

Annual Assessment Report for 2021-2022 AY

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2021-2022 AY will be due September 30th 2022 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh (douglasf@csufresno.edu).

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

Department/Program: _____ Music _____ Degree __BA__

Assessment Coordinator: _____ Tony Mowrer, Ph.D. _____

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

PLO5. Students will demonstrate their performance ability and knowledge in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, the following:

SLO 5a. Performing, at a high level, music from a variety of time epochs, genres, and styles

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

This Learning Outcome is assessed through the Performance Exams and Juries administered to each student taking studio lessons each semester. This includes all students though only students at various stages complete juries while others complete Performance Exams. Rubrics are attached. Specific criteria for Juries are found in the Department Handbook and vary by instrument, as follows. The following is available for students on the Department website: <https://cah.fresnostate.edu/music/students/undergrad-handbook.html>

Juries

A jury is a performance in which the student demonstrates a prescribed set of competencies before a faculty committee. Juries are assessments of the student's progress in the development of his/her artistic and technical abilities on the student's declared performing medium. The faculty for whom the student performs will judge your performance according to an established set of criteria.

Grading for All Juries

Students must pass ALL COMPONENTS of the Jury Examination SIMULTANEOUSLY to receive credit; minimum grade for passing is a "C" for students in the Music as a Liberal Art and Music Education options. A minimum grade for passing is a "B" for students in the Performance (Instrumental, Vocal, Jazz) and Composition options.

The Jury letter grade will be counted as the "final exam" in applied lessons for the semester in which the jury is completed.

Jury I

Upon conclusion of the second semester of music 31-39, or 48, students must attempt Jury I in their declared area of concentration before being permitted to continue their major. Students are allowed two attempts, taken in consecutive semesters, to pass Jury I.

Jury II

To qualify to take Jury II and upon completion of their second year of residence, students must have passed Music 1A, 1B, 40, and 41 with a grade of "C" or better, and passed the Piano Proficiency Examination. Students are allowed two attempts, taken in consecutive semesters, to pass Jury II. Failure to pass a second attempt will result in the student being dropped from the Vocal Performance, Instrumental Performance, Composition, and Music Education options. These students will be allowed to continue their studies in the Music as a Liberal Art option.

Jury Requirements

Teachers from each respective studio establish specific skills, which must be mastered, to pass Jury I and Jury II. See the syllabus for your applied lessons class for these. Your studio teacher may also specify repertoire to be used on your jury exams. The following are general standards for the various performance areas.

Strings: Violin, Viola, Cello, Bass

Jury I

- *Unaccompanied work which may also include an etude or a caprice.*
- *Two pieces in contrasting styles, or two contrasting movements from a large work like a sonata or concerto.*

Jury II

- *Unaccompanied work which may also include an etude or a caprice.*
- *Two pieces in contrasting styles, (or two contrasting movements from a large work like a sonata or concerto)*

- *The selections in Jury II must be more advanced compared with Jury I and must be performed from memory, with the exception of chamber music works, including sonatas.*

Wind & Brass

Jury I

- *Play major and minor scales up to four sharps and flats*
- *Perform an etude*
- *Perform an accompanied or unaccompanied solo*

Jury II

- *All major and minor (natural, harmonic, melodic) scales; chromatic scales*
- *Perform an etude*
- *Perform an accompanied or unaccompanied solo*

Percussion

Jury I:

- *Play major and minor scales (harmonic, melodic) up to four sharps and flats*
- *Perform a snare drum and timpani etude*
- *Perform a memorized solo with accompaniment on a mallet keyboard instrument.*

Jury II:

- *All major and minor (harmonic, melodic) scales; chromatic scales*
- *Perform a multiple percussion and timpani etude*
- *Perform a memorized four-mallet solo on mallet keyboard instrument*

Piano

Piano students present 3 pieces in contrasting styles for Jury I, and another, more advanced, group of 3 pieces in contrasting styles for Jury II. All jury pieces must be played from memory. For both Jury I and Jury II, piano students also demonstrate their sight-reading ability.

Guitar

Jury I:

- *Scales (1 and 2 octave): major and minor scales, emphasis on correct left and right hand fingering*
- *Studies from any of the following: Tarrega, Sor, Carcassi, Giuliani*
- *A solo selected from the intermediate level repertoire for guitar; must be memorized*

Jury II:

- *Scales (3 octaves): all major and minor, from the Diatonic Major and Minor Scale book by Andreas Segovia; emphasis on tone quality and correct fingering*
- *Studies from any of the following: Tarrega, Sor, Carcassi, Giuliani*
- *A solo selected from the guitar repertoire or appropriate transcription from other instruments; must be memorized*

Voice

Jury I (attempted after the first semester of study; retaken if necessary, after end of second semester):

- *At least seven memorized solos, two or more of which must be in a foreign language*
- *Vaccai Studies in Italian - Level 1*
- *Major scale and selected triads*
- *Check of tonal memory*

Jury II (taken after 4 semesters of study):

- *Sixteen memorized solos complete to date*
- *Vaccai Studies in Italian - Level 2*
- *All minor, chromatic, and whole tone scales; the Alma Mater*

The vocal and choral areas have separate handbooks to cover juries and related matters. See these for more specific information about jury requirements. If you do not already have the appropriate handbook, ask your studio teacher for one.

Composition

Composition Jury:

- *Works submitted must demonstrate that the student shows adequate promise to continue with the composition emphasis and ultimately mount a successful composition senior recital*
- *A portfolio of 3 recent compositions (including recordings or MIDI realizations).*
- *A list of works/curriculum vitae*
- *A reflective essay that addresses professional goals, musical aesthetics, and compositional intent.*
- *A self-assessment of sample works.*

Jury II:

- *Works submitted must demonstrate that the student shows adequate promise to generate works of a high enough quality for the composition senior recital.*

- *A portfolio of 3 compositions composed as a student at CSU Fresno (including recordings or MIDI realizations)*
- *A list of works/curriculum vitae*
- *A reflective essay that addresses professional goals, musical aesthetics, and compositional intent.*
- *A self-assessment of sample works.*

Works submitted must demonstrate adequate sensitivity (appropriate to the student's level) regarding important musical issues, such as: musical invention, structural clarity, formal unity/cohesion, accurate and practical notation, successful use of performance medium and sense of musical detail.

Instrumental Jazz Performance

Jury II:

- *All major(modes) and minor (natural, harmonic, melodic) scales; chromatic scales, diminished scales, whole tone scales*
- *Perform an etude or transcription*
- *Perform one accompanied tune*

Instrumental Jazz Performance - Percussion

Vibraphone

- *Scales (full range and including arpeggios) consisting of all major modes, altered dominant, Lydian dominant, diminished, diminished dominant and whole tone*
- *Prepare one tune from the standard jazz repertory including melody, accompaniment and two improvised choruses*

Drum Set

- *Prepare one tune from the standard jazz repertory improvising over form while interpreting melodic and harmonic information.*
- *Sight read a rhythmic style etude or drum chart equivalent*
- *Perform one time-keeping or solo transcription (transcribed and notated by student)*

While Juries carry greater weight, the same form and rubric are, generally, used to provide feedback for Performance Exams and for Juries. Of necessity, some areas, i.e. Voice and Composition use different forms/rubrics for the feedback they provide students. These are provided at the conclusion of this report.

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

128 students were evaluated during the spring 2022 semester. Students who completed their recitals in the current or previous semesters were exempt from this evaluation. In addition, students who are in the Music as a Liberal Art Option do not take lessons after their fourth semester as a student. Consequently, they are not required to take Performance Exams or Juries after their fourth semester as students.

The rubric most used to assess Performance Exams and juries in the Department is used to assess several categories of performance, including Technical Mastery, Musicianship, Repertoire, Stage Presence, and Memorization. Possible scores in each area range from 1-6. The average score awarded in these areas range from a low of 4.99 to a perfect 6. Given this range of scores, a 4 will be considered a marginal score and any score below a 4 will be considered failing. Only a few students included on this rubric were given a score as low as a 2 or 3 indicating that these students were not reaching the high level of performance apparently being reached by their colleagues.

As mentioned above, the Composition and Voice areas have developed different forms more suitable for their needs. The Composition area uses these forms for their exams and Juries while the Voice area uses the standard rubric for Performance Exams and the different form, using a 100 point scale, for Juries. Jury scores for nine students were recorded. Over-all, the average score for the nine students was 89.94. Of the nine students, two students received failing scores--<80%.

The Composition area uses a 5-point rubric but changes the areas of judgement to better fit the Composition area. Because of the 5-point scale, it is expected that over-all scores might appear to be lower than other music students placed on a 6-point scale. Scores were recorded for 14 Composition students. The average score for each area of examination ranged from a 4.3 to a high of 4.7, good to high scores.

Based on the data recorded, all but 5 students met or exceeded the minimum allowable score on their Performance Exam or Jury. Over-all, students in the Music Department seem to be meeting performance goals, as observed through their scores on Performance Exams and Juries.

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

Music students become music majors largely because they enjoy performing their instrument. Because of the varying quality of music programs in the school districts in California and in the Central Valley, it is expected that there will be a range of abilities welcomed to the Department each year. That our students perform on their instruments at, generally, high levels is a testament to their instructors and their dedication to skill improvement. Given this variation of skill levels along with fairly consistent high scores on Exams and Juries, however, one does question the possibility of grade inflation. Studio professors might give some thought to this possibility and consider their level of generosity when scoring these Exams and Juries.

During the 2021/2022 year, the Department recognized weaknesses regarding the rubric that had been used for many years. The Voice and Composition areas had already modified the rubric so it would work better for those areas. In response, a new rubric was approved in May 2022 and will be used for the first time in December 2022. The new rubric, as well as the Composition and Voice forms, are attached. The number system of the new rubric changes from a 6-point scale to a 10-point scale. This may be helpful in mitigating any grade inflation that may exist.

While our students generally do well on performance exams, one significant issue did come up that the Department needs to address. This involves the process as opposed to rubrics, grade inflation, or substance. When compiling the data, it became clear that not all studio areas are adhering to the standard practice of having multiple professors involved in assessing each student. As many as four professors were involved in assessing these exams in some studio areas. The most common number involved in assessing exams is two professors and that seems reasonable, given the expertise required to adequately assess a student's performance. There were several cases in a number of instrument areas, however, where only a single professor was involved in assessing these Exams and Juries. The Department needs to take steps to assure that multiple professors are present for every Performance Exam and Jury. This will add a measure of validity to the scores students receive on these assessments.

5. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in your 2020-21 assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year's report please write N/A as your answer to this question.

N/A

While no changes in the process were recommended in 2020/2021, some student weaknesses were noted and curriculum changes are to be implemented at such time as the Bachelor of Music program elevation is brought online. The BM has been approved by the Chancellor's Office and, as of summer, 2022, approval has been gained by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). NASM has requested further information of Music Education as a result of its linkage with the Kremen School of Education before granting final accreditation to that program. The Music Education program has been approved by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing for many years. It is the only program in the Music Department requiring this level of accreditation, in addition to NASM.

6. What assessment activities will you be conducting during AY 2022-23?

2022/2023 will mark the beginning of the new degree program, Bachelor of Music. The new SOAP for this program has been provided and should be available on the University SOAP page. The PLO being assessed in 2022/2023 is PLO3. Assessments will be completed via course exams.

PLO3. Students will demonstrate their knowledge of world music in a variety of ways including, but not limited to, the following:

SLO 3a. Identify, describe, and analyze differences in genres and styles found in music from world cultures.

NOTE: For the AY 2021-22 Report, due September 30, 2022, there is no Question 7 pertaining to program review. For future Department/Program Annual Assessment Reports, there will be a question about how your Department/Program has planned to incorporate Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion into your assessment practices. We will discuss JEDI at assessment workshops in fall 2022 and resources will be available in the Department Coordinators Google Drive.

Performance Assessment Form

Student's Name _____ Performance Date _____

MA or BA Option _____ Instrument/Voice Type _____

Type of Performance (Circle One): Recital Jury I Jury II Performance Examination

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

Assessment of Technical Mastery:

Rating _____

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

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

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

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

Assessment of Musicianship:

Rating _____

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

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

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

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

Breadth of Repertoire:**Rating** _____

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

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

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

Stage Presence:**Rating** _____

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

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

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

Memorization (if applicable):**Rating** _____

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

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

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

Overall Assessment of Performance:

Rating _____

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

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

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

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

Faculty Comments:

Overall Rating: _____ **A - C = Pass** **D - F = Fail**

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

Faculty committee member signature: _____

adopted Fall 2004

Voice Jury Grading Sheet

Student Name _____ Student ID: _____

Studio Faculty Name _____

Date _____ Jury I Jury II (circle one) Attempt 1 2

	Diction Pronunciation	Rhythmic Accuracy	Pitch Accuracy	Scales
Scoring	Number of Errors	Number of Errors	Number of Errors	Number of Errors
	Score /25	Score /25	Score /25	Score /25

Note: 5 points are deducted for stopping, more than 1 point is deducted for major errors.

Total score /100

Letter Score (A=90-100, B 80-90, F below 80)

Pass _____ Fail _____

Other faculty scores

NAME _____ Score /100

NAME _____ Score /100

NAME _____ Score /100

Final score _____ 100

_____ (check here) This is the second attempt and the student has failed therefore the student cannot continue in the major (Jury 1) or cannot continue in the Music Ed/Performance option (Jury 2).

Faculty Signature _____

Faculty Signature _____

Faculty Signature _____

Faculty Signature _____

-PLEASE PRINT LEGABLY-

Student's Name: _____ FS ID#: _____

COMPOSITION ASSESSMENT FORM – Semester _____

Student Name: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____

Type of Assessment (Check One):

Jury I

Jury II

Recital

Hearing

Semester Examination

Rating Scale:

Outstanding = 5 (A), Very Good = 4 (B), Satisfactory = 3 (C),

Unsatisfactory = 2 (D), Failing = 1 (F)

Ratings

Aesthetic Goals: The capacity for the student's work to demonstrate clear aesthetic goals and to realize those goals in an effective musical manner. A high ranking demonstrates both a clear rationalization as well as an effective musical treatment of chore concepts in the work.

Rating (1-5) _____

Musical Invention: The ability of the student to express and develop core musical concepts as they relate to the works aesthetic goals. These concepts may be expressive, dramatic, abstract, or theoretical in nature. A high ranking demonstrates a clear and successful development of these concepts.

Rating (1-5) _____

Formal Design: The capacity for the student's work to demonstrate an appropriate degree of structural clarity, formal unity, and cohesion. A high ranking, demonstrates that the work successfully conveys this clarity through effective use of repetition, contrast, development, etc.

Rating (1-5) _____

Use of Performance Medium: The ability of the student to compose effectively and/or idiomatically for the performance medium or media utilized (vocal, instrumental, electronic, multi-media, etc.). A high ranking demonstrates very effective use of the vocal, instrumental, and electronic voices present.

Rating (1-5) _____

Presentation: The ability of the student to represent their music accurately and clearly within their score and/or through performance. A high ranking demonstrates the student's ability to not only accurately represent their music in the score and/or through performance, but also their ability to present their music as it would be seen in a professionally published manuscript or heard in a professional recital.

Rating (1-5) _____

Breadth of Creativity: The capacity of the student to compose works of a wide variety of media and styles, if such variety is appropriate to the composer's personal aesthetic goals. A high ranking demonstrates both the will and the capacity of the student to push their own personal boundaries and explore concepts that develop and/or exceed part aesthetic goals.

Rating (1-5) _____

Compositional Voice: The ability of the student to exemplify a means towards developing a consistent and individualized musical voice. A high ranking demonstrates that the student has either achieved, or is working to achieve, a distinctive compositional style or manner of expression.

Rating (1-5) _____

Sub Total: add point values of all previous categories

35 = 5 = A+

Divided by seven (number of categories)

 / 7

OVERALL ASSESSMENT:

Grade: Pass	4.5 – 5.0	A	Fail	2.5 – 2.99	C-
	3.5 – 4.49	B		1.5 – 2.49	D
	3.9-3.49	C		0-1.49	F



Evaluating Professor Signature: _____

Comments:

Undergraduate Jury/Performance Assessment Form

Student Name: _____ Semester: _____

Degree Track: _____ Instrument/Voice Type: _____

Type of Performance (Circle One):

Entrance Audition Jury I Jury II Jury III Performance Exam Recital Hearing Recital

Scales (If jurying): Pass _____ Fail _____ Memorization (If Required): Pass _____ Fail _____

Sight Reading (if applicable): Pass _____ Fail _____

Assessment of Technical Mastery(40%) _____

Excellent (9-10) A: The student performs with pitch, intonation, articulation, and rhythmic accuracy at a very high level. Throughout the performance, the student's technical mastery is easily and consistently executed, and clearly exceeds the fundamental technical standards of their instrument or voice.

Very Good (8-8.9) B: Throughout the performance, the student is well prepared and delivers a competent performance that exceeds the fundamental performance standards for technical mastery of their instrument or voice.

Satisfactory (7-7.9) C: Throughout the performance, the student is adequately prepared and delivers a performance that meets the fundamental performance standards for technical mastery of their instrument or voice.

Failing (0-6.9) F: The student has significant technical weaknesses throughout the performance and falls below the fundamental performance standards for technical mastery of their instrument or voice.

Assessment of Musicianship (40%) _____

Excellent (9-10) A: The student clearly performs with a musical understanding at a very high level.

Very Good (8-8.9) B: The student performs with above average application of fundamental musicianship skills.

Satisfactory (7-7.9) C: The student performs with basic application of fundamental musicianship skills.

Failing (0-6.9) F: The student does not meet a fundamental level of musicianship skills.

Stage Presence (20%): _____

Outstanding (9-10) A: The student is dressed appropriately, exhibits confidence, poise, appropriately acknowledges other performers, bows appropriately, is clearly comfortable with his or her environment and is enjoying the act of performing.

Excellent (8-8.9) B: The student is dressed appropriately, exhibits confidence, poise, appropriately acknowledges other performers, bows appropriately, but is slightly uncomfortable with his or her environment and/or with the act of performing.

Satisfactory (7-7.9) C: The student is dressed appropriately, exhibits some confidence and some poise. The student acknowledges other performers and bows appropriately but is clearly not comfortable with their environment and/or the act of performing.

Unsatisfactory/Failing (0-6.9) F: The student did not dress appropriately, lacks two or more of the following elements: confidence, poise, appropriate acknowledgement of other performers, bowing. The student is clearly uncomfortable with his or her environment and/or with the act of performing.

Faculty Comments:

Overall Rating:

Technical = __ x 4 =

Musical = __ x 4 =

Stage Presence = __ x 2 =

Total = __/100

A= 90-100, B= 80-89.9, C = 70-79.9, F = 0-69.9

JURY:

_____ Pass all sections

_____ Fail (Reason: _____)

Faculty committee member signature: _____