

**Music Education (B.M.E.)  
Assessment of Student Learning Report  
2022**

**A. Program Information**

Department: **Music, Theatre, and Dance**  
 Program: **Music Education (B.M.E.)**  
 Contact Name: Phillip Payne  
 Contact Email: ppayne@ksu.edu  
 Program assessment website: <http://www.k-state.edu/musiceducation/slos.html>

**B. Outcome Reporting**

**Student Learning Outcomes**

**SLO 1**

The teacher of PK-12 music has skills in pedagogy (planning, delivering instruction, and assessment) for vocal, instrumental, and general music.

**Assessment Methods(s)** Briefly describe the assessment tools, measures, or forms of evidence that will be utilized to demonstrate students' accomplishment of the learning outcomes and who will be assessed.

**.....Assessment 1 and expected level of performance**

Data are collected from rubric criteria items embedded into three course projects: Peer Masterclass (MSUC 670), Unit Plan Fair (MUSIC 670), and Final Jazz Teaching Episode (MUSIC 513).

**Results** The summary of data related to the prior-set student achievement goals. Identify how many students were assessed, student achievement relating to minimum competency expectations, (if possible student achievement indicators relating to Basic and/or exceptional levels). *The results must include achievement data in addition to a narrative summary.*

**.....Results for assessment 1 and what was learned from the results**

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Basic 70%-84%	Accomplished 85%-94%	Exemplary 95% <
5	2005-2006	-----	1	1	3
18	2006-2007	-----	2	5	11
13	2007-2008	-----	1	2	10
6	2008-2009	-----	1	2	3
10	2009-2010	-----	-----	5	5
18	2010-2011	1	4	7	6
9	2011-2012	-----	1	2	6
15	2012-2013	-----	1	3	12
18*	2013-2014	3	3	8	4
21	2014-2015	1	3	7	10
19	2015-2016	1	5	9	4
22	2016-2017	1	5	15	1
26	2017-2018	2	16	7	1
Data Reported Through PBI	2018-2022	X	X	X	X

**DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION**

Scores for candidates on the teaching unit project illustrate that 97% of students are meeting minimum expectations with respect to developing knowledge and skills in pedagogy with 49% meeting full expectations across content and skills. Given the continued refining of the collection mechanism employed through Power BI we are able to be more accurate with identifying areas of weakness within the program. We can also refine the measures to better detect points of misunderstanding and address these through classes, projects, or assignments. While the cumulative results indicate success, we found that selecting appropriate and varied pedagogies based on context and lesson planning emerged as areas where students demonstrated some weaknesses. Areas of interest emerging this academic year focus on integrating technology and proper pedagogies for varied age levels across a curriculum. Our focus will be to aim instruction and activities to specifically address these gaps in both knowledge

and practice. As we suggested last year, this emergence could be the pandemic in limiting both our abilities to model how singing can integrate throughout as well as sharing method materials for both discussion and exploration. We have seen this grow to some extent and this is evident by the increase of students in the emerging category for several areas. If these occurrences were minor, we asked the students to resubmit and revise to ensure they were meeting standard prior to student teaching. In some cases, the students chose to change majors. We will continue to find ways to address this through content, sequencing, and in-class instruction. Our assessments remain effective in differentiating learning and mastery of concepts with respect to instructional planning as we also observe them demonstrate these competencies in the classroom during their student teaching experience. Disaggregating the various lines within the rubrics of multiple embedded assignments have allowed us to be more focused in our course and curricular adjustments as revealed above. These data accurately reflect where the pre-service teachers are in this stage of their development as well as reflect the areas that will need additional attention given the gap in in-person instruction due to COVID-19. A majority of the students are clearly ready for the rigors of the music classroom. Students who scored unsatisfactory in any of the embedded assignments were asked to resubmit as well as have a conference with the professors about what and how to remedy their issues. If all requests were met; they continued in the program. In this case, the two students who scored unsatisfactory completed the assignment as instructed and needed additional information to demonstrate the requested skills. Furthermore, our courses are now designed to allow for formative assessments throughout the course to build competency and/or mastery throughout. This is another example of adjustments we have employed since shifting to Power BI. As always, review of the assessment instrument will continue to be ongoing. In one final comment, we will monitor the impact of COVID-19 carefully as concessions made for timelines impacted quality to some extent and the return to "normality" has created an emergence of a new realization of the expectations. We will monitor this as this academic year continues.

\*Indicates new criteria on categorization.

## SLO 2

The teacher of PK-12 music has skills in creating, arranging, and improvising.

**Assessment Method(s)** Briefly describe the assessment tools, measures, or forms of evidence that will be utilized to demonstrate students' accomplishment of the learning outcomes and who will be assessed.

### .....Assessment 1 and expected level of performance

Data are collected from rubric criteria items embedded into three course projects: Peer Masterclass (MUSIC 670), Beginning Band Episode (MUSIC 513), Cover Band Project (MUSIC 512), and Final Jazz Teaching Episode (MUSIC 513).

**Results** The summary of data related to the prior-set student achievement goals. Identify how many students were assessed, student achievement relating to minimum competency expectations, (if possible student achievement indicators relating to Basic and/or exceptional levels). The results must include achievement data in addition to a narrative summary.

### .....Results for assessment 1 and what was learned from the results

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Basic 70%-84%	Accomplished 85%-94%	Exemplary 95% <
12	2005-2006	2	3	3	4
6	2006-2007	-----	2	2	2
23	2007-2008	2	-----	-----	21
10	2008-2009	-----	-----	3	7
17	2009-2010	-----	-----	-----	17
16	2010-2011	2	1	8	5
16	2011-2012	-----	-----	-----	16
18	2012-2013	-----	-----	-----	18
24*	2013-2014	0	2	9	12
20	2014-2015	3	5	8	4
20	2015-2016	4	2	5	9
26	2016-2017	1	5	15	5
29	2017-2018	5	8	10	6
Data Provided through BI	2018-2022	X	X	X	X

### DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Scores for candidates on the improvisation project illustrate that 95% of the candidates achieved at the minimum level. However, when disaggregating the data, we found that about 42% were only achieving at minimum levels for

selecting appropriate music and improvising melodies. These numbers are an improvement from last year. Given the return to in-person instruction and practica, we are happy to see this improvement and connect it to this return to the classroom in many respects. As mentioned last year, we are beginning to incorporate improvisation back into earlier years as it relates to teaching music, so we anticipate next academic year as the first year to see any impact these changes have had on the development of our students. The improvement just in this year could be an indication of where it is trending; however, we are still in the data collection phase. Additionally, we hope to implement or administer an indirect assessment regarding improvisation and appropriate musical selection during the upcoming year that will better measure their perceptions of readiness in these areas to determine both curricular and instructional decisions. Teaching our students how to assess this process continues to be a focus of this project and one that is still under development as reported in SLO 6. "Another issue we saw emerge in this academic year was that the cover song project in 2020 had a small percentage of students fall into the emerging category. We worked specifically with these students to develop these skills. In every case, there is a hesitancy to break outside of the norm for how they experienced music education. We will continue to refine the process of delivery to allow for more adjustment to this notion of music education." (Quote from last year. We did indeed do this and we are seeing an increased engagement on this process. The limited contact and masking did have some impact, but this year we focused on reframing the experience and the connection is different. The teaching they display is different. We will continue to monitor to see if this anecdotal evidence is supported by a trend in the data. As this process emerges so will our rubrics and assessment of their learning.

\*Indicates new criteria on categorization.

### SLO 3

The teacher of PK-12 music has skills in reading and writing music.

**Assessment Methods(s)** Briefly describe the assessment tools, measures, or forms of evidence that will be utilized to demonstrate students' accomplishment of the learning outcomes and who will be assessed.

**.....Assessment 1 and expected level of performance**

Data are collected from rubric criteria items embedded into three course projects: Juries (MUSIC 255/455), PRAXIS THEORY SCORE (MUSIC PreK-12): assessed on the nationally normed PLT exam), and Beginning Band Teaching Episode (MUSIC 513).

**Results** The summary of data related to the prior-set student achievement goals. Identify how many students were assessed, student achievement relating to minimum competency expectations, (if possible student achievement indicators relating to Basic and/or exceptional levels). *The results must include achievement data in addition to a narrative summary.*

**.....Results for assessment 1 and what was learned from the results**

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Basic 70%-84%	Basic 85%-94%	Exemplary 95% <
32	2005-2006	1	1	8	24
6	2006-2007	1	1	3	1
11	2007-2008	—	—	—	11
21	2008-2009	2	1	8	10
23	2009-2010	2	1	6	14
25	2010-2011	3	1	8	13
31	2011-2012	2	1	8	20
17	2012-2013	0	0	7	10
43*	2013-2014	0	4	31	8
20	2014-2015	0	0	4	16
22	2015-2016	2	8	8	4
23	2016-2017	2	0	0	21
22	2017-2018	0	0	0	22
Scores Reported in PBI	2018-2022	X	X	X	X

**DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION**

In this SLO, we are measuring the students' abilities in reading and writing music. Ultimately, these skills measured in areas outside of the music education division. Our scores continue to indicate that they are proficient in both areas. Across both content and skills, they are 98% meeting minimal expectations with 43% meeting full expectations. With this level of rigor, several areas emerge where we can expect growth moving forward. Among the first areas identified were developing criteria for their students. The ability to determine whether their students have successfully learned to read and write music continues to be a point of struggle for our students across many projects. The ability

to define music literacy is one we must now explore addressing earlier in the curriculum to better address this issue. Some of the changes are not as impactful as we had hoped. We also observed this phenomenon in integrating technology across these same projects. There appears to be a disconnect with how to employ technology for deeper understanding of musical performance. There was also a faculty change this year and some of the projects had not had the same impact as years past and some remediation was occurring. We will monitor to see if the new pathways forged this year create any development in the next two years as the students continue through the process. Furthermore, we must remain vigilant in how we approach both technology and notational skills across our projects. Establishing connections for the students and then reinforcing their knowledge and skill sets will be vital. We also must realize that how they interact with music and technology must be disaggregated into multiple criteria that will better help us teach both the teaching of music reading and notation as well as the skills listed in outcome two. The cross-SLO connections will be vital moving forward. Conversely, they are the strongest in reading and writing music themselves. Finally, addressing score variety by both sound and sight continue to be an area where we need to spend time in our courses. We will focus on amending courses and curricula to better address this need as we continue to uncover sources for these disconnects. We will continue to refine this measure to align with musicality and expectations even further.

\*Indicates new criteria on categorization.

**SLO 4**

The teacher of PK-12 music has skills in listening to, analyzing, describing, and performing music.

**Assessment Methods(s)** Briefly describe the assessment tools, measures, or forms of evidence that will be utilized to demonstrate students' accomplishment of the learning outcomes and who will be assessed.

**.....Assessment 1 and expected level of performance**  
 Data are collected from rubric criteria items embedded into three course projects: Unit Plan (MUSIC 670), Cover Band (MUSIC 512), Curriculum Project (MUSIC 512) and Beginning Band Teaching Episode (MUSIC 513).

**Results** The summary of data related to the prior-set student achievement goals. Identify how many students were assessed, student achievement relating to minimum competency expectations, (if possible student achievement indicators relating to Basic and/or exceptional levels). The results must include achievement data in addition to a narrative summary.

**.....Results for assessment 1 and what was learned from the results**

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Basic 70%-84%	Accomplished 85%-94%	Exemplary 95% <
32	2005-2006	1	1	8	24
6	2006-2007	1	1	3	1
11	2007-2008	-----	-----	-----	11
21	2008-2009	2	1	8	10
23	2009-2010	2	1	6	14
25	2010-2011	3	1	8	13
31	2011-2012	2	1	8	20
17	2012-2013	0	0	7	10
43*	2013-2014	0	4	31	8
20	2014-2015	0	0	4	16
22	2015-2016	2	8	8	4
23	2016-2017	2	0	0	21
22	2017-2018	0	0	0	22
Scores reported in PBI	2018-2022	X	X	X	X

**DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION**

Ninety-two percent (95%) of students are meeting minimum requirements in this outcome with a majority of student meeting full expectations. As we disaggregated the information further, we were able to identify that the most pressing issues were in creating a variety of learning experiences, musical elements, and form. In each of these the connection from these topics into music education seemed to be the primary issues. With this in mind, we made a concerted effort to adjust the way these embedded assessments were presented, the way the content was processed, and how we engaged with the students in discussing the content. We also eliminated any redundancies or items that distracted from focusing solely on these topics from the courses in which they were taught. We have also created

more workshop time within the classes to better allow for Q&A sessions to better understand the application of the material. We are anxious to see how this connects with student outcomes in AY23. Given the visual recognition and description issues emerging last year, we flipped the classroom to have in-person sessions more focused on workshopping concepts rather than content delivery. As such, visual recognition and description significantly improved. We will now focus on allowing for more creativity and establishing environments that allow for these opportunities to better work with the small percentage of students who still struggle with developing effective teaching strategies (4%).  
 \*Indicates new criteria on categorization.

**SLO 5**

The teacher of PK-12 music has skills in selecting, analyzing, interpreting, presenting, and evaluating music and music performance within the context of music education.

**Assessment Methods(s)** Briefly describe the assessment tools, measures, or forms of evidence that will be utilized to demonstrate students' accomplishment of the learning outcomes and who will be assessed.

**.....Assessment 1 and expected level of performance**  
 CURRICULUM/REPERTOIRE SELECTION PROJECT: assessed in MUSIC 512

**.....Assessment 2 and expected level of performance**  
 E/S INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLAN: Assessed in MUSIC 670.

**Results** The summary of data related to the prior-set student achievement goals. Identify how many students were assessed, student achievement relating to minimum competency expectations, (if possible student achievement indicators relating to Basic and/or exceptional levels). The results must include achievement data in addition to a narrative summary.

**.....Results for assessment 1 and what was learned from the results**

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Basic 70%-84%	Accomplished 85%-94%	Exemplary 95% <
5	2005-2006	-----	-----	-----	5
13	2006-2007	-----	2	3	8
13	2007-2008	1	1	2	9
9	2008-2009	1	-----	-----	8
14	2009-2010	-----	2	2	10
17	2010-2011	-----	-----	9	8
19	2011-2012	-----	1	7	11
12	2012-2013	-----	1	4	7
19*	2013-2014	-----	4	10	5
20	2014-2015	2	3	4	11
22	2015-2016	4	3	10	5
23	2016-2017	2	3	14	4
22	2017-2018	3	7	8	4
Scores reported in PBI	2018-2022	X	X	X	X

**DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION**

Again, 92% of students were found to meet at least minimum expectations with selecting, analyzing, interpreting, and presenting music in a variety of contexts. Fifty-three percent met full expectations of the program. Once again, we found that content was covered well and that students were generally scoring well in these areas. The professional skills were once again more varied. This is often to be expected given the limited amount of authentic teaching opportunities provided for our students throughout this process. Across the board, lesson planning emerged as the largest issue. Given curricular and staffing changes, the integration and embedding of the lesson planning process has waned in the past few years. As faculty, we have discussed ways to highlight this throughout and work on integrating it more effectively. We do not see this as a major issue, as our students demonstrate high levels of professional skills. In the end, we have addressed these issues through a revision of approaching this content and modeling this much more for our future teachers through both the projects and our content delivery. We hope to see additional progress through these implemented changes.

\*Indicates new criteria on categorization.

**SLO 6**

The teacher of PK-12 music can assess musical knowledge and skills.					
<b>Assessment Methods(s)</b> Briefly describe the assessment tools, measures, or forms of evidence that will be utilized to demonstrate students' accomplishment of the learning outcomes and who will be assessed.					
<b>.....Assessment 1 and expected level of performance</b> Assessment sections of Curriculum (MUSIC 512), Unit Plan (MUSIC 670), and Assessment Portfolio (MUSIC 512)					
<b>Results</b> The summary of data related to the prior-set student achievement goals. Identify how many students were assessed, student achievement relating to minimum competency expectations, (if possible student achievement indicators relating to Basic and/or exceptional levels). <i>The results must include achievement data in addition to a narrative summary.</i>					
<b>.....Results for assessment 1 and what was learned from the results</b>					
Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Basic 70%-84%	Accomplished 85%-94%	Exemplary 95% <
23	2016-2017	3	6	7	7
22	2017-2018	5	14	3	0
Scores reported through PBI	2018-2022	X	X	X	X
<b>DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION</b>					
<p>The data for AY 22 continue to reflect some major improvements from previous years' data. Students have improved in both content knowledge and in professional skills. Furthermore, students are meeting full expectations at a higher rate than last year as well. The number of students achieving in the developing range also continues to decrease. In fact, this is the first year that we see no students in the knowledge developing knowledge category. Assessment is an abstract concept for which they do not have a great deal of experience with or knowledge of in their time as students. They understand testing, they understand evaluation, but they often struggle with wrapping their minds around assessment. They struggle with the process and how to implement it across a program and how it is more of a process than a single moment in time or single event in the classroom. The assessment data bear this out quite resoundingly. One change we have made this year is to spend more time breaking this process down more specifically in how to make these measurement decisions. Our focus is to continue embedding assessment discussion across our courses and develop a shared language to better define how our students develop an assessment-minded focus in their teaching. The approach of flipping the classroom as well as more intentional coverage and integration of self- peer- and teacher designed assessments have allowed for a deeper understanding throughout. We are seeing this develop, but only in conversations. We will continue finding ways to see this realize itself into practice as well. However, the primary issue is that there is a level of practical application that only teaching and applying assessments in the classroom can address. We have added an additional session in our student teaching seminar to now close the loop with them as practitioners to address this issue post hoc. One item that emerged this year is that we see now that they are not connecting the concepts across various educational activities. They perform well in the Assessment Portfolio, but then have difficulty in applying the concepts within the context of curriculum development. We have worked to cross pollenate our courses to better address this issue. Careful monitoring of the data will allow us to see if any observations are supported by student achievement data. We will continue to revise the assessment sections within our various projects embedded throughout the curriculum to allow for more growth.</p>					

## SLO 7

The teacher of PK-12 music demonstrates professional responsibility and reflective practice.					
<b>Assessment Methods(s)</b> Briefly describe the assessment tools, measures, or forms of evidence that will be utilized to demonstrate students' accomplishment of the learning outcomes and who will be assessed.					
<b>.....Assessment 1 and expected level of performance</b> CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT ON PORTFOLIO assessed in student teaching					
<b>Results</b> The summary of data related to the prior-set student achievement goals. Identify how many students were assessed, student achievement relating to minimum competency expectations, (if possible student achievement indicators relating to Basic and/or exceptional levels). <i>The results must include achievement data in addition to a narrative summary.</i>					
<b>.....Results for assessment 1 and what was learned from the results</b>					
Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Basic 70%-84%	Accomplished 85%-94%	Exemplary 95% <
5	2005-2006	-----	1	1	3
13	2006-2007	-----	-----	-----	13

20	2007-2008	1	-----	-----	19
11	2008-2009	1	1	2	7
14	2009-2010	-----	2	6	6
17	2010-2011	-----	2	5	10
19	2011-2012	-----	1	-----	18
16	2012-2013	-----	-----	-----	16
18	2013-2014	-----	-----	-----	18
22	2014-2015	-----	-----	-----	22
16	2015-2016	-----	-----	-----	16
19	2016-2017	-----	-----	-----	19
New Measure	2017-2018	NA	NA	NA	NA
Measure in PBI	2018-2022	X	X	X	X

**DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION**

*Ninety-six percent of students meet at least minimum expectations as it relates to outcome #7 with 65% meeting full expectations. As with our other outcomes, these assessments differentiate the learning really well and allow us to pinpoint our actions as we make content or curricular choices. In terms of content knowledge, the biggest area of need is in connecting programs with the community. While this is modeled daily and shared daily across our building, the students are not making the connection as to how it impacts them as a teacher. Thus, we need to address this by spending more than two class periods and integrating our messaging more throughout all of our courses. In terms of skills, the ability to articulate a philosophy emerged as an issue with some of our students. Part of this is attributed to a logistical issue in Canvas that measured the draft stage, but also a curricular change that we will address moving forward. We are re-establishing the development of these ideals in our sophomore level course as previously applied. Now that there is better alignment of faculty resources, this should result in some depth building within the pre-service teachers and better connection to their own thoughts and ideas. How we address the philosophical development of our teachers is critical and we will continue to refine this process and content sequencing. Given a new approach to class and a more focused set of flipped lectures, the discussion emerged as much more fruitful in discussing what they believe about the music classroom and how diversity and culturally responsive teaching fits into this process. Adding the earlier connection will also be critical. The development of our teachers is clear in these areas as we made those conscious changes to content sequence and delivery. As always, we will continue to monitor their development throughout the semesters.*

- A. Faculty review occurs on a regular basis and the content of our discussions are included in the document above specific to each outcome. Our future plans are also integrated throughout given the continual assessment processes employed in the music education program.
  
- B. The Music Education Division in the School of Music, Theatre, and Dance continue to produce graduates who set the standard for new music teachers in the state of Kansas. K-State Music Education Graduates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions across a variety of contexts and environments as measured through multiple measures embedded in the curriculum and aligned with KSDE Standards. Our graduates are highly sought after in the early hiring stages and demonstrate a high level of achievement as related to the licensing standards set by the Kansas State Department of Education. Our SLOs are aligned with these standards and an average of 94% of our students are meeting or exceeding licensing standard expectations. Our current 98% placement rate indicates a clear alignment of embedded assessments, teacher licensure, and success in the music classroom.