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

In 2013, the Department of Music faculty began the process of revising graduate student outcomes and assessment plan, developing six provisional learning outcomes based on prior formulations and standards alignments. We elected to gather initial data on all of these, as well as additional assessments that we had been examining in prior years, pending the development of a revised assessment plan, curriculum map, and assessment cycle in the current academic year. The outcomes are:

**MUSG1** (Research, Writing, Presentation)
Students will demonstrate masters-level research, writing, and presentation skills.

**MUSG2** (Thesis or Project)
Students will create a thesis or thesis project at a masters level, directed toward their professional and personal goals, as a culmination of their graduate work, in keeping with their major field of study.

**MUSG3** (Specialized Field)
Students will demonstrate masters-level competency and progress in a specialized field, selected from musical composition, conducting, performance, performance-pedagogy, and music education.

**MUSG4** (Music Theory)
Students will demonstrate masters-level knowledge in music theory, including a range of compositional styles and techniques.

**MUSG5** (Music History)
Students will demonstrate masters-level knowledge and critical thinking in music history, including terminology, chronology of styles, composer, and landmark work recognition.

**MUSG6** (Ensemble Performance)
Students will demonstrate advanced performance skills and their knowledge of ensemble repertoire.

2. How were they assessed?

A) What methods were used?

Outcomes MUSG1, 3, 4, and 5 were assessed by examining course grades for all students enrolled in the various major fields. 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 80% of students earning a B or better** in relevant coursework is reasonable.
Outcome MUSG2 was assessed by asking the graduate committee chairs to rank completing students as Pass-Outstanding, Pass-Satisfactory, or Did Not Pass at the conclusion of the students six credits of MUS 700, oral examination, and graduate project/thesis. This is a direct measure of knowledge and skill. Our goal is 100% of students demonstrating appropriate mastery to pass MUS 700.

Outcome MUSG6 was assessed by individual ensemble directors using a rubric via Blackboard and Waypoint outcomes (see undergraduate report for more details on method) as well as final course grades. 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 100% of students judged Satisfactory or above is reasonable. This outcome does not apply to summers-only MM student in the Music Education program, as there are no ensembles available. Substitutions are made based on individual participation in courses with ensemble elements, for example percussion techniques or conducting. This outcome therefore is embedded in the overall coursework performance summary for each student.

B) Who was assessed?

All declared graduate music majors enrolled Fall 2013-Summer 2014 (n = 50).

C) When was it assessed?

Data was gathered for each quarter and at program completion.

3. What was learned?

- Were the Standards of Mastery met?

  Standards of Mastery were met for five out of six program outcomes.

- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>MUSG1</th>
<th>MUSG2</th>
<th>MUSG3</th>
<th>MUSG4</th>
<th>MUSG5</th>
<th>MUSG6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3/3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance-Pedagogy</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>35/37</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>6/6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33/37</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42/47</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>43/47</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome status</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note: Totals vary by outcome due to students’ differing courses of study; not all students enroll in courses of certain types every year.

Of the 11 students that completed their thesis/project and examinations (MUS2), 5/11 (45%) were judged by their committee chairs as Outstanding.

Additional assessments included the departmental graduate music history and theory exams, and the Advanced Measures of Music Audiation (AMMA) test, a norm-referenced aural skills test that has been administered on entry to all summer students since 2012 (N = 37). Given three years of data, we were able to calculate correlation coefficients to see how well these three measures agreed (to allow predictive analysis) or disagreed (as measuring separate constructs). A summary is provided below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Correlation with AMMA Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMMA Total Percentage Rank</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Aural</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Written</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All tests have 100 points possible.

- Please also include a concise interpretation or analysis of the results.

We believe the present assessment data confirm that the Master of Music degree programs at CWU are meeting the stated goals and mastery levels of the department. Outcome MUSG6, relating to ensemble performance, was below our ideal 100% mastery level due to the anomalous failing grade of one student in Spring of 2014. We do not feel that this represents a trend, but rather a unique situation of one individual student. Subsequent conversations with this student’s committee chair/major advisor and ensemble director indicate that this individual has a history and pattern of failing to follow through with commitments in a reliable fashion, and has been frankly advised on numerous occasions about the implications this may have on his success in future professional or academic endeavors.

With small numbers of students in various major fields, the relatively low percentages for MUSG1 among students in conducting and performance can also be viewed as inordinately influenced by the achievement of one or two students. However, the grades based on assignments and projects in MUS 521, Research Methods, can be viewed as an important indicator of student preparedness and engagement in the scholarly side of graduate music study. This data may indicate a relative weakness among students whose primary interest is music performance and conducting. Incoming music education summer students are generally scoring modestly well on the history and theory exams, with a wide variance in preparation. Those that do well seem to be those that are actively teaching advanced theory and history content in their classrooms. Given the constraints on providing remedial coursework, we believe the best approach is to continue to use the scores as part of advising and course of study design, as well as to gauge the content of core history and theory course offerings.

The AMMA is a norm-referenced audiation test with extensive validation in the literature. Entering summer MM students’ mean scores put them in the upper quartiles of the norm-reference of college music majors. This is gratifying but not surprising that successful music teachers with undergraduate degrees in music would represent a relatively highly-skilled population in regard to rhythmic and melodic audiation. It is interesting that the AMMA composite score shows a moderately strong correlation with the aural portion of the theory exam, as well as the music history exam (which has a significant listening portion). It does not apparently correlate with skill in the written portion of the theory exam. This highlights the importance of continually refining aural skills across the curriculum.

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.

We feel that student success and strong performance in MUS 521, Research Methods, is a critical element to later success in the program for most students. We will examine our orientation, advising, and colloquium activities in order to identify and support students who may be challenged by the necessary research and writing skills. As this is typically the first course that graduate students take in the program, we would like to see strong academic skills from program entry and refined throughout the course of study.

We realize we have set a high standard (100% satisfactory) for graduate students in ensembles, and the fact that one student did not meet the attendance and participation requirements is not cause for undue alarm. However, we will be certain to emphasize the requirement and the expectations of various ensembles through orientation, advising, and general faculty-student interaction.

- 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 engaged in a departmental process of revising program outcomes and assessments. We gained valuable feedback from the recent NASM accreditation review, and are revising the Performance-Pedagogy major field to emphasize the pedagogy element as per the accreditation feedback, essentially converting it to a Pedagogy major field. We also instituted a graduate colloquium once a quarter for resident students during the regular academic year.

The summer offering of MUS 612 was designed to address the needs of the summer music education cohorts, and scores from the diagnostic music history test were consulted to identify areas of relative emphasis during this course. Due to the structural limitations of the summers-only model, we have begun discussions of the role, structure, and use of the music history and music theory entrance exams.

- Were those changes effective?

The summer offering of MUS 612, informed by the results of the history diagnostic exam, was generally popular with students despite being quite rigorous. All students performed well in the class.

We have yet to acquire program data regarding the revised Pedagogy major field or the graduate colloquium initiated in fall of 2014. We will be gathering this during the current academic year.

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

This work is currently ongoing, with a goal of a completed revision by Spring 2015.