

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18

Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.

Unit/Program Name: Music (Undergraduate Programs)

Contact Name(s) and Email(s): Scott.Buchanan@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities

<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?</p>
<p>1. Students will synthesize an understanding of the context and structure of music through analysis, research and writing.</p>	<p>Evaluation of final research paper from MUS 351</p>	<p>100% of students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 40 out of 50 possible points (80%) on the Sight Singing Skills Rubric.</p>	<p>Altogether, 82% (n=28) of students met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>To better prepare our students to conduct research and write, we have revised our music history sequence to provide a slower and more systematic coverage of materials as well as address skills essential to writing and research, such as engaging with scholarly writing and developing strategies of argumentation.</p>
<p>2. Students will synthesize an understanding of musical concepts and structures through the creation and realization of music.</p>	<p>Evaluation of MUS 213 final Sight Singing exams</p>	<p>100% of students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 37.5 out of 50 possible points (75%) on the Sight Singing Skills Rubric.</p>	<p>Due to a computer error, data for use in this point of assessment was lost.</p>	<p>To prevent another loss of assessment data, all assessment artifacts will now be archived on a departmental virtual or cloud drive.</p>
<p>3. Students will synthesize an understanding of musical concepts and structures through the creation and realization of music.</p>	<p>Evaluation of MUS 213 final Dictation exams</p>	<p>100% of students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 37.5 out of 50 possible points (75%) on the Dictation Rubric.</p>	<p>Due to a computer error, data for use in this point of assessment was lost.</p>	<p>To prevent another loss of assessment data, all assessment artifacts will now be archived on a departmental virtual or cloud drive.</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.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must 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 must 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.
- 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: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

Based on our most recent assessment cycle, it was revealed that our students are increasingly comfortable recalling their historical knowledge of music. A historical framework for understanding music is generally present and historical facts are easily recalled, a trend that has steadily increased in recent years as evidenced by student performance on exams. However, students continue to struggle with applying the knowledge they have acquired. More precisely, students find it difficult to make critical assessments of musical works they are not familiar with in order to determine probable composers and genres, associate music with specific historical periods, communicate aesthetic value of works unfamiliar to them, and use historical knowledge in written contexts (e.g. research papers, program notes).

In the coming year, the School of Music will undergo a revision of our student learning outcomes in an effort to isolate specific skills that are more easily measured. At present, most of our current learning outcomes are multidimensional and unnecessarily complicated, which makes assessment difficult and the interpretation of data problematic. By amending our assessment plan and cycle, the School of Music will be able to better align our student learning outcomes with the accreditation standards of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and the Indiana Department of Education content standards. With regard to specific points of assessment for the upcoming year, the School of Music is planning to shift our assessment calendar to an individual program assessment that occurs on a two-year cycle. Currently, we have four student learning outcomes that are part of our undergraduate core (i.e. music history, music theory and skills, piano, and applied). For the coming year, we plan to assess music history and applied music juries. Additionally, we have four undergraduate degree programs and concentrations that will be assessed using a two-year cycle as well. These include music education, music business, music performance, and music composition. The undergraduate liberal arts degree in music corresponds with the undergraduate music core only and will be assessed as a consequence. In the coming year, we will assess music education and music composition degree programs, thus leaving music business and music performance for the 2019-2020 academic year.

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

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. Revised music theory core to allow for more effective sequencing of courses	Newly proposed sequence was presented to faculty for approval; approved by faculty vote	Data will be collected to determine the success of this change in sequencing	N/A	Increased retention rate for FTFT freshmen within the School of Music
2. Increase 6-year graduation rate to 35% by 2019	Tutoring efforts, curriculum revision in music history and music theory/skills core,	The latest Blue Reports data was used to track this goal.	In the 2011 cohort, the 6-year graduate rate was 35.0%; however, the 2012 cohort, the 6-year graduate rate increased to 46.3%	We are continuing to work to improve both the 4-year and 6-year graduation rates.
3. Establish a more positive and safe learning environment	During the Fall 2018 faculty retreat, we had a workshop presentation on positivity and collegiality	Data will be collected via our School of Music Exit Survey to determine the impact of this goal	As a unit, we continue to be understaffed, having lost 3 faculty lines since the beginning of Fall 2017 (2 to retirement and 1 to administrative appointment).	Continued efforts to request tenure-track lines in critical areas

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

Three or so years ago, academic units were asked to take a close look at their program curricula to identify possible “roadblocks to on-time graduation,” and look for ways to eliminate them. In the School of Music curriculum, one of these roadblocks is the fundamentals theory class (MUS 101). This course is for incoming freshmen who do not score high enough on the theory placement test in order to take Theory I (MUS 111). They need to take this 3-credit course; however, it does not count towards their degree requirements. The four-semester sequence required for all music majors begins with MUS 111. Thus, these students (nearly 55% of

each incoming freshman class) are instantly a semester behind, at minimum. After years of debate and discussion on what adjustments to make to the Music Theory sequence, the School of Music faculty has agreed on the following:

There will still be MUS 101 for incoming freshman who do not score well on the placement test (Year 1/Fall). However, MUS 111 (Theory I) will not be offered until Year1/Spring. This will allow for all students in the incoming freshmen cohort to start in Theory I at the same time. This is only a change in schedule flow for the sequence. Additionally, university hiring practices have made it impossible to continue offering off-sequence courses.

This change, in combination with the newly reconstructed sequence in Music History (which began Fall 2018) should significantly increase percentages in retention, persistence, and both 4-year and 6-year graduation rates. Data will be carefully collected, and studied to see the effects of these changes moving forward.

We continue to study the data collected from our exit survey instrument. Students have indicated, for the second year in a row, that academic advising is still a major issue. To that end, there has been a change in advisors for our freshmen in the University College. This new person has worked diligently to get our freshmen in the proper courses. Additionally, she has met with School of Music advisors to insure a smooth transition occurs as students move from a UC advisor to a SoM advisor. Lastly, in Spring 2018, the academic advisors in the School of Music met with the Associate Dean in the College of Arts & Sciences to insure that proper advising is taking place in all areas of our program.

Lastly, it is imperative that the School of Music be granted the appropriate resources in order for our majors to receive the quality education they are paying for, and deserve. Specifically, the unit currently does not have Tenure/Tenure-track lines in three *critical* areas: Applied Piano, Choral Music Education, and Music Theory. Just in the last two years, the faculty in these areas have either retired, or moved into administrative duties. None have been replaced. The School of Music cannot continue to be held accountable for recruiting talented students and maintaining enrollment when there is constant turnover in personnel. Word is out! High school music teachers in the state of Indiana are encouraging their talented students to go elsewhere, as they are very much aware that we do not have quality faculty members in place.

Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific—assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college's assessment site in Blackboard.

Dear Scott,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are 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 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	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Developing (1.75/3.00)	
Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes blew in blue): Developing (1.75/3.00)	
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning outcomes are student-centered and pretty specific and measurable (see recommendations for something to consider).• Alignment of outcomes with NASM and IDE standards is a fantastic idea for increasing the usefulness of your assessment process and meaningfulness of learning for students.• Clear information about courses and assignments used for assessment of each learning outcome. Great use of different types of assessment to capture different student learning performances at various points across the curriculum.• Good information about student performance on the 1st outcome.• Good information about how findings will be used to support student learning, writing, and research skills in music history, as well as how assessment artifacts and data will be stored in the future to preserve data integrity.• Great information about how the outcomes, assessment plan, and assessment cycle will be tailored to reflect learning in the separate programs for the coming year. It's clear that thoughtful consideration of the benefits and limitations of the current program has been undertaken to get to where you are now.• Clear goals for student success with good strategies to support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Each outcome starts with "students will synthesize an understanding," but it's hard to understand what that means. The second half of your outcomes that defines what students will actually do ("through the creation and realization of music) is really where the measurable part of the outcome comes in. Consider whether you need the first part or if you can streamline the wording to make the outcome more clear (so you know whether you're measuring synthesis, understanding, or the performance action named in the second half of the outcomes). Your notes in 1b echo some of this sentiment, but I think you're in a good place to refine what you have to get what you're looking for.• From the expectations for student performance I'm not completely sure which evaluation methods are used for each outcome (are Milestone 3 and the possible points on the rubrics from the same rubric? Does the Sight Singing Skills Rubric apply to the 1st outcome?). Clarify this information, and possibly attach the rubric in the future so that I can have a clearer understanding.• If the rubrics are used by multiple faculty, make a note of how they are prepared to use the rubrics consistently to ensure data quality.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Add information about how faculty are informed of results and involved in the process of determining how they're used to improve student learning.• Seeing increases in the 2012 6 year graduation rate, I wonder if you might increase your target rate again or provide more up-to-date data and include 4, 5, and 6 year rates so you can see the breakdown over time.• Consider making notes about the student success goal tied to revising music theory core and establishing a positive, safe learning environment. For instance, establishing a positive, safe learning environment sounds like a fantastic goal for retention and completion, but the strategies listed seem to apply to faculty relationships more than the impact on students. It can be inferred that more collegiality among faculty will translate to more supportive interactions with students, but make sure to connect those dots in your goal language.• Make note of which faculty are primarily responsible for each goal.
--	---

Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success (Parts 2a & 2b) Scoring Rubric is included below with no notations just for your reference (the SSC did not choose to report in this way).

Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)Unit/Program:

Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary