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# Music, BA and BM Degree Assessment Report 2016-17

Note: At the suggestion made in the 2016 Assessment Feedback Report, we are combining the BA and BM degree assessments. Degree-specific issues will be addressed throughout our report.

The Bachelor of Arts degree in music combines music training with a traditional Liberal Arts education. BA students are expected to achieve an appropriate sophomore level of performance as they are required to take only two years of applied lessons. The capstone course for this degree is a senior thesis/project presentation.

The Bachelor of Music degree in music performance is a professional degree for students who have a high level of musical ability. The degree contains instrumental, piano, and vocal concentrations, and all students are assessed by the same methods. The capstone course for this degree is a senior performance recital.

Program assessment outcomes and rubrics were developed to be used for the first time during Spring 2014. At the suggestion made in the 2016 Assessment Feedback Report, the department assessment committee amended those outcomes to include learning verbs that were more specific and better fitted to our discipline. These changes were then approved by the entire faculty.

Because our online form submission process wouldn’t allow mid-year changes, the new outcomes will be implemented in the 2017-18 academic year. Both old and new outcomes are listed below and on the attached rubrics.

## STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

### 1. Specificity of Outcomes

Student Learning Outcomes:

1. Students will demonstrate appropriate performance skills and knowledge of musical style for their level of experience.
2. Students will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate music literature & historical relevance.
3. Students will demonstrate appropriate ability to apply theoretical concepts to music.
4. Students will acknowledge that they received effective instruction in their music degree program.

New Student Learning Outcomes:

1. Students will perform with appropriate skills and knowledge of musical style for their level of experience.
2. Students will articulate knowledge of appropriate music literature & historical relevance.
3. Students will apply theoretical concepts to music.
4. Students will acknowledge that they received effective instruction in their music degree program.

### 2. Comprehensive Outcomes

The student learning outcomes are comprehensive and are based on faculty consensus. The skills-based learning that is required of our students is cumulative and should improve throughout the student’s degree, thus the reason for assessing their performances each year, at the sophomore comprehensive exam, and at the culminating senior thesis/project presentation (BA) or senior recital (BM). Since our program is skills-based, performance/presentation is the ideal medium of assessing student ability to synthesize skills and other knowledge.

### 3.Communicating Outcomes

The faculty are provided the complete assessment plan including student learning outcomes. The assessment plan, student learning outcomes, and rubrics are posted on the department SharePoint site. An annual departmental assessment meeting is held for discussion of results and suggestions for improvement. Learning outcomes are communicated to students in their applied lessons via the rubric for each activity. Students are also able to view the completed rubrics with scores and comments (filled out by faculty at the jury, sophomore comprehensive exam, and project presentation/recital jury).

## CURRICULUM MAP

### 4.Curriculum Map

See further explanation of courses/activities under Measurement (Modes of Assessment chart).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Courses/Activities | Performance Skills | Knowledge of Literature | Theoretical Concepts | Effective Instruction |
| MUAP (appliedlessons) | X | X | X |  |
| SophomoreComprehensive | X | X | X |  |
| BA: MUSI 4700Senior Thesis/Project |  | X | X |  |
| BM: MUSI 3800(Junior Recital) MUSI 4800(Senior Recital) | X | X | X |  |
| Exit Survey |  |  |  | X |

## MEASUREMENT

### Outcome-Measure Alignment

1. Students will demonstrate appropriate performance skills and knowledge of musical style for their level of experience.

Measures: a. The student demonstrates appropriate musicianship.

* 1. The student demonstrates appropriate technical proficiency.
	2. The student demonstrates appropriate tone quality.
1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate music literature & historical relevance. Measures: a. The scope of the thesis/project/performance is appropriate.
	1. The literature/repertoire selected for the project/performance is significant.
	2. The student discusses or performs issues of musical style appropriately.
2. Students will demonstrate appropriate ability to apply theoretical concepts to music. Measures: a. The student demonstrates an understanding of theoretical concepts.
	1. The performance/argument is presented accurately.
	2. The student discusses issues appropriately. (Sophomore Comprehensive only)
	3. The student presents effective oral arguments. (Sophomore Comprehensive only)
3. Students will acknowledge that they received effective instruction in their music degree program.

List of revised outcomes with corresponding measures:

1. Students will perform with appropriate skills and knowledge of musical style for their level of experience.

Measures: a. The student performs with appropriate musicianship.

* 1. The student performs with appropriate technical proficiency.
	2. The student performs with appropriate tone quality.
1. Students will articulate knowledge of appropriate music literature & historical relevance. Measures: a. The scope of the thesis/project/performance is appropriate.
	1. The literature/repertoire selected for the project/performance is significant.
	2. The student discusses or performs with issues of musical style appropriately.
2. Students will apply theoretical concepts to music.

Measures: a. The student articulates/performs with an understanding of theoretical concepts.

* 1. The performance/argument is presented accurately.
	2. The student discusses issues appropriately. (Sophomore Comprehensive only)
	3. The student presents effective oral arguments. (Sophomore Comprehensive only)
1. Students will acknowledge that they received effective instruction in their music degree program.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Modes of Assessment:** | **Outcomes** |
| **Semester Juries:** Students perform juries at the conclusion of each semester of applied study (MUAP) that assess their ability to perform effectively, their knowledge of appropriate music literature and style, and their comprehension oftheoretical concepts through performance. | 1,2,3 |
| **Sophomore Comprehensive:** The Sophomore Comprehensive Exam is required of all students at the conclusion of Performance IV (MUAP 2620) which is the culmination of a four-semester sequence in applied lesson study (MUAP 1520, 1620, 2520, 2620). The exam, which is comprised of oral presentation and performance components, assesses their ability to perform effectively, their knowledge of appropriate music literature and style, and their comprehension of theoreticalconcepts through performance. | 1,2,3 |
| **Senior Thesis/Project (BA):** Students in the BA in Music degree are required to complete Senior Thesis/Project MUSI 4700, a culminating course typically taken during their final semester. This course requires a committee of at least three and notmore than four faculty members with one faculty member serving as the project director. | 2,3 |
| **Junior/Senior Recital Juries (BM):** Students in the Bachelor of Music degree are required to complete Junior Recital MUSI 3800 and Senior Recital MUSI 4800, culminating courses typically taken at the end of their junior year and during their final semester. Two to three weeks prior to the recital, each student performs a recitaljury for a committee of at least three area faculty members. | 1,2,3 |
| **Music Exit Survey:** A Music Student Exit Survey to solicit student evaluation of theinstructional effectiveness of the program will be administered to students during their thesis/project or senior recital semester (typically their final semester). | 4 |

### 6.Direct Measures

All assessments are direct measures of student learning except for the exit survey.

### Data Collection

**Semester Juries:** Each spring semester, student juries will be assessed through a rubric completed by the student’s area faculty (three minimum) to quantify student success in demonstrating the desired outcomes. The student score used for assessment purposes will be an aggregate score of the combined faculty rubric scores.

**Sophomore Comprehensive:** Sophomore comprehensive exams will be assessed using a rubric completed by the appropriate area faculty to quantify student success in demonstrating the desired outcomes. These exams occur in the student’s fourth semester of applied study (typically during a spring semester, but occasionally in fall semesters). The student score used for assessment purposes will be an aggregate score of the combined faculty rubric scores. The sophomore comprehensive exam is an important assessment of student progress midway through their study. Deficiencies can then be addressed in order for students to continue their progress towards a successful capstone experience (senior thesis project for BA students and senior recital for BM students).

**Senior Thesis/Project (BA):** Student projects for Senior Thesis/Project MUSI 4700 will be assessed using a rubric completed by the student’s faculty committee (three minimum) to quantify student success in demonstrating the desired outcomes. These assessments typically occur in the student’s final semester in the degree program. The student score used for assessment purposes will be an aggregate score of the combined faculty rubric scores. Students will be expected to demonstrate a level of proficiency appropriate for a graduating senior. Note that the expectation for a senior level of performance skill is not expected for students in this degree program.

**Junior/Senior Recitals (BM):** Student recitals, Junior Recital MUSI 3800 and Senior Recital MUSI 4800, will be assessed using a rubric completed by the student’s faculty committee (three minimum) to quantify student success in demonstrating the desired outcomes. These recitals typically occur at the end of the junior year and during the final semester of the degree program. The student score used for assessment purposes will be an aggregate score of the combined faculty rubric scores. Students will be expected to demonstrate a level of proficiency appropriate for junior level for MUSI 3800 and at the level of a graduating senior for MUSI 4800

**Music Exit Survey:** The Music Student Exit Survey results will be collected and tallied annually.

All data will be assembled and reviewed at least annually by the Music Faculty Assessment Committee. Music faculty will meet no less than once annually to discuss the assessment results and how to continue to improve student learning. A report to faculty on the results will lead the discussion of how we might change or augment our degree program and particular ways to improve student learning.

## RESULTS

### 8-9. Reporting and Interpreting Results

Both reporting and interpreting results are organized by outcome/method for clarity.

Rubrics, the chart of rubric results, and exit survey results are attached at the end of this report.

# Expected Outcome 1: Performance skills

1. Students will demonstrate appropriate performance skills and knowledge of musical style for their level of experience.

Measures: a. The student demonstrates appropriate musicianship.

* 1. The student demonstrates appropriate technical proficiency.
	2. The student demonstrates appropriate tone quality.

# Assessment Method 1: Semester Juries

Findings:

Average rubric scores for musicianship, technical proficiency, and tone quality competencies for first- and second-year BA and BM student semester juries can be found on the attached chart.

The average scores in 2016-17 ranged from 2.65 to 2.73 (BA) and 2.95 to 3.05 (BM) for first- year students and 2.61 to 2.86 (BA) and 2.86 to 2.94 (BM) for second year students (scale is 1 to

4, with 4 being the highest score). We can also track scores for students as they progress each year (see color coding on chart).

As expected, average rubric scores for musicianship, technical proficiency, and tone quality competencies were higher for BM students than BA students. Average scores for 2016-17 second-year students were somewhat lower in most competencies than for first year students. While this may be due to a difference in overall abilities in each class, this should be noted for future reference. This could also be attributed to increased expectations from faculty regarding progress in development of tone quality and technical skills. In tracking students from their freshman year (2015-16) to their sophomore year (2016-17), BA students show improvement in musicianship and tone quality but a slight decrease in technical proficiency. BM students show little or no improvement in all three areas. As the technical proficiency demands increase each year, these technical issues may also affect musicianship and tone quality. Written comments indicated a continued need for students to focus on tone quality and spend more practice time and attention to detail in working out technical passages. Students continue to need more development in achieving consistent tone quality in all registers (high, medium, and low) of their instrument. These are typical findings in training young musicians who are developing the self- discipline required in music performance.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can concentrate on areas that need improvement. Faculty will be encouraged to continue to focus on practice skills related to technique, development of tone, and basic musicianship while still addressing individual student needs, a critical pedagogical method for music study.

# Assessment Method 2: Sophomore Comprehensive Exams

Findings:

During 2016-17, average rubric scores for musicianship, technical proficiency, and tone quality competencies for the performance section of the sophomore comprehensive exam ranged between 2.61 to 2.86 (BA) and 2.86 to 2.94 (BM) on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest score (see attached chart).

As expected, average rubric scores for musicianship, technical proficiency, and tone quality competencies were higher for BM students than BA students. Comparisons between scores of consecutive years for the same groups of students show a continued need to focus on improving tone quality as technical proficiency demands increase. Written comments also continue to indicate the necessity for improved development of technical skills including diction, articulation, counting, and rhythm.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can focus on areas that need improvement. Faculty will be encouraged to continue to emphasize tone quality development and technical skills.

# Assessment Method 3: Junior/Senior Recitals (BM only)

Findings:

Average rubric scores for musicianship, technical proficiency, and tone quality competencies for junior and senior recital juries can be found on the attached chart. In 2016-17, the average scores

ranged from 3.06 to 3.40 for junior recital juries and 2.83 to 3.17 for senior recital juries on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest score. Scores for both junior and senior recital jury competencies were higher for musicianship and tone quality as compared to technical proficiency. Scores for junior recital juries were higher than senior recitals. This could be attributed to the low (2) sample size of the students performing their senior recitals. If we track those same two students from their junior recital jury in 2015-16 to their senior recital jury in 2016-17, there is improvement in all three competencies.

Written comments confirm that students are performing with an appropriate level of musicianship and tone quality with some inconsistencies in technique. Endurance issues sometimes play a part in performance issues.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can focus on areas that need improvement. Faculty will be encouraged to emphasize practice skills that address difficult technical passages and a wider range of expression in the recital music while still addressing individual student needs, a critical pedagogical method for music study. Practice habits that affect endurance should be examined for those students with stamina issues.

# Expected Outcome 2: Knowledge of Literature

1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate music literature & historical relevance. Measures: a. The scope of the thesis/project/performance is appropriate.
	1. The literature/repertoire selected for the project/performance is significant.
	2. The student discusses or performs issues of musical style appropriately.

# Assessment Method 1: Semester Juries

Findings:

Average rubric scores for scope, literature, and musical style competencies for first- and second- year BA and BM student semester juries can be found on the attached chart. In 2016-17, the average scores ranged from 2.69 to 3.18 (BA) and 2.94 to 3.29 (BM) for first-year students and

2.85 to 3.18 (BA) and 2.93 to 3.52 (BM) for second-year students (scale is 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest score).

As expected, average rubric scores for scope, literature, and musical style competencies were higher for BM students than BA students. The scores for musical style for BA and BM first-year and second-year students continue to be the lowest of the three measures for this outcome.

Written comments indicated that most students are performing literature of quality that is appropriate for their level. However, while some students performed with an appropriate overall sense of style, they should continue to work on varying the musical style and expression to fit each piece they perform. For some students, issues with technique affected their ability to cultivate a variety of styles.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can concentrate on areas that need improvement. Faculty will be encouraged to continue to focus on education of stylistic characteristics suitable for each piece, while still addressing individual student needs, a critical pedagogical method for music study.

# Assessment Method 2: Sophomore Comprehensive Exams

Findings:

During 2016-17, average rubric scores for scope, literature, and musical style competencies for the sophomore comprehensive exam ranged between 2.85 and 3.18 (BA) and 2.93 to 3.52 (BM) on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest score (see attached chart). As expected, average rubric scores for scope, literature, and musical style competencies were higher for BM students than BA students. Comparisons between consecutive years for the same group of students show that scores for musical style continue to be the lowest of the three measures. Written comments confirm that while the scope and literature of the selected pieces continued to be appropriate, there is a lack of thorough demonstration of accurate musical style and nuance for each piece.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can focus on areas that need improvement, primarily the understanding and expression of musical style to fit particular musical works.

# Assessment Method 3: Senior Thesis/Project (BA only)

Findings:

There were no students completing their senior thesis/project in 2016-17 due to low enrollment in this degree in previous years. We anticipate at least seven students to sign up for this class in 2017-18.

How did you use findings for improvement? N/A

# Assessment Method 4: Junior/Senior Recitals (BM only)

Findings:

Average rubric scores for scope, literature, and musical style competencies for junior and senior recital juries can be found on the attached chart. In 2016-17, the average scores ranged from 3.33 to 3.94 for junior recital juries and 3.00 to 3.83 for senior recital juries on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest score. Scores for senior recital juries were lower than for junior recital juries possibly due to the low (2) sample size of students performing senior recital juries. Those two students did show improvement in the scope and literature competencies between their junior and senior recital juries, but their musical style scores decreased. The score for the musical style competency continues to be the lowest of the three average scores for all students. Written comments indicated that literature performed continues to be of excellent quality and appropriate to both junior and senior levels. Many students showed a mastery of various musical styles throughout their recital juries, but in some cases, students performed with the same style for each piece.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can address areas that need improvement. Faculty will be encouraged to continue to focus on student understanding of all musical styles, especially when performing an entire recital of varied literature.

# Expected Outcome 3: Theoretical Concepts

1. Students will demonstrate appropriate ability to apply theoretical concepts to music. Measures: a. The student demonstrates an understanding of theoretical concepts.
	1. The performance/argument is presented accurately.
	2. The student discusses issues appropriately. (Sophomore Comprehensive only)
	3. The student presents effective oral arguments. (Sophomore Comprehensive only)

# Assessment Method 1: Semester Juries

Findings:

Average rubric scores for understanding of theoretical concepts and accuracy of performance competencies for first- and second-year BA and BM student semester juries can be found on the attached chart. In 2016-17 the average scores ranged from 2.73 to 2.77 (BA) and 2.85-2.95 (BM) for first-year students and 2.72 to 3.03 (BA) and 2.79 to 2.97 (BM) for second-year students (scale is 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest score).

As expected, average rubric scores for understanding of theoretical concepts and accuracy of performance competencies were higher for BM students than BA students, with the exception of accuracy of performance in second-year students. Written comments indicated that consistency in accuracy of performance is an area of concern for students from both years. There also seems to be improvement in the performance of major and minor scales since last year.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can hone in on areas that need improvement. Faculty will be encouraged to continue to emphasize scale study and the understanding of theoretical concepts. They will be asked to stress the importance of methodical and thorough practice habits. They should continue to assess whether performance anxiety influences accuracy of performance while still addressing individual student needs, a critical pedagogical method for music study.

# Assessment Method 2: Sophomore Comprehensive Exams

Findings:

In 2016-17, average rubric scores for understanding of theoretical concepts, accuracy of performance, discussion of issues, and presentation of an effective argument ranged between

2.72 and 3.14 (BA) and 2.79 and 3.19 (BM) on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest score (see attached chart). Comparisons between scores of consecutive years for the same group of students also show substantial improvement in the first two measures for BA students and a decrease in accuracy of performance for BM students. Written comments indicated that students have some lack of understanding of the theoretical concepts of music in general and the relationship of those concepts to performance. There also seems to be a continued need for improvement in student abilities to sing intervals accurately during their sophomore comprehensive exam. Comments also showed students’ grasp of the history and literature of their instrument to be thorough and well prepared for the exam.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can focus on areas that need improvement. Faculty will be encouraged to discuss the connection of theoretical issues to performance and to assess issues that affect accuracy, while still addressing individual student

needs, a critical pedagogical method for music study. It will be suggested that faculty review chord spelling/identification and singing of intervals with their students more frequently.

# Assessment Method 3: Senior Thesis/Project (BA only)

Findings:

There were no students completing their senior thesis/project in 2016-17 due to low enrollment in this degree in previous years. We anticipate at least seven students to sign up for this class in 2017-18.

How did you use findings for improvement? N/A

# Assessment Method 4: Junior/Senior Recitals (BM only)

Findings:

Average rubric scores for understanding of theoretical concepts and accuracy of performance competencies for junior and senior recital juries can be found on the attached chart. In 2016-17, average scores ranged between 3.00 and 3.40 for junior recital juries and between 2.67 and 3.33 for senior recital juries on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being the highest score. Scores for senior recital juries were lower than junior recital juries, possibly due to the small (2) sample size for senior recitals. Those two students did show excellent improvement in the theoretical concepts competency from their junior to senior recital juries, while their accuracy of performance score stayed the same for both years. Written comments indicated that while accuracy was an issue for many students, they tended to improve as they became more comfortable with performing during the recital jury. However, for some students, a decrease in stamina through the performance affected their accuracy towards the end of the recital jury.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can concentrate on areas that need improvement. Faculty will be encouraged to continue to focus on performance issues such as focus and endurance in preparing an entire public recital, while still addressing individual student needs, a critical pedagogical method for music study.

# Expected Outcome 4: Effective Instruction

1. Students will acknowledge that they received effective instruction in their music degree program.

# Assessment Method 1: Music Exit Survey

Findings:

Survey questions and results for the past five assessment periods are attached. Overall scores for 2016-17 are positive in general and showed improvement in some areas over previous years, while other area scores decreased a bit. During 2016-17, the percentage of students who selected “strongly agree” or “agree” was 100% on seven out of the twelve questions. Highest scores were given for questions addressing 1) applied faculty providing training that encouraged and developed student growth as a performer and musician, 2) applied faculty providing support in program planning and development, 3) music instructors displaying a thorough understanding of course content, 4) music instructors being effective in teaching stated course objectives, 5) music faculty providing helpful feedback regarding course content and assessment, and 6) music faculty supporting musical growth and intellectual development for students. Areas in which

students expressed the greatest need for improvement include 1) student opportunities to develop understanding of and commitment to diversity, 2) student acquisition of knowledge in their areas of study, and 3) fulfillment of expectations regarding the overall program.

How did you use findings for improvement?

Results will be discussed at the August faculty meeting so that faculty can focus on areas that need improvement. Faculty should continue to assist students in seeking opportunities for diversity in their education. Specific course objectives referring to issues of diversity will be encouraged. Faculty will be asked to have discussions with their students to find out what they expect out of the music program.

Additional Comments:

The survey results are comprehensive for all music majors (BA, BM, and BME). To help achieve close to 100% participation, the survey was tied to the final recital or project beginning in

2013-14.

### 10. Communicating Results

Results are shared with all program faculty in the August assessment faculty meeting.

## USE OF RESULTS

### 11. Purposeful Reflection and Action Plan

During the August faculty assessment meeting, results are discussed and suggestions for improving student learning are made. (See specific comments for each assessment method in Results section above.) Due to these discussions in past years, we have implemented curricular changes such as the addition of a core MUSI 2730 Music Appreciation course for music majors only, so that our music students can focus on material appropriate to their level of music ability in their core fine arts class (regular Music Appreciation courses do not require any music background). Faculty will discuss methods of reinforcing music skills and theoretical concepts in all classes. They also will be asked to continue to discuss ideas throughout the year in addition to the annual assessment meeting.

**Degree Assessment Rubric for Evaluation of the Semester Jury/Soph Comp/Jr Recital Jury/Sr Recital Jury**

Student: Evaluator: Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Course number: Year/Semester: Degree program: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Student Learning Outcomes***

1. *Students will demonstrate appropriate performance skills and knowledge of musical style for their level of experience.*
2. *Students will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate music literature & historical relevance.*
3. *Students will demonstrate appropriate ability to apply theoretical concepts to music.*

Rank the following from 1 to 4 with 4 being the highest score.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measures** | **4 Advanced** | **3 Proficient** | **2 Basic** | **1 Little or None** | **Score and Comments** |
| ***The student demonstrates appropriate musicianship.*** | The student is expertly effective in demonstrating appropriatemusicianship. | The student is consistently effective in demonstratingAppropriate musicianship. | The student is generally effective in demonstrating appropriatemusicianship. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in demonstratingAppropriate musicianship. |  |
| ***The student demonstrates appropriate technical proficiency.*** | The student is expertly effective in demonstrating appropriatetechnical proficiency. | The student is consistently effective in demonstratingappropriate technical proficiency. | The student is generally effective in demonstrating appropriatetechnical proficiency. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in demonstratingappropriate technical proficiency. |  |
| ***The student demonstrates appropriate tone quality.*** | The student is expertly effective in demonstrating appropriate tonequality. | The student is consistently effective in demonstratingappropriate tone quality. | The student is generally effective in demonstrating appropriate tonequality. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in demonstratingappropriate tone quality. |  |
| ***The scope of the performance is appropriate.*** | The scope of the performance is superblyappropriate for the assignment. | The scope of the performance is satisfactorilyappropriate for the assignment. | The scope of the performance is somewhatappropriate for the assignment.  | The scope of the performance is poorly appropriate for theassignment. |  |
| ***The literature or repertoire selected for the performance is significant.*** | The literature selected for the performance is of exemplary quality. | The literature selected for the performance is of excellent quality. | The literature selected for the performance is of moderate quality. | The literature selected for the performance is inconsistent or of poor quality. |  |
| ***The student demonstrates performance of musical style appropriately.*** | The student is expertly effective in demonstrating performance of musical style. | The student is consistently effective in demonstrating performance ofmusical style. | The student is generally effective in demonstrating performance of musical style. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in demonstrating performance of musicalstyle. |  |
| ***The student demonstrates an understanding of theoretical concepts.*** | The student is expertly effective in demonstrating an understanding ofTheoretical concepts. | The student is consistently effective in demonstrating anunderstanding of theoretical concepts. | The student is generally effective in demonstrating an understanding ofTheoretical concepts. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in demonstrating anunderstanding of theoretical concepts. |  |
| ***The student performs accurately.*** | The student is expertly effective inpresenting an accurate performance. | The student is consistentlyeffective in presenting an accurate performance. | The student is generally effective inpresenting an accurate performance.  | The student is inconsistent and/or onlysomewhat effective in presenting an accurate performance.  |  |
| ***The student discusses issues appropriately (Soph Comp only)*** | The student is expertly effective in discussing issues appropriately. | The student is consistently effective indiscussing issues appropriately.. | The student is generally effective in discussing issues appropriately. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective indiscussing issues appropriately. |  |
| ***The student presents effective oral arguments.******(Soph Comp only)*** | The student is expertly effective in presenting oral arguments. | The student is consistently effective inpresenting oral arguments. | The student is generally effective in presenting oral arguments. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective inpresenting oral arguments. |  |

**Degree Assessment Rubric for Evaluation of BA Senior Thesis/Project**

Student: Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Student Learning Outcomes***

Year/Semester: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. *Students will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate music literature & historical relevance.*
2. *Students will demonstrate appropriate ability to apply theoretical concepts to music.*

Rank the following from 1 to 4 with 4 being the highest score.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measures** | **4 Advanced** | **3 Proficient** | **2 Basic** | **1 Little or None** | **Score and Comments** |
| ***The scope of the thesis/project is appropriate.*** | The scope of the thesis/project is superbly appropriatefor the assignment. | The scope of the thesis/project is satisfactorilyappropriate for the | The scope of the thesis/project is somewhatappropriate for the | The scope of the thesis/project is poorly appropriate for theassignment. |  |
|  |  | assignment. | assignment. |  |
| ***The literature or repertoire selected for the project is significant.*** | The literature selected for the project is of exemplary quality. | The literature selected for the project is of excellent quality. | The literature selected for the project is of moderate quality. | The literature selected for the project is of poor quality. |  |
| ***The student discusses issues of musical style appropriately.*** | The student is expertly effective in discussing musical style. | The student is consistently effective in discussing musical style. | The student is generally effective in discussing musical style. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in discussingmusical style. |  |
| ***The student demonstrates an understanding of theoretical concepts.*** | The student is expertly effective in demonstrating an understanding of theoretical concepts. | The student is consistently effective in demonstrating an understanding of theoretical concepts. | The student is generally effective in demonstrating an understanding of theoreticalconcepts. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in demonstrating anunderstanding of theoretical concepts. |  |
| ***The argument or performance is presented accurately.*** | The student is expertly effective in presenting an accurate argumentor performance. | The student is consistently effective in presenting an accurate argumentor performance. | The student is generally effective in presenting an accurate argumentor performance. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in presentingan accurate argument or performance.  |  |

*Please provide additional relevant comments below.*

**2017 Degree Assessment Rubric for Evaluation of the Semester Jury/Soph Comp/Jr Recital Jury/Sr Recital Jury**

Student: Evaluator: Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Course number: Year/Semester: Degree program: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Student Learning Outcomes***

1. *Students will perform with appropriate skills and knowledge of musical style for their level of experience.*
2. *Students will articulate knowledge of appropriate music literature & historical relevance.*
3. *Students will apply theoretical concepts to music.*

Rank the following from 1 to 4 with 4 being the highest score.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measures** | **4 Advanced** | **3 Proficient** | **2 Basic** | **1 Little or None** | **Score and Comments** |
| ***The student performs with appropriate musicianship.*** | The student is expertly effective in performing with appropriatemusicianship. | The student is consistently effective in performing withAppropriate musicianship. | The student is generally effective in performing with appropriatemusicianship. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in performing withAppropriate musicianship. |  |
| ***The student performs with appropriate technical proficiency.*** | The student is expertly effective in performing with appropriatetechnical proficiency. | The student is consistently effective in performing withappropriate technical proficiency. | The student is generally effective in performing with appropriatetechnical proficiency. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in performing withappropriate technical proficiency. |  |
| ***The student performs with appropriate tone quality.*** | The student is expertly effective in performing with appropriate tonequality. | The student is consistently effective in performing withappropriate tone quality. | The student is generally effective in performing with appropriate tonequality. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in performing withappropriate tone quality. |  |
| ***The scope of the performance is appropriate.*** | The scope of the performance is superblyappropriate for the assignment.  | The scope of the performance is satisfactorilyappropriate for the assignment.  | The scope of the performance is somewhatappropriate for the assignment. | The scope of the performance is poorly appropriate for theassignment. |  |
| ***The literature or repertoire selected for the performance is significant.*** | The literature selected for the performance is of exemplary quality. | The literature selected for the performance is of excellent quality. | The literature selected for the performance is of moderate quality. | The literature selected for the performance is inconsistent or of poor quality. |  |
| ***The student performs with appropriate musical style.*** | The student is expertly effective in performing with appropriate musicalstyle. | The student is consistently effective in performing withappropriate musical style. | The student is generally effective in performing with appropriate musicalstyle. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in performing withappropriate musical style. |  |
| ***The student performs with an understanding of theoretical concepts.*** | The student is expertly effective in performing with an understanding ofTheoretical concepts. | The student is consistently effective in performing with anunderstanding of theoretical concepts.  | The student is generally effective in performing with an understanding ofTheoretical concepts.  | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in performing with anunderstanding of theoretical concepts.  |  |
| ***The student performs accurately.*** | The student is expertly effective inpresenting an accurate performance.  | The student is consistentlyeffective in presenting an accurate performance.  | The student is generally effective inpresenting an accurate performance. | The student is inconsistent and/or onlysomewhat effective in presenting an accurate performance. |  |
| ***The student discusses issues appropriately (Soph Comp only)*** | The student is expertly effective in discussing issues appropriately. | The student is consistently effective indiscussing issues appropriately.. | The student is generally effective in discussing issues appropriately. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective indiscussing issues appropriately. |  |
| ***The student presents effective oral arguments.******(Soph Comp only)*** | The student is expertly effective in presenting oral arguments. | The student is consistently effective inpresenting oral arguments. | The student is generally effective in presenting oral arguments. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective inpresenting oral arguments. |  |

**2017 Degree Assessment Rubric for Evaluation of BA Senior Thesis/Project**

Student: Evaluator:

Date:

***Student Learning Outcomes***

Year/Semester:

1. *Students will articulate knowledge of appropriate music literature & historical relevance.*
2. *Students will apply theoretical concepts to music.*

Rank the following from 1 to 4 with 4 being the highest score.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measures** | **4 Advanced** | **3 Proficient** | **2 Basic** | **1 Little or None** | **Score and Comments** |
| ***The scope of the thesis/project is appropriate.*** | The scope of the thesis/project is superbly appropriatefor the assignment. | The scope of the thesis/project is satisfactorilyappropriate for the assignment.  | The scope of the thesis/project is somewhatappropriate for the assignment.  | The scope of the thesis/project is poorly appropriate for theassignment. |  |
| ***The literature or repertoire selected for the project is significant.*** | The literature selected for the project is of exemplary quality. | The literature selected for the project is of excellent quality. | The literature selected for the project is of moderate quality. | The literature selected for the project is of poor quality. |  |
| ***The student discusses issues of musical style appropriately.*** | The student is expertly effective in discussing musical style. | The student is consistently effective in discussing musical style. | The student is generally effective in discussing musical style. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in discussingmusical style. |  |
| ***The student articulates an understanding of theoretical concepts.*** | The student is expertly effective in ***articulating*** an understanding of theoretical concepts. | The student is consistently effective in ***articulating*** an understanding of theoretical concepts. | The student is generally effective in ***articulating*** an understanding of theoreticalconcepts. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in ***articulating*** anunderstanding of theoretical concepts.  |  |
| ***The argument or performance is presented accurately.*** | The student is expertly effective in presenting an accurate argumentor performance. | The student is consistently effective in presenting an accurate argumentor performance. | The student is generally effective in presenting an accurate argumentor performance. | The student is inconsistent and/or only somewhat effective in presentingan accurate argument or performance.  |  |

*Please provide additional relevant comments below.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2013-14 results |  |  |  | 2014-15 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 Juries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Measures | BM (6) | BA (3) | BME (7) |  |  | BM (8) | BA (9) | BME (12) |
| Musicianship | 2.98 | 2.76 | 2.50 |  |  | 3.35 | 2.86 | 2.85 |
| Technical Proficiency | 2.88 | 2.48 | 2.55 |  |  | 3.44 | 2.82 | 2.87 |
| Tone Quality | 3.12 | 2.64 | 2.40 |  |  | 3.43 | 2.86 | 2.74 |
| Scope | 3.56 | 3.28 | 3.07 |  |  | 3.79 | 3.27 | 3.44 |
| Literature | 3.45 | 3.39 | 3.04 |  |  | 3.83 | 3.45 | 3.57 |
| Musical Style | 3.03 | 2.63 | 2.72 |  |  | 3.40 | 2.77 | 2.99 |
| Theoretical Concepts | 3.03 | 2.63 | 2.65 |  |  | 3.28 | 2.92 | 2.61 |
| Accuracy | 2.86 | 2.43 | 2.59 |  |  | 3.30 | 2.85 | 2.87 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 2 Sophomore Comprehensive | BM (8) | BA (1) | BME (10) |  |  | BM (2) | BA (1) | BME (5) |
| Measures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Musicianship | 3.28 | 3.75 | 3.12 |  |  | 3.33 | 3.50 | 2.81 |
| Technical Proficiency | 3.24 | 3.50 | 2.91 |  |  | 2.82 | 3.60 | 2.88 |
| Tone Quality | 3.19 | 3.50 | 2.86 |  |  | 3.23 | 3.90 | 2.90 |
| Scope | 3.50 | 3.75 | 3.41 |  |  | 3.58 | 4.00 | 3.39 |
| Literature | 3.74 | 3.50 | 3.72 |  |  | 3.81 | 4.00 | 3.70 |
| Musical Style | 3.25 | 3.00 | 3.01 |  |  | 3.55 | 3.20 | 2.87 |
| Theoretical Concepts | 3.12 | 3.00 | 3.06 |  |  | 3.76 | 3.40 | 2.68 |
| Accuracy | 3.24 | 3.25 | 3.04 |  |  | 3.44 | 3.70 | 2.76 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 3 Junior Recital | BM (0)\* | BA (N/A) | BME (4) |  |  | BM (10) | BA (N/A) | BME (13) |
| Measures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Musicianship |  |  | 2.83 |  |  | 3.40 |  | 3.19 |
| Technical Proficiency |  |  | 2.75 |  |  | 3.21 |  | 3.06 |
| Tone Quality |  |  | 2.83 |  |  | 3.23 |  | 3.04 |
| Scope |  |  | 3.17 |  |  | 3.72 |  | 3.62 |
| Literature |  |  | 3.00 |  |  | 3.83 |  | 3.67 |
| Musical Style |  |  | 2.67 |  |  | 3.38 |  | 3.18 |
| Theoretical Concepts |  |  | 2.92 |  |  | 3.42 |  | 3.32 |
| Accuracy |  |  | 2.67 |  |  | 3.35 |  | 3.21 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 4 Senior Recital | BM (4)\* | BA (N/A) | BME (N/A) |  |  | BM (11) | BA (N/A) | BME (N/A) |
| Measures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Musicianship | 3.69 |  |  |  |  | 3.59 |  |  |
| Technical Proficiency | 3.38 |  |  |  |  | 3.38 |  |  |
| Tone Quality | 3.52 |  |  |  |  | 3.48 |  |  |
| Scope | 3.57 |  |  |  |  | 3.70 |  |  |
| Literature | 3.58 |  |  |  |  | 3.80 |  |  |
| Musical Style | 3.57 |  |  |  |  | 3.44 |  |  |
| Theoretical Concepts | 3.61 |  |  |  |  | 3.49 |  |  |
| Accuracy | 3.36 |  |  |  |  | 3.27 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \*note that assessment plan was implemented midway through the semester, after recital juries and some recitals had already occurred. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BA Project |  | BA (2) |  |  |  | BA (1) |  |  |
| Scope |  | 3.67 |  |  |  | 4.00 |  |  |
| Literature |  | 3.83 |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |
| Musical Style |  | 3.50 |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |
| Theoretical Concepts |  | 3.33 |  |  |  | 3.00 |  |  |
| Accuracy |  | 3.33 |  |  |  | 3.50 |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2015-16 |  |  |  |  | 2016-17 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 Juries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Measures | BM (9)\*\* | BA (6) | BME (24)\*\* |  |  | BM (9)\*\*\* | BA (4) | BME (12)\*\*\* |
| Musicianship | 2.98 | 2.63 | 2.70 |  |  | 3.05 | 2.65 | 2.83 |
| Technical Proficiency | 2.93 | 2.65 | 2.68 |  |  | 3.01 | 2.63 | 2.80 |
| Tone Quality | 2.95 | 2.51 | 2.79 |  |  | 2.95 | 2.73 | 2.69 |
| Scope | 3.31 | 3.15 | 3.41 |  |  | 3.29 | 3.06 | 3.37 |
| Literature | 3.50 | 3.31 | 3.43 |  |  | 3.23 | 3.19 | 3.46 |
| Musical Style | 2.86 | 2.72 | 2.84 |  |  | 2.94 | 2.69 | 2.82 |
| Theoretical Concepts | 2.98 | 2.47 | 2.68 |  |  | 2.85 | 2.77 | 2.89 |
| Accuracy | 2.99 | 2.83 | 2.71 |  |  | 2.95 | 2.73 | 2.76 |
|  | \*\*3 students are BM/BME double majors and are counted in both categories | \*\*\*1 student is a BM/BME double major |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 2 Sophomore Comprehensive | BM (6)\*\* | BA (7) | BME (14)\*\* |  |  | BM (9)\*\*\* | BA (6) | BME (15)\*\*\* |
| Measures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Musicianship | 3.28 | 2.83 | 2.78 |  |  | 2.86 | 2.86 | 2.92 |
| Technical Proficiency | 3.16 | 2.68 | 2.73 |  |  | 2.93 | 2.61 | 2.85 |
| Tone Quality | 3.16 | 2.56 | 2.70 |  |  | 2.94 | 2.65 | 2.91 |
| Scope | 3.74 | 3.31 | 3.29 |  |  | 3.31 | 3.18 | 3.36 |
| Literature | 3.88 | 3.35 | 3.39 |  |  | 3.52 | 3.17 | 3.39 |
| Musical Style | 3.28 | 2.82 | 2.82 |  |  | 2.93 | 2.85 | 2.79 |
| Theoretical Concepts | 3.17 | 2.76 | 2.94 |  |  | 2.97 | 2.72 | 2.81 |
| Accuracy | 3.17 | 2.96 | 2.80 |  |  | 2.79 | 3.03 | 2.81 |
| Discussion of Issues | 3.16 | 2.89 | 2.77 |  |  | 3.06 | 2.94 | 3.09 |
| Effective Oral Argument | 3.15 | 3.07 | 2.97 |  |  | 3.19 | 3.14 | 3.09 |
|  | \*\*3 students are BM/BME double majors and are counted in both categories | \*\*\*4 students are BM/BME double majors |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 3 Junior Recital Juries | BM (2) | BA (N/A) | BME (6) |  |  | BM (6)\*\*\* | BA (N/A) | BME (12)\*\*\* |
| Measures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Musicianship | 2.67 |  | 2.78 |  |  | 3.56 |  | 2.78 |
| Technical Proficiency | 2.67 |  | 2.56 |  |  | 3.06 |  | 2.56 |
| Tone Quality | 3.00 |  | 2.78 |  |  | 3.44 |  | 2.61 |
| Scope | 3.33 |  | 3.44 |  |  | 3.94 |  | 3.36 |
| Literature | 3.67 |  | 3.50 |  |  | 4.06 |  | 3.44 |
| Musical Style | 3.17 |  | 2.89 |  |  | 3.33 |  | 2.58 |
| Theoretical Concepts | 2.83 |  | 3.06 |  |  | 3.40 |  | 2.81 |
| Accuracy | 2.67 |  | 2.61 |  |  | 3.00 |  | 2.58 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | \*\*\*3 students are BM/BME double majors |
| Level 4 Senior Recital Juries | BM (8) | BA (N/A) | BME (N/A) |  |  | BM (2) | BA (N/A) | BME (N/A) |
| Measures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Musicianship | 3.17 |  |  |  |  | 3.17 |  |  |
| Technical Proficiency | 3.13 |  |  |  |  | 2.83 |  |  |
| Tone Quality | 2.96 |  |  |  |  | 3.17 |  |  |
| Scope | 3.63 |  |  |  |  | 3.50 |  |  |
| Literature | 3.88 |  |  |  |  | 3.83 |  |  |
| Musical Style | 3.29 |  |  |  |  | 3.00 |  |  |
| Theoretical Concepts | 3.25 |  |  |  |  | 3.33 |  |  |
| Accuracy | 2.92 |  |  |  |  | 2.67 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BA Project | BA (1) |  |  |  |  | BA Project | 0 students for 2016-17 |
| Scope | 1.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Literature | 1.67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Musical Style | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Theoretical Concepts | 1.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Accuracy | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Music Department Exit Survey Results

2012-13 2013-14 2014-15 2015-16 2016-17

number of responses 22/26 (85%) 34/34 (100%) 22/26 (85%) 16/16 (100% 10/11 (91%)

1. I have acquired a thorough knowledge of music subject matter in my area of study.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Agree | 43% | 54% | 63.5% | 87.5% | 60% |
| Agree | 52% | 43% | 32% | 12.5% | 40% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 0% | 3% | 4.5% | 0% | 0% |
| Disagree | 5% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

1. I have acquired an understanding of how to apply music theory, history, and style to experiences in performing music.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Agree | 38% | 61% | 59% | 81.25% | 80% |
| Agree | 52% | 36% | 32% | 18.75% | 10% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 5% | 3% | 4.5% | 0% | 10% |
| Disagree | 5% | 0% | 4.5% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

1. I have had opportunities to expand and develop my understanding of and commitment to diversity.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Agree | 33% | 49% | 32% | 87.5% | 50% |
| Agree | 48% | 30% | 59% | 12.5% | 40% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 15% | 15% | 4.5% | 0% | 10% |
| Disagree | 5% | 6% | 4.5% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 4. The program stimulated intellectual curiosity within me regarding music. |
| Strongly Agree | 52% | 64% | 59% | 81.25% | 70% |
| Agree | 43% | 24% | 41% | 18.75% | 20% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 5% | 9% | 0% | 0% | 10% |
| Disagree | 0% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 5. Music course instructors displayed a thorough understanding of the content they taught. |
| Strongly Agree | 67% | 67% | 68% | 93.75% | 70% |
| Agree | 24% | 27% | 23% | 6.25% | 30% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 5% | 3% | 9% | 0% | 0% |
| Disagree | 4% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 5% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 6. Music course instructors were effective in teaching stated objectives. |
| Strongly Agree | 33% | 51% | 50% | 62.5% | 70% |
| Agree | 57% | 37% | 45.5% | 37.5% | 30% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 5% | 3% | 4.5% | 0% | 0% |
| Disagree | 5% | 9% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 7. Music instructors were accessible outside of class. |
| Strongly Agree | 61% | 70% | 73% | 81.25% | 80% |
| Agree | 34% | 21% | 27% | 18.75% | 10% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 0% | 9% | 0% | 0% | 10% |
| Disagree | 5% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| 8. Music faculty provided helpful feedback regarding course content and assessment. |
| Strongly Agree | 42% | 67% | 54.5% | 81.25% | 70% |
| Agree | 39% | 27% | 27% | 18.75% | 30% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 14% | 3% | 14% | 0% | 0% |
| Disagree | 5% | 3% | 4.5% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

1. Music faculty supported me in my musical growth and intellectual development.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Agree | 67% | 76% | 77% | 81.25% | 70% |
| Agree | 28% | 18% | 14% | 18.75% | 30% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 5% | 3% | 9% | 0% | 0% |
| Disagree | 0% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

1. My applied teacher provided approprate levels of support in program planning and development.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Agree | 76% | 82% | 68% | 81.25% | 80% |
| Agree | 15% | 15% | 27.5% | 6.25% | 20% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 9% | 0% | 0% | 6.25% | 0% |
| Disagree | 0% | 3% | 0% | 6.25% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 4.5% | 0% | 0% |

1. My appled teacher provided training that encouraged and developed my growth as a performer and musician.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Agree | 76% | 85% | 77% | 75% | 90% |
| Agree | 15% | 12% | 14% | 25% | 10% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 10% | 0% | 4.5% | 0% | 0% |
| Disagree | 0% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 4.5% | 0% | 0% |
| 12. The overall program fulfilled my expectations. |
| Strongly Agree | 33% | 51% | 59% | 75% | 60% |
| Agree | 58% | 37% | 32% | 25% | 10% |
| Neither Agree nor Disagree | 9% | 0% | 4.5% | 0% | 10% |
| Disagree | 0% | 10% | 4.5% | 0% | 20% |
| Strongly Disagree | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |