

Dear Music department,

As you will recall, your 2018 Departmental Assessment Report was guided by the Assessment Committee's suggestions in our letter from last Spring. This year, the committee read and discussed your department's 2018 Assessment Meeting Report and filled out a new rubric, focusing on your Narrative of Strength and your Action Plan for Improvement.

Your 2019 Departmental Assessment Report should include three things and be e-mailed to Sasha Pfau (Assessment Committee Chair) by May 31, 2019:

1. A copy of the Rubric that your department developed at the 2018 Fall Faculty Conference.
2. An updated Student Assessment Plan.
3. A response to the Assessment Committee's targeted feedback.

### **1. Rubric**

First, we would like you to share the Rubric that your department developed during Fall Faculty Conference. These Rubrics will be posted on the Academic Affairs website so that departments can share in each other's expertise. We would also like to ask you to use the draft Rubric to consider some of your majors this year and provide a brief summary of that conversation.

### **2. Student Assessment Plan**

In examining your Student Assessment Plan, we are recommending that all departments take a look at what is online here:

<https://www.hendrix.edu/academicaffairs/annualassessments/>

You will need to be logged in to view your SAP. We note that your plan online has learning goals and some description of assessment tools, but not a lot of detail about how those will be used.

A strong SAP includes:

- Departmental Learning Goals
- Curriculum Mapping
- Plans for Gathering Information:
  - At least one form of indirect assessment (student survey, exit interview, etc.)
  - At least one form of direct assessment (rubric for a capstone, common course, or learning goal, standardized exam, etc.)
  - A planned cycle for assessment of the goals (i.e. you don't have to assess all goals every year)

### **3. Response to Targeted Feedback**

For your response to our targeted feedback, we have attached a rubric that the Assessment Committee developed in order to give you a high-level view of your

department's responses to the prompts from 2018. This is intended to assist you in developing future action. You should be aware that this cannot be an assessment of what you are doing but only an assessment of what you said on the form you submitted.

As you can see from the rubric, we thought your Narrative of Strength approached standards and your Action Plan for Improvement did as well. The committee would like you to provide us with more information about the rubric that you developed for your senior projects. How has that helped assess student achievement of departmental learning goals?

We welcome you to invite members of the Assessment Committee to come to one of your department meetings this Spring if you think that would be helpful. We have been impressed with your dedication to improvement of student learning, and hope that you will carry on with the momentum that our whole campus developed in our preparation for the Higher Learning Commission's visit.

Thanks in advance,  
Sasha and Megan

Rubric for Department Assessment Meeting Report 2018			
Narrative of Strength (Evidence Based Reason)	Changes made were in response to evidence of student development <input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	Changes were made using weak, anecdotal, or indirect evidence of student development <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	Changes were made with no reference to evidence of student development OR no changes were made <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
Narrative of Strength (Concise)	Changes were explained clearly and concisely <input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	Changes were explained <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	Changes were not explained <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
Narrative of Strength (Plan for Continual Evaluation)	Department has a clearly outlined, defined plan to monitor this going forward <input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	Department has a plan to monitor this going forward, but the plan needs to be reevaluated (see comments) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	Department does not have a defined plan for follow-up <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
Action Plan for Improvement	Action plan addresses committees recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	Action plan is not related to the committee's recommendation, but still seems relevant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	Action plan is unclear and cannot be measured <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
	Evaluation Plan is evidence-based and evidence collected clearly speaks to the evaluation of the action plan and can be used in decision making <input type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	It is unclear how the evaluation plan will be executed and how it will be used in decision making <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	Evaluation plan is not evidence based or it is unclear how evidence collected can be used in decision making <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
Departmental Goals	Department has clear learning goals that reflect desired student outcomes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Meets/Exceeds Standards	Learning goals are a work in progress <input type="checkbox"/> Approaches Standards	Department has no discernable learning goals <input type="checkbox"/> Needs Attention
	Learning Goals are mapped to curriculum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

	PERFORMANCE (50%)					PRESENTATION (50%)					
	Accuracy of Pitches, Rhythms, Intonation	Tone Quality	Interpretation	Stage Etiquette	Vocalists: Diction	Clear Argument	Audience Engagement	Relationship between music performed and research	Argument supported by specific evidence	Clear organization	Appropriate delivery
<b>Music Major Requirements</b>											
MUSI 100 Fundamentals	x							x			
MUSI 200 Diatonic Harmony	x		x			x		x	x		
MUSI 300 Chromatic Harmony	x		x			x		x	x		
MUSI 400 Form & Analysis/Composition			x			x		x	x	x	
MUSI 300 Music History I			x			x	x	x	x		
MUSI 300 Music History II			x			x	x	x	x	x	x
MUSI 200 World Music						x	x			x	x
MUSA 200 Ensembles	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x
MUSA 300/400 Lessons	x	x	x	x	x						

## Hendrix College Music Department

### Jury Evaluation Form

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_

	Poor (D and below)	Average (C)	Good (B)	Excellent (A)
<b>1. Tone Quality 25%</b>	Underdeveloped tone lacking focus and clarity.  <b>50% 55% 60% 65%</b>	Tone is developing and demonstrates inconsistency in quality. Fuzziness or lack of clarity sometimes evident.  <b>70% 75%</b>	Tone quality is generally strong, with occasional issues of technique. The student displays the ability to correct issues during the performance.  <b>80% 85%</b>	Tone quality is vibrant, rich, and produced at a high level throughout the repertoire performed.  <b>90% 95% 100%</b>
<b>2. Accuracy of Pitches, Rhythms, and Intonation 25%</b>	Note/rhythm errors interfere with the musical flow. Performer has to restart due to errors. Intonation is poor. Poor breath support/bow control adversely affects intonation.  <b>50% 55% 60% 65%</b>	Note/rhythm errors evident, but the overall performance remains effective. Pulse and rhythm are not always steady. Intonation issues evident. Inconsistent breath/bow control affects intonation.  <b>70% 75%</b>	Minor note/rhythm errors. Pulse and rhythm are under control most of the time. Overall intonation is good; minor issues occur and performer demonstrates ability to adjust pitch.  <b>80% 85%</b>	Notes and rhythms performed nearly flawlessly. Superb control of pulse and rhythm. Outstanding intonation in all registers and volumes.  <b>90% 95% 100%</b>
<b>3. Expression and Interpretation 25%</b>	Performer lacks a fundamental understanding of the music. Tempo choices are not stylistically appropriate. The performance is not expressive. Lack of dynamic contrasts. Performer's sense of phrasing needs further development. Phrasing lacks cohesiveness.  <b>50% 55% 60% 65%</b>	Performer's musical interpretation is developing. Tempo choices are sometimes not always appropriate. The performance is somewhat expressive, but within a narrow dynamic range. Phrasing evident, but lacks definition, nuance and/or fluidity.  <b>70% 75%</b>	Performer displays a good understanding of the music and a clear sense of musical interpretation. Tempo choices are generally appropriate. The performance is expressive, but sometimes sound is harsh/distorted during passages with dynamic/range extremes. Expressive phrase shaping and contouring of phrases with minor flaws.  <b>80% 85%</b>	Performer displays a deep understanding of the music to render an emotive musical interpretation. Tempo choices are appropriate and tasteful. The performance is highly expressive. Dynamics performed extremely well at all volumes and in all registers. Performer demonstrates a mature sense of phrasing and musicianship.  <b>90% 95% 100%</b>
<b>4. Stage Etiquette 10%</b>	Presentation is not polished at all. Dress and/or demeanor were not appropriate.  <b>50% 55% 60% 65%</b>	Presentation lacks polish. Dress and/or demeanor were somewhat appropriate.  <b>70% 75%</b>	Presentation mostly polished but with minor flaws. Dress and stage demeanor are mostly appropriate.  <b>80% 85%</b>	Presentation is polished and professional. Dress and stage demeanor are appropriate.  <b>90% 95% 100%</b>
<b>5. Vocalists: Diction and Pronunciation 15%</b>	Diction is nonexistent throughout. Consonants are unclear. Pronunciation of language is not correct.  <b>50% 55% 60% 65%</b>	Diction is inconsistent. Many consonants are unclear. Pronunciation has several flaws.  <b>70% 75%</b>	Diction is very good most of the time. A few consonants are not clear. Pronunciation is correct most of the time.  <b>80% 85%</b>	Diction is superior throughout the entire performance. Consonants are clear and pronunciation of language is correct.  <b>90% 95% 100%</b>
<b>5. Instrumentalists: Scales 15%</b>	Many note errors and/or very inconsistent tempo.  <b>50% 55% 60% 65%</b>	Note/tempo issues were evident.  <b>70% 75%</b>	Scales had minor errors. Perhaps some wavering of tempo.  <b>80% 85%</b>	Scales were perfect or nearly perfect. Performed at consistent tempo.  <b>90% 95% 100%</b>

<b>A. Categories 1-3 Average x 75%</b>	<b>B. Category 4 x 10%</b>	<b>C. Category 5 x 15%</b>	<b>TOTAL (sum of A,B,C)</b>
			%

**Hendrix College Music Department  
Jury Evaluation Form**

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_

Additional comments & feedback:

**Faculty Name** \_\_\_\_\_

**Faculty Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

**HENDRIX COLLEGE**  
 Department of Music  
**APPLIED MUSIC SUMMARY**

Area \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Class \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Major \_\_\_\_\_

Home Address \_\_\_\_\_ Home Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Local Address \_\_\_\_\_ Local Phone \_\_\_\_\_

	FALL	SPRING
Instructor		
Course Number		
Instrument/Voice		
Avg. Weekly Practice Hours		

**MATERIALS:** Continue on reverse, if necessary. Use "+" to indicate personal library materials.

<b><u>Technical/Developmental</u></b>		
---------------------------------------	--	--

<b><u>Etude/Study Literature</u></b>		
--------------------------------------	--	--

**Repertoire:**

<b>Solo/Chamber</b> (indicate public performances w/*)		
---	--	--

<b><u>Other:</u></b> (books, articles, recordings, etc.)		
--	--	--

**SUMMARY:**

Ensembles this term:		
Lesson Absence		
Recital Absence		
Technique/etude grade		
Repertoire grade		
Jury Grade		
Final Grade		

