

**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:** \_\_Graduate Degrees in Music\_\_ **Contact Name and Email** [Paul.Bro@indstate.edu](mailto:Paul.Bro@indstate.edu) & [Terry.Dean@indstate.edu](mailto: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><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</b></p> <p><b>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome*</a> each outcome aligns with.</b></p>	<p><b>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome?</b></p> <p><b>(2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</b></p>
<p>1. Master's Students will demonstrate advanced musical skills through preparation, performance, and informed interpretation as a soloist on their principal instruments and as a member of a chamber and/or large ensemble.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of recorded live performance jury</p> <p>(MUS 676)</p>	<p>Students will earn 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, 73% (n=5) 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>2. Master's students will synthesize an advanced understanding of historical contexts and theoretical structures of musical works and styles through analysis, research and writing.</p> <p>(All degree concentrations)</p>	<p>Evaluation of Final Compositions, Analyses, Research &amp; Writing Projects</p> <p>(MUS 539 &amp; MUS 543)</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>No composition, analysis, or research project was scheduled for MUS 543 during the 2015-16.</p> <p>No graduate students were enrolled in MUS 539 during 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. Master's students with a concentration in conducting will present a graduate conducting recital that demonstrates the performance qualities of an entry-level professional conductor.</p> <p>(Wind and Choral Conducting concentrations)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of recorded live conducting performance.</p> <p>(MUS 679)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Conducting Assessment Rubric for applicable performance area.</p>	<p>Due to technical difficulties, the recording of the recital made was deemed unusual for assessment purposes and this point of assessment was not able to be completed.</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. Master's students with a concentration in performance will present a graduate recital with performance skills that demonstrate the performance qualities of an entry-level professional performer.</p> <p>(Music Performance concentration)</p>	<p>Multi-rater evaluation of recorded live performances of final composition recitals</p> <p>(MUS 679)</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% (n=1) 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>5. Master's students with a concentration in education will demonstrate through research and writing an understanding of effective pedagogical techniques developmentally appropriate for all age levels and an understanding of philosophical perspectives in education.</p> <p>(Music Education concentration)</p>	<p>Evaluation of music education practicum or thesis</p> <p>(MUS 697 or MUS 699)</p>	<p>Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Music Education Thesis and Practicum Assessment Rubric.</p>	<p>No graduate students were enrolled in MUS 697 or MUS 699 during the 2015-16 academic year and this point of assessment was not able to be completed.</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>

\* 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 graduate performance juries, writing and analysis in the graduate history and theory curriculum, graduate conducting recitals, graduate performance recitals, and graduate music education theses and practicums. Faculty members expect 100% of students to earn the rating of at least "Meets Expectations" at the graduate level. As the chart above shows, this benchmark was not met for most outcomes.

Outcome 1: 83% of students 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. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2016-17 academic year.

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. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2016-17 academic year.

Outcome 3: The faculty panel, comprised of members from the Ensemble area, deemed the camera placement ineffective for this assessment task. Discussion involved the development of a three-part process for future assessment of this learning outcome. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2016-17 academic year.

Outcome 4: There was only one artifact available for the assessment of this learning outcome. The student achieved the benchmark. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2016-17 academic year.

Outcome 5: No artifacts were available for the assessment of this learning outcome due to the fact that no students were enrolled in MUS 697 or MUS 699. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2016-17 academic year.

During the 2016-17 academic year, the School of Music is scheduled to revisit all of the learning outcomes identified above. Additionally, graduate research methods (MUS 609: Research in Music) is scheduled for assessment.

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

Degree Program: MM in Music    Date: 8.12.16

	<b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 – Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<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.
<b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b>	<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 type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)  <input 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>
<p><b>3. Results</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b></p>	<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. <b>Some do.</b></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>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>

## COMMENTS

### Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

Again, 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 measurable. #2 needs a more appropriate verb (demonstrate?). Please update both the Outcomes Library and the Curriculum Map, which do not match the current outcomes.

#### 2. Measures & Performance Goals

The program identified five rigorous, discrete measures, including performances, compositions, and research projects. In conjunction with comments in Part Two, the performance expectations are clear. But especially for a graduate program, isn't 70% a bit low? Would a more aspirational goal better serve the program and its students—or do the rubrics themselves need to be recalibrated? Please provide the rubrics so that I have a better understanding of exactly what you are assessing. This is particularly important to outcome #2, whose measures include at least three separate projects. Are they really all assessed using the same rubric? Last, you may need to revise your assessment plan so that it focuses on the courses students will actually enroll in. . . .

#### 3. Results

Results were reported and achieved for two of the five outcomes. (Was the score on #1 73% or 83%? Two different results are reported in Part One and Part Two.) As was the case with the undergraduate music program, some planned assessments did not occur; the number of students who were assessed is even smaller. In context with previous years' results, do this year's seem valid?

#### 4. Engagement & Improvement

Part Two suggests that the School "completed assessment of five learning outcomes," which clearly is not the case. But there is some evidence here that results are being examined and actions are being planned to improve them. I appreciate that you are trying some new assessment techniques, and that you are determined to make them work. In next year's report, please provide details about what students do well/less well. Is learning improving? 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.