

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Due to your dean by June 1

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

Degree Program Name: __Undergraduate Degrees in Music__ Contact Name and Email Paul.Bro@indstate.edu & Terry.Dean@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.

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the Graduate Student Learning Outcome* each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome?</p> <p>(2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</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>Only 40% (n=4) of 400-level students met or exceeded the benchmark. Only 20% (n=4) of 200-level students met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2016 faculty retreat</p>
<p>2. Students will synthesize an understanding of the context and structure of music through analysis, research and writing.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Evaluation of Final Analysis project/paper</p> <p>(MUS 212)</p>	<p>Students will earn at least a score of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) in each of seven categories (Context and Purpose of Paper; Content Development; Evidence; Student's Position; Conclusions; Genre and Disciplinary Conventions; and Control of Syntax and Mechanics).</p>	<p>Student artifacts were not made available to the Assessment Committee and this point of assessment failed for the 2015-16 academic year.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2016 faculty retreat</p>
<p>3. Students will integrate technology and musicianship as part of their musical development.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Evaluation of Final Portfolio, which includes a notation project and a MIDI project</p> <p>(MUS 204)</p>	<p>Students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on each of the Technology Project rubrics.</p>	<p>Altogether, 73% (n=11) of students met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2016 faculty retreat</p>
<p>4. 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</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.</p>	<p>No music composition students scheduled recitals for the 2015-16 academic year and this point of assessment failed.</p>	<p>Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results</p> <p>School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2016 faculty retreat</p>

institution. (Music Composition concentration)				
5. 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 repertoire must have the approval of the Individual Performance Study faculty member. (Music Performance concentration)	Multi-rater evaluation of recorded live performances of final recitals (MUS 479)	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.	Altogether, 75% ($n=3$) of students met or exceeded the benchmark.	Assessment Committee collected data and analyzed results School of Music Director reviewed results and will distribute to the full faculty for discussion at the Fall 2016 faculty retreat

* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

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 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).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

In 2015-16, the School of Music completed assessment of five learning outcomes, including undergraduate performance juries, writing and analysis in the theory curriculum, music technology projects, music composition recitals, and senior performance recitals. Faculty members expect 100% of students to earn the rating of at least "Meets Expectations." As the chart above shows, this benchmark was not met for most outcomes.

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: The School of Music Director has recommended that all academic courses with written documents associated with the assessment of learning outcomes will be communicated in course syllabi and assignments/projects submitted via TurnItIn in BlackBoard. This will help guarantee that artifacts are available to the Assessment Committee as needed.

Outcome 3: As a group, the majority of students achieved the benchmark for this learning outcome. Faculty who assessed artifacts have recommended that MUS 204 (Technology for Musicians) be reviewed and updated to better serve the needs of our students and degree programs.

Outcome 4: No music composition students scheduled recitals during the 2015-16 academic year. This point of assessment will be revisited during the 2016-17 academic year.

Outcome 5: As a group, the majority of students achieved the benchmark for this learning outcome. Faculty in the Applied area will discuss methods for increasing student performance such that 100% of undergraduate recitals "Meet Expectations."

During the 2016-17 academic year, the School of Music is not scheduled to revisit any of the learning outcomes identified above as the School of Music is on a three-year rotation for the assessment of these learning outcomes. It has been suggested by some faculty that we revisit Learning Outcome 1 to strengthen both the assessment process and benchmark achievement. Moreover, Learning Outcome 4 will be revisited when next a music composition student schedules a recital. Additionally, the assessment of student teacher placements (MUS 495/496), music business internships (MUS 499), piano proficiencies, MUS 213 sight-singing and harmonic dictation finals, and MUS 211 composition projects will be assessed.

For each of the assessments outlined above, the 2016-17 year will serve to establish a baseline against which future assessment will be analyzed. As such, rubrics and assessment processes are still in the developmental stage and will be finalized during the Fall 2016 semester.

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BA in Music Date: 8.11.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. ? <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that

				<p>demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
3. Results	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
4. Engagement & Improvement	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <i>Will be?</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust</p>

	<p>(planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p>the results of assessment. Some do?</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.</p>	<p>activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

Next year, please submit the report as a Word document so that I can easily attach my scoring rubrics and comments to it.

1. Learning Outcomes

The five outcomes identified for assessment in the Student Learning Summary Report basically are clear and certainly are measurable. #2 needs a more appropriate verb (demonstrate?) and #5 is a bit unwieldy. Please update both the Outcomes Library and the Curriculum Map, which do not include #5. The latter also does not show that the listed outcomes are appropriately covered in the curriculum.

2. Measures & Performance Goals

The program identified four rigorous, discrete measures, including performances, a research project, and a portfolio. Does multi-rater evaluation really occur in all the classes listed for outcome #1?

In conjunction with comments in Part Two, the performance expectations are clear. But isn't 70% a bit low? Would a more aspirational goal better serve the program and its students? Last, please provide the rubrics so that I have a better understanding of exactly what you are assessing.

3. Results

Results were reported for three of the five outcomes; students achieved the standards set for just two of them. So I do have to ask: Is there any chance the traits and abilities associated with "meets expectations" really apply to a higher level of performance? Does the rubric need re-calibration?

Some planned assessments did not occur, and the number of students that were assessed is quite small. In context with previous years' results, do this year's seem valid? In regard to the first outcome, I would note that if students are doing so poorly at the 400-level, you really do need to take a good look at earlier performance. Where are they losing ground (or simply failing to gain it)? Your plan to use rubrics throughout the applied lessons should help you answer this question.

4. Engagement & Improvement

At least two faculty members are involved with the program's assessment. Part Two suggests that they take their role seriously, reviewing the data available and making viable suggestions for improvement. In next year's report, please provide details about what students do well/less well. Has learning improved? If so, why? If not, why not?

This report offers a good foundation for student learning assessment. I hope to see more evidence of engagement, follow-through, and improvement in next year's report.