



SLO Assessment Cycle for MUSI 25G

Performance Workshop (Brass) SLO Modified: [01/14/2011]

Ronald Dunn's Team Members:

1. [Robert Farrington](#) (x8507) MUSI
2. [Anna Poklewski](#) (x8652) MUSI

Additional Team members not on list/notes about team:

Additional Notes:

Outcomes:

Outcome 1: Statement Modified: [04/15/2011]

The successful student will improve their ability to rehearse and perform as an individual and/or ensemble.

Assessment Cycle Records:

Outcome 1: Assessment Planning Modified: [04/15/2011]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2011

Assessors: Ronald Dunn, Robert Farrington, Anna Poklewski

Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations • Written Reports • Performances (Simulated)

Outcome 1: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [04/15/2011]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 2

Changes:

Methods:

Students receive critiques and plans for improvement during in-class lessons and mock performances. Student progress is measured during subsequent lessons/performances. Additionally, students written critiques of live professional performances; their progress in their ability to recognize and assimilate areas applicable to their own growth is assessed in these critiques.

Summary:

Successful students improved significantly in their rehearsal and performance skills.

Students' needs were sometimes a lack of preparation or adequate practice time. Other times, performance fear (stage fright) was a significant issue. For these students, more exercises focused on reducing these fears has been assigned, but perhaps more can be done in this area.

Students gained most from frequent in-class performance and clear instructions for improvement.

Those students who were able to follow instructions for improvement, including adequate and well-focused practice time did meet our expectations of success.

Enhancement (Part I):

Each of the Music 25 courses has a mix of student levels and different needs depending on the instrument involved, and thus, content is dependent on these factors. Revisiting the assessments in each cycle will serve to enhance our methodology, and hence will improve student learning.

Enhancement (Part II):

None.

Outcome 2: Statement Modified: [04/15/2011]

The successful student will demonstrate acquired musical skills through final public performance.

Outcome 2: Assessment Planning Modified: [04/15/2011]

Assessment Strategy Used:

Quarter: Spring 2011

Assessors: Ronald Dunn, Robert Farrington, Anna Poklewski
Assessment Tools: Performances/Demonstrations

Outcome 2: Reflect & Enhance Modified: [02/02/2012]

Number of people involved in Phase III: 2

Changes:

Methods:

Students give a public performance each quarter. They are evaluated on their integration of previous lessons' content and overall improvement in performance technique, interpretation and stage presence.

Summary:

Student outcomes validate our assessment tools. successful students make marked improvements in the areas identified above.

Some students need additional work to overcome debilitating fear-work that goes beyond the scope of the class.

Given the parameters for the class--group instruction, and the limited number of units assigned to the class, areas of potential improvement are limited.

To better serve students, a private-lesson, juried-performance based program is needed.

Students who were able to apply exercises and critiques into their performances were, as a rule, successful, and met our expectations of success.

Enhancement (Part I):

Instructors continually assess methodology to improve or adjust to the specific dynamics of individual classes. By communicating with one another, and discussing our techniques and outcomes, enhancement of our teaching techniques will follow.

Enhancement (Part II):

To change to a lesson-based, juried-performance model for the performance aspect of our music program,adequate resources for revision of degree and transfer requirements and curriculum writing will be needed.

[Number of Outcomes for MUSI 25G: 2]