**STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT PROGRAM**
**SUMMARY FORM  AY 2004-2005**

Degree and Program Name: Bachelor of Music: Performance Option

Submitted By: W. Parker Melvin, Acting Chairperson

**PART ONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning objectives?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed?</th>
<th>What are the expectations?</th>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Demonstrate an intellectual and aural understanding of the structural elements of music through the use of the basic vocabulary of music.</td>
<td>1. Random selection of recital, semester and junior standing jury adjudication results from Applied Study courses. The adjudication is done using evaluation forms and rubrics developed and currently being revised by the department. These forms and rubrics share basic, universal criteria used to evaluate all performances as well as instrument-specific criteria. 2. Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation as part of a new system implemented in Spring, 2005 using a rubric specifically for portfolios. Specific artifacts evaluated include program notes required for Senior Recital programs and select assignments from Music Theory, Analysis, and/or Arranging courses.</td>
<td>1. Jury and recital evaluation forms/rubrics use the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent (50%), Competent (30%), Minimally Competent (20%), Not Competent (0%). 2. The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent (75%), Competent (25%), Minimally Competent (0%), Not Competent (0%).</td>
<td>1. There is currently no jury/recital data available; a plan is currently being formulated for the collection and evaluation of data from these sources for AY 05-06. 2. Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50% Highly Competent and 50% Competent. These percentages are expected to improve as more specific guidelines for what artifacts should be submitted are implemented in Fall, 2005.</td>
<td>The faculty performs the jury and recital evaluations, and the Assessment Committee (AC) performs the portfolio evaluations and gathers and evaluates data from all sources. The AC then reports to the Chair and Curriculum Committee (CC). The Chair and AC are responsible for making any consequent modifications to the assessment process; the Chair and CC are responsible for formulating any consequent curricular modifications and presenting them to the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identify and analyze the role of music within a variety</td>
<td>Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation as</td>
<td>The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the</td>
<td>Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50%</td>
<td>The AC performs the portfolio evaluations and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please complete a separate worksheet for each academic program (major, minor) at each level (undergraduate, graduate) in your department. Worksheets are due to CASA this year by **June 1**. Worksheets should be sent electronically to eskjse@eiu.edu and should also be submitted to your college dean. For information about assessment or help with your assessment plans, visit the Assessment webpage at [http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/](http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/) or contact Karla Sanders in CASA at 581-6056.
of cultures and historical periods, its impact on society, and its stylistic interpretation. part of a new system implemented in Spring, 2005 using a rubric specifically for portfolios. Specific artifacts evaluated include program notes required for Senior Recital programs and papers from Music History courses and Non-Western Music (if taken—not a required course for Performance Majors).

| 3. Demonstrate an awareness of structure and style through the development of skills necessary to create, critique, and perform music from a variety of cultures and historical periods. | 1. Random selection of recital, semester and junior standing jury adjudication results from Applied Study courses. The adjudication is done using evaluation forms and rubrics developed and currently being revised by the department. These forms and rubrics share basic universal criteria used to evaluate all performances as well as instrument-specific criteria. 2. Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation as part of a new system implemented in Spring, 2005 using a rubric specifically for portfolios. Specific artifacts evaluated include recital programs demonstrating a variety of literature and papers from Music History courses and Non-Western Music (if taken—not a required course for Performance Majors). | 1. Jury and recital evaluation forms/rubrics use the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent (50%), Competent (30%), Minimally Competent (20%), Not Competent (0%). 2. The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent (75%), Competent (25%), Minimally Competent (0%), Not Competent (0%). | 1. There is currently no jury/recital data available; a plan is currently being formulated for the collection and evaluation of data from these sources for AY 05-06. 2. Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50% Highly Competent, 25% Competent and 25% Minimally Competent. These percentages are expected to improve as more specific guidelines for what artifacts should be submitted are implemented in Fall, 2005. | The faculty performs the jury and recital evaluations, and the AC performs the portfolio evaluations and gathers and evaluates data from all sources. The AC then reports to the Chair and CC. The Chair and AC are responsible for making any consequent modifications to the assessment process; the Chair and CC are responsible for formulating any consequent curricular modifications and presenting them to the faculty. |

| 4. Demonstrate musical comprehension and leadership necessary to conduct an ensemble. | Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation as part of a new system implemented in Spring, 2005 using a rubric specifically for | The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent, 25% Competent and 25% Minimally Competent. | Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50% Highly Competent, 25% Competent and 25% Minimally Competent. | The AC performs the portfolio evaluations and then reports to the Chair and CC. The Chair and AC are responsible for |
| 5. Understand, use, and apply technology. | Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation as part of a new system implemented in Spring, 2005 using a rubric specifically for portfolios. Specific artifacts evaluated include electronic and/or hard copy examples of technology projects completed in music coursework. | The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent (75%), Competent (25%), Minimally Competent (0%), Not Competent (0%). | Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 25% Highly Competent, 50% Competent, and 25% Minimally Competent. These percentages are expected to improve as more specific guidelines for what artifacts should be submitted are implemented in Fall, 2005. | The AC performs the portfolio evaluations and then reports to the Chair and CC. The Chair and AC are responsible for making any consequent modifications to the assessment process; the Chair and CC are responsible for formulating any consequent curricular modifications and presenting them to the faculty. |

(Continue objectives as needed. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.)

PART TWO

Describe what your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

With regard to the Director’s comments on last year’s report, no action was taken regarding greater clarity and specificity in Objectives 2 and 5, respectively. Objective 2 indicates the integration of historical and cultural study in music, which is in keeping with national standards. The Director’s comments were only recently shared with the Assessment Committee, which has taken them under advisement in order to consider possible revision of the objectives in AY 05-06. For the most part, the Director’s comments and questions regarding “How, Where, and When Assessed,” “Expectations,” and “How Results Will Be Used” have been addressed in the table above.
The primary accomplishment since the last report is the formulation of a specific process for the evaluation of portfolios submitted by students in their last semester before graduation. There portfolio submission was not previously enforced nor were evaluations conducted.

Work towards clarity and uniformity of standards of evaluation for juries and recitals continued throughout AY 04-05, and at least one division of the department is in the process evaluating the appropriateness of terms used to evaluate the performance criteria (Highly Competent, etc.) for juries. Work towards improved clarity of language in the rubrics also continued throughout AY 04-05.

**PART THREE**

Summarize changes and improvements in curriculum, instruction, and learning that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

Appropriate data only recently began to be collected, the results of which are still being evaluated. The one clear indication from portfolio evaluations is a need for greater specificity as to what types of artifacts should be submitted as evidence of meeting the Learning Objectives. Those more specific guidelines are currently being formulated. Curricular modifications made in AY 04-05 were primarily as a result of the department’s Self Study done in preparation for our ten-year accreditation visit that took place in February 2005. The most notable modification was the stipulation of a “C” or better in all core music classes in the Performance Major. This was not as result of any particular data gathered but was rather a collective decision a to “raise the bar” for academic standards and to preserve the integrity of the degree. The Self Study also revealed a need for more clearly defined standards for admission and recital requirements in the Composition Concentration of the Performance Option.

Plans for the AY 05-06 include the completion of work on all recital and jury evaluation forms and rubrics and the implementation of a plan for the random gathering and assessment