



DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC
INTERIM ASSESSMENT REPORT 2015–2016

OVERVIEW

Department: **Music**

Report Preparer: **Dr. Drew Collins**

Members of the Assessment Committee for the Department of Music: **Dr. Carlotta Parr (Dept. Chair); Dr. Drew Collins (cmte. chair); Dr. Daniel D'Addio; Dr. Linda Laurent**

Program Name and Level: **Bachelor of Science in Music Education**

Program Assessment Question	Response
1) URL: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	http://www.ccsu.edu/music/learningOutcomes.html
2) LO Changes: Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., LO more discrete, LO aligned with findings)	<p>In response to feedback from the University Assessment Committee, the Department of Music’s Assessment Committee has revised the wording of the Learning Outcomes used in our Assessment Reports. These have been approved by the department faculty. The rephrasing of our Learning Outcomes for the Bachelor of Science in Music Education are:</p> <p>Each student in the program is expected to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. demonstrate competence in musicianship, to include: aural skills, and knowledge and application of music theory; 2. demonstrate competence in musical performance on his/her primary instrument, with particular emphasis on technical precision; 3. demonstrate competence in basic piano playing skills appropriate to a K-12 classroom music

	<p>teacher;</p> <p>4. exhibit knowledge of instructional methods as they pertain to choral, instrumental, and general music education;</p> <p>5. demonstrate application of pedagogy and instructional methods as they pertain to choral, instrumental, and general music education.</p>
3) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well?	<p>Consistently (for over 6 years), we have been collecting, collating, and examining the data. Records have been kept.</p> <p>So far, the current assessment process shows a direct correlation between data gathered and overall success of the students in the program, thus signifying that the learning outcomes and assessment instruments are both relevant and significant.</p>
4) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan should be reported here)	<p>The Department of Music assessment committee will continue to investigate whether other relevant assessment instruments exist or need to be created in order to provide a comprehensive assessment of students' progress in the degree program. Currently, the committee does not find that any other assessment instruments are necessary in order to gather essential data.</p> <p>Regarding improvements in the report, the Department of Music Assessment Committee has been working to revise and create additional rubrics to evaluate capstone projects. These new rubrics will be better tailored to the specifics of each type of capstone project.</p>

For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 5, 6 and 7:

LO #1) Each student in the program is expected to demonstrate competence in musicianship, to include: aural skills, and knowledge and application of music theory.	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	<p>Sophomore Review</p> <p>This multi-part exam consists of separate evaluation experiences assessing aural dictation, sight-singing, and written theory.</p>
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	<p>Department of Music Assessment Committee. This committee consists of about 4 out of 9 of our full-time faculty. This committee may or may not include any members of the Theory/Aural Skills area.</p>
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what	<p>Conclusion: As is similar to most programs across the country, the Department of Music at CCSU has found that Aural Skills—especially sight-singing—are the most challenging area for our students. Sight reading of melodies, i.e., the ability to sing a piece a music without having had a</p>

evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	chance to look at it and practice in advance, and without the aid of a piano or other supporting instrument, is the most challenging skill in this area for our students.
	Evidence: The numeric results of the sight-singing components of this assessment are scored by two faculty in the areas of theory/aural skills in the Department of Music. Trends on the last 5 years are found in table.
	Changes: Discussions in several department committees about how to improve student performance in these skill areas are ongoing. To date, the only consensus reached has been to remove the limit on the number of attempts allowed for each student for each exam component.

LO #2) Each student in the program is expected to demonstrate competence in musical performance on his/her primary instrument, with particular emphasis on technical precision.

5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	Performance Jury Examination Information is drawn from performance juries, the “final exams” of performance lessons each semester. Juries are graded by three faculty members (at least one full time faculty member is on the panel for each individual student taking a jury). The private lesson/course instructor is not one of the three panelists for a particular student’s jury, so the student’s performance at the jury is evaluated by faculty other than the instructor.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	Department of Music Assessment Committee
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: Students are meeting this learning outcome. Evidence: All B.S. students are required to play a Performance Jury Examination at the end of each semester. The Department of Music uses two data points from the Performance Jury Examinations for string students (accuracy and bow control) and two from those of voice students (accuracy and tone) to determine whether this Learning Outcome has been met. As seen in Table 3a, the average score for string students from AY 2009-10 through AY 2013-14 in the area of 'Accuracy' ranged from 2.5-3.22 (out of 4 points). Some improvement over the past 4 semesters is noted. In the area of 'Bow Control', the average scores ranged from 2.11–2.92 (out of 4 points) for AY 2011-12 through AY 2013-14. Based on the data in Table 3b, the average score for voice students from AY 2010-11 through AY 2014-15 in the area of 'Accuracy' was very high at 7.00 points or higher (out of 8 points) for each semester. In contrast, for the area of 'Tone Quality' during the same period, the average scores were lower, ranging from 5.27–6.21 points (out of 8).

	<p>Changes: Given the current success rate, no changes are required at this time. However, discussions among the faculty about revising the jury form are ongoing. Vocal tone continues to be an area where there is room for improvement.</p> <p>To date, the materials reported in the Evidence area above only report students in the areas of string and voice. We continue to explore ways to make our assessment tool consistent across all performance areas.</p>
--	---

LO #3) Each student in the program is expected to demonstrate competence in basic piano playing skills appropriate to a K-12 classroom music teacher.	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	Piano Proficiency
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	Department of Music Assessment Committee
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: Students in the B.S. program are successfully completing the piano proficiency.
	Evidence: Piano Proficiency results for the last five years are included in Table 3. Each student is afforded four attempts for any one section of the piano proficiency. All students but one passed all sections of the exam before the fourth attempt.
	Changes: Two years ago, the piano faculty changed the selection of pieces for the sight reading component of the piano proficiency. Pieces of a more reasonable difficulty level were selected for the sight reading portion of the piano proficiency.
	Discussions are currently underway about possibly removing the limit on the number of attempts, as we have done with the Sophomore Review. At this time, however, the data do not suggest that such a change is warranted at this time.

LO #4) Each student in the program is expected to exhibit knowledge of instructional methods as they pertain to choral, instrumental, and general music education.	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than	PRAXIS II: Content and Instruction in Music, Test #5114 (a standardized test administered by Educational Testing)

GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	Educational Testing Service (ETS)
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: Students in the B.S. program are successfully completing the PRAXIS II.
	Evidence: Our overall pass rate from AY 2011-12 through AY 2014-15 is 82%, with two of those years having a 100% pass rate.
	Changes: The data do not suggest that a significant change is needed at this time. However, each year, we collect anecdotal evidence in the wake of the exam about areas our students felt concern. We have discussed offering a PRAXIS prep session, but have opted instead to incorporate it into our Student Teacher Seminar.

LO #5) Each student in the program is expected to demonstrate application of pedagogy and instructional methods as they pertain to choral, instrumental, and general music education.	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	Three indicators from Final Student Teaching Evaluation (EDSC 420 and EDSC 421)
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	Department of Music Assessment Committee
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion: The data collection method by the School of Education and Professional Studies has changed. There is not a large enough data sample to draw meaningful conclusions.
	Evidence: n/a
	Changes: n/a

B.S. Sophomore Review Results - Written

	AY 2010 - 2011 (N = 6)			AY 2011 - 2012 (N = 11)			AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 13)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 18)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N = 5)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	0	3	3	0	2	9	0	6	7	0	11	7	0	5	0
Pass	0	3	3	0	2	9	0	6	7	0	11	4	0	3	0
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0
AY Total Attempts	6			11			13			18			5		
AY Pass	6			11			13			15			3		
AY Fail	0			0			0			3			2		

B.S. Sophomore Review Results - Dictation

	AY 2010 - 2011 (N = 14)			AY 2011 - 2012 (N = 10)			AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 7)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 18)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N = 8)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	6	3	7	4	4	5	0	5	16	0	7	11	0	6	2
Pass	4	3	3	1	4	5	0	0	14	0	3	9	0	4	2
Fail	2	0	4	3	0	0	0	5	2	0	4	2	0	2	0
AY Total Attempts	16			13			21			18			8		
AY Pass	10			10			14			12			6		
AY Fail	6			3			7			6			2		

B.S in Music: Final Report AY 2014 - 2015

TABLE 1a. Results of Sophomore Review for the past four academic years (Written and Dictation portions)

B.S. Sophomore Review Results - Intervals

	AY 2010 - 2011 (N = 11)			AY 2011 - 2012 (N = 6)			AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 6)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 19)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N = 7)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	3	2	6	0	1	5	0	1	5	3	9	7	0	2	5
Pass	3	2	6	0	1	5	0	1	5	3	6	4	0	2	4
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	1
AY Total Attempts	11			6			6			19			7		
AY Pass	11			6			6			13			6		
AY Fail	0			0			0			0			0		

B.S. Sophomore Review Results - Rhythm

	AY 2010 - 2011 (N = 10)			AY 2011 - 2012 (N = 6)			AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 6)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 17)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N =)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	2	3	6	0	1	5	0	1	5	2	9	6	0	3	5
Pass	1	3	6	0	1	5	0	1	5	1	8	4	0	3	4
Fail	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
AY Total Attempts	11			6			6			17			8		
AY Pass	10			6			6			13			7		
AY Fail	2			0			0			4			1		

B.S in Music: Final Report AY 2014 - 2015

TABLE 1b. Results of Sophomore Review for the past four academic years (Intervals and Rhythm portions)

B.S. Sophomore Review Results - Melodies

	AY 2010 - 2011 (N = 21)			AY 2011 - 2012 (N = 13)			AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 18)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 34)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N = 10)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	7	6	8	4	4	5	2	4	12	11	14	10	0	5	5
Pass	4	3	0	1	4	3	1	2	1	4	10	3	0	3	0
Fail	3	3	1	3	0	2	1	2	11	7	3	7	0	2	5
AY Total Attempts	21			13			18			35			10		
AY Pass	7			8			4			17			3		
AY Fail	7			5			14			17			7		

B.S in Music: Final Report AY 2014 - 2015

TABLE 1c. Results of Sophomore Review for the past four academic years (Melodies portion)

B.S. in Music Education Piano Proficiency Results

BS Music Ed	AY 2011 - 2012				AY 2012 - 2013				AY 2013 - 2014				AY 2014 - 2015				AY 2015 - 2016			
	1st Attempt	2nd Attempt	3rd Attempt	4th Attempt	1st Attempt	2nd Attempt	3rd Attempt	4th Attempt	1st Attempt	2nd Attempt	3rd Attempt	4th Attempt	1st Attempt	2nd Attempt	3rd Attempt	4th Attempt	1st Attempt	2nd Attempt	3rd Attempt	4th Attempt
Scales																				
AY Totals	9	4	0	0	7	6	1	0	11	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	1	0	0
Pass	6	4			2	5	1		8	2			0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0
Fail	3	0			5	1	0		3	0			1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Harmonization																				
AY Totals	10	5	0	0	6	4	2	0	11	4	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
Pass	6	4			3	2	1		6	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
Fail	4	1			3	2	1		5	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Preparation																				
AY Totals	9	5	1	0	7	9	5	0	11	3	4	2	3	2	3	0	1	1	1	1
Pass	6	1	1		2	1	2		6	0	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
Fail	3	4	0		5	8	3		5	3	0	0	3	1	2	0	1	1	0	0
Tranposition																				
AY Totals	10	3	0	0	6	4	0	0	11	2	0	1	3	2	1	0	1	1	0	0
Pass	7	3			2	3			6	2		0	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
Fail	3	0			4	1			5	0		1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Sight Reading																				
AY Totals	10	4	1	0	6	8	3	0	11	5	2	1	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	0
Pass	1	4	1		2	4	3		5	4	2	1	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0
Fail	9	0	0		4	4	0		6	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

B.S. in Music: Final Report AY 2014 - 2015

TABLE 2. Results of Piano Proficiency Examination for BS students for AY 2010-11 through AY 2014-15.

STRING JURIES - BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

	AY 2010 - 2011		AY 2011 - 2012		AY 2012 - 2013		AY 2013 - 2014		AY 2014 - 2015	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
# (N = 2)	3	5	3	3	6	5	7	8	3	2
Range: Accuracy	2.75 - 3.00	2.67 - 3.50	2.33 - 3.67	2.00 - 3.67	3.00 - 3.67	2.17 - 3.67	3.00 - 3.33	3.00 - 3.33	3.00 - 3.67	3.33 - 3.67
Range: Bow Control	2.50 - 8.00	2.33 - 3.67	2.00 - 2.33	2.33 - 3.00	2.33 - 3.00	2.00 - 3.50	2.33 - 3.00	2.33 - 3.67	3.00 - 3.50	3.00 - 3.00
Accuracy Average (Maximum = 4.00 pts)	2.88	3.06	3.11	2.89	3.22	3.03	3.19	3.13	3.39	3.50
Bow Control Average (Maximum = 4.00 pts*)	5.10	2.78	2.11	2.78	2.72	2.83	2.86	2.92	3.17	3.00

* Maximum = 8.00 pts. During AY 2010 - 2011

ACCURACY: FALL (2015)

3.00 = 3	
3.33 = 1	3.00 - 3.99 = 5 83.33%
3.50 = 1	4.00 = 1 16.67%
4.00 = 1	

BOW CONTROL: FALL (2015)

2.50 = 1 16.67%	2.50 - 2.67 2 33.33%
2.67 = 1 16.67%	3.00 - 3.99 4 66.67%
3.00 = 1 14.29%	
3.33 = 2 33.33%	
3.67 = 1 16.67%	

ACCURACY: SPRING (2016)

2.67 = 1	2.00 - 2.99 = 1 33.33%
3.00 = 2	3.00 - 3.99 = 2 66.67%

BOW CONTROL: SPRING (2016)

2.67 = 1 33.33%	2.00 - 2.99 1 33.33%
3.00 = 1 33.33%	3.00 - 3.99 2 66.67%
3.50 = 1 33.33%	

Revised: 6/24/16

TABLE 3a. Results of Performance Juries (violin, viola, cello, and bass students) for the past four academic years.

VOICE JURIES - BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

	AY 2010 - 2011		AY 2011 - 2012		AY 2012 - 2013		AY 2013 - 2014		AY 2014 - 2015	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
# (N = 2)	18	17	5	12	21	15	13	11	11	9
Range: Accuracy	5.00 - 8.00	6.00 - 8.00	6.33 - 8.00	6.50 - 8.00	5.00 - 8.00	6.00 - 8.00	6.00 - 8.00	5.67 - 8.00	5.00 - 8.00	6.33 - 8.00
Range: Tone Quality	4.00 - 7.83	4.33 - 8.00	4.00 - 7.00	5.00 - 8.00	4.00 - 7.00	4.00 - 8.00	4.67 - 7.67	4.00 - 8.00	4.00 - 7.33	4.00 - 7.00
Accuracy Average (Maximum = 8.00 pts)	7.58	7.63	7.00	7.79	7.40	7.51	7.46	7.03	7.56	7.30
Tone Quality Average (Maximum = 8.00 pts)	6.02	6.11	5.27	6.21	5.76	5.63	5.94	5.61	5.35	5.41

ACCURACY: FALL (2015)

6.67 = 1		
7.33 = 2	6.00 - 6.99 = 1 6.25%	
8.00 = 13	7.00 - 7.99 = 2 12.50%	
	8.00 = 13 81.25%	

TONE QUALITY: FALL (2015)

4.33 = 2 12.50%	7.33 = 1 6.25%	4.00 - 4.99 = 3 18.75%
4.67 = 1 6.25%	7.67 = 1 6.25%	5.00 - 5.99 = 3 18.75%
5.00 = 2 12.50%		6.00 - 6.99 = 7 43.75%
5.67 = 1 6.25%		7.00 - 7.99 = 2 12.50%
6.00 = 7 43.75%		

ACCURACY: SPRING (2016)

6.00 = 1		
7.00 = 2	6.00 - 6.99 = 1 8.33%	
7.33 = 2	7.00 - 7.99 = 4 33.33%	
8.00 = 2	8.00 = 2 16.67%	

TONE QUALITY: SPRING (2016)

4.00 = 1 8.33%	7.00 = 1 8.33%	4.00 - 4.99 = 3 25.00%
4.33 = 1 8.33%	7.67 = 1 8.33%	5.00 - 5.99 = 4 33.33%
4.67 = 1 8.33%		6.00 - 6.99 = 1 8.33%
5.00 = 2 16.67%		7.00 - 7.99 = 2 16.67%
5.67 = 2 16.67%		
6.67 = 1 8.33%		

Revised: 6/24/16

TABLE 3b. Results of Performance Juries (vocal students) for the past four academic years.

B.S. in Music Education Praxis Results

	AY 2011 - 2012	AY 2012 - 2013	AY 2013 - 2014	AY 2014 - 2015	AY 2015 - 2016
0114 & 5114					
Taking	1	13	10	9	
Pass	0	12	6	9	
Fail	1	1	4	0	
0111 & 0113					
Taking	15	1			
Pass	14	1			
Fail	1	0			

Certification in Music: Final Report AY 2014 - 2015

TABLE 4. Results of PRAXIS II since AY 2010-2011.