

Program Assessment Plan
2018-2019

College of Humanities and Social Sciences
CSU-Pueblo Department of Music
David Volk, Chair

Bachelor of Arts in Music

Developed by Jennifer Shadle Peters
and David Volk
with input from Music Faculty

Music Department Mission:

To provide the highest quality music education possible for the music major pursuing a career as a performer, educator, and scholar, as well as the student wishing to minor in music and persons wishing to learn about music as part of a professional or liberal arts tradition and a part of human culture and experience.

The Music Department's primary program is the Bachelor of Arts in Music. Within this program, some students choose to take additional specialized courses for an Emphasis area in either Performance or Music Education and PreK-12 Teaching Licensure. Within all program emphases, the department's mission of providing high quality music education as a basis of a career in the discipline is central to our curriculum and instructional practices.

Beginning Fall 2015, the Department of Music formalized an option for students to complete PreK-12 Teaching Licensure through graduate course work applicable toward the Master of Education degree upon completion of licensure requirements.

Student Learning Outcomes:

There are five outcomes considered essential for all graduates of the program. In addition, the music education and music performance emphasis areas each require specific outcomes specific to their professional requirements. Music Education must be designed to satisfy Colorado Department of Education requirements for licensure.

Upon completion of the Bachelor of Arts degree in Music, all students will

1. *Read, analyze, and perform music* with fluency in at least one performance medium and in a variety of genres and styles.
2. *Use the piano proficiently* as an instrument for independent study of music theory, analysis of scores, and preparation of compositions or arrangements, as appropriate to the common tasks of a professional musician.
3. *Demonstrate proficiency in aural recognition* and analysis of music, and in singing musical lines at sight, as appropriate to the common tasks of a professional musician.
4. *Recognize and describe* representative selections of music from all *the significant style periods and genres* of western art music.
5. *Create arrangements and original compositions* utilizing the recognized ranges and idioms of orchestral and band instruments and of vocal ensembles.

The achievement of these outcomes will enable graduates to compete successfully with their peers for graduate school admissions, or to begin a performing career at some levels locally. Related career fields, such as arts management or audio-engineering, would require further specialized training, but a solid bachelor's degree in music is a recognized beginning in such careers.

In addition to the outcomes described above, students in the *Performance Emphasis* program will

6. *Conduct large and small ensembles* in their primary performance medium.
7. *Prepare and present in public* a wide selection of repertoire representative of the highest standard of performance technique and style appropriate to young professional artists.

In addition to the general outcomes, students in the *Music Education Emphasis* program will

6. *Conduct large and small ensembles* in their primary performance medium.
7. *Demonstrate* through field experiences and student teaching the *necessary skills and dispositions for teaching music* in a variety of public school settings.
8. *Create instructional plans, long-range curriculum outlines, and assessments* for music education at elementary and secondary levels, following Colorado Content Area Learning Standards and incorporating recognized best practices in music pedagogy.

All of the outcomes listed above are observable and measurable, although some measures of musical understanding and achievement cannot be quantified. It is difficult in some regards to prevent all overlapping of outcomes (i.e., the understanding of theory and history will play a considerable role in a student's correct interpretation of a piece of music in performance), but the assessments themselves are designed to target discrete aspects of the student's development.

Focus of Assessment for the Department of Music in 2018-2019

1) *Music Theory and Aural Skills* course sequencing

Continuing discussions and assessment commenced in 2017-18, the Department primarily focused assessment efforts this year on reviewing the sequencing of Music Theory and Aural Skills courses. Two primary concerns have been: (1) the success and retention of students who enter the department having not auditioned prior to enrollment (the department has a long standing policy of allowing students to register in their first semester without audition; continuation in the major is contingent upon successfully completing the first semester applied music jury. This policy facilitates enrollment of students declaring a music major at Orientation who have not previously auditioned), and (2) whether either or both of the sequences should be delayed until the second semester of the freshmen year rather than commencing the first semester of the freshmen year.

From continued discussions informed by the assessment data, the department **finalized a decision to postpone the beginning of the four-semester aural skills sequence from the first freshmen semester to the second freshmen semester, beginning Fall 2019.**

2) *Applied Music Rubric and Student Achievement in Applied Music*

The Applied Music Performance Rubric was designed in 2015 and fully implemented in 2017. This is the first year the department can document student progress in applied music as assessed by the rubric over a span of three years. This is the first significant opportunity the department has had to review both the efficacy of the rubric and statistical progress of students.

Rubric results from 2017, 2018, and 2019 suggest the **rubric is effective in evaluating student progress in applied music over time and that departmental applied music instruction is effective and meeting the desired standards.**

Assessment Work in Recent Years

In 2016-17, the department reviewed the progress of majors since 2013 in timely completion of the departmental Piano Proficiency exam. This review highlights the success of sustained efforts in designing and implementing a robust departmental piano proficiency program with clear student goals for each level of study and established remediation plans for students who do not meet these goals in the standard time frame allotted in departmental curricular plans.

Specific attention was given in recent years to improve the departmental assessment program through the development of new assessment measures. The *Applied Performance Rubric* and an updated *Junior Qualification Exam* were implemented in 2015-2016. The department believes these measures are providing better information upon which to make curricular improvements.

The Department of Music identified a number of program strengths and weaknesses in past years. Stemming from program assessment, the department significantly revamped piano proficiency requirements in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. The department continues to note improved timely completion of the departmental Piano Proficiency Examination by its majors.

Overall, the Department of Music continues to redesign and improve assessment efforts. When the new Chair arrived in 2013, Music Faculty expressed concern over the effectiveness of the Junior Qualifications Exam (originally an oral exam). Faculty also noted that semester-by-semester applied music jury evaluations did not adequately compare student progress across every instrumental group and failed to document student growth over time.

Faculty continue to discuss possible implementation of additional assessment tools. A online portfolio for majors could provide an opportunity for broad assessment of a number of student artifacts: composition/arranging projects in Music Theory courses and MUS 357 – Orchestration and Arranging (SLO 5), program notes for recitals and other performances (SLO 4), videos of conducting performances (SLO 6 for Performance and Music Education Emphases). The Department has also discussed possible implementation of a Music Literature exam as part of the written Junior Qualifications exam (SLO 4).

The MUS 151-281 (Aural Skills I – IV) provides focused instruction toward SLO 3. The Department continues discussion on additional assessment tools that might be employed in reviewing this SLO outside of the course exams.

The Department continues discussion of possibility of adding a *Community Engagement* student learning outcome to the essential outcomes of all majors.

Progress toward these goals in 2018-2019:

Performance Rubric

The Chair designed and proposed a new Performance Rubric in Spring 2015 which was piloted in one studio in Spring 2016 and more broadly used in applied music jury examinations in Spring 2017. Applied Music jury performances are presented by all majors who have not completed the applied music requirements of their emphasis area. Students presenting Junior or Senior level recitals for a given semester do not jury additionally; a separate recital hearing is held at least six weeks before their recital date. The performance rubric has not been used to date in recital hearings, but will be considered for use in future semesters.

The rubric identifies student progress along a spectrum of experience and ability divided into four broad stages of development: (1) Acquiring knowledge regarding the fundamentals of music and the instrument (or voice) of study, (2) Mastering the basic technical demands in performance of one's instrument (or voice), (3) With acquisition of basic technique for one's instrument (or voice), shifting primary attention to the development of musical judgment and expressivity in performance, (4) With a mature sense of musical judgment developed, shifting primary attention to the development of repertoire and professional career performances. The rubric subdivides each of these developmental areas into "emerging" and "mastering" levels.

The following table charts levels assessed in Spring 2018 juries:

Acad. Level	Foundations		Technical Development		Development of Musical Judgment		Repertoire and Career dev.	
	Emerging	Mastering	Emerging	Mastering	Emerging	Mastering	Emerging	Mastering
Fresh.		2	9	5				
Soph.			1	2	2	3		
Junior			1	2	4	5		
Senior					4	2	1	1

The following table charts levels assessed in Spring 2019 juries:

Acad. Level	Foundations		Technical Development		Development of Musical Judgment		Repertoire and Career dev.	
	Emerging	Mastering	Emerging	Mastering	Emerging	Mastering	Emerging	Mastering
Fresh.	1	3	3	2				
Soph.	1			3				
Junior			1	2	2			
Senior				1	1	5	3	1

Notes:

- Although we had enrollment decline in 2018-2019 that accounts for some of the fewer responses in Spring 2019 juries, we also had less consistency in the use of the rubric in Spring 2019. This is something the department will work to correct in Spring 2020.
- Music faculty will continue to review use of the rubric in the Fall Convocation Departmental meeting with the goal of centering scores more and more closely around the mean, although wide use of the rubric appears successful overall with scores being relatively consistent across faculty evaluators and instrumental groups.

- Scores by academic level fall within desired ranges: students in higher academic levels demonstrate desired gains across their tenure of study.
- Conversations will continue around requisite scores required for retention in the major at each emphasis level, and differentiation of levels expected in the General, Music Education, and Performance tracks. The lowest level scores from Spring 2019 in each academic level represent a weakness in applied music that the department may determine is not acceptable for retention in the program. The department is encouraged that the vast majority of students are performing at desired levels.

Of the 29 students assessed with the rubric in Spring 2019, we now have scores for 9 of these students that span a period of three years; for an additional 2 students, we have scores that span a period of two years. The following chart documents the scores received by these students over the past three years:

	Spring 2017 score	Spring 2018 score	Spring 2019
Student 1	20	15.8	21.25
Student 2	12.5	13	30
Student 3	24.5	30	35.5
Student 4	26.7	(no rubric assessment)	32.5
Student 5	14.3	19.7	30
Student 6	25	(no rubric assessment)	35
Student 7	20	(no rubric assessment)	25
Student 8	25	(no rubric assessment)	40
Student 9	30	(no rubric assessment)	35
Student 10	(entered 2018)	16.25	18.75
Student 11	(entered 2018)	18.75	20

Again, the rubric appears effective in documenting student progress over time and demonstrates the desired progress of students in applied music instruction through their undergraduate tenure. In only one instance above did a student's score drop in a subsequent year (Student 1; faculty have noted this student's particularly weakness in applied music). Discussions continue around implementing specific benchmarks for retention in each of the three tracks within the major and how the newly approved Bachelor of Arts in Humanities and Social Sciences (interdisciplinary) major may be employed for students who do not achieve desired benchmarks.

Music Theory Course Sequencing

For Fall 2018, the Department limited registration in MUS 150 (Music Theory I) to students who had previously auditioned for the department or who received departmental permission to enroll without audition (previously, there was no registration restriction on the course). Two students who did not audition previously for the department were permitted to enroll in MUS 150 for Fall 2018 (one of these students is a Music minor, not major).

The following tables chart the academic progress of students who had previously auditioned in comparison to those who did not. Retention in Program information is also provided. The data confirms that restricting enrollment in the course does reduce W/D/F grades and improves retention in major. In fact, the retention in program of 12 students in 2018-19 exceeds the 10 students retained in 2017-18, despite significantly higher enrollment in 2017-18.

2017-18

Grade						Withdrew		Registered in Music					Continuing In Music?	
W	F	D	C	B	A	Fall 2018	Spring 2018	Spring 2018	Fall 2018				No	Yes
									Not Expected	Unknown	Expected	Yes		
<i>Students who auditioned prior to first term of enrollment (18 total)</i>														
1			2	1	14	1	1	14	1	1	3	9	1	8
<i>Students who did NOT audition prior to first term of enrollment (14 total)</i>														
2	3		1	3	5	1		7	1	2	1	3	1	2

2018-19

Grade						Withdrew		Registered in Music					Continuing In Music?	
W	F	D	C	B	A	Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Spring 2019	Fall 2018				No	Yes
									Not Expected	Unknown	Expected	Yes		
<i>Students who auditioned prior to first term of enrollment (20 total)</i>														
1	1	1		1	15			17	3	1	2	11		11
<i>Students who did NOT audition prior to first term of enrollment (2 total)</i>														
				2				1*	1		1*			1*

Notes:

- With some exceptions, grade distribution and persistence (those continuing for next year as Music majors or minors) is higher among students who audition prior to their first semester of enrollment than those who do not.
- Auditioning prior to first-term enrollment is not a guarantee of success, however. Three withdrew before the Fall term ended or did not receive passing grades. None of these three are expected to return to CSU-Pueblo in Fall 2019.
- Neither is not-auditioning prior to the first-term enrollment a guarantee of failure. One student who did not audition prior to his first-term enrollment entered as a Music minor this year, received passing grades in the freshmen theory sequence, and is expected to continue as a Music minor in Fall 2019.

W/D/F grades in 2018-19 for three students who previously auditioned is a concern. The Department continues to administer pre- and post- tests in each of the first two semesters of Music Theory (those results are included as an appendix to the report). The Department is **proposing implementation of a Music Theory Diagnostic Exam for all students (auditionees and non-auditionees) and developing a course plan that delays the Music Theory course sequence until the Sophomore year for students who enter with significant deficiencies in music literacy. The Department is also reworking the 4-year course plan to begin the Aural Skills sequence in the Spring semester of the Freshmen year, delaying its start by one semester. We will assess student progress in the Aural Skills course sequence in future years to determine if the delayed start improves student success as anticipated.**

Written Junior Qualifications Exam

In Spring 2019, the department administered the 2016 revised written Junior Qualifications Exam (Appendix E) to rising Junior Music majors. This written exam replaced the previous oral examination administered to rising Junior Music majors. Results are as follows:

Music Theory (9 students completed the exam)

		Score:	<u>Exemplary/Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory*</u>		
Lower level skills	1) Analysis of key and diatonic harmony		7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)
	2) Analysis of modulation		4 (44%)	1 (11%)	4 (44%)
Higher level skills	3) Analysis of chromatic harmony		1 (11%)	3 (33%)	5 (56%)
	4) Resolution of harmony		0 (0%)	5 (56%)	4 (44%)

* Exemplary, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory scores derived as follow:

- For item 1: Exemplary score represents correct analysis of 6 of 6 diatonic chords; Satisfactory represents correct analysis of 6 of 6 diatonic chords with errors in figured bass analysis; Unsatisfactory score represents incorrect analysis of key and/or Roman Numeral analysis of chords.
- For item 2: Exemplary score represents correct identification of key and analysis of chords; Satisfactory score represents correct identification of key, but errors in figured bass analysis and/or analysis of one of four chords; Unsatisfactory score represents incorrect analysis of key, or incorrect analysis of more than one of four chords in new key.
- For item 3: Exemplary score represents correct identification of 3 of 3 chromatic chords; Satisfactory score represents correct identification of 2 or 3 chromatic chords; Unsatisfactory score represents correct identification of 1 or 0 of 3 chromatic chords.
- For item 4: Exemplary score represents correct resolution of at least 3 of 5 examples and correct identification of chord and pitch content with no more than part-writing errors in at least a fourth example; Satisfactory score represents correct resolution of at least 2 of 5 examples and correct identification of chord and pitch content with no more than part-writing errors in at least a third example; Unsatisfactory score represents correct resolution of less than 2 of 5 examples.

Music History (9 students completed the exam)

		Score:	<u>Exemplary/Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory*</u>		
Lower level skills	1) Identification of Historical Periods		9 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (17%)
	2) Identification of Period dates		7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0 (25%)
Higher level skills	3) Identification of representative composers		6 (67%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)
	4) Description of style in each period		1 (11%)	3 (33%)	5 (56%)

* Exemplary, Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory scores derived as follow:

- For item 1: Exemplary score represents correct identification of all 6 historical style periods. Satisfactory represents correct identification of at least 5 of 6 historical style periods. Unsatisfactory score represents correct identification of less than 5 of 6 historical style periods.
- For item 2: Exemplary score represents correct identification of approximate dates for all 6 historical style periods. Satisfactory represents correct identification of approximate dates for at least 5 of 6 historical style periods. Unsatisfactory score represents correct identification of approximate dates for less than 5 of 6 historical style periods.
- For item 3: Exemplary score represents correct identification of representative composers for at least 6 of 6 historical periods. Satisfactory represents correct identification of representative composers for at least 4 or 5 historical style periods. Unsatisfactory score represents correct identification of representative composers for less than 4 of 6 historical style periods.
- For item 4: Exemplary score represents correct identification of stylist traits of 6 of 6 historical periods with detailed information provided regarding melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic traits. Satisfactory represents correct identification of stylistic traits of 4 or 5 historical periods with detailed information provided regarding melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic traits. Unsatisfactory score represents incorrect identification of stylistic traits for at least 4 historical periods.

Notes:

- In both Music Theory and Music History areas, students demonstrate strong understanding of lower level musical skills and knowledge and emerging strengths in higher level skills and knowledge.
- Additional external assessment measures document our student's strengths in musical analysis. Music Education students completing Music PLACE exams consistently score at high levels in Musical Analysis. PLACE scores are consistently weaker in Music History and Aural Skills. Music Theory instructor Mike Deluca proctors pre- and post- tests in both Music Theory I and Music Theory II. Students consistently demonstrate strong gains on these exams.
- The department continues to discuss the development of additional assessment tools, especially those that would better track student progress in historical understanding. Recital program notes and Music History research papers provide additional opportunities for assessment.

Timeline for Assessment of Program SLOs

Recent assessment has focused on the following SLOs:

1. *Read, analyze, and perform music* with fluency in at least one performance medium and in a variety of genres and styles.
2. *Use the piano proficiently* as an instrument for independent study of music theory, analysis of scores, and preparation of compositions or arrangements, as appropriate to the common tasks of a professional musician.
3. *Demonstrate proficiency in aural recognition* and analysis of music, and in singing musical lines at sight, as appropriate to the common tasks of a professional musician.
4. *Recognize and describe* representative selections of music from all *the significant style periods and genres* of western art music.

(for Music Performance)

7. *Prepare and present in public* a wide selection of repertoire representative of the highest standard of performance technique and style appropriate to young professional artists.

For 2019-20, focus will shift to the following SLOs:

5. *Create arrangements and original compositions* utilizing the recognized ranges and idioms of orchestral and band instruments and of vocal ensembles.
 - This will involve review of compositions/arrangements produced by students in the MUS 357 Orchestration and Arranging course

and:

(for Music Performance and Music Education)

6. *Conduct large and small ensembles* in their primary performance medium.
 - This will involve review of student progress in the MUS 358 and MUS 359 conducting sequence of courses

For 2020-21, focus will shift to the remaining Music Education SLOs:

7. *Demonstrate* through field experiences and student teaching the *necessary skills and dispositions for teaching music* in a variety of public school settings.
8. *Create instructional plans, long-range curriculum outlines, and assessments* for music education at elementary and secondary levels, following Colorado Content Area Learning Standards and incorporating recognized best practices in music pedagogy.

APPENDIX B

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC PERFORMANCE RUBRIC

Foundations		Development of Performance Technique		Development of Musical Judgment		Development of Professional Performance Career	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is beginning to develop an understanding of pitch and rhythmic notation and execution Numerous errors in pitch and/or rhythmic execution appear in performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is mastering the fundamentals of pitch and rhythmic execution well enough that consideration of technical development can begin Occasional errors in pitch and rhythmic execution (beyond incidental mistakes) appear in performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is beginning to develop an understanding of the performance technique idiomatic to their instrument or voice, but application is uneven. Student prone to errors in tone production, intonation, and/or technical execution Inconsistency in tempo may be apparent, but pitch and rhythmic errors are generally secondary to errors in technique. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is beginning to master the basic performance technique idiomatic to their instrument or voice, with the principal concern in performance shifting now toward expressivity and musical nuance. Student prone to errors in musical judgment such as improper phrasing or accentuation of line, and/or incorrect articulation or dynamic control. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student demonstrates solid control of the technical demands of his or her instrument or voice and an emerging maturity in musical judgment. Student is beginning to establish a breadth of repertoire commensurate with public performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student demonstrates solid control of the technical demands of the instrument or voice and an established maturity in musical judgment. Student is beginning to establish a breadth of repertoire that public performance, especially in local venues, is to be encouraged and expected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student demonstrates strong potential for professional success as a performing musician. Performance demonstrates a level of professional accomplishment that public performance, including regional venues, is to be encouraged and expected Student has an emerging breadth of repertoire commensurate with a distinguished performance career 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student demonstrates strong potential for professional success as a performing musician. Performance demonstrates a level of professional accomplishment that public performance, including national venues, is to be encouraged and expected. Student has completed a breadth of repertoire commensurate with a distinguished performance career
0-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40

Sight-Reading Ability			
Little or no ability to sight-read	Emerging ability to sight-read	Ability to sight-read is proficient	Ability to sight-read is exceptional
0-4	5-6	7-8	9-10

Scales or Rudiments			
Little or no ability to execute	Emerging ability to execute	Ability to execute is proficient	Ability to execute is exceptional
0-4	5-6	7-8	9-10

APPENDIX C

Colorado State University – Pueblo
Department of Music

JUNIOR QUALIFICATIONS EXAMINATION

Name: _____

Date: _____

Degree Program (General, Music Education, Performance): _____

**** READ INSTRUCTIONS FOR EACH QUESTION CAREFULLY ****

I. Music Theory

Provide Roman numeral/figured bass analysis for each of the chords in the chorale below. Resolve the chords marked with an asterisk and provide Roman numeral/figured bass analysis for the chord to which you resolve.

A modulation occurs in the last four chords of the example. For the chord marked with two blanks (which functions as a pivot, or common, chord), provide Roman numeral analysis in both the original key and, once identified, the key to which the example modulates.

=====

===== *

=====

=====

=====

===== *

=====

=====

===== *

=====

=====

=====

=====

===== *

=====

Name: _____

II. Music Appreciation/History

From approximately 400 AD to present, scholars typically define six broad stylistic eras in the history of western music.

In the space provided below, identify these six eras, approximate dates for each, and a representative composer from each era. Additionally, briefly describe a melodic/harmonic and rhythmic feature that distinguishes the music of each era.

1) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

2) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

Junior Qualifications Exam, page 3

Name: _____

3) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

4) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

Junior Qualifications Exam, page 4

Name: _____

5) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

6) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

APPENDIX D

Music Theory I Pre/Post Test Results 2018

Name	Pre-Test Score	Post Test Score	Gain/Loss
Herman, Deklin	70	100	+30
Akin, Ian	70	98	+28
Campenella, Ashleigh	46	96	+50
Causey, Bridget	22	96	+74
Gonzales, Gabbie	44	84	+40
Krohn, Hester	18	98	+80
Montoya, Dominic	52	98	+66
Nab, Samantha	52	100	+48
Rampa, Elijah	36	94	+58
Rose, Paul	62	94	+32
Aragon, Samantha	52	100	+50
Bush, Jillian	32	82	+50
Dooley, JHannah	38	98	+60
Duran, Anastasia	42	90	+48
Foster, Mariah	22	82	+60
Hacsi, Lisa	20	94	+74
Masrtinez, Gavin	30	76	+46
Myers, Shania	50	98	+48
O'Connor, Rachel	52	84	+32
Oatman, Elizabeth	62	92	+30
Opp, Brady	12	65	+56
Stroup, Courtney	30	92	+62
Torres-Ferrer, John	24	90	+66
Vigil, Maya	40	80	+40