1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

In accordance with the Department of Music’s assessment plan for undergraduate degrees revised and approved by faculty in 2013, we assessed the following outcomes common to all undergraduate programs:

MUS3 (Individual Applied Music): Students are able to interpret, prepare, and perform a variety of musical works on a primary instrument or voice sufficient to the requirements of their major.

MUS4 (Collaborative Applied Music): Students are able to interpret, prepare, and perform a variety of musical works through collaboration in musical ensembles sufficient to the requirements of their major. Students will:

4.1 Demonstrate knowledge of ensemble repertoire and its historical context and performance practice.
4.2 Demonstrate individual and ensemble practice and rehearsal techniques, error detection skills, sight-reading skills, leadership skills, and problem-solving skills.
4.3 Prepare and execute the individual demands of ensemble literature in a cycle of polished public performances.

The Department of Music created a three-year assessment cycle that encompasses all six core outcomes for undergraduate music. This is the first year we have assessed these outcomes. In addition, we continued to monitor outcomes MUS1 (Music Theory) and MUS 6 (Musical Disposition), the focus of prior assessment reports, to judge the effectiveness of program changes. This ongoing monitoring is now an important function of our staff advising specialist, and will not be reported here.

2. How were they assessed?

A) What methods were used?

Outcome MUS3 was assessed using area-specific quarterly jury performance forms that collect faculty panel ratings in relevant areas such as tone, rhythm, articulation, diction, articulation, etc. on common anchored rubrics. Each area has unique requirements. Juries are generally either “regular” or “level change” juries. This is a direct measure of knowledge and skill. This was the first assessment of this outcome, to establish a baseline standard of mastery. We believe a goal of at least 90% of students being judged Satisfactory or Outstanding is reasonable.

Outcome MUS4 was assessed using a common rubric with a 5-point scale (Exemplary, Proficient, Satisfactory, Basic, Unsatisfactory) for each component. Ensemble directors accessed rosters for required ensembles through Blackboard and completed the evaluation using Waypoint Outcomes. This is a direct measure of knowledge and skill. This was the first assessment of this outcome, to establish a baseline standard of mastery. We believe a goal of overall means in all areas as Satisfactory or above is reasonable.

B) Who was assessed?

For MUS3, all declared music majors are required to perform a quarterly jury (n = 455).

All students are required to participate in a large ensemble while in residence. Students enrolled in Winter 2014 sections of University Chorale, Chamber Choir, Symphony Orchestra, and Symphonic Band were assessed (n = 239). Data was not available for Wind Ensemble.
C) When was it assessed?

Jury data was collected for Fall 2013 and Spring 2014, ensemble data in Winter 2014.

3. What was learned?

- Were the Standards of Mastery met?
  Yes.

- Please report results in specific qualitative or quantitative terms, with the results linked to the outcomes you assessed, and compared to the standard of mastery (criterion) you noted above.

For outcome MUS3, several analyses were made of number of juries at each level, number of juries with piano accompaniment, and number of level change juries. This data is not directly pertinent to student achievement, but does inform department planning with regard to attrition and resources available for accompanists.

For Fall 2013, 21.3% of juries were judged Outstanding, 74.7% Satisfactory, and 2.5% Did Not Pass; 25.4% were missing accompanist. For Spring 2014, 30.0% of juries were judged Outstanding, 67.1% Satisfactory, and 2.7% Did Not Pass; 20.1% were missing accompanist. With the standard of mastery defined as at least 90% of juries judged Satisfactory or Outstanding, the departmental goal was met.

The following table summarizes assessment results for outcome MUS4:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensemble</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Repertoire and Performance Practice</th>
<th>Practice and Rehearsal Skills</th>
<th>Prepare and execute performance</th>
<th>Total/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chamber Choir</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorale</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestra</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symphonic Band</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the standard of mastery defined as mean scores for all areas as Satisfactory or above (3 out of 5), the department goal was met (average over all areas was 4.1).

The following tables from Waypoint Outcomes show basic distributions by ensemble:
Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

The overall assessment results summarized above, as well as additional analysis, confirms the general belief that the CWU music department is attracting and retaining excellent students with regard to applied music study, and supporting excellent faculty in the studios and ensembles. While about 3% of juries were judged Unsatisfactory, these tended to be at the 164 (freshman) level and in most cases, students did not continue in the program. This highlights the importance of the quarterly jury in monitoring and supporting students toward program completion.

While means are a rough measure of overall student body achievement in ensembles, very few students were evaluated as Basic or Unsatisfactory. It will be worthwhile to continue to ensure that ensemble directors note “outliers” and bring unusually low ensemble performance or participation to the attention of the department academic advisor. It is to be expected that average student achievement level will be higher in the more selective ensembles like Chamber Choir and Wind Ensemble. While all the means were very close, it may be warranted to discuss the lowest area, Knowledge of Repertoire and Performance Practice, to see if indeed this data is revealing a relative weakness in the ensemble area.

As might be expected, more students were judged to be performing at the Exemplary level in Chamber Choir and Orchestra. Chamber Choir is a select auditioned ensemble that tends to be populated with more advanced students from the vocal area, and the same is true for at least the wind/brass/percussion sections of the Orchestra.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?

- Please note specific changes to your program as they affect student learning, and as they are related to results from the assessment process.
- If no changes are planned, please describe why no changes are needed.

At present, we do not plan any major changes to the ensemble procedures or outcomes. As an overall element of a complex program, the assessment data do not indicate areas for immediate concern. We feel it would be valuable to re-examine ensemble and placement expectations, as well as repertoire and rehearsal/performance expectations, to ensure that students are provided an opportunity to learn that is as comparable as possible across the three main areas and at the various ensemble levels.

The availability of accompanists has been of concern to some applied faculty, and the current assessment data bears out that a rather large percentage of juries (20-25%) across the department were lacking an accompanist, yet should have had one. In the Spring of 2014, the department initiated a voucher program to support student access and equitably distribute accompanist services. We will continue to monitor this rate, and expect that we can reduce the number of unaccompanied juries.
While it is to be expected that different applied areas will need flexibility in order to address the unique aspects of their instrument/voice and pedagogy, it will be valuable to re-examine parity across all applied areas with regard to level expectations (100, 200, 300 level, etc.) as well as jury procedures to advance from level to level. Overall, the department should strive for a consistent time-to-degree, regardless of student specialization, within the context of the highest artistic standards possible appropriate to our institutional type and mission.

We would like to develop and administer some form of annual student survey to gather indirect evidence of program effectiveness with regard to applied and ensemble instruction. This may form a part of our overall assessment plan in other areas, as well.

- In addition, how has/will the department report the results and changes to internal and external constituents (e.g., advisory groups, newsletters, forums, etc.).

Assessment results were discussed in a department faculty meeting and will form the basis for further discussions in department committees and at the College level. Plans are underway to create an “assessment and accreditation” area of the department website to allow wider access to these reports, data summaries, NASM accreditation, and other items.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?

- Please describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results.

We have continued to develop the role of the departmental advisor in tracking student progress at several key points and places in the program. These quarterly and annual summaries have been quite useful, and are based on prior assessment results in the areas of music theory and musical disposition (concert and convocation attendance). These elements are now routine assessment activities, and we feel that this work of a new staff member (in addition to recruiting and advising) has contributed significantly to our programs’ effectiveness.

We embedded the piano proficiency exam in the third quarter of class piano, with the intent of reducing or eliminating the number of students lacking proficiency prior to student teaching.

We developed and implemented new formats and procedures for convocation and recital attendance using student barcode scans.

We have been developing a sophomore review for music education majors, which will allow us to help keep students on track and potentially allow struggling students an earlier point at which to re-evaluate their major choice.

- Were those changes effective?

Yes, the advising changes and ongoing monitoring have been seen by faculty as helpful and effective. The new class piano procedures have reduced the number of students “stuck” without exam completion at the time they wish to student teach—we would like this to be down to zero within the next year. We have reduced the number of students that are multiple quarters behind in their expected convocation and recital attendance.

- Please also discuss any changes you have made to your assessment plan or assessment methods.

In the fall of 2013 we approved a revision of the undergraduate assessment plan, which included a three-year assessment cycle (to begin with the 2013-14 school year). This year we experimented with a course-embedded holistic assessment in the ensemble area using Blackboard and Waypoint Outcomes. This method seemed promising, and we will continue to explore the use of Canvas for future assessments. We will be establishing baseline and target levels for various measures during the upcoming year, as well. We are currently looking at indirect methods of assessment (student survey) and other existing measures to incorporate into our assessment plan and cycle.