

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): MUSIC

Department: Fine and Performing Arts

Degree or Certificate Level: BA

College/School: College of Arts and Sciences

Date (Month/Year): September 2021

Assessment Contact: Aaron Johnson

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? AY 20-21

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2019

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

Students **produce** performances of standard repertoire **employing** technique appropriate to the student's instrument or voice in solo recitals and/or juries.

Music Performance students **prepare** standard repertoire and **interpret** it accurately and expressively.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe and identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Both outcomes listed above were assessed using Junior Recital (MUSC 3850) and Senior Recital (MUSC 4961) performances presented during the 20-21 academic year – three Junior Recitals and two Senior Recitals. Junior and Senior Recitals involve preparation and presentation of a solo recital in the student's primary performance area (either piano or voice). Junior and Senior Recitals are required for the Music Performance concentration. Recitals were video recorded and archived for the faculty to access and assess.

Madrid does not offer a degree in music. Courses were not online or off campus.

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (do not just refer to the assessment plan).

All music faculty members were involved in the assessment process. A rubric was used for each recital. Faculty scored the student's level of achievement in multiple areas (see rubric attached) with scores for all areas aggregated into a total score.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

The data shows that every student presenting a recital last year demonstrated competency in every category. Every student scored 1 (good) or 2 (excellent) in every category by all faculty. The aggregated scores for each student show that all five scored in High Pass range (12-10).

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

We learned that each student who presented a recital met or exceeded expectations in every category. All performances were well prepared and professionally presented using proper technique and musical/textual interpretation. This tells us that the

students' voice/piano instructors are making sure the students are ready to present their recitals. All students scored Excellent or Good for each category by all faculty members. Aggregate scores for each student were all in the High Pass range.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The datasheet (see Appendix) was shared with faculty and discussed during their first faculty meeting of the school year. Faculty also make a point of discussing student progress directly after recitals are presented.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Course content● Teaching techniques● Improvements in technology● Prerequisites | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Course sequence● New courses● Deletion of courses● Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings |
| Changes to the Assessment Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Student learning outcomes● Artifacts of student learning● Evaluation process | <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)● Data collection methods● Frequency of data collection |

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

The preparation for Junior and Senior Recitals typically includes a recital pre-hearing at least two weeks prior to the recital date. In the pre-hearing, the student presents selections from the recital for the music faculty. The faculty then determines if the student is ready to proceed with the recital or not. Because of COVID, we eliminated pre-hearings to reduce exposure. Instead, we consulted with the student's voice/piano instructor to determine if the student was ready. No one knows more about the student's readiness than their instructor. Moving forward, we will eliminate the barrier of the pre-hearing and will replace it with consultation with the student's individual instructor. We will continue to monitor this and make changes if necessary.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

Three years ago, we changed the way the Piano Proficiency Exam is administered. The PPE is a playing test all music majors must pass in order to demonstrate minimum competencies at the piano. Previously, it was a non-course degree requirement. Some students, particularly non-piano majors, struggled to pass the exam. We made the exam part of an existing class all majors must take (Class Piano IV) resulting in more students passing the exam on their first attempt.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

A rubric/grade sheet is completed for each student by all faculty members attending the PPE. Grade sheets are kept on file and referred to as needed.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

All students are passing the PPE, and most on their first attempt.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

Because we only have 1-3 students taking the Piano Proficiency Exam each year, it is difficult to make generalizations. However, one of the two students preparing for the exam last year struggled, in large part

because Class Piano IV was forced to be delivered online due to the pandemic. The instructor of the class has redesigned the curriculum of the class and has assembled her own textbook that will be better suited to preparing students both in-person and online, if the need ever arises again.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.

APPENDIX

Junior/Senior Recital Assessment Rubric

Junior/Senior Recital Assessment

Name: _____ Recital date: _____

Instrument/voice: _____ Reviewer (please print): _____

| | Excellent | Good | Not satisfactory | Comments |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|----------|
| TECHNIQUE | Excellent Error-free performance, including excellent diction (singers) | Good Solid performance, few errors | Not satisfactory Many errors | |
| Circle one: | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| MUSICALITY | Excellent Accurate performance demonstrating understanding of style, aesthetic, emotional or affective content | Good Accurate performance | Not satisfactory Mechanical performance, lacking expressivity and apparent understanding of style, aesthetic, emotional or affective content | |
| Circle one: | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| INTONATION/TONE | Excellent Consistently in tune/good tone, few lapses | Good Mostly in tune, good tone | Not satisfactory Poor intonation, poor tone | |
| Circle one: | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| RHYTHM, DYNAMICS, PHRASING | Excellent Accurate rhythm, nuanced dynamic and phrasing control | Good Mostly accurate rhythm, adequate control over dynamics | Not satisfactory Irregular grasp of rhythm, poor dynamic and phrasing control | |
| Circle one: | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| PERFORMANCE PRACTICE | Excellent Consistently at ease | Good Mostly at ease | Not satisfactory Not at ease | |
| Circle one: | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| PROGRAM FORM AND CONTENT | Excellent Inclusive, clear, accurate writing, no errors of form or content, excellent layout | Good Acceptable writing, no factual errors, acceptable form and layout | Not satisfactory Inadequate form and style, mechanical and factual errors, flawed layout | |
| Circle one: | 2 | 1 | 0 | |

Add all circled numbers:

| | | |
|--|---------|----------|
| Cumulative assessment (circle one): | | |
| HP (12-10) | P (9-5) | NP (4-0) |

HP = High Pass
P = Pass
NP = No Pass

2020-21 Data for Junior and Senior Recitals

| student: AS (jr) | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|---------------|---------------------|-------|
| faculty | technique | musicality | intonation/tone | rhythm | perf practice | program and content | TOTAL |
| AJ | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| ST | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| RH | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| (avg) | 1.333333333 | 1.666666667 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |

High Pass

| student: LB (sr) | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| faculty | technique | musicality | intonation/tone | rhythm | perf practice | program and content | TOTAL |
| AJ | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| ST | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| RH | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| (avg) | 1.666666667 | 1.666666667 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11.33333333 |

High Pass

| student: MB (jr) | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| faculty | technique | musicality | intonation/tone | rhythm | perf practice | program and content | TOTAL |
| AJ | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| ST | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| RH | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| (avg) | 1.666666667 | 1.666666667 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11.33333333 |

High Pass

| student: DC (jr) | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|------------|-----------------|--------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| faculty | technique | musicality | intonation/tone | rhythm | perf practice | program and content | TOTAL |
| AJ | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| ST | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| RH | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| (avg) | 1.333333333 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10.33333333 |

High Pass

| student: DC (sr) | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|--------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| faculty | technique | musicality | intonation/tone | rhythm | perf practice | program and content | TOTAL |
| AJ | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| ST | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| RH | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 |
| (avg) | 2 | 2 | 1.333333333 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11.33333333 |

High Pass