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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. Recital performances, semester and junior standing jury performances 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 program notes required for Senior Recital programs and select assignments from Music Theory, Analysis, and/or Arranging courses.  3. Results of exit interviews. | 1. Performance assessment forms use the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent – **HC** (75%) Competent – **C** (25%)  Minimally Competent – **MC** (0%)  Not Competent - **NC** (0%)  2. The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent – **HC** (75%) Competent – **C** (25%)  Minimally Competent – **MC** (0%)  Not Competent - **NC** (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 performance majors are as follows for:  **AY 2016-17** (58 performance assessments):   * 16 HC (28%) * 30 C (52%) * 12 MC (21%) * 0 NC (0%)   2. In **AY 2016-17**, in the areas relating to program notes, performance majors scored as follows (6 portfolios evaluated): all students were HC (100%).  3. Insufficient data. In **AY 2016-17**, no performance majors completed the exit survey. | Music faculty complete the jury and recital evaluations, and the Assessment Committee (AC) completes 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. |
| 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 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 exit interviews. | 1. The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent – **HC** (75%) Competent – **C** (25%)  Minimally Competent – **MC** (0%)  Not Competent - **NC** (0%)  2. Feedback indicating that this learning objective is being addressed in appropriate areas of the curriculum. | 1. In **AY 2016-17**, in the areas relating to program notes, performance majors scored as follows (6 portfolios evaluated): all students were HC (100%).  2. Insufficient data. In **AY 2016-17**, no performance majors completed the exit survey. | The AC completes 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—not a required course for Performance Majors).  3. Results of exit interviews. | 1. Performance assessment forms use the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent – **HC** (75%) Competent – **C** (25%)  Minimally Competent – **MC** (0%)  Not Competent - **NC** (0%)  2. The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent – **HC** (75%) Competent – **C** (25%)  Minimally Competent – **MC** (0%)  Not Competent - **NC** (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 performance majors are as follows for:  **AY 2016-17** (58 performance assessments):   * 16 HC (28%) * 30 C (52%) * 12 MC (21%) * 0 NC (0%)   2. In **AY 2016-17**, in the areas relating to program notes, performance majors scored as follows (6 portfolios evaluated): all students were HC (100%).  3. Insufficient data. In **AY 2016-17**, no performance majors completed the exit survey. | The faculty completes the jury and recital evaluations, and the AC completes 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. |
| 4. Demonstrate musical comprehension and leadership necessary to conduct an ensemble. | 1. Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation. Specific artifacts evaluated include evaluations and/or video excerpts from Conducting courses.  2. Results of exit interviews. | 1. The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent – **HC** (75%) Competent – **C** (25%)  Minimally Competent – **MC** (0%)  Not Competent - **NC** (0%)  2. Feedback indicating that this learning objective is being addressed in appropriate areas of the curriculum. | 1. In **AY 2016-17**, in the area relating to conducting, performance majors scored as follows (6 portfolios evaluated): all students were HC (100%).  2. Insufficient data. In **AY 2016-17**, no performance majors completed the exit survey. | The AC completes 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. |
| 5. Understand, use, and apply technology. | 1. Evaluation of portfolios submitted prior to graduation. Specific artifacts evaluated include electronic and/or hard copy examples of technology projects completed in music coursework.  2. Results of exit interviews. | 1. The portfolio rubric uses the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Highly Competent – **HC** (75%) Competent – **C** (25%)  Minimally Competent – **MC** (0%)  Not Competent - **NC** (0%)  2. Feedback indicating that this learning objective is being addressed in appropriate areas of the curriculum. | 1. In **AY 2016-17**, in the area of technology, performance majors scored as follows (6 portfolios evaluated): all students HC (100%).  2. Insufficient data. In **AY 2016-17**, no performance majors completed the exit survey. | The AC completes 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. |

**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.*

**Performance Assessment**

Jury and recital preview data continue to serve as one of our most important tools for assessing student achievement in the area of Performance. Since the last report (AY 2014-2016), the Assessment Committee (AC) has collected and processed 68 distinct evaluations of performance majors from Music faculty. Faculty continue to use the Performance Assessment Tool and Rubric for both jury and recital preview evaluations, which provide us with performance feedback on all music students in the program. Since our last report, the AC has continued to evaluate student performances according to the following scale 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 AC has shared jury data from the current period with all applied faculty members and this data will be used to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses. Applied faculty were again asked to submit specific Repertoire Records in both the FA 2016 and SP 2017 semesters to assist in the AC’s evaluation process. The AC is pleased to report that all applied faculty assisted and participated in the jury and recital preview assessment process during the current period.

**Portfolios**

Music Performance students continue to be strongly encouraged by the AC to submit a final portfolio prior to graduation. Student compliance with this request continues to improve, particularly with the assistance of each student’s applied faculty member. During the current evaluation period **(AY 2016-2017)**, six performance students submitted portfolios, which represents a significant increase in participation over the four portfolios submitted during the last *two-year* evaluation period (AY 2015-2016). The AC has continued to discuss options for making the portfolio submission an official requirement for graduation, however this proposed requirement seems less vital for AC purposes considering the increase in voluntary participation from performance majors. In addition, the quality of portfolios submitted during the current period was very good and the AC feels that the work represented in these documents illustrates the merit of both the Performance curriculum and of the students pursuing it.

The AC continues to encourage Performance students to develop an electronic portfolio and, for the first time, one portfolio submitted during the current period was electronic. The AC continues to discuss training options for students, who are not able to receive class instruction in this area as do their Teacher Licensure peers. Performance students do receive specific instructions for creating their portfolios, which have a reduced number of document categories compared to the Teacher Licensure requirement. The AC uses a revised Performance Portfolio Evaluation Tool to reflect these changes.

**End-of-Semester Music Major Exit Survey Participation**

The AC will continue to discuss options for improving Performance major participation in the annual graduating music student exit survey. No performance majors have completed this survey for the past two reporting periods.

**University Learning Goals**

During the current period, the AC continued to evaluate 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.” As part of our evaluation process, we collect music history papers documenting their ability to analyze this role.
2. **Writing and critical reading**
   1. According to the Music Department learning objective I.3, we evaluate our students’ ability to “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.” As part of our evaluation process, we collect student written program notes that document the ability to write critically and analytically.
   2. 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?*

Results from **AY 2016-17** performance evaluations indicate that performance students are weakest in the following Department of Music Learning Objectives:

I.1. Demonstrate an intellectual and aural understanding of the basic structural elements of music through the use of the basic vocabulary of music.

I.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.

In an effort to improve I.1., the Music Department has completed an overhaul of musicianship classes designed to reinforce the goals of improving achievement in music theory and aural training. All music majors now attend *Comprehensive Musicianship* classes five days a week, in which these skills are presented in a unified format by the same instructor each day. It is the Music Department’s continued hope that this modernized musicianship program will allow students to work fluidly between music theory and ear training subjects with their instructor helping them to focus on the areas that are in the need of most practice. The AC notes that positive results from this curricular change are already clear from the improved quality of Performance major portfolios.

Performance students also show some weakness in I.3. The AC has encouraged applied music faculty to ensure their students are aware of the portfolio creation requirement and performance students have been notified that appropriate performance programs should be retained for the duration of their time at EIU. With the assistance of applied music faculty, performance students continue to submit detailed program notes for all degree recitals. These program notes are scored by the AC as part of a graduating performance student’s portfolio. Program notes are researched and compiled by performance students, but applied music faculty often assist their students in properly editing the notes before a final version is submitted. It is the AC’s hope that this ongoing requirement will assist performance students not only in their understanding of the pieces prepared for recitals, but also in their critical thinking and writing skills.

In relation to the students’ requirement to “…perform music from a variety of cultures and historical periods,” performance evaluations show an unfortunate decrease in musicianship with only 28% of jury and preview recitals reaching the Highly Competent (HC) category, compared with 51% during the previous evaluation period. There are many variables that might help explain a lower rate of HC performances, including many new faculty members who might have evaluated Performance students differently than did their predecessors, but the drop is significant enough that the AC will make faculty aware of it during AY 2017-2018. It is important to note that the methods of both evaluating performances and of measuring that data have not changed during the two reporting periods discussed here.

The Performance major jury and recital preview data referenced here is shared with applied music faculty and the Department Chair, allowing faculty and Department administration to begin comparing student achievement between applied studios with some measure of accuracy. Faculty and the Chair gain access to a master spreadsheet of performance evaluations that shows student achievement in a variety of common metrics used to denote quality of musicianship.

The AC will continue to review Music Department learning objectives during the coming academic year with a focus recommending revisions to the objectives to more fully align with the University’s Writing and Critical Reading and Critical Thinking goals. Currently, Teacher Licensure students receive significant experience teaching and communicating in a variety of classes and in front of a variety of ensembles, however Performance students have fewer opportunities for similar experiences. The AC will also explore the possibility of updating the Music Department’s learning objectives to give more weight and clarity to the need for all music majors to strive for excellence in the development of their musicianship.