



## Music [MUSC]

**Cycles included in this report:**  
Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

This PDF document includes any files attached to fields in this report.

To view the attachments you should view this file in Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, or another PDF viewer that supports viewing file attachments.

The default PDF viewer for your device or web browser may not support viewing file attachments embedded in a PDF.

If the attachments are in formats other than PDF you will need any necessary file viewers installed.

## Program Name: Music [MUSC]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021

### 1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

50-99% Distance/Traditional

### 2 Is this program offered at an off-site location?

No

### 2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.

### 3 Example of Program Improvement

2016-2017:

Will see graduation rates rise beginning with the 2016 report.

2017-2018:

- Retention rates have stabilized over the past three years.
  - PART anticipates exceeding the Board of Regents benchmark for graduates in 2018-2019.
- Changes have been made to faculty teaching schedules which created time for faculty to have more individual contact with students (office hours).

2018-2019:

- Number of Music graduates, 15, has met or surpassed Board of Regents benchmark.
- Student scores on the Major Performance Area Entrance Diagnostic Exam have increased 8% over the past 3 years.
  - We believe increased scores on the diagnostic exam will lead to greater student retention from year one - year two.
- Student advising is becoming a strength within the Music program.
  - Students have been registering

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

### 4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2016-2017:

Continue to meet Board of Regent's benchmarks for graduation rates.

2017-2018:

- 100% of 2017-2018 Bachelor of Music graduates (all concentrations) are:
  - Employed in a field directly related to the degree concentration; or,
  - Currently enrolled in an accredited graduate program.
- Student enrollment has increased:
  - MUSC: +6.2%

2018-2019:

- 2018-2019 Bachelor of Music Graduate Statistics
  - 2018-2019 Bachelor of Music - Music Education Instrumental graduates (8 total) are:
    - Employed as full-time music educators (6 of 8).
    - Enrolled in graduate studies (2 of 8).
  - 2018-2019 Bachelor of Music - Music Performance Instrumental graduates (2 total) are:
    - Employed as full-time music educators (1 of 2).
    - Employed as full-time professional musician (1 of 2).
  - 2018-2019 Bachelor of Music - Music Education Vocal graduate (1 total) is:

- Employed as full-time music educators (1 of 1).
- 2018-2019 Bachelor of Music - Music Performance Vocal graduates (4 total) are:
  - Enrolled in graduate studies (2 of 4)
- Student Recruitment
  - HDPa actively recruited 136 students.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

## 5 Program Mission

The Department of Performing Arts provides the opportunity for students to develop their talent and potential as creative artists in theatre and music and as music educators. To this end, the department offers curricula, coursework and experiences in music, music education and theatre, that prepare students for professional careers and graduate school entrance in music, music education, and theatre arts. To students with other majors, the department provides minor degrees in music and theatre, survey courses in music, and performances opportunities that enhance the quality of a liberal arts education and enrich the lives of all students.

## 6 Institutional Mission Reference

The Department of Performing Arts supports the University's fundamental mission by contributing to the array of liberal arts programs at the baccalaureate level, providing K-12 music educators to serve this region, and providing cultural events at appropriate functions and ceremonies that enrich, entertain, and enhance the University and the region.

## 7 Assessment and Benchmark Major Performance Area Entrance Diagnostic Rubric

Assessment: Major Performance Area Entrance Diagnostic Rubric measures musicianship, expression/musicality, and sight-reading.

Benchmark: 45% of entering candidates will earn a score of 6 or above (scale 0-9) on the Major Performance Area Entrance Diagnostic Rubric.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

Music Program Performance Rubric

### Outcome Links

#### Musicianship [Program]

Students demonstrate continued growth in musicianship and acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music.

## 7.1 Data

Academic Year	Candidates that earned a score of 6 or above		
	#	%	SR
2013-2014	52/63	83%	
2014-2015	34/45	76%	
2015-2016*	18/32	56%	
2016-2017**	27/30	90%	
2017-2018	24/30	80%	
2018-2019	30/37	81%	2.32
2019-2020	15 /18	83%	
2020-2021***	13/18	72%	

\*One candidates' rubric did not include sight reading so omitted.

\*\*Three candidates' rubrics did not include sight reading so omitted.

\*\*\*One candidate did not have a sight reading score so omitted. For a second candidate, two rubrics are missing, so this student was also omitted.

### 7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Expected level of achievement was met. Continue to monitor, analyze, and assess outcomes. Consider a separate rubric for transfer students. No changes at this time.

2017-2018:

Expected level of achievement was met. Revised benchmark for 2018-2019: 45% of entering candidates will earn a score of 6 or above (scale 0-9) on the Major Performance Area Entrance Diagnostic Rubric.

Begin monitoring and reporting on student sight-reading score from rubric; students continually under-perform in sight-reading component of the rubric.

2018-2019:

Revised benchmark of 45% was exceeded. 81% of entering candidates earned a score of 6 or above (scale 0-9) on the Major Performance Area Entrance Diagnostic Rubric. Continue monitoring and reporting on student sight-reading score from rubric; students continually under-perform in sight-reading component of the rubric.

2019-2020:

83% of entering candidates earned a score of 6 or above (scale 0-9) on the Major Performance Area Entrance Diagnostic Rubric. Revised benchmark of 45% was exceeded. Continue monitoring and reporting on student sight-reading score from rubric; students continually under-perform in sight-reading component of the rubric.

2020-2021:

68% of entering candidates earned a score of 6 or above (scale 0-9) on the Major Performance Area Entrance Diagnostic Rubric. Despite the reduced percentage, revised benchmark of 45% was exceeded. This is also a result of the pandemic and the hurricanes in which many incoming students may not have had access to their instruments or lessons at home.

## 8 Assessment and Benchmark Music 200/202 Major Performance Sophomore Level Board

Assessment: Major Performance Sophomore Level Board is assessed in MUSC 200 and the 202 level course in the students performance area.

Benchmark:

75% of program candidates will pass the 200/202 level major performance board requirement on the first attempt.

75% of instrumental program candidates will earn a score of 10 or above.

75% of vocal program candidates will earn a score of 12 or above.

Prior to 2013-2014, the benchmark for vocal program candidates was a score of 10.

### Outcome Links

#### Musicianship [Program]

Students demonstrate continued growth in musicianship and acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music.

#### Standards for Music Teachers [External]

##### 2 Program Content

In addition to the common core of musicianship and general studies, the musician electing a career in school-based teaching must develop competencies in professional education and in specific areas of musicianship. Professional education components should be dealt with in a practical context, relating the learning of educational principles to the student's day-by-day work in music. Students must be provided opportunities for various types of observation and teaching. Within the curricular guidelines above, attention should be given to breadth in general studies, attitudes relating to human, personal considerations, and social, economic, and cultural components that give individual communities their identity.

### b. Music Competencies

The profession of school music teacher now encompasses a wide range of traditional, emerging, and experimental purposes, approaches, content, and methods. Each institution makes choices about what, among many possibilities, it will offer prospective specialist music teachers. Institutions may offer a comprehensive curriculum involving two or more specializations and/or focus on one or more particular specializations. The following standards provide a framework for developing and evaluating a wide variety of teacher preparation program goals and achievements. Items b.(1), (2), (3), and (4) apply to all programs that prepare prospective music teachers. Items c.(1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) apply to specializations singly or in combination as determined by the focus and content of specific program offerings determined by each institution.

### c. Specialization Competencies

Institutions and other educational authorities make decisions about the extent to which music teachers will be prepared in one or more specializations. The following competencies apply singly or in combination consistent with the specialization objectives of each teacher preparation program in music.

## 8.1 Data

Academic Year	Instrumental candidates that earned a score of 10 or above		Vocal candidates that earned a score of 12 or above		Candidates that passed on the first attempt	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	10	N/A	2	N/A		100%
2014-2015	11/14	78%	4/4	100%		100%
2015-2016	14/15	93%	3/6	50%		100%
2016-2017*	4/4	100%	5/6	83%		100%
2017-2018	N/A	N/A	3/4	75%		75%
2018-2019	10/10	100%	0/2	0%	11	92%
2019-2020	4/4	100%	3/3	100%	7	100%
2020-2021	10/13	77%	2/2	100%	15	100%

\*Three instrumental program candidates' rubrics only assessed sight reading so omitted.

### 8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Continue to monitor, analyze, and assess outcomes. No changes at this time.

2017-2018:

Expected level of achievement of vocal candidates was met. No instrumentalists were enrolled in MUSC 200/202. All candidates passed 200/202 on the first attempt. Continue to monitor, analyze, and assess outcomes. No changes at this time.

2018-2019:

Expected level of achievement was met by all instrumental candidates, and by 0/2 vocal candidates. Continue to monitor, analyze, and assess outcomes. No changes at this time.

2019-2020:

Expected level of achievement was met by all instrumentalists and vocalists. Will continue to monitor, analyze and assess outcomes. No changes at this time.

2020-2021:

Expected level of achievement was met by 10/13 (77%) of instrumentalists and by 2/2 (100%) of vocalists. All candidates passed on the first attempt. Will continue to monitor, analyze and assess outcomes. No changes at this time.

## 9 Assessment and Benchmark MUED 320 Final Curriculum Project

Assessment: MUED 320 (Teaching Music in Elementary Schools for Diverse Learners, Grades K-5) final curriculum project rubric.

Benchmark: 80% of program candidates will earn a score of 70% or above on a final curriculum project rubric in MUED 320.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 80% of program candidates will earn a score of 75% or above on a final curriculum project rubric in MUED 320.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

MUED 320 Grad Stand\_Rubric for Curr Project (revised)

### Outcome Links

#### Planning for Teachers [Program]

All level teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in classes to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessment for student progress in K-12 education.

#### Other Certification Area Competencies [External]

##### All Levels K-12 Education

The standards in which the following certification competences are defined: Art Education, Dance Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Languages Education, Health and Physical Education, Music Education, and Theater Education.

#### Standards for Music Teachers [External]

##### a. Standard

Curricular structure, content, and time requirements shall enable students to develop the range of knowledge, skills, and competencies expected of those holding a professional baccalaureate degree in music education as indicated below and in Standards VIII.

##### 2 Program Content

In addition to the common core of musicianship and general studies, the musician electing a career in school-based teaching must develop competencies in professional education and in specific areas of musicianship. Professional education components should be dealt with in a practical context, relating the learning of educational principles to the student's day-by-day work in music. Students must be provided opportunities for various types of observation and teaching. Within the curricular guidelines above, attention should be given to breadth in general studies, attitudes relating to human, personal considerations, and social, economic, and cultural components that give individual communities their identity.

##### d. Teaching Competencies

The musician-teacher must be able to lead students to competency, apply music knowledge and skills in teaching situations, and integrate music instruction into the process of P-12 education. Essential competencies are:

## 9.1 Data

Semester	Candidates that earned a score of 70% or above on a final project rubric	
	#	%
Fall 2013	7/8	87.5%
Fall 2014	8/9	89%
Fall 2015	8/9	89%
Fall 2016	6/6	100%
Fall 2017	9/13	69%
Fall 2018	8/13	61.5%
Fall 2019	11/11	100%
Fall 2020	4/4	100%

### 9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Expected level of achievement was not met. Students must work to address more fully all sections specified on the rubric. Many models were provided for student perusal of this

project. The project was limited to grades K-2. The rubric was amended to include folk songs repertoire along with the Basal Series. Writing of lessons plans was addressed more during the course of the semester to allow for better preparation of this project. Also, more attention was given to areas other than the writing of lesson plans for this project. Leave expected level of achievement to read 80% of program candidate completers earn a score of 75% or above on a rubric-scored final project.

2017-2018:

Expected level of achievement will be changed to read: 80% of program candidate completers will earn a score of 70% or above on a rubric-scored final project for the 2018-2019 reporting cycle.

2018-2019:

We are very close to achieving the target of 80% earning a score of 70% on the rubric scored final project. I am recommending that we keep the benchmark where it is for at least on more cycle. If scores don't improve, then we will need to either address a change in the benchmark or modify the class project.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

Fall 2020: Expected level of achievement was met. Students entering the class should already have knowledge and understanding of the Education Departmental Lesson Plan Template. This will enable the teacher to teach more specific planning in regard to musical content and transitions for the music classroom while not having to continually focus primarily on teaching the template format. The project was broken down into smaller segments so that by the end of the semester all areas were completed successfully. Students submitted a virtual lesson as part of the final project. The teacher is looking forward to being back in the classroom in a face-to-face setting moving forward. Continue to keep Expected Level of Achievement the same 80% of program candidates completers will earn a score of 70% on a rubric-scored final project.

Spring 2021: Expected Level of Achievement was met. Expectations should continue as in Fall 2020 above.

## 10 Assessment and Benchmark MUED 324 Final Project

Assessment: MUED 324 (Teaching Instrumental Music in Secondary School, Grades 6-12) final project rubric.

Benchmark: 80% of program candidates will earn a score of 80% or above on a final project rubric in MUED 324.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 80% of program candidates will earn a score of 75% or above on a final project rubric in MUED 324.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

324 Final Research Project Grading Rubric

324 Final Research Project Grading Rubric

### Outcome Links

#### Planning for Teachers [Program]

All level teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in classes to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessment for student progress in K-12 education.

#### Other Certification Area Competencies [External]

##### Secondary Grades 6-12 Education

The standards in which the following certification competences are defined: Agricultural education, Business and Marketing Education, Computer Science Education, Family and Consumer Sciences Education, Foreign Languages Education, Journalism Education, Science Education, Social Studies

Education, and Technology education.

### Standards for Music Teachers [External]

#### a. Standard

Curricular structure, content, and time requirements shall enable students to develop the range of knowledge, skills, and competencies expected of those holding a professional baccalaureate degree in music education as indicated below and in Standards VIII.

#### c. Specialization Competencies

Institutions and other educational authorities make decisions about the extent to which music teachers will be prepared in one or more specializations. The following competencies apply singly or in combination consistent with the specialization objectives of each teacher preparation program in music.

#### d. Teaching Competencies

The musician-teacher must be able to lead students to competency, apply music knowledge and skills in teaching situations, and integrate music instruction into the process of P&A12 education. Essential competencies are:

## 10.1 Data

Academic Year	Candidates that earned a score of 80% or above on a final project rubric	
	#	%
2014-2015	10/10	100%
2015-2016	5/5	100%
2016-2017	7/7	100%
2017-2018	13/13	100%
2018-2019	10/10	100%
2019-2020	8/8	100%
2020-2021	7/7	100%

### 10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

The expected level of achievement was met. The Music Education Program Coordinators (MEPC) will continue to analyze and monitor these outcomes. One comment is that the amount of subject matter that needs to be covered in this course far exceeds the ability of the most talented and dedicated students to properly comprehend and apply. This will remain the case until we are able to expand the number of courses in this area and offer the subject matter covered over several semesters.

2017-2018:

The expected level of achievement was met. Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Project [191.1 out of possible 200 points], the students completing the project excelled in the sections dealing with proposed facilities and in most cases equipment and music issues. The weakness (if any) would be in the understanding of the woodwind and/or brass instruments (percussion consistently strong across all students) and the issues surrounding the purchase of marching band uniforms. The project is being redesigned for spring 2019 to focus more attention on these areas of concern.

Change the measure of proficiency to read: 80% of candidates will earn a score of 80% or above on the final project rubric in MUED 324.

2018-2019:

The expected level of achievement was met. Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Project [165.8 out of possible 200 points], the students completing the project experience encountered more difficulty than in previous years. Much of this could be attributed to changing the emphasis of the rubric used to score the project, and the removal of the facilities portion of the final project. This is the first time that we have used this new rubric



and also the first time that the expected level of proficiency was 80% - continued review is prescribed.

2019-2020:

The expected level of achievement was met. Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Project [169 out of possible 200 points], the students completing the project experience improved slightly if analyzing the raw score but actually did much better than could have been expected with the sudden change to COVID-19 protocols at the very time that this project was to commence. Due to the quarantining of the students, there was not as much opportunity for them to interact with each other as is normal during the usual face-to-face class meetings.

2020-2021:

The expected level of achievement was met. Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Project [191.2 out of possible 200 points], the students completing the project experience improved greatly over previous years did much better than could have been expected with the delivery of the course via Zoom due to the continuation of COVID-19 protocols. This is the last time that this course will be taught as part of the "old catalog" and will shift to being taught during the fall semesters.

## 11 Assessment and Benchmark MUED 326 Final Project

Assessment: MUED 326 (Teaching Vocal Music in Secondary School, Grades 6-12).

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will earn a score of 80% or above on the final project rubric in MUED 326.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 80% of program candidates will earn a score of 75% or above on a final project rubric in MUED 326.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

MUED 326 Teaching Projects Rubric

### Outcome Links

#### Planning for Teachers [Program]

All level teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in classes to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessment for student progress in K-12 education.

#### Other Certification Area Competencies [External]

##### Secondary Grades 6-12 Education

The standards in which the following certification competences are defined: Agricultural education, Business and Marketing Education, Computer Science Education, Family and Consumer Sciences Education, Foreign Languages Education, Journalism Education, Science Education, Social Studies Education, and Technology education.

#### Standards for Music Teachers [External]

##### a. Standard

Curricular structure, content, and time requirements shall enable students to develop the range of knowledge, skills, and competencies expected of those holding a professional baccalaureate degree in music education as indicated below and in Standards VIII.

##### b. Music Competencies

The profession of school music teacher now encompasses a wide range of traditional, emerging, and experimental purposes, approaches, content, and methods. Each institution makes choices about what, among many possibilities, it will offer prospective specialist music teachers. Institutions may offer a comprehensive curriculum involving two or more specializations and/or focus on one or more particular specializations. The following standards provide a framework for developing and evaluating a wide variety of teacher preparation program goals and achievements. Items b.(1), (2), (3), and (4) apply to all programs that prepare prospective music teachers. Items c.(1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) apply to specializations singly or in combination as determined by the focus and content of specific program offerings determined by each institution.

##### c. Specialization Competencies

Institutions and other educational authorities make decisions about the extent to which music teachers will

be prepared in one or more specializations. The following competencies apply singly or in combination consistent with the specialization objectives of each teacher preparation program in music.

#### e. Professional Procedures

In order to implement programs to achieve the competencies identified in the foregoing sections, the following standards and guidelines apply:

### 11.1 Data

Academic Year	Candidates that earned a score of 80% or above on a final project rubric	
	#	%
2013-2014	2/2	100%
2014-2015	1/1	100%
2015-2016	3/3	100%
2016-2017	—	—
2017-2018	3/3	100%
2018-2019	1/2	50%
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	—	—

#### 11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Expected level of achievement was met. The Music Education Program Coordinators (MEPC) will continue to analyze and monitor these outcomes.

2016-2017:

No students were enrolled in MUED 326 in the spring of 2017.

2017-2018:

Expected level of achievement was met. Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Project, the students completing the project excelled in the micro-teaching element of the class.

Change the measure of proficiency to read: 80% of candidates will earn a score of 80% or above on the final project rubric in MUED 326.

2018-2019:

Expected level of achievement was not met. Only one candidate out of the two completed the final project. The candidate that completed the final project earned a score of 85% on the rubric. The other candidate did not turn in a final project therefore earning a score of 0% on the rubric scored teaching project. Based on the score on the rubric for the final project, the student that completed the project excelled in the micro-teaching aspect of the class.

Based on the score returned by the cooperating teacher, the program candidate who completed the project executed the project at a high level of competency. Recommend keeping the the measure of proficiency at "80% of the program candidates will earn a score of 80% or above on the final rubric scored project."

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

Due to the inability of the students to be able go into the public school classrooms due to Covid-19 restrictions, this project was not able to be completed. This project will be re-implemented for the next teaching cycle.

## 12 Assessment and Benchmark MUED 411 or 414 Final Project

Assessment: MUED 411 (Teaching Band and Orchestra Literature) or 414 (Teaching Choral Literature) Final Project rubric.

Benchmark: 75% of program candidates will earn a score of 80% or above on a final project rubric in MUED 411 or MUED 414 (Teaching Band and Orchestral Literature or Teaching Choral Literature).

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 85% of program candidates will earn a score of 80% or above.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

411 Instructional Design Project Rubric

### Outcome Links

#### Musicianship [Program]

Students demonstrate continued growth in musicianship and acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music.

#### Other Certification Area Competencies [External]

##### All Levels K-12 Education

The standards in which the following certification competences are defined: Art Education, Dance Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Languages Education, Health and Physical Education, Music Education, and Theater Education.

#### Standards for Music Teachers [External]

##### a. Standard

Curricular structure, content, and time requirements shall enable students to develop the range of knowledge, skills, and competencies expected of those holding a professional baccalaureate degree in music education as indicated below and in Standards VIII.

##### b. Music Competencies

The profession of school music teacher now encompasses a wide range of traditional, emerging, and experimental purposes, approaches, content, and methods. Each institution makes choices about what, among many possibilities, it will offer prospective specialist music teachers. Institutions may offer a comprehensive curriculum involving two or more specializations and/or focus on one or more particular specializations. The following standards provide a framework for developing and evaluating a wide variety of teacher preparation program goals and achievements. Items b.(1), (2), (3), and (4) apply to all programs that prepare prospective music teachers. Items c.(1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) apply to specializations singly or in combination as determined by the focus and content of specific program offerings determined by each institution.

##### c. Specialization Competencies

Institutions and other educational authorities make decisions about the extent to which music teachers will be prepared in one or more specializations. The following competencies apply singly or in combination consistent with the specialization objectives of each teacher preparation program in music.

## 12.1 Data

MUED 411:

Academic Year	Candidates that earned a score of 80%		Average Score
	#	%	
2014-2015	5/5	100%	91%
2015-2016	9/9	100%	94.68%
2016-2017	5/5	100%	87.44%
2017-2018	4/4	100%	86.12%
2018-2019	12/13	92%	80.8%
2019-2020	12/12	100%	87.2%
2020-2021	9/10	90%	84%

## MUED 414:

Academic Year	Candidates that earned a score of 80%		Average Score
	#	%	
2013-2014	1/3	33%	76%
2014-2015	2/2	100%	83%
2015-2016*	1/2	50%	76%
2016-2017	2/3	66%	82.3%
2017-2018	—	—	—
2018-2019	2/2	100%	89.5
2019-2020	—	—	—
2020-2021	—	—	—

\*One candidate earned a score of 92%, the other candidate earned a score of 60%.

### 12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

MUED 411: Expected level of achievement was met for instrumentalists. Based on the assessment data available over the past four years, no modifications are recommended at this time.

MUED 414: Expected level of achievement was not met for vocal. Continue to include analysis of choral works both small and large scale to challenge the student to think critically, and allow the student to investigate conducting issues within a given composition.

Change benchmark to 75% earn a score of 80% or above for 2017-2018.

2017-2018:

MUED 411:

- The expected level of achievement was met.
- Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Project (215.3 out of possible 200 points), the students completing the Instructional Design Project excelled in the teacher guide portion.
- The weakness (if any) would be in the understanding of the importance/clarity /completeness of the student workbook portion of the project.
- The difficulty in assessing any changes to the course is based on the statistical numbers being skewed at times due to the low number of students in the course.
- Currently, there are 13 students enrolled in MUED 411 for the fall 2018 term and so we should have a better understanding of any trends at the conclusion of this term.

2018-2019:

MUED 411:

- The expected level of achievement was met.
- Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Project (201.6 out of possible 200 points), the students completing the Instructional Design Project excelled in most of the sections contained within the teacher guide portion of the assignment.
- The weakness, as in previous years, is in the understanding of the importance/clarity /completeness of the student workbook portion of the project.
- The assessment of the need for any changes to the course is based on the statistical numbers being much larger this past year.
- Currently, there are 13 students enrolled in MUED 411 for the fall 2019 term and so we should have a better understanding of any trends at the conclusion of this term having had to larger sample sizes than in the past.

MUED 414

The expected level of achievement was met. The rubric scores indicate the work was completed at a very high level or competence. We will need to continue to include analysis of choral works, both small and large scale, to challenge the student to think critically, and to allow the student to investigate vocal issues within a given composition. The course requires a lot of listening hours and score study. The limitations of this project is in the availability of instrumental scores for analysis that go with major choral works being studied.

2019-2020:

MUED 411:

- The expected level of achievement was met.
- Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Project (217.9 out of possible 250 points), the students completing the Instructional Design Project excelled in most of the sections contained within the teacher guide portion of the assignment.
- The average is slightly lower than what was actually happening with the majority of the students - we had two students who scored significantly lower than the majority of the class
- The weakness, as has been in previous years as has been transmitted in the instructions leading up to the project, is in the understanding of the importance/clarity /completeness of the student workbook portion of the project. The students do an excellent job on the teacher resource portion of the project and then seem to lose the momentum to complete the project with as much completeness.
- The assessment of the need for any changes to the course is based on the statistical numbers being much larger this past year.

2020-2021:

MUED 411:

- The expected level of achievement was met.
- Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Project (210.9 out of possible 250 points), the students completing the Instructional Design Project excelled in most of the sections contained within the teacher guide portion of the assignment.
- The average is slightly lower than what was actually happening with the majority of the students - we had one student who scored significantly lower than the majority of the class and one student electing not to complete the project. This student was still able to accumulate enough points to pass the course.
- The weakness, as has been in previous years as has been transmitted in the instructions leading up to the project, is in the understanding of the importance/clarity /completeness of the student workbook portion of the project. The students in this class did an excellent job on the teacher resource portion of the project and they also did much better than in previous classes with the student section of the project.
- The assessment of the need for any changes to the course is based on the statistical numbers being smaller this past year.

MUED 414:

Due to the course being changed from face-to-face to online, materials were not available for students to complete this final project. The materials for this project are housed in the choral library which was not available to students and faculty due to ongoing construction from the hurricanes.

### **13 Assessment and Benchmark MUED 425 Final Classroom Management Assessment Project**

Assessment: MUED 425 (Classroom Management and Organization in the Elementary /Secondary Music Education Classroom and Field Experience) final classroom management assessment project rubric.

Benchmark: 85% of program candidates will earn a score of 80% or above on final classroom management assessment project rubric used in MUED 425.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

425 Classroom Management Plan Grading Rubric

425 Classroom Management Plan PPT Rubric

[Outcome Links](#)

**Planning for Teachers [Program]**

All level teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in classes to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessment for student progress in K-12 education.

**Other Certification Area Competencies [External]****All Levels K-12 Education**

The standards in which the following certification competences are defined: Art Education, Dance Education, English as a Second Language Education, Foreign Languages Education, Health and Physical Education, Music Education, and Theater Education.

**Standards for Music Teachers [External]****1 Curricular Structure****a. Desirable traits****2 Program Content**

In addition to the common core of musicianship and general studies, the musician electing a career in school-based teaching must develop competencies in professional education and in specific areas of musicianship. Professional education components should be dealt with in a practical context, relating the learning of educational principles to the student's day-by-day work in music. Students must be provided opportunities for various types of observation and teaching. Within the curricular guidelines above, attention should be given to breadth in general studies, attitudes relating to human, personal considerations, and social, economic, and cultural components that give individual communities their identity.

**b. Music Competencies**

The profession of school music teacher now encompasses a wide range of traditional, emerging, and experimental purposes, approaches, content, and methods. Each institution makes choices about what, among many possibilities, it will offer prospective specialist music teachers. Institutions may offer a comprehensive curriculum involving two or more specializations and/or focus on one or more particular specializations. The following standards provide a framework for developing and evaluating a wide variety of teacher preparation program goals and achievements. Items b.(1), (2), (3), and (4) apply to all programs that prepare prospective music teachers. Items c.(1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) apply to specializations singly or in combination as determined by the focus and content of specific program offerings determined by each institution.

**c. Specialization Competencies**

Institutions and other educational authorities make decisions about the extent to which music teachers will be prepared in one or more specializations. The following competencies apply singly or in combination consistent with the specialization objectives of each teacher preparation program in music.

**d. Teaching Competencies**

The musician-teacher must be able to lead students to competency, apply music knowledge and skills in teaching situations, and integrate music instruction into the process of P-12 education. Essential competencies are:

**e. Professional Procedures**

In order to implement programs to achieve the competencies identified in the foregoing sections, the following standards and guidelines apply:

**13.1 Data**

Semester	Candidates that earned a score of 80%	
	#	%
Fall 2013	6/6	100%
Fall 2014	4/4	100%
Fall 2015	8/8	100%
Fall 2016	10/10	100%
Fall 2017	4/4	100%
Fall 2018	9/10	100%
Fall 2019	12/12	100%
Fall 2020	16/16	100%

### 13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Expected level of achievement was met. The Music Education Program Coordinators (MEPC) will continue to analyze and monitor these outcomes.

2017-2018:

- The expected level of achievement was met.
- The students completing the Classroom Management Plan Part 1 (written = 200 points out of a possible 250 points) excelled in the classroom organization, lessons, effective teaching practices, and evaluation/assessment strategies.
- The students completing the Classroom Management Plan Part 2 (PowerPoint = 50 points out of a possible 250 points) excelled in the visual presentation, cohesiveness, and sequencing of information.
- The weakness (if any) would be:
  - In part 1: the understanding of the professional development portion of the project (mostly completeness of coverage); and,
  - In part 2: the lack of comprehension of the amount of information per slide that is effective in presentations.
- The difficulty in assessing any changes to the course is based on the statistical numbers being skewed at times due to the low number of students in the course.
- Currently, there are 10 students enrolled in MUED 425 for the fall 2018 term and so we should have a better understanding of any trends at the conclusion of this term.

2018-2019:

- The expected level of achievement was met.
- The students completing the Classroom Management Plan Part 1 (written = 200 points out of a possible 250 points) once again excelled in the classroom organization, lessons, effective teaching practices, and evaluation/assessment strategies.
- The students completing the Classroom Management Plan Part 2 (PowerPoint = 50 points out of a possible 250 points) all seemed to excel in the visual presentation, cohesiveness, and sequencing of information.
- The weakness (if any) would be:
  - In part 1: the understanding of the professional development portion of the project (mostly completeness of coverage); and,
  - In part 2: the lack of comprehension of the amount of information per slide that is effective in presentations.
- Currently, there are 13 students enrolled in MUED 425 for the fall 2019 term and so we have redesigned portions of this final project, including the elimination of the Powerpoint presentation portion so that the students can focus their attention to Part I.

2019-2020:

- The expected level of achievement was met.
- The students completing the Classroom Management Plan excelled in the classroom organization, lessons, effective teaching practices, and evaluation/assessment strategies.
- The weakness (if any) would be: Formatting / Careful proofing
- Currently, there are 16 students enrolled in MUED 425 for the fall 2020 term and so we will continue with the redesigned portions of this final project.

2020-2021:

- The expected level of achievement was met.
- The students completing the Classroom Management Plan once again excelled in the classroom organization, lessons, effective teaching practices, and evaluation /assessment strategies.
- The weakness (if any) would be: Assessment guidelines that would meet the standards of today modern school administrations

- Currently, there are 7 students enrolled in MUED 425 for the fall 2021 term and so we will continue with the redesigned portions of this final project. (Please note - this will be the last class that will take this course as a lead into their student teaching semester.)

**14 Assessment and Benchmark** Entrance Theory Diagnostic Exam [Approved]

Assessment: The music theory diagnostic exam and post tests will assess incoming music students aptitude in music theory and fundamentals.

Benchmark: 85% of students successfully completing MUSC 100 will pass the Post Test Theory Diagnostic Exam and be allowed entrance into MUSC 113.

**Outcome Links**

**Musicianship [Program]**

Students demonstrate continued growth in musicianship and acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music.

**14.1 Data**

Academic Year	Students that passed the Entrance Theory Diagnostic Exam	
	#	%
2013-2014	7/38	18%
2014-2015	3/31	10%
2015-2016	6/33	20%
2016-2017	8/38	21%
2017-2018	8/41	20%
2018-2019	8/34	23%
2019-2020	8/39	20%
2020-2021	12/29	41%

**14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2015-2016:

The drop and failure rate in previous years in Freshman Music Theory (MUSC 101-102, prior to 2013-2014) was excessive; resulting in cohorts at the sophomore, junior, and senior levels that mitigated against appropriate levels of student in upper division courses, and low graduation rates. Beginning fall 2014, MUSC 100 was moved to the fall, to give students an opportunity to acquire the physical and intellectual skills for an improved opportunity for success in the music degree plan. Passage rate of MUSC 201 beginning spring 2015 should indicate if this adjustment is successful; and it was, with an 80% passage rate.

2016-2017:

Of the 21%, 13% were placed into MUSC 101 and 3% into MUSC 102. The 79% of students that did not pass were enrolled into MUSC 100. Expected level of achievement was met. Continue to monitor, analyze, and assess.

2017-2018:

Expected level of achievement met. 34 students took MUSC 100 post-test. 33 students passed into MUSC 101. Overall average for MUSC 100 (post-test) was 89% (vs. average score of 43% on diagnostic test). Continue to monitor, analyze, and assess; compare with this cohorts pass rate in MUSC 201 in spring 2020.

2018-2019:

- 34 students took pre-test
  - average score 44.8%
  - 8 of 34 (23%) scored above 70% qualifying them to move directly to MUSC 101
  - 26 of 34 (76%) were required to take MUSC 100 (Music Theory Review)



- 6 of those passing the initial Diagnostic chose to take MUSC 100; 2 moved directly to MUSC 101.
- 28 students took the post-test
  - average score 91.8%
  - 27 of 28 (96%) students scored a passing grade to move to MUSC 101
  - 3 of the students enrolled (of 31 students) did not complete the course and did not take the post-test.
- Of the total students taking the pre-test (34) a total of 30 (88%) qualified to move to MUSC 101 following the MUSC 100 Music Theory Review Course.

The diagnostic, remediation tool (MUSC 100) and post-test results indicate that this indicator for success of our incoming freshman is continuing to be useful in providing a basis for student success over the 4-5 year cohort success rate in graduation.

#### 2019-2020:

This was a large cohort - 39 total taking the entrance exam; with 8 students passing the diagnostic, and 31 taking the slated to take the MUSC 100 Theory Review course. In the Post-test phase, 27 took the post-test with an average of 85.3%. There was a massive breakdown in the courses following the MUSC 100 course. This large cohort suffered significant losses - with only 15 of 34 students surviving to take MUSC 214 in Sp2021 (of these - only 11 passed). This points a problem both in retention from the Freshman to the Sophomore level, as well as to weakness and inconsistency in the teaching of MUSC 113 and MUSC 213. With the sheer numbers of these students who have either dropped out of school or changed majors it points to a significant problem in having younger and less experienced faculty teaching at the lower division, as well as retention in the major. This will be addressed immediately F2021 with the assignment of senior faculty to teaching the lower division courses.

#### 2020-2021:

The average for the diagnostic in F2020 was 63/100 (significantly higher than in previous years). 12 students passed the diagnostic; 11 were placed directly in MUSC 113, and one student w/AP music theory ("4") was placed directly in MUSC 213. 20/20 students passed the MUSC 100 Post-test, with an average of 90.7%. 27/31(87%) students registered for MUSC 113 in Spring 2021 - of that 20/27 (74%) passed MUSC 113 - a significant loss in the cohort - 2 years of these kinds of losses are notable - and have had significant effect on the total number within the department. With the sheer numbers of these students who have either dropped out of school or changed majors it points to a significant problem in having younger and less experienced faculty teaching at the lower division, as well as retention in the major. This will be addressed immediately F2021 with the assignment of senior faculty to teaching the lower division music theory courses.

### 15 Assessment and Benchmark MUSC 214 (was MUSC 201) Final Composition/Analysis Project

Assessment: MUSC 214 (Principles of Music III) Final Composition/Analysis Project rubric.

Benchmark: 75% of program candidates will earn a score of 70% or above on the MUSC 214 final composition/analysis project rubric.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

Comp rubrics MUSC201 Sp2020

Comp Rubrics MUSC213 Sp2021

MUSC 214 Final Composition and Grading

MUSC 214 Final Composition Rubric

#### Outcome Links

#### Musicianship [Program]

Students demonstrate continued growth in musicianship and acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music.

### 15.1 Data

	Candidates that met	
--	---------------------	--

Academic Year	the benchmark		Average Score
	#	%	
2013-2014	3/29	10%	55%
2014-2015	19/23	80%	80%
2015-2016	19/23	80%	80%
2016-2017	25/26	96%	—
2017-2018	21/21	100%	99%
2018-2019	—	—	—
2019-2020	14/14	100%	91
2020-2021	12/13	92%	84

### 15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Expected level of achievement met. Continue to analyze, monitor, and assess. Considering the use of a music standardized test by Educational Testing Services.

2016-2017:

Expected level of achievement met. Continue to analyze, monitor, and assess. Considering the use of a music standardized test by Educational Testing Services (i.e. the MUSIC Graduate Record Exam).

2017-2018:

Expected level of achievement surpassed, with continued growth (over multiple years) in the number of students achieving at a high level. This is a specific result of the process used by the current instructor to work with students in a "composition seminar" atmosphere, as well as improved preparation at the lower division theory levels. Continue to analyze, monitor, and assess. Consider increasing difficulty/length of the project.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

High level of achievement by all students: High grade on rubric 99, low grade 81, average 91. High quality projects. No changes at this time.

2020-2021:

Drop off in quality and numbers, reflecting changes in teaching in MUSC 113, 213. High score 98, low score 0, average 84. Projects of lessor quality, with significant notation problems. This is being addressed by reassigning senior faculty to lower division music theory courses.

## 16 Assessment and Benchmark MUSC 313 (was MUSC 202L) ET Final Proficiency Exam

Assessment: MUSC 313 (MUSC 202L) (sight-reading/ear training) Final Proficiency Exam rubric.

Benchmark:

75% of program candidates will earn a score of 70% or above on the MUSC 313 (sight-reading /ear training) final proficiency exam rubric.

75% of program candidates will complete the proficiency requirement on first attempt.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

ET Final #5 Fall 2019 student answer sheet.musx.pdf

Final Exam MUSC 202LA F2020

### Outcome Links

#### Musicianhip [Program]

Students demonstrate continued growth in musicianship and acquire a rudimentary capacity to create original or derivative music.

## 16.1 Data

Academic Year	Candidates that earned a score of 70% or above on the MUSC 313 final proficiency exam rubric		Candidates that completed the proficiency requirement on the first attempt	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	15/16	91%	16/16	100%
2014-2015*	—	—	—	—
2015-2016	16.5/22	75%	16.5/22	75%
2016-2017	17/18	94%	18/18	100%
2017-2018	16/24	75%	18/18	100%
2018-2019	—	—	—	—
2019-2020	12/12	100%	12/12	100%
2020-2021	11/11	100%	11/11	100%

\*MUSC 202L was not offered in 2014-2015.

\*MUSC 202L will be subsumed in MUSC 313 in Fall 2021

### 16.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Expected level of achievement met. Continue to analyze, monitor, and assess. Considering the use of a music standardized test by Educational Testing Services.

2017-2018:

Expected level of achievement met. Continue to analyze, monitor, and assess. Considering the use of a music standardized test by Educational Testing Services.

Check on parity of grading and teacher expectations: One section had a 100% pass rate; one section had a pass rate of 33%. This raises questions as to teacher expectations.

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

Testing was "in-person" with grades showing a fairly wide range, depending on skill levels and test taking abilities. high score 107, low score 70, avg. 89. all students met benchmark, but some just barely.

2020-2021:

Testing online was implemented in the eartraining software Auralia; overall grades have improved (in part because of the nature of no time pressure for the test, and [possibly] the reduction in test anxiety. High marks (High score of 100/100, low score of 77/100; average 93). Change from 2019-2020 positive. Continue online process without changes.

## 17 Assessment and Benchmark MUSC 415 Final Research Project (was MUSC 330)

Assessment: The MUSC 415 (was MUSC 330) (20<sup>th</sup> Century Techniques and Materials) final research project rubric measures the program candidate's ability to synthesize their knowledge of theoretical analysis techniques, historic/style elements, technology, and research skills into a project focusing on contemporary repertoire and practice.

Benchmark: 85% of program candidates will earn a score of 70% or above on the MUSC 415 (20<sup>th</sup> Century Techniques and Materials) final research/composition project grading rubric.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 75% of program candidates will earn a score of 70% or above on the MUSC 330 (20<sup>th</sup> Century Techniques and Materials) final research/composition project rubric.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

12-tone matrix (Packet)  
 Composition Project (Finale)  
 MUSC 330 Final Composition Directions  
 MUSC 330 Final Composition Rubric  
 MUSC 415A - Final Project Grading Rubric

### Outcome Links

#### Music History [Program]

Students acquire basic knowledge of music history and repertoires through the present time.

### 17.1 Data

Semester	Candidates that met the benchmark	
	#	%
Spring 2014	10/10	100%
Spring 2015	19/19	100%
Spring 2016	1/1	100%
Fall 2016	15/17	88%
Fall 2017	13/13	100%
Fall 2018		
Fall 2019	no data	no data
Fall 2020	8/8	100%

#### 17.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Expected level of achievement was met. Continue to analyze, monitor, and assess. Considering the use of a music standardized test by Educational Testing Services.

2017-2018:

Greater than the expected level of achievement was met. As this is one of the final two upper division theory courses, a level of class achievement of less than 100% percent would be indicative of a failure, either:

- 1) Teacher expectations that are out of line with professional standards for undergraduate students in the lower division theory courses (too low, allowing a student to pass to the upper division without sufficient preparation); or,
- 2) A teacher with expectations that are too high to reconcile with professional standards for upper division undergraduate music theory; or,
- 3) The final possible scenario for a pass rate of less than 100% is student who suffers a catastrophic failure related to either health or family issues.

Continue to monitor and consider changing benchmark to "85% of program candidates will earn a score of 70% or above on the MUSC 330 (20<sup>th</sup> Century Techniques and Materials) final research/composition project rubric."

2018-2019:

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

high competency with all students enrolled in the course. See rubric and composition project guidelines. As an upper division course (combined music history and theory), a high level of achievement is expected. Changing benchmarks upwards will be considered for 2021-22 master plan, by the ad hoc music theory committee.

### 18 Assessment and Benchmark MUSC 363 Final Written Research Project Rubric

Assessment: Music history/literature knowledge indicators of the MUSC 363 (Music History II) final written research project rubric

Benchmark: 80% of program candidates will earn a score of 6 (scale of 0-9) or above on the music history/literature knowledge indicators of the MUSC 363 (Music History II) final written research project rubric.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

MUSC 363 - Final Project Rubric

### Outcome Links

#### Music History [Program]

Students acquire basic knowledge of music history and repertoires through the present time.

## 18.1 Data

Semester	# of candidates that completed MUSC 363	Candidates that met the benchmark	
		#	%
Spring 2014	14/14	12/14	86%
Spring 2015	17/18	15/18	83%
Spring 2017	20/21	17/21	85%
Spring 2018	22/26	20/26	77%
Spring 2019	19/23	—	—
Spring 2020	18/20	—	—
Spring 2021	11/13	10/13	77%

### 18.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Expected level of achievement was met. Continue to analyze, monitor, and assess. Considering the use of a music standardized test by Educational Testing Services.

2017-2018:

The rubric used for this assessment is outdated and must be revised in order to collect useful data.

2018-2019:

Data was not reported by the faculty member who taught MUSC 363 in Spring 2019. A new assessment method measuring student knowledge in music theory and history will be implemented in the Spring 2020 semester. Each student will take the Music Content Test by Educational Testing Services. This assessment tool will aid the faculty in making adjustments to individual courses and curricula.

2019-2020:

No data collected due to COVID-19 Pandemic. Course work alterations were implemented due to online courses, resulting in having to alter the final project. This resulted in no collectable data.

2020-2021:

Level of achievement was impacted directly by the two students who dropped the course. The 77% was with only one student failing to meet the benchmark and two students dropping the course. The percentage of those who met the benchmark that does not include those who dropped is 91%. The only way to improve the original percentage is to have less students drop, as well as to increase the number of students enrolled in the course so having a small number of students drop will not impact the benchmark percentage so dramatically. This showcases that the level of achievement was quite high and definitely met for this semester.

The rubric has been updated to include both music specific sections, as well as writing specific areas of evaluation. The edits also include adjusting the eras covered in the course, as well as removal of the presentation aspect to make it writing-specific.

Next year we will contact Educational Testing Services to have the Music Content Test take place at the end of the semester. This will result in more information to assess the students' comprehension regarding what they learned in the previous semester, and we will be able to adjust the course accordingly.

**19 Assessment and Benchmark MUSC 408/410 Final Conducting Project**

Assessment: The final conducting project of MUSC 408/MUSC 410 (Instrumental/Choral Conducting).

Benchmark: 90% of program candidates will earn a score of 80% or above on the final conducting project of MUSC 408 (Instrumental/Choral Conducting).

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was 85% of program candidates will earn a score of 80% or above.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

408 Final Conducting Project Rubric - 150 Points  
 MUSC 410 Final Conducting Lab Evaluation Rubric

**Outcome Links**

**Performance Skills [Program]**

Students demonstrate an array of performance skills with increasing sophistication and are able to synthesize these skills in performance.

**19.1 Data**

Academic Year	MUSC 408 candidates that met the benchmark	
	#	%
2013-2014	6/6	100%
2014-2015*	—	—
2015-2016	8/8	100%
2016-2017	4/4	100%
2017-2018	6/6	100%
2018-2019	—	—
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	—	—

\*Music 408 was not offered in 2014-2015.

Academic Year	MUSC 410 candidates that met the benchmark	
	#	%
2013-2014	2/2	100%
2014-2015	2/2	100%
2015-2016	2/2	100%
2016-2017	3/3	100%
2017-2018*	—	—

2018-2019	2/2	100%
2019-2020	—	—
2020-2021	—	—

\*Music 410 was not offered in 2017-2018.

### 19.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Expected level of achievement was met. Continue to monitor, analyze, and assess outcomes.

2017-2018:

MUSC 408: Expected level of achievement was met. Based on the score on the Rubric for the Final Conducting Project (129.8 out of possible 150 points), the students excelled in the areas of basic conducting patterns, right and left-hand technique and overall musicianship (phrasing, articulation, and releases). The weakness would be in the areas of error detection and correction along with verbal communication with the ensemble. The course lacks a lab band that the students could conduct on a regular basis throughout the semester, and the low number of students in the course prohibits much "live" conducting of their classmates. Until the students have a consistent live ensemble to conduct throughout the semester, these areas will be of concern.

MUSC 410 was not offered.

MUSC 408 and MUSC 410 should be separated for analysis since the two courses use different evaluation criteria.

2018-2019:

MUSC 410

The expected level of achievement was met.

The inclusion of a student conducting lab has proven invaluable to the development of the students' conducting and communication skills. The use of video has helped the students to be able to study their conducting and to see immediately how to improve the conducting gesture and communication with a choir. The limitations of this lab choir is that the students only get to conduct twice in the semester in front of a "live" choir. One way of addressing this problem would be to encourage conducting students to participate in Concert Chorale as a "student conductor."

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The expected level of achievement was not met in MUSC 410.

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, students were unable to participate in a live conducting lab. Therefore, the students were unable to be graded by the rubric designed for this project. Students did conduct to recordings but were unable to show interpretive skills that would be evident in a live conducting lab experience. They did have a unit on error detection through a programmed text, but were unable to respond verbally and put the conducting back into context to see if they had effected change with their feedback.

## 20 Assessment and Benchmark MUSC 490/492 Major Performance Area Capstone/Senior Recital

Assessment: MUSC 490/492 Major Performance Area Capstone/Senior Recital rubric.

Benchmark:

90% of instrumental program completers earn a score of 12.5 or above on the Major Performance Area Capstone/Senior Recital (MUSC 490/492) rubric.

85% of vocal program completers earn a score of 15 or above on the Major Performance Area Capstone/Senior Recital (MUSC 490/492) rubric.

90% of program completers pass the MUSC 490/492 requirements on the first attempt.

Prior to 2018-2019, the benchmark was 90% of instrumental program completers earn a score of 12 or above.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark for instrumental candidates was that 85% will earn a score of 10 or above, and 85% of vocal candidates will earn a score of 12 or above.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

Music Program Performance Rubric

### Outcome Links

#### Performance Skills [Program]

Students demonstrate an array of performance skills with increasing sophistication and are able to synthesize these skills in performance.

## 20.1 Data

Academic Year	490/492 instrumental completers that earn a score of 12.5		490/492 vocal completers that earn a score of 15		Completed on first attempt	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	6/6	100%	5/5	100%	—	100%
2014-2015	5/5	100%	2/2	100%	—	100%
2015-2016	8/8	100%	3/3	100%	—	100%
2016-2017	6/6	100%	2/2	100%	—	100%
2017-2018	6/6	100%	2/2	100%	—	100%
2018-2019	8/8	100%	6/7	86%	15/15	100%
2019-2020	4/4	100%	2/2	100%	6/6	100%
2020-2021	17/17	100%	0/1	0%	18/18	100%

### 20.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Raise benchmark to 12/18 for instrumental and 15/21 for vocal.

2017-2018:

Expected level of achievement was met. Recommend raising benchmark to 12.5 for 2018-2019.

2018-2019:

Expected level of achievement was not met: 1 vocalist did not meet the benchmark of 15. All instrumentalists met the benchmark of 12.5. Continue to closely monitor progress of students and encourage improvement as students prepare to present the capstone recital.

2019-2020:

Expected level of achievement was met by all instrumentalists (rubrics ranged from 14 to 18) and by 1/2 of vocalists. Continue to closely monitor progress of students and encourage improvement as students prepare to present the capstone recital.

2020-2021:

17/17 instrumentalists exceeded the expected level of achievement - rubrics ranged from 13 to 18. One vocalist did not meet expected level of achievement. All candidates passed on the first attempt.

Continue to closely monitor progress of students and encourage improvement as students prepare to present the capstone recital.



Assessment: PIAN 216 proficiency examination rubric.

Benchmark:

85% of program candidates complete the proficiency requirement on the first attempt.

85% of program candidates will earn a score of 70% or above on the PIAN 216 proficiency examination rubric.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was that 80% of program candidates will earn a score of 70% or above on the PIAN 216 proficiency examination rubric, and 80% of candidates will complete the proficiency requirement on the first attempt.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

Piano Proficiency Rubric

### Outcome Links

#### Performance Skills [Program]

Students demonstrate an array of performance skills with increasing sophistication and are able to synthesize these skills in performance.

## 21.1 Data

Academic Year	PIAN 216 candidates that completed the proficiency on the first attempt		Candidates that completed the proficiency and scored above 70%	
	#	%	#	%
2013-2014	15/19	79%	15/15	100%
2014-2015	13/16	81%	13/13	100%
2015-2016	13/16	81%	13/13	100%
2016-2017	16/19	84%	16/16	100%
2017-2018	18/20	90%	18/18	100%
2018-2019	21/22	95%	21/21	100%
2019-2020	13/14	93%	13/13	100%
2020-2021	11/11	100%	11/11	100%

### 21.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Expected level of achievement was met. Continue to monitor, analyze, and assess outcomes.

2017-2018:

Expected level of achievement was met. In order to continually meet the benchmark, we will work on the sight-reading element in this course.

The goal is to have the students score 2.00 or higher (scale 0-3) in the sight-reading portion.

2018-2019:

Expected level of achievement was met. The percentage of candidates who completed the proficiency on the first attempt increased from 90% to 95%.

Out of the 21 students who passed the proficiency: 100% achieved a score of 2 or higher in the sight-reading portion (scale 0-3).

In order to continually meet the benchmark, students will be given more exercises to improve sight-reading and repertoire performance. The goal is to have the students score 2.00 or higher (scale 0-3) in the sight-reading and repertoire portion.

2019-2020:

Expected level of achievement was met. The percentage of candidates who completed the proficiency was 93%. One student did not attempt to complete the proficiency - he did not show up for the final exam.

Out of the 13 students who passed the proficiency: 100% achieved a score of 2 or higher in the sight-reading portion (scale 0-3).

Students will continually practice repertoire pieces along with sight-reading excerpts to develop fluency at keyboard playing.

2020-2021:

Expected level of achievement was met. The percentage of candidates who completed the proficiency on the first attempt increased from 93% to 100%.

Out of the 11 students who passed the proficiency: 8/11 (73%) achieved a score of 2 or higher in the sight-reading portion (scale 0-3); and 100% achieved a score of 2 or higher (scale 0-3) in the repertoire performance portion.

In order to continually meet the benchmark, students will practice sight-reading in class assignments and develop confident piano repertoire performance. The goal is to have the students score 2.00 or higher (scale 0-3) in the sight-reading and repertoire portion.

## 22 Assessment and Benchmark Music Education Vocal/Instrumental Enrollment and Completers

Assessment: Enrollment and Completer Data.

Enrollment numbers are based on candidates currently enrolled in the program who have submitted an EDUC 200 packet.

Benchmark: The EPP has set a goal to increase enrollment by 7% across programs each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment.

### 22.1 Data

Music Education (Vocal and Instrumental) - Enrollment and Completer Data:

Academic Year	# of students officially enrolled in program with an EDUC 200 packet	# of completers in fall semester	# of completers in spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	13			7
2014-2015	15			4
2015-2016	18			7
2016-2017				
2017-2018	25	0	4	4
2018-2019	35	0	8	8
2019-2020				
2020-2021	27	1	8	9

#### 22.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

This benchmark has been met or exceeded.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: Official enrollment (candidates with an EDUC 200 packet) has steadily increased over the past five years. There was a 39% increase from 2015-2016 to 2017-2018.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data:

The benchmark was exceeded. There was a 40% increase in enrollment from the 2017-2018 AY to the 2018-2019 AY. There was also a 100% increase in the number of completers.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal for 2019-2020 will be to again achieve at least a 7% increase in the number of candidates enrolled in the Music Education program.



#5113 breakdown:	Number	0	6	0	0	0	4
Music History and Literature	Mean		9				9.25
	Range		6-10				7-11
	% correct (14)						66%
Theory and Composition	Mean		12				11.75
	Range		7-14				11-13
	% correct (16)						73%
Performance	Mean		35				15.50
	Range		30-38				14-17
	% correct (23)						67%
Pedagogy, Professional Issues, and Technology	Mean		18				
	Range		14-22				
	% correct (56)						

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
#5113 overall	Number	0	8			1	8
	Mean		166.1			161	164
	Range		158-178			161	156-170
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%			0%	100%
#5113 breakdown:	Number		8			1	8
Music History and Literature	Mean		10			8	9
	Range		6-12			8	5-14
	% correct (14)		71%			50%	64%
Theory and Composition	Mean		12.3			10	12.8
	Range		9-16			10	11-16
	% correct (16)		77%			63%	80%
Performance	Mean		15.6			16	15.3
	Range		15-19			16	13-23
	% correct (23)		68%			70%	66%
Pedagogy, Professional Issues, and Technology	Mean		31.3			31	34.1
	Range		28-37			31	27-47
	% correct (56)		66%			66%	73%
Special Category: Listening	Mean					17	17.8
	Range					17	14-25
	% Correct (25)					68%	71%

### 23.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Although 100% of students passed prior to student teaching, 86% passed on the first attempt.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: 100% of the completers in 2017-2018 achieved the passing score on the Praxis Music Content exam on the first attempt. Percentage Correct for the categories were as follows: Music History and Literature (66%), Theory and Compositions (73%), and Performance (67%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: This is the first year that sub-category data was reported and analyzed. Therefore, the faculty will continue to look at sub-category data to drive instruction where needed. As the faculty redesigns the program to meet teacher residency requirements, the scope and sequence will be noted to ensure that the topics of the Praxis Content exam are sufficiently covered.

2018-2019:

Analysis of Data: 100% of the completers in 2018-2019 achieved a passing score on the Praxis Music Content exam on the first attempt. Percentage Correct for the categories were as follows: Music History and Literature (71%), Theory and Compositions (77%), Performance (68%), and Pedagogy, Professional Issues, and Technology (66%).

This is the second year that sub-category data was reported and analyzed. Each of the three subcategories increased, with significant progress shown in Music History & Literature and Theory and composition.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Over the past two years, 100% of candidates (n=12) passed the Music Content Praxis exam on the first attempt. The goal for 2019-2020 is for 90% of Music Education majors to achieve a passing score on the Praxis Music Education Exam on the first attempt.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

1) As major portions of the program have recently been redesigned to meet year-long residency requirements, Performing Arts faculty will monitor exam scores to ensure the scope and sequence covers the Music Praxis content sufficiently.

2019-2020:

Analysis of data:

No data per number of students successfully completing the Music Praxis Content Standards Exam (5113)

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The number of successful completers remained high even with the start of a shutdown of the University and the area public schools due to the COVID-19 pandemic

The Performing Arts Department will continue to refine the instruction provided to our students to be successful in passing this important component of their matriculation through our program.

2020-2021:

100% of the completers in 2020-2021 achieved a passing score on the Praxis Music Content exam on the first attempt. (Please note that several students were unable to successfully complete the exam due to listening equipment issues experienced by taking the exam on the campus of the University of Louisiana-Lafayette (Hurricanes Laura & Delta closed the local outlets). Percentage Correct for the categories were as follows: Music History and Literature (64%), Theory and Compositions (80%), Performance (66%), and Pedagogy, Professional Issues, and Technology (73%).

This is the third year that sub-category data was reported and analyzed. Most of the subcategories either increased or maintained, with a slight reduction in Music History and Literature (faculty change).

**Plan for Continuous Improvement:**

The goal for 2021-2022 is for 90% of Music Education majors to achieve a passing score on the Praxis Music Education Exam on the first attempt.

**Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:**

1) As major portions of the program have recently been redesigned and several long-standing faculty have retired, the Performing Arts faculty will monitor exam scores to ensure the scope and sequence covers the Music Praxis content sufficiently.

**24 Assessment and Benchmark FEE Content**

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation Domain 5 measures the Content Specific Components related to teaching observations.

The FEE Scoring Scale is as follows: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 90% of the candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of Domain 5 (Content Specific Components) on the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 100% of students will meet or exceed the benchmark of 2.00, which is the benchmark set by the State of Louisiana.

**24.1 Data****Music Education - Content specific components on FEE III:**

MUSIC Component	Fall 2015			Spring 2016			Fall 2016			Spring 2017		
	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range
5.1	0			7	3.91	3.50-4.00	0			11	3.58	2.75-4.00
5.2				7	3.91	3.50-4.00				11	3.76	3.13-4.00
5.3				7	3.79	3.13-4.00				11	3.78	2.75-4.00
5.4				7	3.83	3.50-4.00				11	3.81	3.00-4.00
5.5				7	3.88	3.25-4.00				11	3.79	2.63-4.00
5.6				6	3.81	3.00-4.00				11	3.60	2.38-4.00
5.7				6	3.90	3.63-4.00				11	3.73	3.25-4.00
5.8				7	3.82	3.00-4.00				11	3.77	3.25-4.00
5.9				7	3.82	3.38-4.00				11	3.44	2.63-4.00
5.10				5	3.73	3.00-4.00				10	3.81	3.00-4.00
5.11				2	3.88	3.75-4.00				7	3.97	3.88-4.00
5.12				5	3.98	3.88-4.00				8	3.51	3.13-3.88
5.13				5	3.98	3.88-4.00				8	3.83	3.25-4.00
5.14				5	4.00	4.00				8	3.92	3.50-4.00

MUSIC	Fall 2017			Spring 2018			Fall 2018			Spring 2019			
Component	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	% Proficient or Higher
5.1	0			4	3.58	3.25-4.00				7	3.39	2.13-4.00	71%
5.2				4	3.53	3.00-4.00				7	3.54	2.75-3.88	86%
5.3				4	3.29	2.88-3.75				7	3.32	2.38-4.00	71%
5.4				4	3.88	3.50-4.00				7	3.85	3.50-4.00	100%
5.5				4	3.85	3.67-4.00				7	3.66	3.00-4.00	100%
5.6				4	3.78	3.38-4.00				5	3.87	3.67-4.00	100%
5.7				4	3.23	2.75-3.63				5	3.03	2.25-3.50	60%
5.8				4	3.08	2.00-3.88				7	3.28	2.63-3.83	71%
5.9				4	3.28	2.33-3.88				7	3.42	2.83-4.00	71%
5.10				3	3.63	3.00-4.00				6	3.67	2.75-4.00	83%
5.11				0						1	4.00	4.00	100%
5.12				4	3.60	3.25-4.00				6	3.37	2.75-3.88	83%
5.13				4	3.88	3.63-4.00				6	3.54	2.75-4.00	83%
5.14				4	4.00	4.00				6	4.00	4.00	100%

MUSIC	Fall 2020				Spring 2021			
Component	#	Mean	Range	% Proficient or Higher	#	Mean	Range	% Proficient or Higher
5.1					8	3.35	2.75-3.88	88%
5.2					8	3.10	2.25-3.88	75%
5.3					8	3.42	3.13-3.63	100%
5.4					3	3.47	3.17-3.67	100%
5.5					8	3.56	3.00-4.00	100%
5.6					8	3.46	2.88-4.00	88%
5.7					8	3.57	3.25-4.00	100%
5.8	1	4.00	4.00	100%	8	3.52	3.13-3.75	100%

5.9	1	4.00	4.00	100%	8	3.67	3.25-4.00	100%
5.10	1	1.00	1.00	0%	8	3.58	3.00-4.00	100%
5.11					8	3.49	3.00-4.00	100%
5.12								
5.13								
5.14								
TECH 1					8	3.72	3.38-4.00	100%
TECH 2					8	3.67	3.25-4.00	100%
TECH 3					8	3.60	3.13-4.00	100%

MUSIC	Fall 2021				Spring 2022			
Component	#	Mean	Range	% Proficient or Higher	#	Mean	Range	% Proficient or Higher
5.1	0							
5.2								
5.3								
5.4								
5.5								
5.6								
5.7								
5.8								
5.9								
5.10								
5.11								
5.12								
5.13								
5.14								

**24.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2016-2017:

This benchmark has been met or exceeded.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark for this assessment was met. The candidates had a mean score of 3.00 or above in each component measured on the Field Experience Evaluation Domain 5 rubric during the student teaching semester. There were four categories in which at least one candidate did not meet benchmark: 5.3, 5.7, 5.8, and 5.9.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Music and education faculty will review the data from the FEE Domain 5 rubric and adjust instructional methods and materials as needed.

2018-2019:



The difficulty in making a conclusion of the assessment measures from the provided statistics is that this evaluator was not present to do the observation of said student candidates during their student teaching experiences. The obvious flaw in using this raw data to draw a general conclusion is that many of the sub-categories may not be applicable depending on the actual class that was being observed. 5.1 through 5.5 and 5.12 through 5.14 are the only music content categories that can be expected to be observed during any formal evaluation session.

The benchmark was not met for the 18-19 AY. The following components of Domain 5 met benchmark: 5.4 (100%), 5.5 (100%), 5.6 (100%), 5.11 (100%), and 5.14 (100%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Music education faculty will continue to review the data from the FEE Domain 5 rubric and adjustment to the stated desired outcomes may need to be modified to assure the quality of the conclusions associated with this tool.

Mentors and University Supervisors will be encouraged to look for opportunities to score candidates on Domain 5 of the FEE rubric. In addition, secondary education faculty and Music education faculty should revisit and revise (if needed) the elements of Domain 5 to ensure that they are aligned to appropriate content standards.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- Secondary education faculty and Music Education faculty will meet to review and revise (if necessary) the elements of Domain 5 to ensure that the elements are aligned to current content standards.

2019-2020:

No data available due to the removal of all candidates from their schools - COVID-19. An alternative method of evaluation was instituted.

2020-2021:

The difficulty in making a conclusion of the assessment measures from the provided statistics is that the majority of the semester was dealing with post-natural disasters and pandemic alterations to classroom delivery methods and experiences.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

Music education faculty will continue to review the data from the FEE Domain 5 rubric and make the necessary adjustments to the stated desired outcomes.

Mentors and University Supervisors will be encouraged to look for opportunities to score candidates on Domain 5 of the FEE rubric based on the new assessments.

## 25 Assessment and Benchmark inTASC Standards - Lesson Planning

Assessment: InTASC standards are aligned to the lesson plan components.

Lesson Plan Rubric scoring scale: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 80% of the candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Lesson Plan Rubric.

### 25.1 Data

Music Education - Lesson Plan Data from EDUC 333:

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Essential Questions		Number	0	7	0	11	0	2
		Mean		2.43		1.00		
		Range		2.00-3.00		1.00		

		% Proficient or Higher	43%		0%		
Content Standards		Number					
		Mean	3.14		3.36		3.50
		Range	3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00		3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%		82%		100%
Student Outcomes	4n	Number					
		Mean	2.57		3.00		2.00
		Range	2.00-3.00		1.00-4.00		2.00
		% Proficient or Higher	57%		64%		0%
Technology	5l	Number					
		Mean	3.00		3.45		3.00
		Range	3.00		2.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%		82%		50%
Student Use of Technology		Number					
		Mean					1.50
		Range					1.00-2.00
		% Proficient or Higher					0%
Teacher's Use of Technology		Number					
		Mean					4.00
		Range					4.00
		% Proficient or Higher					100%
Educational Materials		Number					
		Mean	3.00		3.82		4.00
		Range	3.00		3.00-4.00		4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%		100%		100%
Interdisciplinary Connections		Number					
		Mean					3.50
		Range					3.00-4.00
		%					

		Proficient or Higher						100%
Procedures	3k	Number						
		Mean		3.00		3.64		3.00
		Range		3.00		3.00-4.00		3.00
		% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%		100%
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Number						
		Mean		2.43		2.18		2.50
		Range		2.00-3.00		1.00-3.00		2.00-3.00
		% Proficient or Higher		33%		27%		50%
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	8i	Number						
		Mean		2.14		1.45		3.00
		Range		2.00-3.00		1.00-3.00		2.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher		14%		18%		50%
Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice	7k	Number						
		Mean		3.00		3.45		
		Range		3.00		2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher		100%		91%		
Whole Group Methods		Number						
		Mean						2.00
		Range						2.00
		% Proficient or Higher						0%
Collaborative Practice: Methods		Number						
		Mean						3.00
		Range						3.00
		% Proficient or Higher						100%
Independent Practice: Methods		Number						3.00
		Mean						3.00
		Range						100%
		% Proficient or Higher						
		Number						

Closure		Mean	2.29	2.64	3.50
		Range	2.00-3.00	1.00-4.00	3.00-4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	29%	55%	100%
Formative /Summative Assessment	6j	Number			
		Mean	3.00	3.18	
		Range	3.00	2.00-4.00	
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	82%	
Informal Assessment		Number			
		Mean			4.00
		Range			4.00
		% Proficient or Higher			100%
Formal Assessment		Number			
		Mean			4.00
		Range			4.00
		% Proficient or Higher			100%
Relevance & Rationale	2j	Number			
		Mean	3.00	3.18	3.00
		Range	3.00	1.00-4.00	3.00
		% Proficient or Higher	100%	82%	100%
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Number			
		Mean	2.14	2.36	4.00
		Range	2.00-3.00	1.00-4.00	4.00
		% Proficient or Higher	14%	27%	100%
Differentiation	7j	Number			
		Mean	2.00	2.36	
		Range	2.00	1.00-4.00	
		% Proficient or Higher	0%	46%	
		Number			
		Mean			4.00

Differentiation by Content	Range						4.00
	% Proficient or Higher						100%
Differentiation by Learning Environment	Number						
	Mean						1.00
	Range						1.00
	% Proficient or Higher						0%
Post-Lesson Reflection	Number						
	Mean						1.00
	Range						1.00
	% Proficient or Higher						0%

Rubric Element	InTASC Standard		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
Essential Questions		Number	0	0		
		Mean				
		Range				
		% Proficient or Higher				
Content Standards		Number		6		
		Mean		3.00		
		Range		1.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher		67%		
Student Outcomes	4n	Number		7		
		Mean		2.86		
		Range		2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher		57%		
Technology	5l	Number		5		
		Mean		2.80		
		Range		1.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher		60%		
Student Use of Technology		Number		5		
		Mean		2.20		
		Range		1.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher		40%		

Teacher's Use of Technology		Number	5		
		Mean	3.40		
		Range	2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	80%		
Educational Materials		Number	4		
		Mean	4.00		
		Range	4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%		
Interdisciplinary Connections		Number	4		
		Mean	3.25		
		Range	3.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%		
Procedures	3k	Number	7		
		Mean	3.14		
		Range	2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	71%		
Lesson "Hook"	8j	Number	5		
		Mean	2.20		
		Range	1.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	20%		
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions	8i	Number	7		
		Mean	3.14		
		Range	2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	71%		
Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice	7k	Number	3		
		Mean	2.67		
		Range	2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	33%		
Whole Group Methods		Number	4		
		Mean	3.00		
		Range	2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	75%		

Collaborative Practice: Methods		Number	4		
		Mean	2.50		
		Range	2.00- 3.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	50%		
Independent Practice: Methods		Number	4		
		Mean	2.25		
		Range	1.00- 3.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	50%		
Closure		Number	4		
		Mean	2.25		
		Range	1.00- 4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	25%		
Formative/Summative Assessment	6j	Number	2		
		Mean	4.00		
		Range	4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%		
Informal Assessment		Number	5		
		Mean	3.80		
		Range	3.00- 4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%		
Formal Assessment		Number	5		
		Mean	3.00		
		Range	2.00- 4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	60%		
Relevance & Rationale	2j	Number	6		
		Mean	2.83		
		Range	1.00- 4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	67%		
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental	1e	Number	7		
		Mean	2.57		
		Range	1.00- 4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	57%		

Differentiation	7j	Number	2		
		Mean	3.00		
		Range	2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	50%		
Differentiation by Content		Number	5		
		Mean	2.40		
		Range	2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	20%		
Differentiation by Learning Environment		Number	5		
		Mean	3.00		
		Range	2.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	60%		
Post-Lesson Reflection		Number	3		
		Mean	3.33		
		Range	3.00-4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%		
Content Connection to Assigned Strategy		Number	1		
		Mean	4.00		
		Range	4.00		
		% Proficient or Higher	100%		

2020-2021:

See attached file for 2020-2021 data.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

MUED\_ Lesson Plan Data\_20-21

### 25.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Essential questions will be removed from the lesson plan rubric because they do not align to P-12 classroom instruction of completers.

Categories below the benchmark are being addressed through the revision and clarification of the lesson plan instructions.

2017-2018:

Analysis of Data: The benchmark was not met. There were several areas in which the mean score for the two candidates with data reported was below 3.00: Student Outcomes (2.00); Student use of Technology (1.50); Lesson Hook (2.50); Whole Group Methods (2.00); Differentiation by Learning Environment (1.00); and Post-Lesson Reflection (1.00). In five of the categories listed above, neither of the candidates scored above the benchmark.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: The scores reported above pose concern. During 2018-2019, a piloted version of EDUC 333 is being created to directly address the needs of the K-12 curriculum areas. This should address the needs of the K-12 candidates to better



understand the lesson plan as it relates to their own content area and therefore performs better in the classroom.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not met for the lesson plan. Specifically, the following elements fell below benchmark: Content Standards (67%), Student Outcomes (57%), Technology (60%), Student Use of Technology (40%), Procedures (71%), Lesson Hook (20%), Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions (71%), Modeled, Guided and Collaborative Independent Practice (33%), Whole Group Methods (75%), Collaborative Practice: Methods (50%), Independent Practice: Methods (50%), Closure (25%), Formal Assessment (60%), Relevance and Rationale (67%), Exploration, Extension, Supplemental (57%), Differentiation (50%), Differentiation by Content (20%), and Differentiation by Learning Environment (60%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The goal is for at least 80% of candidates to score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Lesson Plan Rubric.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

- The inTASC lesson plan is also scored in MUED 425, which follows EDUC 337 in the sequence of courses, during the Field Experiences I & II components of the course. The MUED 425 professor will request the lesson plan rubric results at the conclusion of each semester from the EDUC 337 faculty member in order to use those results to further teach, enhance, and/or stress any perceived weaknesses the music education students are having prior to the start of residency.
- All secondary candidates are required to enroll in a lesson planning course to improve planning.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was not met for the 2020-2021 academic year as there were several elements on the rubric where less than 80% of candidates scored at the proficiency level (3.00) or above: Student Outcomes and Assessments (56%), Explanation for the Inclusion of Cross-Disciplinary Content and 6 ELA Standards (50%), Relevance and Rationale (78%), Small group/Paired Instruction (75%), Independent Practice (75%), Closure (25%), Instructional Resources/Materials (50%), Teacher's Use of Technology (50%), Student Use of Technology (33%), Assessments (78%), Differentiation by Content, Product, and Process (22%), Differentiation by Learner (50%), Post Instruction Response to Intervention (44%) and Reflection of Instructional Strategies (25%).

In on 32% of the elements on the rubric did the candidates meet benchmark. The addition of EDUC 318: Planning and Instruction for Literacy in the Content Area should better prepare candidates for writing and executing lesson plans particular to their subject area.

Additionally, lesson plans will be pulled from methods courses and from the final portfolio to determine growth in the candidate as pertaining to this assessment.

## **26 Assessment and Benchmark FEE - Specific inTASC Standards**

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) measures the following elements: Domain 1: Planning and Preparation; Domain 2: Classroom Environment; Domain 3: Instruction, and Domain 4: Professionalism.

The following scoring scale is used: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 90% of candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element in the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric for Domains 1-4.

### **26.1 Data**

2017-2018:

Data table is attached.

2018-2019:  
Data table is attached.

2019-2020:  
No data table is available.

2020-2021:  
Data table is attached.

*Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).*

Music Education\_FEE\_17-18

Music Education\_FEE\_18-19

Music Education\_FEE\_20-21

### **26.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement**

2016-2017:  
This benchmark has been met or exceeded.

2017-2018:  
Analysis of Data: The benchmark was met. 100% of the candidates scored above the 3.00 benchmark on each element in domains 1-4 with the exception of one candidate scoring 2.88 on element 2.2.3.

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Candidates seem to be performing extremely well on their FEE during Student Teaching. As more work to establish inter-rater reliability occurs, the scores will continue to be analyzed for areas in need of attention.

2018-2019:  
The benchmark was not met. For Domain 2: The Classroom Environment, 88% of the candidates scored at or above benchmark. Specific elements in Domain 2 that fell below benchmark include: 2.1.1 (71%), 2.1.2 (86%), 2.2.1 (86%), 2.2.2 (86%) and 2.2.3 (86%). Also falling below benchmark were the following elements in Domain 3: Instruction, 3.1.1 (86%), 3.1.2 (86%), and 3.3.2 (86%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:  
The benchmark for the 2019-2020 AY will be for 90% of candidates to score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric for Domains 1-4.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:  
- Methods courses will emphasize a shift to student-led discussions  
- Music and Secondary faculty will meet to determine appropriate strategies for fostering student-led discussions and classroom management procedures.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:  
The benchmark was not met. For Domain 2: The Classroom Environment, 82% of the candidates scored below the benchmark. Specific elements in Domain 2 that fell below benchmark include: 2.1.2 (63%), 2.2.2 (63%) and 2.2.3 (86%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:  
The benchmark for 2021 - 2022 will be for 90% of candidates to score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric for Domains 1-4.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:  
- 2.1.2 "Management of Transition" - more emphasis will be placed on dealing with this in MUED 320, MUED 324/326, and MUED 425  
- 2.2.2 "Monitoring of Student Behavior" - the students were not able to complete their Field Experiences I, and II in Fall 2020 due to the pandemic. this area is one of the major

challenges that all music education professionals deal with due to the complexity created by the number of students in many of the ensembles classes

## 27 Assessment and Benchmark Outcomes - TCWS

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

The scoring scale for the Teacher Candidate Work Sample is: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will score a 3.00 or above on each of the elements on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric.

### 27.1 Data

Previous Data:

Music Education - Teacher Candidate Work Sample (data from EDUC 333):

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	7	0	11
	Mean		2.57		3.00
	Range		2.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		43%		82%
Pre-assessment	Number				
	Mean		2.29		2.91
	Range		2.00-3.00		1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		29%		73%
Post-assessment	Number				
	Mean		3.00		2.64
	Range		2.00-4.00		1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		86%		55%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number				
	Mean		2.42		2.91
	Range		2.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		29%		73%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number				
	Mean		2.70		3.00
	Range				
	% Proficient or Higher		71%		91%
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number				
	Mean		2.40		3.27
	Range		2.00-3.00		2.00-4.00

	% Proficient or Higher		43%		91%
Response to Interventions	Number				
	Mean		1.14		3.18
	Range		1.00-2.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		0%		91%

Criteria		Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Fall 2018	Spring 2019
Choice of Assessment (Content Standards and outcomes aligned with expected rigor)	Number	0	2	0	7
	Mean		3.50		3.14
	Range		3.00-4.00		2.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		71%
Strength: Data to Determine	Number		2		7
	Mean		3.50		3.71
	Range		3.00-4.00		3.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%
Weakness: Data to Determine	Number		2		7
	Mean		4.00		4.00
	Range		4.00		4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		100%		100%
Analysis	Number		2		7
	Mean		2.50		2.43
	Range		2.00-3.00		1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		50%		43%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number		2		7
	Mean		2.50		2.43
	Range		2.00-3.00		1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		50%		57%
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number		2		7
	Mean		2.50		3.00
	Range		2.00-3.00		1.00-4.00

	% Proficient or Higher		50%		71%
Response to Interventions	Number		2		7
	Mean		2.50		2.86
	Range		1.00-4.00		1.00-4.00
	% Proficient or Higher		50%		57%

Criteria		Fall 2019	Spring 2020	Fall 2020	Spring 2021
Choice of Assessment	Number				8
	Mean				4.00
	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
Pre-assessmet	Number				8
	Mean				4.00
	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
Post-assessment	Number				8
	Mean				4.00
	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
Analysis	Number				8
	Mean				4.00
	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number				8
	Mean				4.00
	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
Application	Number				8
	Mean				4.00
	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%
Response to	Number				8
	Mean				4.00

Interventions	Range				4.00
	% Proficient or Higher				100%

### 27.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Assessment is a weakness. We are revamping the lesson plan template and rubric, and we are rewriting the education assessment course.

2017-2018:

Analysis of data: four of the seven categories (57%) had a mean score below benchmark: Analysis (2.50); Alignment of Lesson Evidence (2.50); Application (2.50); and Response to Intervention (2.50).

Plan for Continuous Improvement: Alignment of Lesson Evidence has been consistently below the benchmark of 3.00 for the past three cycles of data. K-12 education faculty will revisit the instructions and support provided for this element to make adjustments.

2018-2019:

The benchmark was not met. There were several categories on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample that did not meet benchmark: Choice of Assessment (71%), Analysis (43%), Alignment of Lesson Evidence (57%), Application (71%) and Response to Interventions (57%).

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The Teacher Candidate Work Sample is being replaced with the Teaching Cycle which provides specific expectations and increased rigor with scaffolded support to improve candidate abilities to evaluate student learning and plan for instruction.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

The Teaching Cycle will be scaffolded throughout the program and the Senior Residency Portfolio will include the entire Teaching Cycle. During the Senior Residency Portfolio course candidates will be assigned a mentor professor to assist them, answer questions, and guide them through the full process.

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

The benchmark was met.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The Teacher Candidate Work Sample is being replaced with the Teaching Cycle which provides specific expectations and increased rigor with scaffolded support to improve candidate abilities to evaluate student learning and plan for instruction.

Recommendation for Successful Implementation of Plan for Improvement:

The Teaching Cycle will be scaffolded throughout the program and the Senior Residency Portfolio will include the entire Teaching Cycle. During the Senior Residency Portfolio course candidates will be assigned a mentor professor to assist them, answer questions, and guide them through the full process.

## 28 Assessment and Benchmark Music Praxis PLT

Assessment: Music Education candidates must pass the Praxis PLT before student teaching.

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis exam on the first attempt.

### 28.1 Data

Music Education - Praxis PLT #5624:

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5624 overall	Number		7		11		4
	Mean		165		167		166.75
	Range		159-173		162-181		159-176
	% Pass 1st attempt		71%		100%		75%
#5624 breakdown:	Number		7		11		4
Students as Learners	Mean		14		14		14.25
	Range		9-17		11-17		11-16
	% correct (21)		67%		67%		68%
Instructional Process	Mean		14		15		15
	Range		10-18		13-18		14-17
	% correct (21)		67%		71%		75%
Assessment	Mean		8		8		8.5
	Range		6-11		5-11		6-11
	% correct (14)		57%		57%		61%
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean		9		9		8.5
	Range		5-12		6-11		6-10
	% correct (14)		64%		64%		71%
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean		10		10		10.25
	Range		7-14		8-14		6-14
	% correct (16)		63%		63%		64%

		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Fall 2019	Spring 2020
#5624 overall	Number	0	8		
	Mean		166.1		
	Range		159-161		
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%		
#5624 breakdown:	Number		7		
Students as Learners	Mean		15.1		
	Range		12-19		
	% correct (21)		72%		
Instructional Process	Mean		14.1		
	Range		12-17		
	% correct				

	(21)		67%		
Assessment	Mean		9.9		
	Range		8-11		
	% correct (14)		70%		
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean		8.1		
	Range		6-10		
	% correct (14)		63%		
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean		8.6		
	Range		8-9		
	% correct (16)		54%		

2020-2021:

See attached file for 2020-2021 data.

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

MUED\_Praxis PLT\_20-21

### 28.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Although 100% of students passed prior to student teaching, 71% passed on the first attempt.

2017-2018:

75% (3/4) of the completers in 2017-2018 achieved passing scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam on the first attempt. Over the past three years, mean scores have been fairly consistent across categories, with "Assessment" yielding the lowest percentage correct scores each year.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The assessment course has been revised to better prepare candidates for the types of assessments that they will need to create and analyze in the classroom. This should also have a direct effect on the scores achieved in this sub-category of the Praxis PLT.

2018-2019:

100% (7/7) of the completers in 2018-2019 achieved passing scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam on the first attempt. Over the past four years, mean scores have been fairly consistent across categories, with "Assessment" yielding the lowest percentage correct scores each year.

Plan for Continuous Improvement:

The assessment course has been revised to better prepare candidates for the types of assessments that they will need to create and analyze in the classroom. This should also have a direct effect on the scores achieved in this sub-category of the Praxis PLT. [This course is in the College of Education and thus the music education faculty have little input as to the quality of instruction as it relates to outcomes].

2019-2020:

2020-2021:

100% (8/8) of the completers in 2020-2021 achieved passing scores on the Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching Exam on the first attempt. Over the past four years, mean scores have been fairly consistent across categories, with "Assessment" yielding the lowest percentage of correct scores each year.



**Plan for Continuous Improvement:**

The assessment course has been revised to better prepare candidates for the types of assessments that they will need to create and analyze in the classroom. This should also have a direct effect on the scores achieved in this sub-category of the Praxis PLT. [This course is in the College of Education and thus the music education faculty have little input as to the quality of instruction as it relates to outcomes].

End of report