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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 2017-2018** (39 performance assessments):   * 8 HC (20.5%) * 16 C (41%) * 14 MC (36%) * 1 NC (2.5%)   2. In **AY 2017-2018**, all 6 performance majors submitted portfolios. Students scored at the following levels:  90% or higher (HC) = 2  80% or higher (C) = 4  3. Insufficient data. In **AY 2017-2018**, 2 of 6 performance majors completed the exit survey. Some comments are included in narrative below. | 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 2017-2018**, all 6 performance majors submitted portfolios. Students scored at the following levels:  90% or higher (HC) = 2  80% or higher (C) = 4  2. Insufficient data. In **AY 2017-2018**, 2 of 6 performance majors completed the exit survey. Some comments are included in narrative below. | 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 2017-2018** (39 performance assessments):   * 8 HC (20.5%) * 16 C (41%) * 14 MC (36%) * 1 NC (2.5%)   2 In **AY 2017-2018**, all 6 performance majors submitted portfolios. Students scored at the following levels:  90% or higher (HC) = 2  80% or higher (C) = 4  3. Insufficient data. In **AY 2017-2018**, 2 of 6 performance majors completed the exit survey. Some comments are included in narrative below. | 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 2017-2018**, all 6 performance majors submitted portfolios. Students scored at the following levels:  90% or higher (HC) = 2  80% or higher (C) = 4  2. Insufficient data. In **AY 2017-2018**, 2 of 6 performance majors completed the exit survey. Some comments are included in narrative below. | 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 2017-2018**, all 6 performance majors submitted portfolios. Students scored at the following levels:  90% or higher (HC) = 2  80% or higher (C) = 4  2. Insufficient data. In **AY 2017-2018**, 2 of 6 performance majors completed the exit survey. Some comments are included in narrative below. | 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**

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.

Jury and recital preview data continue to serve as the primary tool for assessing student achievement in the area of Performance. 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. Applied faculty were again asked to submit specific Repertoire Records in both the FA 2017 and SP 2018 semesters to assist in the AC’s evaluation process.

**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. This is the first year that all performance majors submitted a portfolio. During the current evaluation period **(AY 2017-2018)**, six performance students submitted portfolios. The AC has continued to discuss options for making the portfolio submission an official requirement for graduation. 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.

**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. Two performance majors completed the exit survey this year. With such little participation, quantitative data is not generalizable and will not be shared here. The only narrative comments specific to performance curriculum/experience are:

*“It provided me with performance experience with excellent faculty who were eager to share their wisdom.”*

*“The wonderful facilities, and frequent guest artists.”*

**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.

While the university learning goals are discussed in the music department, more needs to be done to explicitly measure progress in these areas.

**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?*

Performance students continue to show some weakness in I.3. 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.

The assessment committee without a doubt needs to be more active next year. Faculty members in the music department serve on multiple committees and assessment was no doubt pushed to the back burner this year. Data collection continued, but next year will provide the opportunity for new faculty participation and ideas for future improvement.