Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

Degree Program Name: __Graduate Degrees in Music__ **Contact Name and Email** Scott.Buchanan@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

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year? If this is a graduate program, indicate the **Graduate Student Learning Outcome*** each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What method(s)s did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
1. Master's students will demonstrate an understanding of research methods by conducting bibliographic research, and demonstrating comprehension of qualitative and quantitative concepts.	Evaluation of Graduate Literature Review papers (MUS 609)	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).	Only 50% (n=6) 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 2017 faculty retreat
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. (All degree concentrations)	Evaluation of Final Compositions, Analyses, Research & Writing Projects (MUS 539)	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).	Altogether, 75% (n=4) 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 2017 faculty retreat

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. (Wind and Choral Conducting concentrations)	Multi-rater evaluation of recorded live conducting performance. (MUS 679)	Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Conducting Assessment Rubric for applicable performance area.	No graduate students were enrolled in MUS 679 during the 2016-17 AY and this point of assessment failed.	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 2017 faculty retreat
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. (Music Performance concentration)	Multi-rater evaluation of recorded live performances of final recitals (MUS 679)	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.	No graduate student final recitals were completed during the 2016-17 AY and this point of assessment failed.	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 2017 faculty retreat
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. (Music Education concentration)	Evaluation of music education practicum or thesis (MUS 697 or MUS 699)	Students will achieve at least a score of 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Music Education Thesis and Practicum Assessment Rubric.	Altogether, 100% (n=1) 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 2017 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 2016-17, 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: As a group, only 50% of students achieved the benchmark for this learning outcome. In general, those students who did not meet the benchmark struggled with assignments due to language challenges associated with their status as non-native speakers of English. To address this issue, a possible writing diagnostic to be implemented as part of the application and matriculation process may be explored, which would help guarantee that students in the School of Music's graduate programs have the language skills necessary for success. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2017-18 AY.

Outcome 2: As a group, the majority of students achieved the benchmark for this learning outcome. In order to increase students' likelihood of success, written assignments in graduate music history and theory courses will be staged to allow for more instructor feedback. Likewise, students will be encouraged to schedule one-on-one meetings with instructors. Moreover, requiring writing samples as part of the application and matriculation process would help guarantee that students in the School of Music's graduate programs demonstrate the requisite language skills for success. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2017-18 AY.

Outcome 3: No artifacts were available for the assessment of this learning outcome due to the fact that no final graduate conducting recitals were scheduled during the 2016-17 AY. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2017-18 AY.

Outcome 4: No artifacts were available for the assessment of this learning outcome due to the fact that no final graduate performance recitals were scheduled during the 2016-17 AY. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2017-18 AY.

Outcome 5: There was only one artifact available for the assessment of this learning outcome. The student achieved the benchmark, which is expected. All Master of Music students with a concentration in Education work through a logical sequence of coursework, which guides them toward successful completion of the benchmark. This point of assessment is scheduled to be revisited during the 2017-18 AY.

During the 2017-18 academic year, the School of Music is scheduled to revisit all of the learning outcomes identified above.

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. **Student Learning Outcomes**	☐ No outcomes were identified. ☐ No Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes were identified. ☐ Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☒ Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. ☒ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☒ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☐ Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. ☐ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☐ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☐ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☐ 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. ☐ Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. **Measures &**	☐ No measures are provided.	☐ Measures are provided, but	☒ At least one direct measure	☐ Multiple measures were

Performance Goals				
	☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☒ Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate. *Seems low.* ☐ Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.	was provided for each outcome. ☒ Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. ☒ Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.	employed, and most are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☒ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. ☐ Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do. ☐ If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that

				grades are calibrated to the outcomes.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected. ☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☒ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☒ Some data are being collected and analyzed. ☒ Some results are provided. ☒ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Data are being collected and analyzed. ☐ Results are provided. ☐ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	☐ 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. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☒ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☒ No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☐ Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. ☐ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☒ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. *Plan to.* ☐ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ☒ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. ☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. ☐ 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. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the

				result of assessment.
				☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.
				☐ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☒ **Level 1 - Developing**	☐ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS:

My biggest concern is that while there are some data, they suggest that students (even this small N) are not achieving the targets set for them, even though these targets also are fairly low. Writing remains a challenge for graduate music majors; this report identifies some potential actions to help students improve, and I look forward to hearing about their positive impact. Also, is there an indirect measure for the graduate program?

The rubric attached to your Student Learning Summary Report identifies specific items the assessment committee will need to address to move closer to the "mature" realm. The key, of course, is to present complete data, analyses that reveal precisely what students know and can do (and don't know, can't do), appropriate plans for intervention, and results that show improvement in learning.

You also should know that because we are gearing up for the Higher Learning Commission (which will visit ISU in 2020 or 2021 as part of the accreditation reaffirmation process), it is particularly important for us to be able to provide evidence that we are systematically assessing our curricular and co-curricular programs; using the information we derive from that process to develop actionable plans for improvement in student learning; and documenting the improvements that result. Thus, it is even more important that in Part Two of your 2018 Student Learning Summary Report, you describe your program's efforts to comply with these expectations.