

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2020-21 Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.

Degree Program Name: __ Undergraduate Degrees in Music __ Contact Name and Email Scott.Buchanan@indstate.edu & Terry.Dean@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</p>
<p>1. Students will synthesize musical skills through preparation, performance, and informed interpretation as a soloist on their principal instrument.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of recorded live performances of barrier juries and final juries</p> <p>(MUS 272, 274, 276 & MUS 472, 474, 476)</p>	<p>Students will Meet Expectations by earning at least 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Jury and Recital Assessment Rubric for applicable performance area.</p>	<p>90% (n=10) of 400-level students met or exceeded the benchmark. Only 64% (n=22) of 200-level students met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>To better assess student performance on juries, the Jury and Recital Assessment Rubric will be used as a tool in lessons. Additionally, faculty will work to incorporate the rubric for use in all student performance juries to better assessing student progress. Lastly, a norming session will be held for all performance faculty to make sure the rubric is being used consistently across all areas.</p>
<p>2. Students will present a recital of compositions in a variety of media, styles, and forms that the faculty jury panel determines would reasonably be deemed worthy of acceptance into a master's degree program in music composition at a peer institution.</p> <p>(Music Composition concentration)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of recorded live performances of final composition recitals</p> <p>(MUS 479)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Composition Recital Assessment Rubric for applicable performance area.</p>	<p>Altogether, 100% (n=2) of students met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>To better assess student performance on composition recitals, the School of Music will work to provide ensemble resources to students their compositions can be realized more easily in performance. Additionally, hiring a tenure-track music theorist with a background in composition would likely to help revitalize this program area as we do not currently have a full-time faculty member for composition.</p>

<p>3. Students will present a 45 to 60-minute senior recital with performance skills that demonstrate technical facility, musicality, artistry, and poise at a level that the faculty jury panel determines would reasonably be deemed worthy of acceptance into a master's degree program in music performance. All required recitals should contain repertoire that span musical styles and/or time periods, and instrumental variety, if appropriate. All recital repertoires must have the approval of the Individual Performance Study faculty member.</p> <p>(Music Performance concentration)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of recorded live performances of final recitals</p> <p>(MUS 479)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Jury and Recital Assessment Rubric for applicable performance area.</p>	<p>Altogether, 100% (<i>n</i>=5) of students met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>It is common practice in the School of Music to not permit students to present a recital until it is clear they are ready to do so and unequivocally meet expectations for performing musicians. No changes are anticipated regarding this area of assessment.</p>
<p>4. Students will combine theoretical knowledge with practical workplace applications to develop into music industry professionals prepared to quickly assess the needs of a position and a company, then to be a positive, effective, creative, and professional asset to the company and to the overall music industry.</p> <p>(Music Business concentrations)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of final portfolio comprised of bi-weekly reports which address how theory has been applied to the workplace in a positive, effective and creative manner</p> <p>(MUS 499)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Music Business Internship Rubric.</p>	<p>Altogether, 100% (<i>n</i>=16) of students met or exceeded the benchmark. Eight students met expectations and 8 students exceeded expectations.</p>	<p>To better support students during the internship experience, music business faculty plan to revise the methods by which students report their experiences while working in the field. In part, this will involve a change to bi-weekly reports such that they are more reflective than they are summaries of student experiences.</p>
<p>5. Students will demonstrate through practical field experience and written documents, such as unit and lesson plans, their ability to plan and deliver pedagogically competent and developmentally appropriate music instruction in a variety of music classrooms.</p> <p>(Music Education concentrations)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of weekly portfolio entries and final self-evaluation.</p> <p>(MUS 495)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Music Education Student Teaching Experience Rubric.</p>	<p>Altogether, 100% (<i>n</i>=32) of students met or exceeded the benchmark. Ten students met expectations and 22 students exceeded expectations.</p>	<p>To improve student performance and assessment efforts for the student teaching experience, a music specific student teacher assessment evaluation is being developed and will be implemented in the block classes to better track student need and improvement in content areas.</p>

<p>6. Students will synthesize an understanding of musical concepts and structures through the creation and realization of music.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Evaluation final sight singing exam</p> <p>(MUS 213)</p>	<p>Students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Sight Singing Skills Rubric.</p>	<p>This point of assessment was not successfully met for the current assessment cycle. The music theory faculty member charged with this course submitted examples of student sight singing that do not accurately communicate student performance in this area. Students were given melodies to prepare rather than one that asks students to apply the skill as the School of Music would want to assess.</p>	<p>To better measure student aural skills, the School of Music plans to incorporate the ETS Music Field Test to assess students in the areas of aural skills, written theory, and music history. Additionally, the possibility of hiring a full-time tenure-track music theory faculty member will provide better guidance in this area.</p>
<p>7. Students will synthesize an understanding of musical concepts and structures through the creation and realization of music.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Scoring of final dictation exam</p> <p>(MUS 213)</p>	<p>Students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Dictations Skills Rubric.</p>	<p>This point of assessment was not successfully met for the current assessment cycle. The music theory faculty member charged with this course submitted examples of student dictation exams that do not accurately communicate student performance in this area.</p>	<p>To better measure student aural skills, the School of Music plans to incorporate the ETS Music Field Test to assess students in the areas of aural skills, written theory, and music history. Additionally, the possibility of hiring a full-time tenure-track music theory faculty member will provide better guidance in this area.</p>
<p>8. Students will synthesize an understanding of musical concepts and structures through the creation and realization of music.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Evaluation of Music Theory 3 final exam</p> <p>(MUS 211)</p>	<p>Students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Music Composition Skills Rubric.</p>	<p>This point of assessment was not successfully met for the current assessment cycle. The music theory faculty member charged with this course submitted examples of student dictation exams that do not accurately communicate student performance in this area.</p>	<p>To better measure student aural skills, the School of Music plans to incorporate the ETS Music Field Test to assess students in the areas of aural skills, written theory, and music history. Additionally, the possibility of hiring a full-time tenure-track music theory faculty member will provide better guidance in this area.</p>
<p>9. Students will complete an Exit Survey upon completion of their undergraduate degree program.</p>	<p>Exit survey was issued to all graduating and recently graduated students.</p>	<p>100% of students will respond to the survey to provide qualitative data about their perception of their time in the School of Music</p>	<p>Students ($n=23$) identified a number of concerns related to advising, curriculum, facilities, and recruitment initiatives.</p>	<p>In response to student exit survey data, the School of Music will continue to optimize our advising practices and to address teaching challenges associated with individual faculty members.</p>

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

- 1) Cohort Sizes 2) Year-to-Year Retention 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate)

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1. Increase 6-year graduation rate to 50% by 2022	Tutoring efforts; curriculum revision in music history and music theory/skills core; mentoring sessions for first-year students.	The latest Blue Reports data is used to track this goal	For the 2014 cohort, the 5-year graduate rate was 34.9%; however, for the 2016 cohort, the 5-year graduate rate increased to 41.8%.	We are continuing to work to improve both the 4-year and 5-year graduation rates.
2. Establish a more positive and safe learning environment	New array of sessions for first-year students were developed to allow greater contact with FT/FT freshman and guarantee proper support and mentoring moving forward in their degree programs.	Data will be collected via our School of Music Exit Survey as well as FT/FT freshman retention data will be used to determine the impact of this goal	A set of new mentoring sessions were officially implemented for the Fall 2019 semester. The sessions addressed a number of key learning and success challenges, such as time management, practice and study techniques, jury preparation, and the like, which historically have been barriers to students’ successful performance.	Increased retention rate for FT/FT freshmen within the School of Music moving forward

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus on in the coming year?

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

- 1) the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness** (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)
- 2) findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
- 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**
- 4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

Outcome 1: As a new baseline for assessment, only 40% of students at the 400-level met or exceeded the target. Adding the use of rubrics throughout the applied lessons during the semester is a recommendation from the Assessment Committee. This may increase scores in future assessment of the learning outcome. (It should be noted that students who exceeded expectations for this learning outcome were students in studios already utilizing rubrics during weekly lessons.) The low achievement of 200-level students with regard to this learning outcome is expected as these students are only part way through their coursework in the area of applied study. The inclusion of these numbers is to better track student growth performers within the various degree concentrations.

Outcome 2: During the reporting period, two composition students presented recitals during the 2020-21 academic year. As the first students to complete the composition recital in many semesters, the Assessment Committee will work with the composition faculty member to determine ways to better support composition students in completing the recital component of their degree program.

Outcome 3: As a group, all students achieved the benchmark for this learning outcome. This is expected as most recitals involve a preliminary hearing in advance of the public performance. Faculty in the Applied area will discuss methods for increasing student performance such that more undergraduate recitals progress beyond “Meets Expectations” to “Exceed Expectations.”

Outcome 4: By their nature, music business internships are each unique unto themselves. With the wide variety of career choices and venues available in this area, there is consequently great variety in the settings for internships. For this reason, a “standardized” experience isn’t possible, making this both a significant benefit and challenging in attempting to subjectively compare one internship experience to another. During the period under review, for instance, internships included established businesses in music retail (three types), music publishing, radio, amphitheater performance venue, churches in which music production was robust, state governmental arts agency, arts administration educational outlet, and traditional arts administration outlets. As such, it is always challenging to calibrate the similarities and differences between internships in which students engage.

To establish a semblance of subjective comparison, students respond to a series of common questions bi-weekly. Questions range from housekeeping issues (hours worked during the bi-weekly period), reportage (kinds of work, projects engaged in, or trained for, what exposure to varied business aspects have been introduced), reflective issues (insights into the effect of interactive experiences with co-workers and/or customers, observations about the workplace culture, and what the intern would like to see change in the coming weeks of the internship), and, finally, whether there are any looming issues of concern in which might require intervention on the intern’s behalf. Tremendous detail in these bi-weekly reports is not necessarily essential; however, students are expected to dig deeper than just time-reporting and consciously think and write about the experience. The goal is to help students/interns realize, again through more pointed reporting topics, or perhaps through use of discussion boards, that there are valuable lessons to be learned from the workplace, even/especially when there are signs of some dysfunction within the business. Students are sometimes reluctant to report such things, but it is the subtle recognition of the difference between criticizing and engaging in critical thinking that is emphasized.

Outcome 5: As a group, all students achieved the benchmark for this learning outcome. This is expected as students spend multiple semesters practicing the delivery of lessons, working with ensembles, and the like. Additionally, faculty in the Music Education area will discuss methods for increasing student performance on state licensure exams. However, the exam changed as of September 1, 2021, and students are passing the new exam with greater frequency than in recent semesters.

Outcomes 6-8: The Music Theory and Aural Skills curriculum was revised during the 2020-21 academic year and went into effect this semester. With these changes, we anticipate seeing greater success among students regarding mastery of essential music theory knowledge and demonstrable aural skills. Additionally, the School of Music is exploring the possibility of using the ETS Subject Test for Music Theory, Music History, and Aural Skills as a means of assessing student performance in these areas. Using this test will both simplify the assessment process and provide greater consistency in obtaining assessment data. Moreover, the ETS Subject Test will provide us data not only about our students, but

also students in comparable programs. Having this information will better inform our curriculum decisions as we continue to refine our curriculum to meet the needs of today's students.

Outcome 9: Based on the 2021 School of Music Exit Survey, there seems to be two or three common points of emphasis. Students agree that School of Music facilities are in fine shape following the renovation of the Fine Arts building is complete. There are comments about the conditions of the restrooms; however, this has been an ongoing battle for years. Constant turnover in the facilities management area (especially during the pandemic) has not helped. Comments regarding the quality of School of Music equipment (instruments, technology, etc.) are generally positive. Students also comment that they are well informed about University policies and School of Music events.

There has been improvement regarding advising since the last survey. Advising duties were re-assigned, and there appear to be fewer complaints. Students still would like to have a School of Music advisor during their freshman year, but that decision is made outside the unit.

Survey responses seem to present a dichotomous view of the School of Music as it relates to acceptance and promoting a sense of community. Some students feel very welcomed, while others share some extremely harsh comments regarding experiences their here. When answering the question, "Does the environment in the School of Music foster a sense of community and acceptance?" over 71% answered "Yes." However, comments from the remaining 29% were quite disturbing. School of Music faculty and administrators will discuss the areas of concern contained in this survey, and work toward an improved culture and learning environment that is more inclusive.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2020-21 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: Undergraduate Music Programs	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning outcomes are clear, specific and measurable. They are designated for all concentrations or specific concentrations for clarity, making the assessment process quite comprehensive. • Direct measures including performance, portfolios, and exams are described with appropriate tools for evaluation and high-quality use of those tools (rubrics evaluated by multiple raters, for instance). Indirect survey measures provide essential supporting information. • Expectations for student performance are clear, and data is reported relative to these expectations. Helpful contextual notes are added with the data when necessary. • Thoughtful discussion is provided about findings, including strategies for supporting strong performance, strategies for addressing weak performance, and ideas for better supporting assessment efforts moving forward. It is abundantly clear from the report that multiple faculty take part in assessment activities and that the School's assessment leadership value the quality of the assessment process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though it is obvious from how involved all your faculty are in assessment that assessment is a shared process, add a specific note about how you share findings of the assessment process. • I think this format representing the different programs works well. Consider still having faculty submit a separate report for Music Ed since it is has a SPA and higher standard for assessment.

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.</p>	<p>Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<p>Analysis & Results</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
<p>Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection if offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results in provided.</p>
<p>Overall Rating</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Mature</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Developing</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped</p>