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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. Apply accepted research practices to the study of Music. | 1.Graduate recital analyses or theses (Performance and conducting concentrations only), Capstone research project (online Education concentration only) written and oral comprehensive exams evaluated by graduate faculty on graduate examination committees (Performance, conducting, composition concentrations only);  2.Classwork: coursework from MUS 5880 (Seminar in Music History) online Music Education concentration only  3. Exit surveys conducted upon completion of the program;  Survey for performance, composition, conducting concentration given SP 2018. Survey for online education concentration will be distributed at completion of program at end of SU 2018. | 1.Rubrics for graduate Recital Analyses and Theses and Capstone research projects with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Superior (50%), Good (50%), Developing (0%), Not Acceptable (0%);  [Students must achieve a *Superior* on our evaluation rubric–average 16/16 points–in order to receive Superior ranking; Students receive *Good* or better on our evaluation rubric– with min. 12/16–in order to receive a Good ranking.  Comprehensive Written Exam evaluations indicate that a student receives Pass (100%), Conditional Pass, or Not Pass;  Oral Examinations must be approved unanimously by the Graduate examination committee;  2.Coursework from MUS 5880: Seminar in Music History: sample paper evaluated for research content and citations: Grade A Superior ranking, Grade B Good ranking, Grade C Developing rank, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Superior (50%), Good (50%), Developing (0%), Not Acceptable (0%);  3.Exit survey questions are expected to give the Graduate Coordinator feedback to share with faculty for purposes of improving the program. In **AY 17-18 4/6** composition, conducting, performancestudents responded to an electronic survey in performance, conducting and composition concentrations. Education concentration will complete survey at the end of SU 18 with graduation of first cohort. | **1.AY 17-18** – Six students submitted Recital Analysis papers or Theses; Six students took Comprehensive Examinations; Six students held Oral Examinations. One student turned in a Recital Analysis in the *Superior* category (17%); Five students turned in Recital Analyses in the *Good* category (83%).  **SU 18** Capstone Research Projects will be evaluated according to the rubric following completion in SU 18  **AY 17-18** Written and oral comprehensive examinations: Six out of six students achieved Pass or Conditional Pass on the Written Exam (the two that received Conditional Pass on a question submitted the necessary paper to qualify for a Pass) and six out of six students passed the Oral Exam.  2.Coursework from MUS 5880: Seminar in Music History: sample paper evaluated for research content and citations: Grade A Superior ranking, 15/19 students (79%) Grade B Good ranking 4/19, (21%), Grade C Developing rank 0%, Not acceptable 0%  3.Exit survey: Graduate Coordinator learns the most/ least successful parts in the Core curriculum and Concentration courses in the MA degree program.  **AY 17-18-**  Four out of four students strongly agree they are prepared to apply research practices to the study of music. Four out of four students feel well-prepared to continue with further graduate study. Four out of four students experienced significant growth and learning from the final project. | The graduate examining committee formed for each student performs the evaluations and reports results to the Graduate Coordinator. In AY 17-18 the exit survey was distributed anonymously and electronically. The Graduate Coordinator evaluates the data and reports to the Chair and Graduate Committee (GC). Graduate Coordinator compiles results and distributes to Graduate Faculty.  The Graduate Coordinator and Graduate Committee are responsible for making any consequent modifications to the assessment process and for formulating any consequent curricular modifications and presenting them to the faculty.  Assessment report is posted on the department of music faculty website. |
| 2. Demonstrate a scholarly approach to the study of music history, literature, and analysis. | 1.Graduate theses, Graduate Recital analyses, results of written and oral comprehensive exams evaluated by graduate faculty on graduate examination committees (performance, composition, and conducting concentrations),  2.Classwork: paper from MUS 5880 Seminar in Music History, (online Education concentration)  3. Exit surveys conducted upon completion of the program;  Survey for performance, composition, conducting concentration given SP 2018. Survey for online education concentration will be distributed at completion of program at end of SU 2018. | 1.Rubrics for Graduate Recital Analyses or Theses with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Superior (50%), Good (50%), Developing (0%), Not Acceptable (0%);  Comprehensive Written Exam evaluations indicate that a student receives Pass (100%), Conditional Pass, or Not Pass;  Oral examinations must be approved unanimously by the Graduate examination committee;  2.Coursework from MUS 5880: Seminar in Music History: sample paper evaluated for research content and citations: Grade A Superior ranking, Grade B Good ranking, Grade C Developing rank, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Superior (50%), Good (50%), Developing (0%), Not Acceptable (0%);  3.Exit survey questions are expected to give the Graduate Coordinator feedback to share with faculty for purposes of improving the program. In **AY 17-18 4/6** students responded to an electronic survey in performance, conducting and composition concentrations. Education concentration will complete survey at the end of SU 18 with graduation of first cohort. | **1.AY 17-18** One student turned in a Recital Analysis in the *Superior* category (17%); Five students turned in Recital Analyses in the *Good* category (83%). In the “Music Analysis” category of the Recital Analysis, students again ranked 17% in *Superior* category and 83% in *Good* category.  **AY 17-18** Written and oral comprehensive examinations: Six out of six students achieved Pass or Conditional Pass on the Written Exam (the two that received Conditional Pass on a question submitted the necessary paper to qualify for a Pass) and six out of six students passed the Oral Exam  2.Coursework from MUS 5880: Seminar in Music History: sample paper evaluated for research content and citations: Grade A Superior ranking, 15/19 students (79%) Grade B Good ranking 4/19, (21%), Grade C Developing rank 0%, Not acceptable 0%  3.Exit survey: Graduate Coordinator learns the most/ least successful parts in the Core curriculum and Concentration courses in the MA degree program.  **AY 17-18-**  Four out of four students strongly agree they are prepared to apply research practices to the study of music. Four out of four students feel well-prepared to continue with further graduate study. | The graduate examining committee formed for each student performs the evaluations and reports results to the Graduate Coordinator. The Graduate Coordinator sends out exit surveys. The Graduate Coordinator evaluates the data and reports to the Chair and the Graduate Committee (GC). Graduate Coordinator compiles results and distributes to Graduate Faculty.  The Graduate Coordinator and Graduate Committee are responsible for making any consequent modifications to the assessment process and for formulating any consequent curricular modifications and presenting them to the faculty.  Assessment report is posted on the department of music faculty website. |
| 3. Demonstrate a level of competency as a performer, conductor, or composer appropriate for developing a career or further graduate study (performance, composition, conducting concentrations only)  Neither performing, conducting, or composing are required in the online music education concentration | 1. a. Recital performances and Graduate Recital (for performance majors only) with program notes, semester and jury performances are assessed using performance assessment forms that include basic, universal criteria used to evaluate all performances as well as instrument-specific criteria.  b. Conducting majors do not give a recital as such, but do prepare a compilation DVD as outlined in the Guidelines for Graduate Recital Analysis (on the graduate music website).  c. Composition majors are not required to have a recital of composed works but may do so if they choose.  2. Evaluation of graduate theses/ recital analyses and results of written and oral comprehensive exams.  3. Exit surveys conducted upon completion of the program;  Survey for performance, composition, conducting concentration given SP 2018. Survey for online education concentration will be distributed at completion of program at end of SU 2018. | 1. a. Performance assessment forms use the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Professional level (50%), Highly Competent (50%), Competent (0%), Unacceptable (0%).  The universal criteria used to evaluate performances are all the same for musicians. The expectations for graduate performances in all areas are higher than for undergraduates.  b. Conducting DVDs are assessed as part of the final Recital Analysis project and evaluated at the Oral Exam.  c. Assessment of a recital is not made since this is not a requirement.  2. Rubrics for graduate recital analyses use the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Superior (50%), Good (50%), Developing (0%), Not Acceptable (0%).  Rubrics for written comprehensive exams are the following levels, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Pass (100%), Conditional Pass (0%), Not Pass (0%).  3. Positive feedback from exit surveys (performance, composition, conducting concentrations) with regard to preparation for meeting this objective. | 1. **AY 17-18** a. Performances and recitals by graduate students in the program consistently rank at Professional level and Highly Competent level. 21/24 and above is considered Professional level. 17/24 and above is considered Highly Competent. 15/24 and above is considered competent. In fall 2017 4/10 students (40%) were evaluated as Professional level and 6/10 students (60%) were evaluated as Highly Competent. In spring 2018 4/9 (44%) students were evaluated as Professional level and 3 students (33%) were evaluated as Highly Competent. 1/9 student was evaluated as competent (11%).  b. N/A  c. N/A  2. **AY 17-18** One student turned in a Recital Analysis in the *Superior* category (17%); Five students turned in Recital Analyses in the *Good* category (83%)  **AY 17-18** Written and oral comprehensive examinations: Six out of six students achieved Pass or Conditional Pass on the Written Exam (the two that received Conditional Pass on a question submitted the necessary paper to qualify for a Pass) and six out of six students passed the Oral Exam.  3. Exit surveys: Four out of four students experienced significant growth and learning from completing the final recital or conducting performances. Four out of four students felt they received either more than sufficient or sufficient experience in various large and small ensembles. Four out of four students feel well-prepared to continue further graduate study. Three students feel well-prepared to pursue job opportunities in job field, one student feels moderately prepared to pursue job opportunities in job field. | Appropriate applied faculty perform jury and recital evaluations, and the graduate examining committee formed for each student performs academic evaluations. The Graduate Coordinator evaluates the data and reports to the Chair and the Graduate Committee (GC). The Graduate Coordinator and Graduate Committee are responsible for making any consequent modifications to the assessment process and for formulating any consequent curricular modifications and presenting them to the faculty.  Assessment report is posted on the department of music faculty website. |
| 4. Demonstrate critical thinking and problem solving (CGS Learning Objective). | 1. Graduate theses and Graduate Recital analyses (performance, conducting, composition concentrations)  Capstone research project (Online Education concentration only)  2. Results of written and oral comprehensive exams evaluated by graduate faculty on graduate examination committee.  3.Coursework from MUS 5880: Seminar in Music History, online Education concentration: sample paper: analysis how musical examples reflect concept  4. Exit surveys conducted upon completion of the program;  Survey for performance, composition, conducting concentration given SP 2018. Survey for online education concentration will be distributed at completion of program at end of SU 2018. | 1.Rubrics for graduate Recital Analyses and Theses and Capstone research projects with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Superior (50%), Good (50%), Developing (0%), Not Acceptable (0%);  [Students must achieve a *Superior* on our evaluation rubric–average 16/16 points–in order to receive Superior ranking; Students receive *Good* or better on our evaluation rubric– with min. 12/16–in order to receive a Good ranking.  2. Comprehensive Written Exam evaluations indicate that a student receives Pass (100%), Conditional Pass, or Not Pass;  Oral Examinations must be approved unanimously by the Graduate examination committee;  3. Grade A Superior ranking, Grade B Good ranking, Grade C Developing rank, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Superior (50%), Good (50%), Developing (0%), Not Acceptable (0%);  4. Positive feedback from exit interviews with regard to preparation for meeting this objective. | **1. AY 17-18** – Six students submitted Recital Analysis papers or Theses; Six students took Comprehensive Examinations; Six students held Oral Examinations. One student turned in a Recital Analysis in the *Superior* category (17%); Five students turned in Recital Analyses in the *Good* category (83%).  **SU 18** Capstone Research Projects will be evaluated according to the rubric following completion in SU 18  2. **AY 17-18** Written and oral comprehensive examinations: Six out of six students achieved Pass or Conditional Pass on the Written Exam (the two that received Conditional Pass on a question submitted the necessary paper to qualify for a Pass) and six out of six students passed the Oral Exam.  3. Grade A Superior ranking, 15/19 students (79%) Grade B Good ranking 4/19, (21%), Grade C Developing rank 0%, Not acceptable 0%  4.**AY 17-18** Four out of four students agreed or strongly agreed that coursework and lessons had improved their critical thinking skills and their ability to problem solve | The graduate examining committee formed for each student performs the evaluations. The Graduate Coordinator evaluates the data and reports to the Chair and the Graduate Committee (GC). The Graduate Coordinator and Graduate Committee are responsible for making any consequent modifications to the assessment process and for formulating any consequent curricular modifications and presenting them to the faculty.  Assessment report is posted on the department of music faculty website. |
| 5. Demonstrate effective writing skills including grammar, syntax, organization, and depth of content (Graduate School standards). | 1.Graduate recital analyses or theses (Performance and conducting concentrations only), Capstone research project (online Education concentration only)  2. Results of written exams evaluated by graduate faculty on graduate examination committee.  3.Classwork: paper from MUS 5880 (Seminar in Music History) online Music Education concentration only, evaluated on grammar and syntax  4. Exit surveys conducted upon completion of the program;  Survey for performance, composition, conducting concentration given SP 2018. Survey for online education concentration will be distributed at completion of program at end of SU 2018. | 1. Rubrics for graduate Recital Analyses and Theses and Capstone research projects with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Superior (50%), Good (50%), Developing (0%), Not Acceptable (0%);  [Students must achieve a *Superior* on our evaluation rubric–average 16/16 points–in order to receive Superior ranking; Students receive *Good* or better on our evaluation rubric– with min. 12/16–in order to receive a Good ranking.  2. Comprehensive Written Exam evaluations indicate that a student receives Pass (100%), Conditional Pass, or Not Pass;  3. Grade A Superior ranking, Grade B Good ranking, Grade C Developing rank, with the percentage of students expected to be at each level in parentheses: Superior (50%), Good (50%), Developing (0%), Not Acceptable (0%);  4. Positive feedback from exit interviews with regard to preparation for meeting this objective. | **1.AY 17-18** – Six students submitted Recital Analysis papers or Theses; Six students took Comprehensive Examinations; Six students held Oral Examinations. One student turned in a Recital Analysis in the *Superior* category (17%); Five students turned in Recital Analyses in the *Good* category (83%).  **SU 18** Capstone Research Projects will be evaluated according to the rubric following completion in SU 18  **2.AY 17-18** Written comprehensive examinations: Six out of six students achieved Pass or Conditional Pass on the Written Exam (the two that received Conditional Pass on a question submitted the necessary paper to qualify for a Pass)  3. Grade A Superior ranking, 15/19 students (79%) Grade B Good ranking 4/19, (21%), Grade C Developing rank 0%, Not acceptable 0%  4. In response to the statement “Coursework improved my ability to demonstrate effective writing skills” one student ‘strongly agreed’, one student ‘agreed’, and two students ‘somewhat agreed.’ | The graduate examining committee formed for each student performs the evaluations. The Graduate Coordinator evaluates the data and reports to the Chair and the Graduate Committee (GC). The Graduate Coordinator and Graduate Committee are responsible for making any consequent modifications to the assessment process and for formulating any consequent curricular modifications and presenting them to the faculty.  Assessment report is posted on the department of music faculty website. |

**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 Music Department has continued to use the new evaluation tools for the 2017-2018 year.

1. We have seen consistent use of Performance Assessment Tool for Graduate level juries and recitals in AY 17-18. For the first time we had significant data for each student from both fall and spring semesters. The resulting data reflects appropriate accomplishment by graduate students in the performing arena.

2. We have begun incorporating the new online MA in Music, Music Education Concentration into our assessment process. This summer we plan to use our current thesis/analysis evaluation tool to assess the Capstone Research project for the education concentration. As our first students graduate from the online program this summer, we will administer an electronic exit survey to gather additional data.

3. We are incorporating coursework from MUS 5880 – Seminar in Music History in our assessment process to find ways to evaluate critical thinking, research skills, and mechanics for the education concentration.

**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?**

Going forward our MA students will graduate under a 32-credit hour program without the thesis option. The new program was designed specifically to address student interest in a performance-centric program. Again, this year on exit survey questions students requested a more performance-oriented program. Students graduating under the new catalogue will have that experience. However, several of the previous sites for assessment will no longer exist. Instead,

* all students will enroll in a zero-credit course MUS 5940 Capstone Performance Project in the final semester. We will be able to use program notes associated with this course for assessment purposes
* the new course MUS 4760 MUS Seminar and Practicum in Music Instruction will provide assignments to assess critical thinking skills
* Assignments and tests from the other core courses in theory and research will be used in place of the comprehensive exams to assess mastery of course content.