COLLEGE ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

Assessed Year: 2018-19

College of Visual and Performing Arts:

     Department of Art and Design

     School of Music

     Department of Theater

College: Visual and Performing Arts

Contact: VPA Assessment Committee Chair - Peggy Farlow, Music

Report Date: February 2020

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY.
FORT WAYNE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY®
FORT WAYNE

Tips and Hints

When you click on tip text, the whole tip is selected so that you can revise the placeholder instructional text. Edit the placeholder text and format it any way you want or cut and paste into the form field. The table of contents updates automatically as you add pages to each section in your document. To see the updates, right-click anywhere in the table of contents and select *Update field*.

Report Expectations:

The finished report should be about 4 -5 pages in length. Include as attachments:

1. Either letters to colleges describing your evaluation of their annual assessment report or the completed Appendix D Rubrics for all departments/programs in your college.

2. Attach all Departmental/Program Annual Assessment reports so that these can be published at http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/assessment/reports/reports-program.html.

Assistance:

If at any point you have questions about completing or submitting this report, please contact the Office of Assessment and Program Review.

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY.
FORT WAYNE

Section 1: Summary of Findings for all Departments/Programs

The VPA College assessment committee consisted of 1) Peggy Farlow-Music, 2) John Hrehov - Art and Design and 3) Robert Shoquist – Theater. This committee met once a week for several weeks to review the departmental assessment reports, to look over the assessment rubrics and to discuss our role in evaluating the departmental reports. Kent Johnson attended one of our meetings to advise us of our responsibilities as members of the College Assessment committee. Each committee member was tasked to review and evaluate the assessment report for their particular department using the evaluation rubrics provided to us by Kent. Copies of the Assessment evaluations from each department are included as appendices to this annual report. A summary of our conclusions are included in this report.

Art and Design:
- Overall, most Student Learning Objectives (SLO's) are clearly stated. A few need to be rewritten to incorporate clearer and more measureable terms.
- All the programmatic curricular maps are strong and progress to application and creative levels relative to Bloom's Taxonomy.
- All categories of Baccalaureate Framework are assessed within the programmatic assessment.
- The portfolio approach is a strong measure of overall program quality.

Music:
- The SLO's are well conceived and communicated and effectively relate concepts to performances or products.
- All the programmatic curricular maps are strong and progress to sufficiently high domains relative to Bloom's Taxonomy.
- All categories of Baccalaureate Framework are assessed within the programmatic assessment.
- The process designed to gather assessment data of core music classes appears strong.

Theater:
- SLO's need to be reviewed to make sure they are written using clear and measurable terms.

PURDUE
U N I V E R S I T Y.
FORT WAYNE

SECTION 1: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR ALL DEPARTMENTS/PROGRAMS

- Programmatic curricular mapping may be misaligned to what occurs in actual practice (introductory vs. mastery levels) and may need to be revised.
- All categories of the Baccalaureate Framework are assessed within the programmatic assessment.
- The interim and exit interviews are strong ideas for collection of assessment data.
- The linkage of SLO's to assessment results are vaguely addressed in most classes. As a result there is not enough data for a variety of types of measures to be considered.
- Under the current assessment structure, data collected for each class only addresses the current year and does not compare assessment data from year to year.
- Due to collection of data at the course performance level, consistency of data across courses is uncertain.
- The assessment data does not reflect the department as a whole, therefore the assessment report cannot account for the assessment of the department as a whole.
- There is no evidence presented in the assessment report that past or current assessment efforts have been critically evaluated.

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY.
FORT WAYNE

Section 2: Recommendations for Academic Departments

After review of the VPA assessment reports, these recommendations are being suggested by the VPA Assessment committee for each of the following departments to consider for next year:

Department of Art and Design:

1. Need to look at any developed SLO's marked as "developed" and ensure the outcomes are measurable
2. **Portfolio Reviews** – continue to use the Freshman and Sophomore portfolio reviews as a means of accessing the quality of learning in the first two years of the program
3. **B.F.A. and Art Education Acceptance** – Detail the amount of students applying for these two degree concentrations and develop a rubric of acceptance and rejection annually
4. **B.F.A. Exhibition Review** – keep records of the senior B.F.A. Project in the form of grades by the full faculty including scores and suggestions
5. **Senior Project Statement** – continue the expectation of a senior project statement developed throughout the two semester courses of Senior Project. Last year it was praised for its, "…demonstrates their ability to effectively communicate their artwork. I think this ends up being a very high level expectation and provides a strong measure of the overall program quality."

School of Music:

PERFORMANCE SLO'S

1. Train all applied faculty in how to use the revised "Brown form" for Performance Assessment and ensure they consistently use it for all performance checks, from entry-level to graduation
2. For student recitals, determine if the performance assessment will occur during the recital hearing or during the recital performance
3. Consider the difference in difficulty of repertoire and performance expectations between concentration recitals and junior/senior recitals

MUSIC THEORY SLO's

4. Include information from Rudiments of Music I and music theory courses for Popular Music majors in future assessments

KEYBOARD PROFICIENCY SLO's

5. Continue to review group piano courses to address professional competencies of music degree programs
6. Identify a new coordinator of piano classes

OTHER

7. Determine how to include SLO's for Music Industry majors as part of the School of Music annual assessment process

Department of Theater:

1. SLO's need to be revised to reflect specific, concise and measurable outcomes.
2. Programmatic curricular map needs to be realigned to better reflect current practices of the department.
3. Additional department-wide comprehensive assessment tools need to be created for all students that are specific, concise, measureable and relate to identified SLO's. The results of these assessment tools need to be included in this assessment report each year to better identify trends and areas of need.
4. Assessment process needs to include a comparison of current assessment data with data collected from previous years in order to recognize trends and reflect on ways to improve student success and identify plans for improvement.

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY.
FORT WAYNE

Section 3: Results of Activities Related to Prior Year Findings

Art and Design: The previous year, the Departments of Fine Arts and Visual Communication and Design combined to become what is now the Department of Art and Design. Information gathered from the previous year's assessment reports were reviewed to assist with the ongoing evolution of the assessment process.

- The assessment process was in an implementation stage last year. As a unified department, Art and Design is working toward developing a better way to assess the presentation and historical results of their stated SLO's.
- The given assessment methods (portfolio review, BFA review and project, etc.) have helped to provide the needed framework for assessing student success as the department moves forward.

Music: The School of Music used information gathered from the previous year's assessment review to make changes to core curriculum in order to improve student performance and to assist with gathering data for future assessments. This is evidenced by the following information included in the 2018-19 School of Music Assessment report:

- Development of a new Performance Assessment tool (brown form) to establish more consistency with evaluation of student performance from audition to graduation
- Added pre-test for music theory to be given to new students at the time they audition for acceptance to the School of Music
- Created a new course track for music theory including the addition of a Rudiments of Music class for new students who are accepted to the School of Music without a basic knowledge of music theory
- Revised keyboard proficiency curriculum to address professional competencies required by specific music programs (i.e., Music Education and Music Therapy)
- Added a Professional Techniques for Choral Ensemble course to address an identified deficiency for Choral Education majors

Theater: The Department of Theater currently collects assessment data by the course and has not established a process for comparing data from the previous year to the current year. The current assessment report did report the following information regarding comparison of findings:

SECTION 3: RESULTS OF ACTIVITIES RELATED TO PRIOR YEAR FINDINGS

- This is the third year of a multi-year approach in which the Theatre faculty will assess at least three courses per year from the Theatre Core. Once the entire Theatre Core has undergone assessment, the Core will be reviewed on the whole with the changes recommended through these assessments will be addressed.
- Recommendations for improvement were included in two course assessment reports and not included in any of the other course assessment reports.

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY®
FORT WAYNE

SECTION 4: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Section 4: Conclusions and Future Directions

Future Directions for all VPA Departments: Members of the VPA Assessment committee have the following suggestions that pertain to each of the departments going forward with their assessment process:

- Remove all identification of individual students from your assessment reports.
- Schedule a time early in the academic year to educate faculty involved in collecting data for department assessment reports to clarify how and when this data will be collected.
- Learn how to use the on-line assessment template being created by Kent Johnson to upload assessment data as it becomes available, thus eliminating the end of semester panic to collect the data all at one time.
- Train LTL's and other part-time faculty who are involved in the collection of assessment data on the assessment process.
- Continue to develop ways to consistently collect assessment data in order to develop reliable assessment results each year.

Art and Design: While the assessment measures currently in place for the Department of Art and Design have been helpful, the VPA Assessment committee suggests a few possible additions to your process:

- Institute annual assessment for the area of Interior Design
- Create an alumni success survey and use it as an assessment tool. This might include
    1. Alumni teaching who graduated from our Art Education program
    2. Alumni currently accepted to graduate programs
    3. Alumni who have advanced to earn a MFA degree in a studio art
    4. Alumni currently in the work place, using their art experience
    5. Graphic Design and Interior Design alumni holding a job using the experience they learned in our program
    6. Alumni working in the Museum or Gallery field
    7. Alumni successes in the area of Gallery and art commissions on the regional, and national level

Music: While the assessment measures currently in place for the School of Music do a good job of assessing student success in the core music classes, the VPA Assessment committee suggests this possible addition to your process:

SECTION 4: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

- Include assessment criteria in the annual report to address student success in the following degree programs
  - Music Education
  - Music Therapy
  - Music Performance
  - Music and an Outside Field
  - Music Industry
  - Popular Music
  - Music minor
  - Jazz minor

Theater: While the assessment measures currently in place by the Department of Theater assess student success in specific courses, the process does not include a comprehensive assessment for the department as a whole. The VPA Assessment committee suggests the following additions to your assessment process:

- Create department-wide comprehensive assessment tools to better identify areas of need across the department.
- Revise your assessment process to include a comparison of current assessment data with data collected from previous years. Review of data from year to year will help the department to better identify trends, to reflect on ways to improve student success and to identify plans for improvement.
- Revise SLO's to better reflect specific, concise and measurable outcomes.

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY.
FORT WAYNE

Attachments

The following information is included with this report:

1. Art and Design Assessment evaluation report 2018-19
2. Music Assessment evaluation report 2018-19
3. Theater Assessment evaluation report 2018-19

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY.
FORT WAYNE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

COLLEGE: **Visual and Performing Arts**   DEPARTMENT: **Art and Design 2018-19**

Clearly stated programmatic student learning outcomes (SLO)				
	Exemplary 3	**Acceptable 2**	**Developing 1**	**Score or holistic evaluation**
Clarity and specificity	All SLOs are stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs and rich descriptions of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students upon completing the program.	SLOs generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students.	SLO's are inconsistently defined for the program, descriptions of the knowledge, skill and value domains are present but lack consistent precision.	**2.5**
Student-centered	All SLOs are stated in student-centered terms (i.e. what a student should know, think, or do).	Most SLO's are stated in student-centered terms.	Some SLO's are stated in student-centered terms	**3.0**
Expectation level	SLO's exceed basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLO's meet the basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLO's meet only a portion of the expectations established by the University or other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	**3.0**
RECOMMENDATIONS: **As recommended, we need to look at any developed SLOs marked as "developed" and ensure the outcomes are measurable.**				

Programmatic Curricular Map				
	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Content Alignment	All SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Most SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Common classes or learning activities are identified for all students completing the program but most SLO's are not clearly mapped to classes or activities.	**3.0**
Student Learning Development of SLOs (Learning Benchmarks)	Curricular Map clearly identifies the progression of student learning relative to all SLOs at specific points in the curriculum	Curricular Map identifies levels of expected learning relative to most SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	Curricular Map identifies expected levels of learning for some SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	**3.0**
Student Engagement	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined in the SLOs.	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs	Classes and/or activities do not consistently engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs.	**3.0**
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Alignment with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
IPFW Baccalaureate Framework Alignment	Specific, clearly defined, student-centered Program Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Generally defined student-centered Program-Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Program-Level SLO's are aligned to some foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	**3.0**
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Assessment Plan – Part 1				
	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Relationship between assessments and SLOs	Detail is provided regarding SLO-to-measure match. Specific items included on the assessment are linked to SLOs. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts.	Description of how SLO's relate to assessment is general but sufficient to show alignment.	Description of how SLO's relate to assessment is incomplete or too general to provide sufficient information for use in determining progress toward SLO.	**3.0**
Types of Measures	All SLOs are assessed using at least two measures including at least one direct measure	Most SLO's are assessed using as least one direct measure.	Most SLO's are either assessed using only indirect measures or are not assessed.	**3.0**
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Assessment Plan – Part 2				
	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Established results	Statements of desired results (data targets) provide useful comparisons and detailed timelines for completion.	Statements of desired results provide a basic data target and a general timeline for completion.	Statements of desired results are missing or unrealistic for completion.	2.5
Data Collection and Design Integrity	The data collection process is sound, clearly explained, and appropriately specific to be actionable.	Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process with limited methodological concerns.	Limited information is provided about the data collection process or includes sufficient flaws to nullify any conclusions drawn from the data	3.0
Evidence of Reliability of Measures	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are clearly explained and consistently support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are stated and generally support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods to ensure reliability of findings are insufficient for drawing meaningful conclusions.	2.5

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Portfolio Reviews – Continue to use the Freshman and Sophomore portfolio reviews as a means of accessing the quality of learning in the first two years of the program.

B.F.A and Art Education Acceptance – Detail the amount of students applying for these two degree concentrations and develop a rubric of acceptance and rejection annually.

B.F.A. Exhibition Review – Keep records of the senior B.F.A. Project in the form of grades by the full faculty including scores and suggestions.

Senior Project Statement – Continue the expectation of a senior project statement developed throughout the two semester course of Senior Project. Last year it was praised for its, "…demonstrates their ability to effectively communicate their artwork. I think this ends up being a very high level expectation and provides a strong measure of the overall program quality."

Reporting Results				
	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Presentation of Results	Results are clearly present and directly related to SLOs. Results consistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are present and related to SLOs. Results generally demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are provided but do not clearly relate to SLO's. Results inconsistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLO's. Use of generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment is unclear.	**TBD**
Historical Results	Past iterations of results are provided for most assessments to provide context for current results.	Past iterations of results are provided for the majority of assessments to provide context for current results.	Limited or no iterations of prior results are provided.	**TBD**
Interpretation of Results	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLOs, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results including an interpretation of how classes/activities might have affected the results.	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLO's, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results.	Interpretation of results does not adequately refer to stated SLO's or identify expectations for student learning relative to SLO's. The interpretation does not include multiple faculty.	**TBD**
RECOMMENDATIONS: All of these areas last year were in the implementation stage. As a unified department this year, we can better assess the presentation and historical results of our SLO's. Our given methods listed above (portfolio review, BFA review and project, etc.) will help to provide the needed frame work.				

Report dissemination and collaboration

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Documents and results are shared with faculty	Information is routinely provided to all faculty with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is provided to all faculty through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to all faculty or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	TBD
Documents and results are shared with other stakeholders	Information is routinely provided to stakeholders (beyond faculty) with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is shared with stakeholders (beyond faculty) through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to stakeholders (beyond faculty) or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	TBD

RECOMMENDATIONS:

All of these areas last year were in the implementation stage. As a unified department this year, we can better assess the presentation and historical results of our SLO's. Our given methods listed above (portfolio review, BFA review and project, etc.) will help to provide the needed frame work.

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 1

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Programmatic and Curricular Improvement	Evidence reported demonstrates a consistent pattern of an integrated assessment, pedagogy and curricular approach that assesses student performance relative to SLOs, uses assessment data to make curricular and/or pedagogical changes and reassesses learning to determine how or the extent to which the change positively influenced student learning.	Evidence reported demonstrates assessment of student learning relative to SLO's and describes curricular and/or pedagogical changes planned or made as a result of assessment of student learning. Some evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/ reassess is demonstrated.	Assessment findings are reported but insufficient evidence of curricular or pedagogical changes are present and limited or no evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/reassess is demonstrated.	**TBD**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

All of these areas last year were in the implementation stage. As a unified department this year, we can better assess the presentation and historical results of our SLO's. Our given methods listed above (portfolio review, BFA review and project, etc.) will help to provide the needed frame work.

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 2				
	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Improvement of Assessment Process (mechanics)	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and specific changes to the assessment process are detailed.	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and moderate changes to the assessment process, or general plans for improvement of assessment process are proposed.	Past and current assessment process are sporadically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, but no evidence of improving upon past assessment or making plans to improve assessment in future iterations is proposed.	TBD

RECOMMENDATIONS:
The Department of Art and Design is gathering information from last year's assessment to make changes where needed. Our measures in place have been helpful, we also suggest a few other possible additions:

- Institute annual assessment for the area of Interior Design
- Create an alumni success survey and use it as an assessment tool. This might include
    1. Alumni teaching who graduated from our Art Education program.
    2. Alumni currently accepted to graduate programs.
    3. Alumni who have advanced to earn a MFA degree in a studio art.
    4. Alumni currently in the work place, using their art experience.
    5. Graphic Design and Interior Design alumni holding a job using the experience they learned in our program.
    6. Alumni working in the Museum or Gallery field.
    7. Alumni successes in the area of Gallery and art commissions on the regional, and national level.

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

COLLEGE: **Visual and Performing Arts**   DEPARTMENT: **School of Music 2018-19**

Clearly stated programmatic student learning outcomes (SLO)				
	Exemplary 3	**Acceptable 2**	**Developing 1**	**Score or holistic evaluation**
Clarity and specificity	All SLOs are stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs and rich descriptions of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students upon completing the program.	SLOs generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students.	SLO's are inconsistently defined for the program, descriptions of the knowledge, skill and value domains are present but lack consistent precision.	**3**
Student-centered	All SLOs are stated in student-centered terms (i.e. what a student should know, think, or do).	Most SLO's are stated in student-centered terms.	Some SLO's are stated in student-centered terms	**3**
Expectation level	SLO's exceed basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLO's meet the basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLO's meet only a portion of the expectations established by the University or other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	**3**
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Programmatic Curricular Map				
	Exemplary **3**	**Acceptable** **2**	**Developing** **1**	**Score or holistic** **evaluation**
Content Alignment	All SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Most SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Common classes or learning activities are identified for all students completing the program but most SLO's are not clearly mapped to classes or activities.	*3*
Student Learning Development of SLOs (Learning Benchmarks)	Curricular Map clearly identifies the progression of student learning relative to all SLOs at specific points in the curriculum	Curricular Map identifies levels of expected learning relative to most SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	Curricular Map identifies expected levels of learning for some SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	*3*
Student Engagement	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined in the SLOs.	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs	Classes and/or activities do not consistently engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs.	*3*
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Alignment with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework				
	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
IPFW Baccalaureate Framework Alignment	Specific, clearly defined, student-centered Program Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Generally defined student-centered Program-Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Program-Level SLO's are aligned to some foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	*3*
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Assessment Plan – Part 1				
	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Relationship between assessments and SLOs	Detail is provided regarding SLO-to-measure match. Specific items included on the assessment are linked to SLOs. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts.	Description of how SLO's relate to assessment is general but sufficient to show alignment.	Description of how SLO's relate to assessment is incomplete or too general to provide sufficient information for use in determining progress toward SLO.	*3*
Types of Measures	All SLOs are assessed using at least two measures including at least one direct measure	Most SLO's are assessed using as least one direct measure.	Most SLO's are either assessed using only indirect measures or are not assessed.	*3*
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Assessment Plan – Part 2

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Established results	Statements of desired results (data targets) provide useful comparisons and detailed timelines for completion.	Statements of desired results provide a basic data target and a general timeline for completion.	Statements of desired results are missing or unrealistic for completion.	*3*
Data Collection and Design Integrity	The data collection process is sound, clearly explained, and appropriately specific to be actionable.	Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process with limited methodological concerns.	Limited information is provided about the data collection process or includes sufficient flaws to nullify any conclusions drawn from the data	*3*
Evidence of Reliability of Measures	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are clearly explained and consistently support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are stated and generally support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods to ensure reliability of findings are insufficient for drawing meaningful conclusions.	*3*

RECOMMENDATIONS: *(as identified by the School of Music Assessment Committee with input from all full-time Music faculty)*
PERFORMANCE SLO's
1. *Train all applied faculty in how to use the revised "Brown Form" for Performance Assessment and ensure they consistently use it for all performance checks, from entry-level to graduation*
2. *For student recitals, determine if the performance assessment will occur during the recital hearing or during the recital performance*
3. *Consider the difference in difficulty of repertoire and performance expectations between concentration recitals and junior/senior recitals*

MUSIC THEORY SLO's
4. *Include information from Rudiments of Music I and music theory courses for Popular Music majors in future assessments*

KEYBOARD PROFICIENCY SLO's
5. *Continue to revise courses to address professional competencies of music degree programs*
6. *Identify a new coordinator of piano classes*

OTHER
7. *Determine how to include SLO's for Music Industry majors as part of the School of Music annual assessment process*

Reporting Results				
	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Presentation of Results	Results are clearly present and directly related to SLOs. Results consistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are present and related to SLOs. Results generally demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are provided but do not clearly relate to SLO's. Results inconsistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLO's. Use of generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment is unclear.	*3*
Historical Results	Past iterations of results are provided for most assessments to provide context for current results.	Past iterations of results are provided for the majority of assessments to provide context for current results.	Limited or no iterations of prior results are provided.	*3*
Interpretation of Results	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLOs, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results including an interpretation of how classes/activities might have affected the results.	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLO's, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results.	Interpretation of results does not adequately refer to stated SLO's or identify expectations for student learning relative to SLO's. The interpretation does not include multiple faculty.	*3*
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Report dissemination and collaboration				
	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Documents and results are shared with faculty	Information is routinely provided to all faculty with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is provided to all faculty through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to all faculty or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	*3*
Documents and results are shared with other stakeholders	Information is routinely provided to stakeholders (beyond faculty) with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is shared with stakeholders (beyond faculty) through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to stakeholders (beyond faculty) or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	*This criteria was not addressed in the assessment report*
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 1

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Programmatic and Curricular Improvement	Evidence reported demonstrates a consistent pattern of an integrated assessment, pedagogy and curricular approach that assesses student performance relative to SLOs, uses assessment data to make curricular and/or pedagogical changes and reassesses learning to determine how or the extent to which the change positively influenced student learning.	Evidence reported demonstrates assessment of student learning relative to SLO's and describes curricular and/or pedagogical changes planned or made as a result of assessment of student learning. Some evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/ reassess is demonstrated.	Assessment findings are reported but insufficient evidence of curricular or pedagogical changes are present and limited or no evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/reassess is demonstrated.	*3*
RECOMMENDATIONS:				

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 2

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or holistic evaluation
Improvement of Assessment Process (mechanics)	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and specific changes to the assessment process are detailed.	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and moderate changes to the assessment process, or general plans for improvement of assessment process are proposed.	Past and current assessment process are sporadically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, but no evidence of improving upon past assessment or making plans to improve assessment in future iterations is proposed.	*3*

RECOMMENDATIONS:

OVERALL COMMENTS:
The School of Music used information gathered from the previous year's assessment to make changes to core curriculum in order to improve student performance and to assist with data gathering for future assessments. This is evidenced by the following information included in their 2018-19 Assessment report:
- *development of a new Performance Assessment tool (brown form) to establish more consistency with evaluation of student performance from audition to graduation*
- *added pre-test for music theory to be given to new students at the time they audition for acceptance to the School of Music*
- *created a new course track for music theory including the addition of a Rudiments of Music class for new students who are accepted to the School of Music without a basic knowledge of music theory*
- *revised keyboard proficiency curriculum to address professional competencies required by specific music programs (i.e., Music Education and Music Therapy)*
- *added a Professional Techniques for Choral Ensemble course to address an identified deficiency for Choral Education majors*

Clearly Stated Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Clarity and specificity	All SLOs are stated with clarity and specificity including precise verbs and rich descriptions of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students upon completing the program.	SLOs generally contain precise verbs, rich description of the knowledge, skills and value domains expected of students.	SLOs are inconsistently defined for the program, descriptions of the knowledge, skill and value domains are present but lack consistent precision.	
Student-Centered	All SLOs are stated in student-centered terms (i.e. what a student should know, think, or do).	Most SLOs are stated in student-centered terms.	Some SLO's are stated in student-centered terms.	
Expectation Level	SLO's exceed basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLO's meet the basic expectations established by the University and other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	SLOs meet only a portion of the expectations established by the University or other necessary approving organizations required of the submitting unit.	

Recommendations:

Programmatic Curricular Map

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Content Alignment	All SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Most SLOs are mapped to common classes or learning activities expected of all students completing the program.	Common classes or learning activities are identified for all students completing the program but most SLO's are not clearly mapped to classes or activities.	
Student Learning Development of SLOs (Learning Benchmarks)	Curricular Map clearly identifies the progression of student learning relative to all SLOs at specific points in the curriculum	Curricular Map identifies levels of expected learning relative to most SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	Curricular Map identifies expected levels of learning for some SLOs at specific points in the curriculum.	
Student Engagement	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined in the SLOs.	Classes and/or activities engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs	Classes and/or activities do not consistently engage students in the work outlined by most of the SLOs.	

Recommendations:

Alignment with IPFW Baccalaureate Framework

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
IPFW Baccalaureate Framework Alignment	Specific, clearly defined, student-centered Program-Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Generally defined student-centered Program-Level SLO's are aligned to all foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	Program-Level SLO's are aligned to some foundation areas of the IPFW Baccalaureate Framework.	

Recommendations:

Assessment Plan – Part 1

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Relationship between assessments and SLOs	Detail is provided regarding SLO-to-measure match. Specific items included on the assessment are linked to SLOs. The match is affirmed by faculty subject experts.	Description of how SLOs relate to assessment is general but sufficient to show alignment.	Description of how SLOs relate to assessment is incomplete or too general to provide sufficient information for use in determining progress toward SLO.	
Types of Measures	All SLOs are assessed using at least two measures including at least one direct measure	Most SLOs are assessed using at least one direct measure.	Most SLOs are either assessed using only indirect measures or are not assessed.	

Recommendations:

Assessment Plan – Part 2

Established Results	Statements of desired results (data targets) provide useful comparisons and detailed timelines for completion.	Statements of desired results provide a basic data target and a general timeline for completion.	Statements of desired results are missing or unrealistic for completion.	
Data Collection and Design Integrity	The data collection process is sound, clearly explained, and appropriately specific to be actionable.	Enough information is provided to understand the data collection process with limited methodological concerns.	Limited information is provided about the data collection process or includes sufficient flaws to nullify any conclusions drawn from the data	
Evidence of Reliability of Measures	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are clearly explained and consistently support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods used to ensure reliability of findings are stated and generally support drawing meaningful conclusions.	Methods to ensure reliability of findings are insufficient for drawing meaningful conclusions.	

Recommendations:

Reporting Results

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Presentation of Results	Results are clearly present and directly related to SLOs. Results consistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are present and related to SLOs. Results generally demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLOs. Results are derived from generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment.	Results are provided but do not clearly relate to SLO's. Results inconsistently demonstrate student achievement relative to stated SLO's. Use of generally accepted practices for student learning outcomes assessment is unclear.	
Historical Results	Past iterations of results are provided for most assessments to provide context for current results.	Past iterations of results are provided for the majority of assessments to provide context for current results.	Limited or no iterations of prior results are provided.	
Interpretation of Results	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLOs, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results including an interpretation of how classes/activities might have affected the results.	Interpretations of results are reasonable given the SLO's, desired levels of student learning and methodology employed. Multiple faculty interpreted the results.	Interpretation of results does not adequately refer to stated SLO's or identify expectations for student learning relative to SLO's. The interpretation does not include multiple faculty.	

Recommendations:

Report Dissemination and Collaboration

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Documents and results are shared with faculty	Information is routinely provided to all faculty with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is provided to all faculty through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to all faculty or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	
Documents and results are shared with other stakeholders	Information is routinely provided to stakeholders (beyond faculty) with multiple opportunities for collaboration to build meaningful future plans.	Information is shared with stakeholders (beyond faculty) through an effective mode and with sufficient detail to be meaningful.	Information is not distributed to stakeholders (beyond faculty) or provides insufficient detail to be meaningful.	

Recommendations:

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 1

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Programmatic and Curricular Improvement	Evidence reported demonstrates a consistent pattern of an integrated assessment, pedagogy and curricular approach that assesses student performance relative to SLOs, uses assessment data to make curricular and/or pedagogical changes and re-assesses learning to determine how or the extent to which the change positively influenced student learning.	Evidence reported demonstrates assessment of student learning relative to SLO's and describes curricular and/or pedagogical changes planned or made as a result of assessment of student learning. Some evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/ re-assess is demonstrated.	Assessment findings are reported but insufficient evidence of curricular or pedagogical changes are present and limited or no evidence of an emergent pattern of assess/curricular or pedagogical change/re-assess is demonstrated.	

Recommendations:

Use of Results for Programmatic Change to Improve Student Learning, Achievement and Success – Part 2

	Exemplary 3	Acceptable 2	Developing 1	Score or Holistic Evaluation
Improvement of Assessment Process (mechanics)	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and specific changes to the assessment process are detailed.	Past and current assessment process are critically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, present and intended improvements to process are identified (when needed) and moderate changes to the assessment process, or general plans for improvement of assessment process are proposed.	Past and current assessment process are sporadically evaluated, including acknowledgement of flaws, but no evidence of improving upon past assessment or making plans to improve assessment in future iterations is proposed.	

Recommendations: