DATA SAY:
The Department of Music has been using a rubric for an end-of-semester jury evaluation of applied music performance. The rubric contains 10 constructs. Eight of these were evaluated by the Office of Assessment. Each construct correlates significantly with the others. Students scored an average of 3.0 on a 4.0 rubric for all constructs. Inter-rater reliability was high for all constructs except professionalism and repertoire.

SO WHAT:
Students are meeting expectations; however, the high correlation between 6 of the 8 constructs indicates that the detailed rubric may be more useful as a 2-construct instrument that measures musical ability (tone quality, intonation, technique, rhythm, interpretation, and dynamics) and musician’s presentation (repertoire and professionalism). The current rubric is tedious, but it supported the faculty's previous less detailed assessments. We need something more global and succinct for faculty use and feedback to students.

HOW WE CHANGED:
The Department of Music compiled findings with help of Office of Assessment, who provided faculty with individual feedback as to how each juror rated students compared to other jurors. The faculty will hold open discussions in a search for something more global which better reflects the priorities of the faculty as we assess student learning outcomes. We also will discuss what we mean by professionalism and repertoire.

WHAT WE GOT:
Faculty attended a summer 2013 assessment institute to compare their ratings with those of colleagues and discuss differences in perceptions of student performance levels. Based on the criteria examined and faculty discussion, the Department of Music will modify the assessment instrument and accompanying definitions accordingly.