

PROGRAM REPORT SUMMARY

Department: Music	Report Type: SUMMARY
Program Name: Bachelor of Science (Music Education)	Program Award Level: Undergraduate; BS
Report Preparer: Dr. Heather de Savage (Assessment Committee Chair); Dr. Charles Menoche (Department Chairperson); Dr. Robert Schwartz (Committee Member)	Academic Year Data: 2019-20
Program Structure: Accredited	Date Report Completed: November 5, 2020
Accreditation Agency: National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)	Date Next Self-Study Due to Agency: Submitted to NASM February 2020; reaccreditation in progress

Program Assessment Question	Response
<p>1) URL: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.</p>	<p>https://www2.ccsu.edu/program/MusicEducationPK12Edu</p>
<p>2) Assessment Instruments: Please list the source(s) of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is/are used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p><i>LO 1: Candidates for the B.S. in Music Education will demonstrate competence in musicianship to include: aural skills, and knowledge and application of music theory.</i></p> <p>Weekly Testing in Aural Skills/Ear Training Courses (generally completed during the first two years): These include sight-reading of melodies, rhythms, and other exercises to demonstrate the development of good musicianship. Exams are evaluated using a point-based grading rubric.</p> <p>Mid-Point Assessment (for first-year students): Data is being collected from faculty using an assessment grid through the entering of MUS 310. Meetings are held with students after their first semester to discuss their progress, and additional meetings with students in trouble following the subsequent semester. Areas of review include First-Year Experience, aural skills, theory, concert/forum attendance, music history, music technology, and MUS 101 Practicum.</p> <p><i>LO 2: Demonstrate competence in musical performance on his/her primary instrument, with particular emphasis on technical precision.</i></p> <p>Performance jury examination (once per semester): Each student is required to give a private performance on their major instrument as a form of “final examination” at the end of the semester. Proficiency criteria vary depending on the nature of the instrument involved, but take into account both technical proficiency and interpretive skill. Selections are drawn from repertoire studied in the student’s applied lessons. Juries are evaluated using a point-based grading rubric.</p> <p><i>LO 3: Demonstrate competence in basic piano playing skills.</i></p>

Piano Proficiency Examinations: All Music majors must pass the piano proficiency examination within four attempts. Most students take this exam at the end of the sophomore year. The exam is given in eight sections: 1) major and minor scales; 2) prepared intermediate selection (2 pages, with score); 3) prepared intermediate selection (2 pages, memorized); 4) arrangement of “The Star-Spangled Banner” provided by the examiners; 5) Harmonizing a simple melody with I, IV, and V⁷ chords; 6) Transposing that harmonization up or down a half or whole step from the original key as requested by the examiners; 7) Sight-reading a simple piano piece; 8) Sight-reading an accompaniment. Five of the eight sections of the exam must be passed before acceptance into the Professional Program is granted. ALL of the exam must be passed before applying for a student teaching assignment. The exam is evaluated using a point-based grading rubric.

LO 4: Exhibit knowledge of instructional methods as they pertain to choral, instrumental, and general music education.

PRAXIS II: Content and Instruction in Music, Test # 5114. This is a standardized test administered by Educational Testing Services for the purposes of ensuring that teachers are properly qualified to teach in their chosen fields.

LO 5: Demonstrate application of pedagogy and instructional methods as they pertain to choral, instrumental, and general music education.

Final Evaluation of Student Teaching: Using data from the elementary and secondary placement placements, student teachers are assessed in four areas as follows: 1) the establishment of high expectations for student learning; 2) literacy strategies; 3) ongoing assessment of student learning; 4) content accuracy. There are three levels of proficiency in each area: “below standard,” “developing,” and “proficient.” Candidates for this degree must achieve a “proficient” level in each area in order to earn an A in student teaching, or they must receive a score of “developing” in each area in order to pass student teaching.

3) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).

Aural Skills: Dr. Brian Kershner evaluates each student’s progress through individual weekly sight-singing tests (5 minutes each); these results are factored into the Mid-Point Assessment.

Mid-Point Assessment: Student Standing Committee in collaboration with members of the faculty. Due to closing of campus in March 2020 and then the sudden departure of secretary and chair soon after the end of the semester, the chair and committee members have been unable to find Mid-Point Assessment data from previous years. If these become available the committee will submit this as an addendum to this submission. This current assessment committee will gather the materials this year and store it on the departmental shared files now residing in the department’s TEAMS area.

Performance Jury: A panel of three faculty members, including at least one full-time faculty member. The panel does not include the student’s applied instructor.

	<p>Piano Proficiency: For each exam, there are two administrators to consist of the Department's Piano Proficiency Coordinator and a member of the piano faculty.</p> <p>PRAXIS II: Educational Testing Services</p> <p>Final Evaluation of Student Teaching: Due to the 2019-2020 pandemic the assessment committee does not feel that the evaluation of the student teacher is reliable data.</p>
<p>4) Results: Since the last submitted report, list:</p> <p><i>a.</i> The conclusion(s) drawn, noting strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p><i>b.</i> The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s).</p>	<p><i>a.</i> As the shift away from the sophomore review was followed by change, and reduction of faculty, departure of key members of the assessment committee, missing elements of data over the last two years, and the impact of the pandemic on the department's resources and faculty time Spring, Summer, and Fall 2020 we are this current committee is not in a position to make any clear conclusions about strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p><i>a.1</i> The NASM (National Association of Schools of Music) external visitation report received at the start of Fall 2020 is currently being studied for elements to be tapped for external evaluator's view of these elements' strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p><i>b.</i> The most significant changes this current year will be development of an effective workflow and file storage of department assessment data allowing assessment work to continue from year to year.</p> <p><i>b.1</i> The Department of Music is currently discussing and preparing responses to the NASM's visitation document provided in early Fall 2020 and will be including possible changes from this NASM document.</p>
<p>5) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well?</p>	<p>Under normal circumstances the above assessment instruments are applied consistently, and students are given guidance on how best to prepare for each component. Changes have been made in recent years to the Mid-Point Assessment to improve the overall process, and to align more effectively with the needs identified within the student body. Student Teachers are evaluated by supporting faculty members (as well as the cooperating teacher) across the course of their assigned placement, and are offered constructive criticism along the way, prior to their final evaluation.</p>
<p>6) Improvements: List ways in which your assessment process needs to be improved based on student data. (A brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here)</p>	<p>The assessment instruments have traditionally relied heavily on in-person interactions between the students and the evaluating faculty members. This point was made more apparent beginning in Spring 2020, at which time all department instruction and evaluation moved to an online format. This affected the entire second half of the Spring semester, and the Department of Music worked quickly and creatively to accommodate the necessary changes. We began to implement virtual approaches to the standard assessment instruments, including aural skills and piano proficiency exams completed in live-streaming contexts (e.g., WebEx, Microsoft Teams, Zoom, etc.), and either live-streaming, or pre-recorded jury performances. Private Lesson Juries in Spring 2020 used</p>

prerecorded audio for accompaniment and was evaluated and scored only by the private lesson teacher. For AY 2020-2021, the Department of Music will request that students exclusively submit pre-recorded video performances, due to the current technological limitations of live-streaming musical performances. (The added challenge for some instrumentalists and vocalists is finding a way to perform “live” with an accompanist, with the performers broadcasting from separate locations.)

A panel of two or three music faculty will evaluate performance juries during this year to bring the pandemic juries closer to the previous jury structure.

The Student Teaching assignments and related evaluation process will continue to adapt to the universal changes that have taken place in the public school system since Spring 2020. Because the teaching format required of the Student Teacher (i.e., in-person, online, or hybrid) depends on that particular school system; we will continue to work to ensure that each Student Teacher receives a fair and standardized assessment of their work, regardless of the nature of their assignment.

Since many of the limitations from Spring 2020 are still in place at the time of this report, and will continue into Spring 2021, the Department of Music will actively pursue methods to improve the assessment process. The goal is to ensure equity of treatment for all of our students, and to offer an effective means for them to stay on track to complete their degree requirements on schedule, with as little disruption as possible.

Currently the Department of Music has been without a secretary since the beginning of the summer and are currently without a graduate assistant and/or student workers. When resources become available and faculty positions stabilize our primary focus will be working to secure the resources necessary to support the infrastructure needed to the gathering and storage of student data.

GENERAL EDUCATION SUMMARY

GENERAL EDUCATION SUMMARY:

1. All departments contribute to the general education foundation of CCSU students (i.e., the CCSU General Education Learning Objectives/Outcomes) and must submit the General Education Summary below.
2. If your department participated in the General Education Assessment initiative (Multi-State model), complete Section 1 below.
3. If your department assesses GenEd Learning Objectives/Outcomes at the department-level, complete Section 2 below.
Complete one Summary table for each LO assessed.
4. URL for the list of CCSU Learning Objectives/Outcomes, click [here](#).

Department:	Report Type: GenEd Summary
Program Name and Level:	Academic Year Data: 2019-20
Report Preparer:	Date Completed:

Participation in General Education Assessment Initiative (Multi-State Collaborative model)	Section 1 Responses
<p>1) Our departmental faculty participated in the assessment of the GenEd Learning Objectives/Outcomes by contributing to the GenEd Assessment Initiative (Multi-State Collaborative model).</p> <p><i>Please list the participating faculty and General Education Learning Objective/Outcome(s) for which faculty have provided student artifacts.</i></p>	<p>Faculty member(s):</p> <p>GenEd Learning Outcome(s)/Objective(s):</p> <p>Course(s):</p>

Complete one Summary table below for each Learning Outcome assessed.

Participation through Department-level GenEd Assessment	Section 2 Responses
<p>1) Courses: List course(s) and the CCSU General Education Learning Objective/Outcome with which the course is aligned. (These include courses across all schools and departments)</p>	

and are not limited only to designated GenEd Study and Skill Area courses.)	
2) <u>Assessment Instruments:</u> What data/evidence, other than GPA, are used to assess the stated CCSU General Education Objective/Outcome? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	
3) <u>Interpretation:</u> Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admin. assistant, etc.).	
4) <u>Results:</u> Since the most recent full report, list: <i>a.</i> The conclusion(s) drawn, noting strengths and weaknesses. <i>b.</i> The changes that were or will be made as a result of those conclusion(s).	
5) <u>Strengths in your Assessment Process:</u> List ways in which your assessment process is working well.	
6) <u>Improvements:</u> List ways in which your GenEd assessment process needs to improve based on student data (A brief summary of changes to assessment plan can be reported here).	

APPENDIX

Please clearly label all supporting data tables by LO.