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The purpose of this paper, the third in what has become a three-part series, is to examine recently published research in the area of assessment and present findings across an international platform in the context of the applied studio. In keeping with Kellner’s (2002) work, previous research can still be grouped across several broad categories: the roles of student and teacher, their behaviors, their interactions, and evaluation. Research conducted in the 21st century can still be categorized loosely into these strands which, for the purposes of this series, have been clustered into three papers. The first paper (Parkes, 2009) examined characteristics of the applied setting and shared the work of several researchers (e.g., Burwell, 2006; Colpir, 2000; Duke, 1999/2000; Duke & Simmons, 2006; Fredrickson, 2007; Gaunt, 2008; Kurkuk, 2007; Laukk, 2004; Mills & Smith, 2003). The second paper, (Parkes, 2010a) focused on the use of practice in the applied studio (e.g., Barry & Hallam, 2002; Byo & Cassidy, 2008; Jorgensen, 2002; Jorgensen & Lehmanna, 1997; Kostka, 2002; Lehnman & Davidson, 2006; Madsen, 2004; Maynard, 2006; Niksza, 2006; Nielsen, 2001, 2008).

This third and final paper examines a body of research concerning the use of assessment and evaluation in the applied studio. Additionally, several authors (Bennett & Stanberg, 2006; Fallin & Garrison, 2005; Parcutt, 2007; Sinsabaugh, 2007) have recently highlighted a more collaborative approach to the current modus operandi of the applied studio. There has been some interest (Parkes, 2011, in press) in the dual roles that applied teachers undertake as performers and/or teachers which will also be explored in this paper in summary of the applied studio setting. Recommendations for the future of applied studio research will also be given. In preparing this extensive literature review for the three articles, relevant works published in English language journals were chosen to be represented, along with salient dissertations, and many databases were utilized, for example but not limited to; Academic Search Complete, Cambridge Journals Online, EBSCOhost, JSTOR, and SAGE.

Assessing musical performance

Colwell (1971) observed that applied lessons were filled with evaluation and that music schools can be seen as trade schools in regard to how they develop a set of specified skills (p. 41). Four decades later, Abeles (2010) makes a similar observation; “We listen to our students’ playing, assessing their strengths and weakness, then help them to determine what additional experiences may strengthen their performance and develop them into well-rounded, independent musicians” (p. 167). Applied teachers make many assessments and evaluations, and have been doing this since the applied, or master-apprentice, lesson paradigm started in European conservatories centuries ago; clearly this is still how applied lessons operate. Faculty have given these assessments informally to students in lessons on a frequent basis. In the case of summative or formal assessments over the last decade music performance assessment research has honed a focus in a new direction, away from what has been seen by some (Brand, 1992; Jones, 1975; Madsen, 1988, 2004; Schleuter, 1997) as the secretive nature of the traditional methodologies in the applied studio.

Assessment in higher education has increased its profile since 1990 (James & Fleming, 2004-2005, p. 51) and it is an area identified by those in the measurement community as an example of unreliable measurement (Guskey, 2006). It is recognized in the 21st century that assessment provides a critical link in teaching and learning (Linn, 1994; Linn, Baker, & Dunbar, 1991; O’Donovan, Price, & Rust, 2004; Shepard, 2000; Stefani, 2004-05) and in response, researchers are exploring assessment techniques across a variety of discipline settings in higher education (eg, Brothers, 2004-2005; Brown, 2004-2005; Calvert, 2004-2005; Connor, 2004-2005; Delandshire & Petrosky, 1998; Goodnough, 2006; James & Fleming, 2004-2005; Jenkins, 2004-2005; Leinhardt, 1990; Lund & Veal, 2008; Macdonald, 2004-2005; O’Donovann, et al., 2004; Van den Berg, Admirall, & Pilot, 2006). The use of assessment in the applied studio, as part of the conservatory setting, has not been a large part of the active research agendas of researchers until the past decade, although ascertaining reliable and valid measurement of musical performance was addressed in the late 1980s in the professional literature by Boyle & Radocy (1987). At that time, they reported evidence of two assessment approaches, global and specific: the former an overall impression and the latter based on specific
Juries and examinations

There is no question that after Abeles (1973) and Fiske (1977), the bulk of the research work carried out, in developing and testing assessment instruments, was done by Bergee (Bergee, 1988; 1989a; 1989b, 1997). Recently he and his colleagues (Bergee, 2003; Bergee & Cecconi-Roberts, 2002; Latimer, Bergee, & Cohen, 2010) have contributed further to this body of work with new studies. In 2003, Bergee proposed that “assessment of music performance in authentic contexts remains an under-investigated area of research” (Bergee, 2003, p. 137) and his study examined the inter-judge reliabilities of faculty evaluations, across brass, percussion, woodwind, voice, piano, and strings for end-of-semester jury performances from the following previously published scales (Abeles, 1973; Bergee, 1988; Jones, 1986; Nichols, 1991; Zdzinski & Barnes, 2002) creating a new one for piano. His sample of faculty participating was small (brass n = 4, percussion n=2, woodwind n = 5, voice n = 5, piano n = 3, and string n = 5). It should be noted here that this is not pointed out as a criticism, but it is indicative of the true nature of the size of music departments and often the sample size for these types of studies. The inter-judge reliabilities, as determined with coefficients of concordance, were “good regardless of panel size” (p. 143) even between most pairwise comparisons of evaluators. Bergee reported that interjudge reliability was stable for scale total scores, subscores, and the global letter grade. Reasons given for this were that veteran faculty assisted younger less-experienced faculty in evaluating student performances. Of most interest in this study is the fact that the researcher specified to the judges participating that the students would not see the grades calculated on the criteria-specific scales. Also that the additional grade and comments, that is the traditional global and actual grading method that was also utilized by the judges, would not be compared to the rating scale grades.

This implies that faculty would not use the scales in “reality” to measure students’ musical performance, but would do so in the interest of assisting the researcher. Bergee states that in the post-evaluation discussions, judges spoke about some of the performance skills or aspects that they had not considered prior to using his scales, indicating that using the scales had made an impact on their perceptions about grading and evaluating musical performance. Parkes (2006) found faculty participation to be the largest problem with testing the use of a criteria-specific rubric designed for both brass and woodwind juries. The use of the scales resulted in Cronbach alphas of .93 each but lack of participation from applied faculty greatly diminished the potential application of the study to further ascertain faculty perceptions about grading and evaluating in the applied studio. The published outline of the full study that expounds the study’s potential, and limitations, can be found in the Proceedings of the 2007 Symposium on Assessment in Music Education (Parkes, 2008a).

Bergee’s work with Latimer & Cohen (Latimer, et al., 2010) investigates the reliability and perceived utility of a performance assessment rubric and while somewhat outside the scope of this work, it is worth acknowledging as a rubric tool that has both appropriate dimensions and descriptors as well as reported improvement in pedagogical utility. The internal consistency was reported at Cronbach’s alpha = .88 and item by item, the inter-correlations ranged from moderately low ($r = .46$) to moderately high ($r = .87$). Judges using the rubric were also canvassed in regards to changes they would make to the rubric and to their perceived estimation of how useful the rubric would be. Respondents reported a generally positive perception of the rubric and that suggestions centered around making the dimensions of the rubric more related or interrelated. This study illustrates a substantive connection between the work of Bergee in the applied studio into high schools, a research direction that will be addressed in more detail further in this paper.

The work of Ciorba and Smith (2009) was conducted to meet accreditation requirements of implementing specific assessment tools and showed faculty commitment to the process and school-wide use of the tool. In their study, they administered a multidimensional assessment tool for all students performing a jury recital (n = 359). The results of this study showed a high degree of interjudge reliability for total scores, and less so for sub-scale scores. Most reliability coefficients were above .70, which was expected and supports the findings of Bergee (2003). However, the process by which the rubric was developed is interesting as it was not developed by one researcher, as in the work of Bergee and Parkes, but by a panel of four faculty who identified common dimensions that were shared across all areas and created descriptors outlining the expected levels of achievement. The rubrics were piloted over two semesters to refine the rubric and determine the applicability of its use in a jury, or final performance, setting. Used across all instrument and voice areas, the findings indicated that performance achievement was positively related with participants’ year in school, with a one-way multivariate analysis of variance. It would be interesting to read a follow-up study revealing what percentage of faculty continue to use the tool currently at the study site.

The above studies all have utilized measurement of the consistent aspects of performance in the studio such as technique, pitch and intonation, rhythm, musical expression or phrasing, and likewise, the recent work of Russell (2010) also reports similar categories already established in music performance structure; tone, intonation, technique, and interpretation or musical effect. It should be considered that these aspects are stable criteria in applied studio performance measurement.

Self and peer assessment

Lebler (2007) states that if the “modern conservatorium is to prosper in a rapidly changing cultural and economic landscape, it will need to … produce graduates who are self-monitoring and self-directing in their learning” (p. 206). His argument is supported by research he carried out in Australia and while the focus is on students enrolled in a Popular Music Bachelor degree, as opposed to the traditional instrumental or
vocal, his point that “assessment practices influence the nature of student learning” (p. 207) in regard to how student evaluate themselves and others, is important to examine. His use of reflective practice, portfolio assessment, and performance assessment (Lebler, 2006) prompted this paper to take a wider review of the existing literature to establish if these techniques are used in the applied studio setting.

Parkes (2010b) conducted a very small case study for the purpose of exploring the use of self-assessment in the applied studio. One applied studio professor at a large Northern American state university agreed to use a criteria-specific performance rubric (Parkes, 2006) with her students (n = 11). The professor gave the rubric to the students in her studio as formative feedback in their lessons and she also instructed students to use it weekly while listening to audio recordings of their lessons. Students kept an online reflective journal in which they were to reflect about their progress, which in-turn were then micro-analyzed for themes. The following categories emerged in the findings: (1) positive perceptions about the rubric from both teacher and students, (2) an increase in student awareness and recognition of how improvements could be made after using the rubric to evaluate their own lesson performance, and (3) a clear understanding of what the professor required. Suggestions for future research included a wider use of applied faculty for the tool, as benefits appeared initially promising particularly in support of learner-centered pedagogies (Weimer, 1992).

Daniel’s (2001, 2004, 2006, 2007) body of work has illustrated deeper understanding of the related aspects of this area in his research from Australia. His early work (Daniel, 2001) examines the role of the learner within self-assessment issues in the applied studio. He recognizes that “the quality of the relationship between the teacher and student will have a distinct effect on the success … of student’s absorption of the comments made by the teacher” (p. 217). Underscoring the importance of skills in self-assessment, he observes two problems with the current teaching and learning setting of the applied studio. First, “the reliance of the student on the teacher, as musical guru” and second, the reliance of students on recordings to shape and develop their skills, rather than “investigating, formulating, and reflecting on their own interpretations” (p. 218). Daniel (2001) set his study with the concert practice or group practice performance class at his institution. This class is where students perform for each other and a professor who gives graded assessment of the performance. In his experimental trial, Daniel asked students (n = 35) to view a video-tape of their performance, and write a 300 word “self critical reflection”. Students were asked to address several issues, namely presentation, musical accuracies, style, overall impression, progress and were also asked what their plans for future direction might be. At the end of the semester they were asked to complete a survey about the experience and additional information such as their prior experience with assessment of performance and the forms of feedback or evaluation they were used to receiving. Results reported that most students still relied on teacher comments but that they were mostly positive about the introduction of a new method of assessment. In analyzing the content of comments that students made in their 300 word reflections, Daniel found that nearly half were very critical of themselves but that 80 % felt the actual process of writing the reports increased their performance skills to some degree. Fifty-seven percent responded that it was high valuable, and a further twenty-six percent reported it was moderately valuable. These results are promising for students in Australia, where it is particularly important for higher education music education to re-evaluate their current pedagogical ethos (Daniel, 2001, p. 215).

Daniel (2004) continued this work and cites the work (p. 91) of Searby & Ewers (1997) from Kingston, England as a case-study model for peer assessment. Their work interestingly has similar categories as the above criteria-specific tools namely;
1) Playing skills: quality of tone; accuracy of tuning; clarity of articulation.
2) Observation of the musical score: appropriate tempi; attention to dynamics; clear and suitable phrasing.
3) Musicality and style: sensitivity to the music's period and performance practice issues; a sense of dramatic shape and pacing in the performance.
4) Program choice: showing variety, balance and appropriateness.
5) Presentation: stage awareness; rapport and communication with the audience.
(Searby & Ewers, 1997, p. 379)

Daniel (2004) investigated the effects of involving students in structured peer assessments that did not impact on final summative or weighted assessment and he examined the students’ perceptions about the process. Students involved in the performance practice class were scheduled to perform twice a semester and each student was required to complete four peer evaluations each week with criteria sheets, which again included elements such as accuracy, dynamics, tone, technical control, fluency, stylistic interpretation, as well as professionalism and presentation (p. 109). These were agreed upon after several sessions of faculty and students in the first six weeks of the first semester to establish usability for the tool. These sessions were reported to have assisted in engaging students in the process of critical assessment of performance. At the end of the first semester, the majority (87%) of students (n = 34) reported a preference for the detailed evaluation sheet and similar results were found for the second semester (n = 31). Students reported that their peers were not appropriately critical. The level of criticism improved and became more accurate in the second semester. Students reported valuing the open discussion process available after the performances. Daniel suggested future refinement of the process as there was a lack of validity in the general appraisal assessments and recommended future research should examine the extent to which students’ achievement in performance is impacted as a result of engaging in peer assessment (p.107).

In completing his investigation of these issues, Daniel (2007) surveyed students (n = 40) to summarize the nature of assessment comments provided by both faculty and peers, and to examine the differences of students between year levels and between faculty, and understand the students’ perceptions in regard to validity and relevance of the assessments. He found an observable increase in the average number of comments as year level increased and that first year students gave mainly positive comments. Second and third year students gave advice and direction to their peers, whereas faculty spread the content of their comments evenly between positive, critical, and advice. Naturally, faculty gave the performers almost double the amount of comments than the students did to their peers. Daniel reports that students still value the comments of faculty more so than that of their peers, and the senior students were more accepting of critical evaluations from both peers and faculty. He notes that although the survey was intended to elicit information specifically about the assessment process, students still wanted to illustrate comments specifically related to the art of performing in their open-ended responses.

In examining differences between faculty and student evaluations, Bergee & Cecconi-Roberts (2002) explored the relationships between faculty, peer and student self evaluation of performance with a pair of experiments. In experiment one, students (n = 29) worked together over the semester to complete peer evaluations in groupings of similar instruments (brass or woodwind etc) each week. Peer evaluation forms from Bergee's previous study (2002) were used. At the end of the semester, students were recorded performing their final performance and more than
Bergee’s previous study (1991) were used. At the end of the semester, students were recorded performing their jury performance and were then asked to evaluate themselves, as they observed their own video. Faculty also evaluated the live performance, yielding acceptable reliabilities. The peer evaluations, the students’ own evaluations, and the faculty judges’ evaluations were compared and there were no significant differences shown in students’ ability to self-evaluate by year in school, their performance level, nor the medium. Findings revealed that peer interaction improved students’ initial ability to self-evaluate but that the areas of tone and musical effect seemed to be the most difficult. In experiment 2, students (n = 56) self-evaluated five times and performances were recorded on a digital recorder. Students listened immediately and using revised (more detailed descriptors) evaluation categories. They also participated in group meetings again where they evaluated existing recordings of exemplary artists, along with the performances of their peers. As with experiment one, students self-evaluated their jury performance at the end of the semester, as did the judge panel. Analyses showed that over time, students’ self-evaluations increased, moving toward peer evaluation scores, and away from judge scores and peer evaluation was consistently higher than judge scores.

Feedback

Duke & Simmons (2006) illustrate that goals and expectations are prominent elements in lessons given by applied faculty, in their case, world-renowned artist-teachers. The connection between these goals and expectations and the assessment points for measurement or evaluation are not specifically stated by Duke & Simmons, however the assumption of the artist-teachers in their study is that the student play in a lesson as if they are performing, to achieve “a high standard” (p. 12). This type of feedback is conveyed to the student consistently in lessons and it is reasonable to assume the student knows this expectation continues to prevail in the jury or recital setting.

The jury or recital setting is considered authentic assessment, in the literal sense of the term ‘performance assessment’ but there is not a great deal known about the formative effects of summative jury feedback on actual student improvement. It may be that the feedback given during lessons is what ultimately creates change in student achievement and growth.

Daniel (2006) pursued the implications of using video footage in piano teaching, with both one-to-one and group lessons. In some respects, this research speaks more to the characteristics of the applied studio, however it also illustrates the interaction between student and teacher, particularly when the issue of feedback is concerned. As such, after 150 hours of teaching were recorded and analyzed for interpretation of actions, a second round of analyses revealed classifications of behaviors that included “evaluative and diagnostic” (p. 198). Findings show that in the first set of analysis, teachers were 16 times more likely to give input than the students in the one-to-one lesson, yet only twice as likely to give input in the group lessons. In the secondary analysis data, results show that students participated minimally in diagnostics, and not at all in evaluation in the one-to-one lesson. Conversely, in the group lessons, students took a much greater role in evaluation, in fact exceeding that of the teacher. Clearly, the effects of peer interaction and participation had some causality, but this study highlights the differences in typical learning settings.

Rostvall & West (2003) also examine interaction, and, to that end also feedback in their study administered in Sweden. In instrumental applied guitar lessons (teachers n = 4, students n = 21) they studied what is still considered in Sweden to be a “hidden and secret activity that goes on behind closed doors” (p. 214). They analyzed the interactions of the group and one-to-one lesson interactions after coding hours of video footage. Findings revealed that the teachers controlled the learning settings and that they did not ask for students’ perspectives at any time. Students in the one-to-one lessons were stopped or interrupted if they made spontaneous comments about the performance or music. This was not seen in the group lessons, where again peer interaction may have had an impact of the distribution of power in the room. Rostvall & West reported that when teachers ignored students perspectives they became less able to analyze the situations in which students were having problems and that students were left to self-diagnose, self-evaluate and self-correct, especially elements such as motor learning and expressive aspects of their performance. Rostvall & West additionally looked interpretatively at their data and concluded that the teachers were ranked hierarchically in the setting as skilled masters, who expected only respect and obedience from students. The teachers’ approach to feedback was to only impart a little of their knowledge of tradition and it was shared incrementally over time. This study illustrates that perhaps the European tradition of master-apprentice is showing marked differences, particularly in the area of feedback and evaluation, in 21st century teaching when it is considered with an international perspective.

Reliability and validity

It is clear that some researchers are establishing good reliabilities with tools used in the applied studio (Bergee, 2003; Bergee & Cecconi-Roberts, 2002; Ciorba & Smith, 2009; Parkes, 2008a) and that if used widely, these tools may make some measurable difference in the perceptions of both students and faculty about assessment in the applied studio. Asmus (1999) proposed that “greater precision in assessment will provide better information to both student and teacher, because it can help evaluation instructional strategies of the past and select appropriate strategies for the future” (p.19). He also supports teachers creating their own assessment tools assuming the validity can be assured (Asmus, 2010) and while his suggestions are made for public school music teachers, they are equally applicable to the applied studio. Most of the labor in establishing the factors present in music performance assessments has been done and reliabilities are generally strong (eg, Abeles, 1973; Bergee, 1988, 1989b; Ciorba & Smith, 2009; Fiske, 1977; H. Jones, 1986; Latimer, et al., 2010; Miksza, 2006; Nichols, 1991; Russell, 2010; Zdzinski & Barnes, 2002). As Asmus (2010) points out, the issue becomes one of validity when we consider defining the construct being measured. If it is the established elements and factors so commonly found, then are these tools appropriate to be used widely? Should they be published and be made easily and publically available?

The reactive answer is ‘probably yes’ and many music programs would benefit but perhaps an alternative approach could be considered because this answer raises several additional questions; Are the goals of all applied teachers the same? Are we, as performance educators, aligned across programs, schools, states, or even countries, in what we expect from our students? Is a performance rubric developed by four faculty at Milikin University (Ciorba & Smith, 2009), for example, going to be valid for use with students in a contrasting music department with another set of teachers and students, in a different college or university? It is possible then, that the answer may be “perhaps not”. It might then, alternatively, be more effective to have applied faculty meet, discuss, and deliberate about the goals they have as individual teachers, and as colleagues, in order to create tools that will be firstly valid for their specific set of students, and secondly may also serve to inform teachers’ practices and pedagogy. They could start with any one of the tools illustrated within this paper, and utilize it as a starting point, rather than
Implications for music education

These suggestions, if acted upon, would surely change the nature of the applied studio. There would need to be more communication between the faculty trained in educational measurement and the applied teachers. In the Northern American model this would require music education faculty, who typically have some education in research, validity, reliability, assessment, standardized testing, and statistical analyses, to participate. Parncutt (2007) advocates for a “fruitful interaction between performance teaching and performance research” (p. 1) and one can widen his vision to include assessment of music performance. Visibility for music assessment has increased due to the launch of the Symposium on Assessment in Music Education held in Florida 2007 and 2009, and the publication of both proceedings (Brophy; 2008, 2010). The applied studio has a presence in these books, and the applied studio assessment topic has been more regularly addressed in scholarly journals over the past two decades. While this trend has added to the quality and availability of assessment tools for the applied studio, Guskey (2006) argues that “few educators [in higher education] receive any formal training in assigning marks to students’ work or in grading students’ performance and achievement” (p. 1) and while he is not specifically speaking about applied music teachers, his point remains relevant, to some extent, to this paper. The work of Parkes (2008b) indicates that 79% of applied teachers (n = 162) who participated in her study, reported that they had no training in either pedagogical techniques, including assessment, as part of their education at all. While research has been conducted into the reliabilities, usefulness, factorial nature, and stability of these tools, the actual rate at which they are being used by applied faculty outside the research studies themselves, may be minimal. The potential effects of this may impact music education as a whole, and music performance education could be the Stewart of a new period of use for valid and reliable assessment techniques.

If there were to be more attention given to assessment practices as part of good instructional pedagogy, the nature of music education may also change. When one considers the recent findings of Bazan (2010), LaCognata (2010), and even the MENC report (1998), it seems that high school teachers are still evaluating students’ attitude, attendance, and participation with alarming regularity. While this is not completely inappropriate, it is a concern, particularly when students are learning important musical skills, musical knowledge, vocabulary, composition and improvising skills, as well as an understanding about music in their own, and others’ cultures. It seems more appropriate to assess those elements and skills with regularity and clarity, and also communicate the importance of being able to assess them to our current music education students. Some teacher educators are addressing this issue (Bauer, 2008; Nierman, 2008; Reimer, 2009; Wutte, 2010) and are sharing this research on an international platform, which is another positive trend. Daniel’s (2006) work with higher education might also support that in high school group learning, we can improve peer evaluation processes. If the nature of assessment in the applied studio was improved, it may have a flow-on effect to the public school methods of assessment in the future.

Suggestions for future research

Some researchers are calling for more collaboration between music education and music performance (Bennett & Stanberg, 2006; Fallin & Garrison, 2005; Sinsabaugh, 2007). Sinsabaugh (2007) in particular, supports the notion that teacher-artists and educators need to communicate well with each other. Her work with partnerships between solo performers and schools gives her a unique perspective on how these communications can occur. Future research should examine best practices for “pulling together” (Fallin & Garrison, 2005) between music educators and music performers. Bennett & Stanberg (2006) address the same issue from the Australian viewpoint. It would seem that the divide between music education and music performance is equally wide where “hierarchical inference … is perpetuated in the separation of education and performance students during their university education” (p. 219). Parkes (2011, in press) addresses the issues of disjunction between performer, teacher, and educator and presents a comprehensive approach to performance pedagogy. Future research questions could address perceived cause of hierarchical perceptions, as well perceived benefits for both performer and educators to work together on the issue of music performance assessment. Parkes (2011, in press) examines this topic philosophically at the higher education level, and perhaps future researchers and authors will be encouraged to make these issues part of the dialogue occurring in K-21 music conversations with music performers and teachers.

There is an issue left untouched in this paper, and this is the area of assessing musical expression and creativity in the applied studio. How do we measure these? Is this process empirically documented or investigated? Should a student learn to approximate the expressive syntax of the master teacher or are they encouraged to create new estimations of meaning for traditional repertoire? It has been the most difficult element to assess and often has the lowest reliabilities as one dimension on currently well-tested assessment tools. There is certainly investigation into this phenomenon (Huron, 2006; Justlin & Persson, 2002, p. 229) and questions are raised as to how is it taught, so perhaps future research could establish this first and then how is it best measured?

In conclusion, this paper suggests that the nature of the applied studio is perhaps slowly changing as the current trajectory of research moves the use of valid and reliable assessments forward into more schools and programs. It is anticipated that as more research is conducted,
more assessment tools, and their use as reported in findings, will be come part of the way music performance is assessed and evaluated in the future. Practical applications may take away from this paper may be demonstrated in the following ways: (1) advocating for better communication between faculty in order to foster the goals of participating in research and removing secrecy or subjectivity in music assessment, (2) facilitating a culture of willingness to adopt or create new assessment practices in music performance schools, and (3) finally, to test and refine assessment practices to establish reliability and validity in assessment use as part of the ongoing teaching and learning cycle in the applied studio.
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