

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

CCSU



Central Connecticut State University

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

FULL ASSESSMENT REPORT AY2012–2013–AY2016–2017

NOVEMBER 8, 2017

OVERVIEW

Department: **Music**

Report Preparers: **Dr. Monica Hershberger**

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

Program Names and Levels: **Bachelor of Science in Music Education and Post-Baccalaureate Certification Program in Music Education; Bachelor of Arts in Music; Master of Science in Music Education**

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC
FULL ASSESSMENT REPORT AY2012–2013–AY2016–2017

NOVEMBER 8, 2017

OVERVIEW

Department: **Music**

Report Preparers: **Dr. Monica Hershberger and Dr. Drew Collins**

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

Program Name and Level: **Bachelor of Science in Music Education and Post-Baccalaureate Certification Program in Music Education**

Program Assessment Question	Response
<p>URL: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.</p>	<p>http://www.ccsu.edu/music/learningOutcomes.html</p> <p>Each student in this 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 teacher; 4. exhibit knowledge of instructional methods as they pertain to choral, instrumental, and general music education; 5. demonstrate application of pedagogy and instructional methods as they pertain to choral, instrumental, and general music education.
<p>Assessment Instruments: Please list the source(s) of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is/are used to assess the stated outcomes.</p>	<p>B.S. Students: Sophomore Review (currently suspended); Solo Performance Jury Examination; Piano Proficiency Examination; PRAXIS II; Three Indicators from Final Student Teaching Evaluation (EDSC 420 and EDSC 421)</p> <p>Post-Baccalaureate Students: Piano Proficiency Examination; Three Indicators from Final Student Teaching Evaluation (EDSC 420 and EDSC 421)</p>
<p>Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?</p>	<p>Department of Music Assessment Committee. This committee consists of about 4 of our 9 full-time faculty. This committee may or may not include any members of the Theory/Aural Skills area.</p>
<p>Results: Since the most recent full report, list</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The conclusions drawn b. The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s). 	<p>For more than seven years, we have collected, collated, and examined the data, with an eye for patterns that may emerge over time.</p> <p>Conclusions: Overall, students in this program are meeting the learning outcomes.</p>

	<p>Changes: 1. The Department of Music voted to suspend the Sophomore Review and is currently in the process of developing a new mid-point assessment; 2. The faculty also approved two new courses: Elementary Theory I, and Elementary Aural Skills I. Students with low scores on the entrance examination are required to take Theory I and Elementary Theory I, and/or Aural Skills I and Elementary Aural Skills I. Student progress will be closely monitored and data regarding student success will be recorded.</p>
<p>Strengths: List ways in which your assessment process is working well.</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>
<p>Improvements: List ways in which your assessment process needs to improve (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here).</p>	<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, other than a mid-point assessment, are necessary in order to gather essential data.</p>

LEARNING OUTCOMES

<p>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.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>Sophomore Review</p> <p>This multi-part exam consisted of separate evaluation experiences assessing (1) written theory, (2) aural dictation, (3) sight-singing intervals, (4) sight-singing rhythm, and (5) sight-singing melodies.</p> <p>The Sophomore Review requirement has been suspended for all current students effective immediately. Courses for which successful passage of Sophomore Review has been a prerequisite (i.e., MUS 310 or MUS 367) will no longer have that barrier. Students who would have been prevented from registering for any such course will now be allowed to register. Successful passage of Sophomore Review will no longer be required for graduation for current students. A new mid-point assessment will be designed</p>

	and implemented in the near future, but will only be required of students matriculating fall 2017 and after.
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?	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.
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: As is similar to most programs across the country, the Department of Music at CCSU has found that Aural Skills—especially sight-singing—is 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 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 over the last 5 years are found in tables 1c-1e.
	Changes: Discussions in several department committees about how to improve student performance in these skill areas are ongoing. To date, the only consensus has been to 1. remove the limit on the number of attempts allowed for each student for each component of the Sophomore Review, and 2. Repeal the Sophomore Review until the faculty agree on a new midpoint assessment.

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?	Solo 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 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	Conclusion: Students are meeting this learning outcome.
	Evidence: Each B.S. student is required to play a Solo Performance Jury Examination at the end of each semester. The Department of Music uses two data points from the Performance Jury Examinations from those of 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.

<p>have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>String Instrument Students As seen in Table 2a, the average score for string students from AY 2012-13 through AY 2016-17 in the area of ‘Accuracy’ ranged from 2.17-4.00 (out of 4 points). In the area of ‘Bow Control,’ the average scores ranged from 2.11–2.92 (out of 4 points) for AY 2012-13 through AY 2016-17.</p> <p>Voice Students Based on the data in Table 2b, the average score for voice students from AY 2012-13 through AY 2016-17 in the area of ‘Accuracy’ was very high at 7.5 points (out of 8 points). In contrast, for the area of ‘Tone Quality’ during the same period, the average score was lower, at 5.63 points (out of 8).</p> <p>Changes: Given the current success rate, no changes are required at this time. However, discussions among the faculty about revising the jury forms—to make them consistent across departments—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>
---	--

<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.</p>	
<p>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>	<p>Piano Proficiency</p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?</p>	<p>Department of Music Assessment Committee</p>
<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the</p>	<p>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.</p>

<p>conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Changes: Two years ago, the piano faculty changed the selection of pieces for the sight reading component of the piano proficiency to those of a more reasonable difficulty level.</p> <p>Discussions are underway about possibly removing the limit on the number of attempts, as was done with the Sophomore Review. At this time, however, the data do not suggest that such a change is warranted.</p>
---	--

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.	
<p>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>	<p>PRAXIS II: Content and Instruction in Music, Test #5114 (a standardized test administered by Educational Testing)</p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence?</p>	<p>Educational Testing Service (ETS)</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>Conclusion: Students in the B.S. program, as a group, are successfully completing the PRAXIS II.</p> <p>Evidence: As seen in Table 4, our overall pass rate from AY 2011-12 through AY 2015-16 is 84%, with one of those years having a 100% pass rate. Data for AY 2016-17 will not be available until Spring 2018. In addition, please note that students used to take an older version of the PRAXIS II (0111 & 0113); we now encourage students to take the newer version (0114 & 5114). We accept both versions of the test, however, and draw our conclusions by tallying the data from both versions.</p> <p>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 II prep session, but have opted instead to incorporate it into our Student Teacher Seminar.</p>

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.	
<p>5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA,</p>	<p>Three indicators from Final Student Teaching Evaluation (EDSC 420 and EDSC 421)</p>

that is used to assess the stated outcomes?	
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 yet a large enough data sample to draw meaningful conclusions.
	Evidence: n/a
	Changes: n/a However, discussions about changing the student teaching evaluation form are underway.

TABLE 1a. B.S. Sophomore Review Results – Written

	AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 13)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 18)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N = 5)			AY 2015 - 2016 (N = 9)			AY 2016 - 2017 (N = 6)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	0	6	7	0	11	7	0	5	0	0	4	5	0	3	3
Pass	0	6	7	0	11	4	0	3	0	0	4	5	0	3	3
Fail	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AY Total Attempts	13			18			5			9			6		
AY Pass	13			15			3			9			6		
AY Fail	0			3			2			0			0		

TABLE 1b. B.S. Sophomore Review Results – Dictation

	AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 21)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 18)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N = 8)			AY 2015 - 2016 (N = 8)			AY 2016 - 2017 (N = 7)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	0	5	16	0	7	11	0	6	2	0	4	4	0	4	3
Pass	0	0	14	0	3	9	0	4	2	0	3	2	0	3	2
Fail	0	5	2	0	4	2	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	1
AY Total Attempts	21			18			8			8			7		
AY Pass	14			12			6			5			5		
AY Fail	7			6			2			3			2		

TABLE 1c. B.S. Sophomore Review Results – Intervals (Sight Singing)

	AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 6)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 19)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N = 7)			AY 2015 - 2016 (N = 14)			AY 2016 - 2017 (N = 12)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	0	1	5	3	9	7	0	2	5	0	4	10	0	4	8
Pass	0	1	5	3	6	4	0	2	4	0	2	8	0	3	6
Fail	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	1	2
AY Total Attempts	6			19			7			14			12		
AY Pass	6			13			6			10			9		
AY Fail	0			0			0			0			0		

TABLE 1d. B.S. Sophomore Review Results – Rhythm (Sight Singing)

	AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 6)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 17)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N = 8)			AY 2015 - 2016 (N = 15)			AY 2016 - 2017 (N = 10)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	0	1	5	2	9	6	0	3	5	0	5	10	0	3	7
Pass	0	1	5	1	8	4	0	3	4	0	3	6	0	2	7
Fail	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	1	0
AY Total Attempts	6			17			8			15			10		
AY Pass	6			13			7			9			9		
AY Fail	0			4			1			6			1		

TABLE 1e. B.S. Sophomore Review Results – Melodies (Sight Singing)

	AY 2012 - 2013 (N = 18)			AY 2013 - 2014 (N = 35)			AY 2014 - 2015 (N = 10)			AY 2015 - 2016 (N = 21)			AY 2016 - 2017 (N = 20)		
	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring	Summer	Fall	Spring
# Attempts	2	4	12	11	14	10	0	5	5	0	8	13	0	8	12
Pass	1	2	1	4	10	3	0	3	0	0	3	4	0	2	4
Fail	1	2	11	7	3	7	0	2	5	0	5	9	0	6	8
AY Total Attempts	18			35			10			21			20		
AY Pass	4			17			3			7			6		
AY Fail	14			17			7			14			14		

TABLE 2a. B.S. String Jury Results

# (N = 47)	AY 2012 - 2013		AY 2013 - 2014		AY 2014 - 2015		AY 2015- 2016		AY 2016- 2017	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
	6	5	7	8	3	2	6	3	4	3
Range: Accuracy	3.00 - 3.67	2.17 - 3.67	3.00 - 3.33	3.00 - 3.33	3.00 - 3.67	3.33- 3.67	3.00 - 4.00	2.67 - 3.00	2.67 - 3.67	3.00
Range: Bow Control	2.33 - 3.00	2.00 - 3.50	2.33 - 3.00	2.33 - 3.67	3.00 - 3.50	3.00 - 3.00	2.50 - 3.67	2.67 - 3.50	2.00 - 3.00	2.67 - 3.33
Accuracy Average (Maximum = 4.00 pts)	3.22	3.03	3.19	3.13	3.39	3.50	3.31	2.89	3.13	3.00
Bow Control Average (Maximum = 4.00 pts)	2.72	2.83	2.86	2.92	3.17	3.00	3.08	3.06	2.60	3.00

TABLE 2b. B.S. Vocal Jury Results

# (N = 129)	AY 2012 - 2013		AY 2013 - 2014		AY 2014 - 2015		AY 2015- 2016		AY 2016- 2017	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
	21	15	13	11	11	9	16	12	10	11
Range: Accuracy	5.00 - 8.00	6.00 - 8.00	6.00 - 8.00	5.67 - 8.00	5.00 - 8.00	6.33 - 8.00	6.67 - 8.00	6.00 - 8.00	6.00 - 8.00	7.00 - 8.00
Range: Tone Quality	4.00 - 7.00	4.00 - 8.00	4.67 - 7.67	4.00 - 8.00	4.00 - 7.33	4.00 - 7.00	4.33 - 7.67	4.00 - 7.67	4.00 - 7.33	4.67 - 7.67
Accuracy Average (Maximum = 8.00 pts)	7.40	7.51	7.46	7.03	7.56	7.30	7.83	7.56	7.67	7.70
Tone Quality Average (Maximum = 8.00 pts)	5.76	5.63	5.94	5.61	5.35	5.41	5.46	5.53	5.65	5.91

TABLE 3. B.S. Piano Proficiency Results

BS	AY 2012 - 2013				AY 2013 - 2014				AY 2014 - 2015				AY 2015 - 2016				AY 2016 - 2017			
	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	7	6	1	0	11	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0
Pass	2	5	1		8	2			0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0
Fail	5	1	0		3	0			1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Harmonization																				
AY Totals	6	4	2	0	11	4	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	0	0
Pass	3	2	1		6	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	0
Fail	3	2	1		5	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Preparation																				
AY Totals	7	9	5	0	11	3	4	2	3	2	3	0	1	1	1	1	7	0	0	0
Pass	2	1	2		6	0	4	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0
Fail	5	8	3		5	3	0	0	3	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	0	0
Transposition																				
AY Totals	6	4	0	0	11	2	0	1	3	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	7	0	0	0
Pass	2	3			6	2		0	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	0	0	0
Fail	4	1			5	0		1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Sight Reading																				
AY Totals	6	8	3	0	11	5	2	1	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	7	1	0	0
Pass	2	4	3		5	4	2	1	2	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0
Fail	4	4	0		6	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0

TABLE 3a. Certification in Music Education Piano Proficiency Results

Certification	AY 2012 - 2013				AY 2013 - 2014				AY 2014 - 2015				AY 2015 - 2016				AY 2016 - 2017			
	Atte mpt 1	Atte mpt 2	Atte mpt 3	Atte mpt 4	Atte mpt 1	Atte mpt 2	Atte mpt 3	Atte mpt 4	Atte mpt 1	Atte mpt 2	Atte mpt 3	Atte mpt 4	Atte mpt 1	Atte mpt 2	Atte mpt 3	Atte mpt 4	Atte mpt 1	Atte mpt 2	Atte mpt 3	Atte mpt 4
Scales	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
Pass	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Fail	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Harmonization	2	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pass	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Fail	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Preparation	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0
Pass	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Fail	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Transposition	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pass	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Fail	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sight Reading	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Fail	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 4. B.S. PRAXIS II Results

	AY 2011-2012	AY 2012-2013	AY2013-2014	AY2014-2015	AY2015-2016
0114 & 5114 (New Test)					
Taking	1	13	10	9	6
Pass	0	12	6	9	6
Fail	1	1	4	0	0
0111 & 0113 (Old Test)					
Taking	15	1	1	6	7
Pass	14	1	0	6	4
Fail	1	0	1	0	3
Both Tests					
Taking	16	14	11	15	13
Pass	14	13	6	15	10
Fail	2	1	5	0	3