detailed critique of contemporary global rock touring practices, Pedelty turns to deep textual analysis of Woody Guthrie's Columbia River songs, suggesting in his study that Guthrie's folk-oriented music played a central role in the development of unsustainable water use practices (3) in the Columbia River valley. He then turns to his extensive ethnographic research with an environmentally-oriented folk band, the Hypoxic Punks, to explore how even the most environmentally-sensitive band may also contribute to climate change, energy use, and other environmental problems, while ultimately registering little impact (4) on the broader discourses about the ecological crises we current face. Pedelty also turns his ethnographic lens toward his work as a musician for</p>	<p>(1) <i>Incorrect use of "impact."</i> (And here comes one of my favorite grammar pointers): You can "impact" something if you actually hit it and leave a dent. (i.e., "The meteor impacted the earth" or "My first impacted his face"). Otherwise, what you're probably going for here is: have an impact on—similar to "influence."</p> <p>(2) <i>All people on earth everywhere? Careful of hyperbole in academic prose. Consider tempering this a bit.</i></p> <p>(3) <i>Wordy. Is there a way to streamline this? (Using fewer but more active/targeted words will give you more room to share your deep, wonderful insights with us.)</i></p> <p>(4) <i>Here it is again. Also, bit of a run-on sentence. Consider breaking it up.</i></p>

documentary films, interrogating the ways in which film soundtracks deploy music to advance specific environmental messages. In this wide-ranging study, Pedelty contributes to the growing scholarly interest in the deep connections between music-making and environmental issues and challenges us to reconsider how our daily musical practices might have broader environmental impacts. (5)

(5) Final sentences really want to pop. They want to leave me so excited, I just can't wait to pick up your book and read it! This one gets away from you, especially the "interest in the deep connections" portion. Invest some more time in this sentence to make it tighter and more streamlined.

Overall comments: I'm still left wondering, How long is this book? Is it organized by chapters/sections . . . ? There is a lot of solid writing here. Your sentences tend to be clear and your authorial tone is quite professional. Now let's nuance that a little bit, clean up sentences where there are a few too many words, pay attention to hyperbole, and avoid what I call "wet-noodle sentences" that flail about and cannot be controlled beginning to end. Lots of potential here!