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**PART ONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations? | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared? |
| 1. Demonstrate an intellectual and aural understanding of the structural elements of music through the use of the basic vocabulary of music. | 1. Semester juries are assessed using performance assessment forms that include basic, universal criteria used to evaluate all performances as well as instrument-specific criteria.  2. Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation using a rubric specifically for portfolios. Specific artifacts evaluated include select assignments from Music Theory, Analysis, and/or Arranging courses.  3. Results of exit survey. | 1. Performance assessment forms use 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. 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. Feedback indicating that this learning objective is being addressed in appropriate areas of the curriculum. | 1.According to the current scoring system, the overall total results for Bachelor of Arts in Music Students:  **AY 2017-2018**  (13 jury assessments):   * 0 (0%) at Highly Competent * 4 (31%) at Competent * 7 (54%) at Minimally Competent * 2 (15%) at Not Competent   2. 3 of 6 BA graduating students submitted a portfolio that was evaluated (One did not submit a portfolio and two were not evaluated). Of the three that were evaluated:    2 = Highly Competent  1 = Competent  3. Insufficient data. Two BA students completed the survey, and neither shared narrative comments. | 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 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.  The AC performs the portfolio evaluations and 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. |
| 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. Specific artifacts evaluated include papers from Music History courses and Non-Western Music (if taken).  2. Results of exit survey | 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. Feedback indicating that this learning objective is being addressed in appropriate areas of the curriculum. | 1. 3 of 6 BA graduating students submitted a portfolio that was evaluated (One did not submit a portfolio and two were not evaluated). Of the three that were evaluated:    2 = Highly Competent  1 = Competent  2. Insufficient data. Two BA students completed the survey, and neither shared narrative comments. | The AC performs the portfolio evaluations and 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. Data gathered from the Performance Assessment Forms.  2. Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation. Specific artifacts evaluated include recital programs demonstrating a variety of literature and papers from Music History courses and Non-Western Music, if taken.  3. Results of exit survey. | 1. Performance assessment forms use 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. 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. Feedback indicating that this learning objective is being addressed in appropriate areas of the curriculum. | 1. According to the current scoring system, the overall total results for Bachelor of Arts Students are as follows for:  **AY 2017-2018**  (13 jury assessments):   * 0 (0%) at Highly Competent * 4 (31%) at Competent * 7 (54%) at Minimally Competent * 2 (15%) at Not Competent   2. 3 of 6 BA graduating students submitted a portfolio that was evaluated (One did not submit a portfolio and two were not evaluated). Of the three that were evaluated:    2 = Highly Competent  1 = Competent  3. Insufficient data. Two BA students completed the survey, and neither shared narrative comments. | 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 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 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.

The BA degree has only been an option for three years. An assessment report was submitted the first year (2015-2016), a report was not submitted the second year (2016-2017), so this is only the second report submitted for this degree program (2017-2018). The newness of the program and inconsistent assessment collection leaves us with data that is severely lacking, but also provides us with opportunity for great improvements in the assessment process next year.

**Performance Assessment**

Jury and recital preview data are an important tool for assessing musical performance for the Bachelor of Arts in Music degree. The scale is as follows: 21.00-24.00 = highly competent, 17.00-20.99 = competent, 12.00-16.99 = minimally competent, and less than 12.00 = not competent. The (BA) jury data indicates that BA students are not yet scoring in the desired ranges of highly competent and competent. The nature of the degree is different, but applied faculty still aim to help students reach a high level of performance. This data will help the applied faculty to move forward in thinking about performance curriculum and goals for BA students.

**Portfolios**

Students in the Bachelor of Arts Degree may submit either an electronic portfolio or a hard copy. We have worked to encourage all BA students to submit a portfolio, but this is not currently connected to a course requirement. During the first year of the program zero BA students submitted a portfolio. Data is missing for last year, and this year we have three of six portfolios that were submitted and evaluated. One additional student submitted an unacceptable portfolio that needed to be reorganized, but the assessment committee did not enforce or follow up with the student regarding resubmission. One additional student submitted an electronic file that was not readable, so this was not evaluated. The final student did not submit a portfolio. While messy, this effort still demonstrates improvement in the process. The assessment committee will work hard next year to continue to improve portfolio submission cooperation.

**Exit Surveys**

Much like the effort to encourage BA students to submit a portfolio, the assessment committee has tried to encourage BA students to complete the exit survey. Zero BA students attended the congratulatory reception for graduates (where we also asked students to complete the exit survey). An assessment committee member sent a follow-up invitation via e-mail link for BA students to complete the survey, and two then completed the survey. We do not feel that we have enough quantitative data to generalize results, and neither student shared any narrative comments. The assessment committee needs to seriously discuss and change the way the exit survey invitation is presented (or enforced/required). Improving the response rate will provide us with very important and necessary feedback.

**University Learning Goals**

We believe that in addition to the university learning goal of Global Citizenship, we are currently evaluating our performance majors in the following areas:

1**) Critical thinking**

According to the music department learning objective I.2. we evaluate our students’ ability to “understand and analyze the role of music within a variety of cultures and historical periods, its impact on society, and its stylistic interpretation.” We collect music history papers documenting their ability to analyze this role and its impact.

2) **Writing and critical reading**

According to the music department learning objective I.2. we evaluate our students’ ability to “understand and analyze the role of music within a variety of cultures and historical periods, its impact on society, and its stylistic interpretation.” We collect music history papers and exams that document their ability to write and read critically.

**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?

As evidenced by this report, an improved data collection process and thoughtful reflection are needed to improve the overall department assessment process for this degree program. The department assessment committee has been nearly inactive this year, so no new initiatives were implemented. Two of the three committee members have left the university (the faculty members assigned to oversee the performance and BA assessment areas), so it will be imperative to recruit replacement faculty members in the future who are committed to the assessment process. This new degree program offers the opportunity for students who are not interested in performance or teacher licensure to pursue many other avenues of music, so there is significant room for the assessment process to play an important role in future curriculum decisions.