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

**Degree and Program Name:** Bachelor of Music: Teacher Certification 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. 3. Results of Music Content Area Certification Exams.</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%). 3. Students are expected to be at or above the statewide average in Subareas 1 and 2: Listening Skills and Music Theory.</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, and it should be noted that only two portfolios were evaluated. 3. Students who took the Content Area Exam in Spring 2005 scored at or above the state average in Subareas 1 and 2: Listening Skills and Music Theory.</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>
</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 cskjs@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.
2. Identify and analyze the role of music within a variety of cultures and historical periods, its impact on society, and its stylistic interpretation.

1. 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 papers from Music History courses and Non-Western Music (if taken—not a required course for Performance Majors). 2. Results of Music Content Area Certification Exams.

1. 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%). 2. Students are expected to be at or above the statewide average in Subarea 4: Music History and Culture.

1. 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, and it should be noted that only two portfolios were evaluated. 2. Students who took the Content Area Exam in Spring 2005 scored above the state average in Subarea 4: Music History and Culture.

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.

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). 3. Results of Music Content Area

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%). 3. Students are expected to be at or above the statewide average in Subarea 4: Music History and Culture.

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 100% Highly Competent. 3. Students who took the Content Area Exam in Spring 2005 scored above the state average in Subarea 4: Music History and Culture.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Exams</th>
<th>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 evaluations and/or video excerpts from Conducting courses.</th>
<th>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%).</th>
<th>Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50% Highly Competent and 50% Minimally Competent. These percentages are expected to improve as more specific guidelines for what artifacts should be submitted are implemented in Fall, 2005, and it should be noted that only two portfolios were evaluated. However, the fact that these are students preparing to be conductors in the public schools makes this a somewhat alarming result that will be examined further.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Understand, use, and apply technology.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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>Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50% Competent and 50% Minimally Competent. These percentages are expected to improve as more specific guidelines for what artifacts should be submitted are implemented in Fall, 2005, and it should be noted that only two portfolios were evaluated. However, the fact that these are students preparing to teach in the public schools makes this a somewhat alarming result that will be examined further.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Able to relate various types of music knowledge and skills within and across the arts.</td>
<td>Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation as part of a new system implemented in Spring, 2005 using a rubric specifically for</td>
<td>The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly</td>
<td>Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50% Competent and 50% Minimally Competent. These percentages are</td>
<td>The AC performs the portfolio evaluations and then reports to the Chair and CC. The Chair and AC are responsible for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Understands and is able to apply pedagogical knowledge and skills appropriate to the teaching of music.</td>
<td>1. 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 lesson plans and teaching evaluations. 2. Results of Music Content Area Certification Exams.</td>
<td>1. 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%). 2. Students are expected to be at or above the statewide average in Subarea 5: Music Education.</td>
<td>1. Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50% Highly Competent and 50% Minimally Competent. These percentages are expected to improve as more specific guidelines for what artifacts should be submitted are implemented in Fall, 2005, and it should be noted that only two portfolios were evaluated. However, the fact that these are students preparing to teach in the public schools makes this a somewhat alarming result that will be examined further. 2. All but one student scored above the state average in Subarea 5: Music Education. The remaining student scored below the state average, but this is believed to be an anomaly due to the very high evaluation ratings of this student’s portfolio.</td>
<td>The AC performs the portfolio evaluations and then reports to the Chair and CCE. 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>8. Demonstrate good communication skills.</td>
<td>Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation as part of a new system</td>
<td>The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students</td>
<td>Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50% Highly Competent and 50% Minimally Competent. These percentages are expected to improve as more specific guidelines for what artifacts should be submitted are implemented in Fall, 2005, and it should be noted that only two portfolios were evaluated. However, the fact that these are students preparing to teach in the public schools makes this a somewhat alarming result that will be examined further. 2. All but one student scored above the state average in Subarea 5: Music Education. The remaining student scored below the state average, but this is believed to be an anomaly due to the very high evaluation ratings of this student’s portfolio.</td>
<td>The AC performs the portfolio evaluations and then reports to the Chair and CCE. 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>9. Use basic skills of measurement and assessment in instructional decision-making.</td>
<td>1. 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 lesson plans and/or student-designed assessment tools. 2. Results of Music Content Area Certification Exams.</td>
<td>1. 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%). 2. Students are expected to be at or above the statewide average in Subarea 5: Music Education.</td>
<td>1. Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 100% Highly Competent. 2. All but one student scored above the state average in Subarea 5: Music Education. The remaining student scored below the state average, but this is believed to be an anomaly due to the very high evaluation ratings of this student’s portfolio.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 10. Demonstrate knowledge of past and present developments, issues research, and social influences in the field of education. | 1. 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 papers from Music Education and/or professional education coursework. 2. Results of Music Content Area Certification Exams. | 1. 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%). 2. Students are expected to be at or above the statewide average in Subarea 5: Music Education. | 1. Portfolio data collected in Spring, 2005 indicated 50% Competent and 50% Minimally Competent. These percentages are expected to improve as more specific guidelines for what artifacts should be submitted are implemented in Fall, 2005, and it should be noted that only two portfolios were evaluated. However, the fact that these are students preparing to teach in the public schools makes this a somewhat alarming result. | 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. |
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. Portfolio submission was not previously enforced nor were evaluations conducted. Music Education faculty are currently devising assessment tools for use in all Music Education courses with specific attention to the preparation of students for student teaching. Forms indicating the results of these assessments will be required artifacts in student portfolios effective Fall 2005.

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 difficulties encountered by members of the Assessment Committee in conducting 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. Data
gathered from student teacher evaluations and exit interviews clearly indicates a need for improved assessment of 1300-level methods courses and
the 3400-level capstone courses and improved curricular coordination between these courses. 100% of the evaluations and interviews indicate a
need for improved training on secondary instruments, in particular. Therefore, assessment tools are currently being devised for all of these courses,
and curricular modifications based on this preliminary data will be considered by the Curriculum Committee beginning in early Fall 2005.

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. Most notably, students in the General Music Concentration of the Teacher Certification
Option must now complete 3 semester hours of Intermediate Applied Voice in order to better prepare them for singing in the classroom, and the
Minor in Music for Teacher Certification has been eliminated.

The primary plan for AY 05-06 is to fully implement the departmental assessment plan outlined above. In particular, plans for the AY 05-06
include the completion of work on all recital and jury evaluation forms and rubrics, the implementation of a plan for the random selection and
assessment of recital and jury evaluations, and to complete the more specific guidelines for portfolio submission mentioned above.