

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20

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 350</p>	<p>100% of students will earn at least of Milestone 3 (Acceptable) or 35 out of 50 possible points (70%) on the Music History Rubric.</p>	<p>Altogether, 78.6% (n=42) 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>Piano Proficiency Evaluations (Degree requirement; Not tied to an individual course)</p>	<p>100% of students will achieve at least a score of 70 out of 100 possible points (70%) on the Piano Proficiency Rubric for their degree program.</p>	<p>Altogether, 71.8% (n=39) met or exceeded the benchmark.</p>	<p>To better prepare students to fulfill the requirements of their piano proficiency assessment, students in class piano courses are encouraged to take the proficiency exam as soon as they have completed the course rather than waiting until later (when skills have declined).</p> <p>Additionally, greater emphasis during class meetings was placed on sightreading, as this specific skill received the lowest scores overall.</p>

3. Students will complete an Exit Survey upon completion of their undergraduate degree program.	Exit survey was issued to all graduating and recently graduated students.	100% of students will respond to the survey to provide qualitative data about their perception of their time in the School of Music	Students identified a number of concerns related to advising, curriculum, facilities, and recruitment initiatives.	In response to student exit survey data, the School of Music will undertake a review of advising and recruitment practices as well as bring in a consultant to review our core music curriculum and make suggestions that will address current barriers to student success and degree completion. Additionally, the Fine Arts Building was renovated during the 2018-19 academic year and we are investing \$100,000 to update the lighting system for the Recital Hall in the Landini Center for Performing and Fine Arts.
---	---	---	--	---

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). The committee has determined that the assessment process for music history should be expanded to examine student work beyond their large-scale research project in order to better understand the breadth of their music history knowledge. It has not yet been determined what artifacts will be examined for this assessment.

Keyboard Proficiency data indicates that students continue to struggle to meet the expectations in two subsections of the exam. On average, students do not meet expectations for the benchmark related to sightreading and score reading. After considering the data available, keyboard faculty have determined that sightreading options on the exam are significantly more difficult than those explored in piano classes. As such, these items will be revised for future exams.

In the coming year, the School of Music will continue to revise our student learning outcomes in an effort to isolate specific skills that are more easily measured. At present, many of our 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 assess applied juries (all degree programs), music theory competencies (all degree programs), the student teaching experience (Music Education program), the music internship experience (Music Business program), and the senior recital experience (Music Performance and Music Composition programs). This plan is slightly different than the schedule proposed last year because revising the assessment process proved to be more challenging than initially anticipated.

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. Implemented revised music history course sequence to slow the rate at which information is presented and to focus on developing transferrable skills related to the field	Newly proposed sequence was launched by the music history faculty	Student completion, DFW rates, and exam data were collected and reviewed against the same data from previous years	Students in the revised music history sequence exhibited greater success overall (e.g. zero failures, higher exam averages, greater confidence with materials) as well as decreased stress related to the course	Increased retention rate for FT/FT freshmen within the School of Music moving forward
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 is 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	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	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	N/A – These new sessions were officially implemented for the Fall 2019 semester.	Increased retention rate for FT/FT freshmen within the School of Music moving forward

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?

During the first weeks of the Fall 2019 semester, a consultant from our accrediting agency, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), will come to campus to review our curriculum. This consultant will meet with our faculty to discuss our curriculum and any barriers (academic and otherwise) that negatively impact student success and degree completion. The focus of the consultants report will be recommendations about how to reconstruct our core music curriculum in order to meet the needs of our students, increase our effectiveness as a program, and maximize the resources of the department. Once this report is received, the School of Music will work collectively to implement a course of action in preparation for our official accreditation visit during the Spring 2022 semester.

Faculty in music history, music theory, music skills, and piano will develop a clearly defined list of student outcomes for each course in the respective sequences in order to more clearly communicate specific skills students will acquire in and need to master in each course. This will also allow faculty teaching these courses to present materials with greater consistency from semester to semester, and in situations where faculty are teaching courses not typically part of their teaching load.

During the 2018-19 semester, the Fine Arts Building underwent a renovation, which included new teaching technology, more adequate and safe equipment and instrument store, more practice rooms and locks for student use, and more office space for faculty. Additionally, the School of Music will spend \$100,000 of endowment funds to replace the lighting system in the Recital Hall in the Landini Center for Performing and Fine Arts. Both of these investments have greatly improved the quality of our teaching facilities.

We continue to study the data collected from our exit survey instrument. Students have indicated, for the second year, that academic advising remains a major issue. To that end, there has been frequent change in the advisor for our freshmen in the University College. We are continuing to work with each new person to get our freshmen in the proper courses.

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 few years, faculty in these areas and others have either retired, moved into administrative roles, or moved to different institutions. 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 in critical areas of the program.

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 2018-19 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 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: B.M. Music Undergraduate Programs	Overall Rating: Mature (2.69/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning outcomes are complex, but are still clear and measureable. Excellent suggestion in the discussion about refining outcomes to align with NASM. This will have long-lasting benefits for the program and for those responsible for assessment and accreditation.• Clear information is provided about courses and assignments used for assessment, including the use of both direct and indirect measures.• Excellent use of a rubric for direct assessment purposes.• Expectations and actual student performance are clearly described.• Suggestions for improvement of student learning are clearly rooted in analysis of the data. Reviewing the individual performance indicators for each outcomes has provided you with such granular insight that your suggestions for improvement can be right on target.• Excellent suggestion to include more points of assessment for music history. This is great as a formative means to provide intervention or as a comprehensive means to better understand learning overall and pinpoint potential barriers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• When updating learning outcomes, make sure not to sacrifice quality complexity for simplicity just for the sake of assessment. There's a good balance to be struck to preserve both measurability and content. I can certainly be of service if needed.• Consider breaking out your reported scores by level on the rubric along with the way it is already reported (which is great). This would give you more insight into how many students were just missing the mark versus completely missing it and allow you to adjust efforts accordingly.• Insights about the capacity and reputation of the program regarding the loss of TT faculty are duly noted. I'm sure this goes without saying, but do share these concerns and any data to accompany them with the CAS Dean's office as part of their look at SEM priorities. You might consider data from your indirect measures or whether your student learning outcome data shows significant difference from when you had more faculty as a data point to explore. I also imagine your consultant visit provided benchmarking information that would be useful in this area. While supporting data doesn't always translate into more resources, more resources, when available, typically starts with supporting data.

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, measureable, 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, measureable, 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 accretor 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 type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped