

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): MUSIC

Department: Fine and Performing Arts

College/School: CAS

Date: 9/20/22

Primary Assessment Contact: Aaron Johnson

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

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. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

Both outcomes listed above were assessed using Junior and Senior Recitals presented during the 21-22 academic year – four Junior recitals and one Senior Recitals. Recitals were video recorded and archived for the faculty to access and assess. Recitals are open to the public.

Madrid does not offer a degree in music. Therefore, Madrid students were not included.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

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

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

Because we are a small program that typically graduates 1-4 students a year, we rarely have a sample size of assessable students greater than four or five for any given SLO. In order to have a larger sample size, we decided to assess the same SLO as last year. For the two-year period, we assessed ten junior/senior recitals (five each year). Aggregating the samples from 2020-2022 gave us a clearer, less anecdotal picture of our students' preparation and success rate.

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.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

Last year we elected to eliminate the barrier of the Junior/Senior Recital pre-hearing. In both years of assessment, we found that all students were well prepared for their recitals. In place of the pre-recital hearing, we consulted with the student's studio teacher to determine readiness. Studio teachers work with each student on a weekly basis. Their judgement of the student's readiness is more meaningful than a pre-recital hearing.

Regarding recital repertoire, the music faculty found that there were some cases where repertoire should have been more appropriately chosen to show breadth and depth. As an example, one voice recital was heavily weighted with opera arias with little to no art songs. Another recital represented the works of only a single composer. Curriculum policies regarding recital repertoire need to be reviewed, reworked, and so that expectations can be communicated to the students and their studio instructors.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

N/A

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

APPENDIX

Junior/Senior Recital Assessment Rubric

Junior/Senior Recital Assessment

Name: _____ Recital date: _____

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

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