**Annual Assessment Report for 2020-2021 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2020-2021 AY will be due September 30th 2021 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh (douglasf@csufresno.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. For purposes of this report, you should only report on two or three student learning outcomes (department’s choice) even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: Music Degree: MA

Assessment Coordinator: Donald Henriques, Ph.D.

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.

 4. Demonstration of Professional Standards

1. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

 Spring 2021 Music 298 project/recitals were used to assess this SLO. As the culminating event for the MA students in the Performance Option are required to complete a recital of 60-75 minutes. Project/Recitals were performed via Zoom. These Project/Recitals included Performance Emphasis students, Composition Emphasis and Music Education research document.

 MA project/recitals were assessed according to the written evaluations of the student's two 298 committee members. The following criteria was used to evaluate the Performance Emphasis Project/Recitals: Technique/Musicianship/Breadth of Repertoire/Stage Presence/Memorization/and Overall Assessment. The Composition Emphasis Project/Recital was evaluated according to Aesthetic Goals/Musical Invention/Formal Design/Use of Performance Medium/Presentation/Breadth of Creativity/Compositional Voice. The Music Education 298 document was evaluated in terms of research/writing, writing, argument, and oral presentation.

 3. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient. Also indicate your benchmark (e.g. 80% of students will be designated as proficient or higher) and indicate the number of students who met that benchmark.

 A total of eleven 298 Project/Recitals were assessed - 9 Performance Emphasis, 1 Composition Emphasis and 1 Music Education Emphasis. 100% of the students were designated as proficient.

4. What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?

 Following the assessment of 298 data, I recommend that the Department revise the Performance Assessment form. This form is used for 198 and 298 performance evaluations. While a higher-level is expected for MA students, it would appear that the criteria categories (Breadth of Repertoire, Stage Presence, Memorization) should be reviewed by the faculty for their usefulness in evaluating graduate performance.

5. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in your 2018-19 assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.

 N/A

6. What assessment activities will you be conducting during AY 2021-22?

 PLO2: Critical Thinking/Oral and Written Communication Skills will be assessed this year.

7. Identify and discuss any major issues identified during your last Program Review and in what ways these issues have or have not been addressed.

Music 220 (Seminar Research Methods and Bibliography) was redesigned following the last review. The online environment as a result of Covid-19 provided the opportunity to address aspects related to bibliographic research, class discussions, peer review writing assignments, and project presentations. These efforts have created a more engaging environment for student-teacher and peer interactions as well as focused the course on disciplinary and interdisciplinary music research.

The following is an example of the Department's Spring 2021 Music 298 Instrumental/Vocal Performance Assessment Form**:**

Rating Scale: Outstanding = 6 (A+), Excellent/Very Good = 5 – 4 (A/B), Satisfactory = 3 (C), Unsatisfactory/Failing = 2 – 1 (D/F)

**Assessment of Technical Mastery**: Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

•Outstanding (6): The student performs with pitch, intonation, articulation, and rhythmic accuracy at a very high level. Throughout the performance, the student’s technical mastery is easily and consistently executed, and clearly exceeds the fundamental technical standards of their instrument or voice.

•Excellent/Very Good (5 – 4): Throughout the performance, the student is well prepared and delivers a competent performance that exceeds the fundamental performance standards for technical mastery of their instrument or voice.

•Satisfactory (3): Throughout the performance, the student is adequately prepared and delivers a performance that meets the fundamental performance standards for technical mastery of their instrument or voice.

•Unsatisfactory/Failing (2 – 1): The student has significant technical weaknesses throughout the performance and either barely meets or falls below the fundamental performance standards for technical mastery of their instrument or voice.

**Assessment of Musicianship**: Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

•Outstanding (6): The student clearly performs with a musical understanding at a very high level.

•Excellent/Very Good (5 – 4): The student performs with above average application of fundamental musicianship skills.

•Satisfactory (3): The student performs with basic application of fundamental musicianship skills.

•Unsatisfactory/Failing (2 – 1): The student either barely meets or falls below a fundamental level of musicianship skills.

**Breadth of Repertoire:** Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

•Outstanding – Excellent (6 – 5): The repertoire is above the standard acceptable for the student’s current level of development and demonstrates an exceptional variety of musical styles and genres.

•Very Good - Satisfactory (4 – 3): The repertoire is at the standard acceptable for the student’s current level of development and demonstrates a sufficient variety of musical styles and genres.

•Weak – Failing (2 – 1): The repertoire is below the standard acceptable for the student’s current level of development and does not demonstrate a sufficient variety of musical styles and genres.

**Stage Presence:** Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

•Outstanding - Excellent (6 – 5): The student is dressed appropriately, exhibits confidence, poise, appropriately acknowledges other performers, bows appropriately, is clearly comfortable with his or her environment and is enjoying the act of performing.

•Very Good - Satisfactory (4 – 3): The student is dressed appropriately, exhibits confidence, poise, appropriately acknowledges other performers, bows appropriately, but is slightly uncomfortable with his or her environment and/or with the act of performing.

•Weak – Failing (2 – 1): The student did not dress appropriately, lacks two or more of the following elements: confidence, poise, appropriate acknowledgement of other performers, bowing. The student is clearly uncomfortable with his or her environment and/or with the act of performing.

**Memorization** (if applicable): Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

•Outstanding – Excellent (6 - 5): The student performs with few or no lapses of memory. Recoveries, if any, do not detract from the presentation.

•Very Good - Satisfactory (4 – 3): The student performs with few or no lapses of memory. Recoveries, if any, are noticeable and may or may not detract from the presentation.

•Weak – Failing (2 – 1): The student performs with frequent and/or very noticeable lapses of memory. Recoveries, if any, are noticeable and detracted from the presentation.

**Overall Assessment of Performance**: Rating \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

•Outstanding (6): The student was rated outstanding in all assessment categories. The student’s performance was at or near a very high artistic level.

•Excellent - Very Good (5 - 4): The majority of the student’s ratings were excellent or very good in each assessment category. The student exceeded established artistic and technical standards for his/her studio.

•Satisfactory (3): The majority of the student’s ratings were excellent or very good in each assessment category. The student satisfactorily met established artistic and technical standards for his/her studio.

•Unsatisfactory – Failing (2 – 1): The majority of the student’s ratings were unsatisfactory or failing in each assessment category. The student barely met or fell below the established artistic and technical standards for his/her studio.

**Faculty Comments:**

Overall Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ A – C = Pass D – F = Fail

(Tally ratings and divide by number of ratings assigned to arrive at corresponding letter grade)

Faculty committee member signature: