Program Assessment Plan
2017-2018

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 <u>observable</u> and <u>measurable</u>, 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 <u>discrete</u> aspects of the student's development.

Focus of Assessment for the Department of Music in 2017-2018
Assessment efforts in 2017-2018 focused specifically on the progress and retention of students who do not formally audition for the department prior to enrollment during their first semester. 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 permits admission for students who do not have as extensive musical preparation as many of their peers, but may have the requisite abilities for success with instruction and experience.

Music faculty have had long-standing concerns around the ultimate success of these students and the best policies and practices for facilitating their entrance and continuation in the program. Program Assessment in 2017-2018 focuses on the outcomes of these students in each of the program measures.

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 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 possible assessment tools on 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 2017-2018:

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 used in future semesters.

For Spring 2018, the rubric was used to assess 41 jury performances. 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 2017 juries:

Acad. Level	Foundations		Technical Development		Development of Musical Judgment		Repertoire and Career dev.	
	Emerging	Mastering	Emerging	Mastering	Emerging	Mastering	Emerging	Mastering
Fresh.		2	6 (3)	5				
Soph.			1	2	2	3		
Junior			1	2	4	5		
Senior					4	2	1	1

Notes:
- Scores appeared relatively consistent across all faculty evaluators and instrumental levels. Using scores of 0 – 40, in only five student assessments were the discrepancy between highest and lowest scores assigned by multiple faculty evaluating the same student greater than 10. Music faculty will continue to review use of the rubric in the Fall Convocation Departmental meeting with the goal of centering scores more closely around the mean, although wide use of the rubric appears successful overall.
- Scores by academic level fall within desired ranges: students in higher academic levels demonstrate desired gains across their tenure of study.
- Three freshmen who had not previously auditioned for the department prior to their first semester of enrollment juried and were assessed with the Applied Music Performance Rubric. Shown in parentheses, each scored in the "emerging" range of Technical Development, in the middle scores of the freshman cohort.
- Conversations will continue around requisite scores required for retention in the major at each emphasis level. The Spring 2017 juries did, as an example, identify weaknesses in a jury for a student who desires to complete the performance emphasis. This student, upon counsel, changed her major from performance to general emphasis. This rubric provides an opportunity to document individual student deficiencies and focus advising around emphasis selection and, ultimately, approval by faculty for each of the emphasis areas.

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

Notes:
- Grade distribution is significantly higher (77% A, 7% WFD) among students who audition prior to their first semester of enrollment than those who do not (36% A, 36% WFD)
- Persistence in major (defined here as students registered as Music majors for Fall 2018 as of June 1, 2018) is significantly higher (44%; 61% including students expected to enroll) for students who audition prior to their first semester of enrollment than those who do not (14%; 21% including students expected to enroll)
- Auditioning prior to first-term enrollment is not a guarantee of success, however. One withdrew before the Fall term ended and another withdrew during the Spring term.

- Neither is not-auditioning prior to the first-term enrollment is not a guarantee of failure. One student who did not audition prior to his first-term enrollment was one of our most successful freshman students in terms of performances and course progress through the year. One other is returning for their sophomore year in music after successfully completing their freshman year course of study and one other is expected to return.

Written Junior Qualifications Exam

In Spring 2018, 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 (12 students completed the exam)

	Score:	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory*
Lower level skills	1) Analysis of key and diatonic harmony	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)
	2) Analysis of modulation	4 (33%)	4 (33%)	4 (33%)
Higher level skills	3) Analysis of chromatic harmony	4 (33%)	4 (33%)	4 (33%)
	4) Resolution of harmony	3 (25%)	6 (50%)	3 (25%)

* 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 (12 students completed the exam)

	Score:	Exemplary	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory*
Lower level skills	1) Identification of Historical Periods	10 (83%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)
	2) Identification of Period dates	7 (58%)	2 (17%)	3 (25%)
Higher level skills	3) Identification of representative composers	4 (33%)	5 (42%)	3 (25%)
	4) Description of style in each period	4 (33%)	3 (25%)	5 (42%)

* 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 5 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.

Music Theory Pre- and Post- Tests (see Appendix D)
The instructor for Music Theory I administers pre- and post-tests during the first and last weeks of the course. The Department compared averages of students who audition prior to their first semester of enrollment versus those who do not audition.

Pre-Test averages (59.3 for auditionees vs. 38.4 for non-auditionees) revealed a significant discrepancy in the preparedness for Music Theory studies of non-auditionees.

Post-Test averages were close (94.8 vs. 86.4), but it is important to note that of the 14 students who did not formally audition prior to enrolling in Music Theory I, only 9 successfully completed the course and both pre- and post- tests.

Notes:
- Auditionees are significantly more prepared, on average, for Music Theory study in their

first semester of enrollment than non-auditionees.
- Of the non-auditionees who successfully complete the course, the post-test results are close to those of auditionees.

Conclusions and Changes in Curriculum moving forward:
Beginning Fall 2018, the department proposes different first-semester courses of study for those who formally audition prior to the first semester of enrollment and for those who do not. Those who have not formally auditioned for the department prior to their first term of enrollment will be interviewed by the Department Chair during Orientation to determine if they are adequately prepared for the schedule permitted auditionees. Without Department Chair approval, non-auditionees will be advised to take the alternative first-semester course of study. This information will be communicated with the Music First Year Advisor to ensure students are properly advised through the Orientation process.

First Semester Course of Study for *Those Who Audition Prior to Enrolling:*	*First Semester Course of Study for* *Those Who **Do Not** Audition Prior to Enrolling:*
(3) ENG 101 (2) Applied Music (1) Ensembles (0) Music Symposium (1) MUS 127 – Fundamental Piano (3) MUS 150 – Music Theory I (2) MUS 151 – Aural Skills I (1) MUS 113 Vocal Tech. (*Music Ed majors*) ** additional courses selected in consultation with advisor	(3) ENG 101 (3) MTH 109 (3) MUS 118 – Music Appreciation (2) Applied Music (1) Ensembles (0) Music Symposium (1) MUS 127 – Fundamental Piano (1) MUS 113 Vocal Tech. (*Music Ed majors*) ** additional courses selected in consultation with advisor

Curriculum:
The Department of Music continues to improve assessment tools and processes and relies on this information heavily in making curricular decisions. The department will assign faculty groups in 2017-2018 to review assessment tools in each SLO area and continue to implement improvements in the departmental assessment and curricular review process.

APPENDIX A (unchanged from 2010-11)
Curriculum Map Showing Alignment of Student Learning Outcomes and Course Content
Music Courses, 2010-2011

CORE OUTCOMES	MUS 118	MUS 150-210-250-280	MUS 151-211-251-281	MUS 127-227-229	MUS 305-355	MUS 357	MUS 358-359	ENSEMBLES	APPLIED LESSONS	SYMPOSIUM STUDIO CLASSES	JR & SR RECITALS	MUS 340-440	
Ability to read, analyze, and perform music		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ability to use the piano Proficiently				X			X						
Ability to demonstrate proficiency in aural recognition	X		X		X		X	X	X				
Ability to recognize and describe the significant style periods and genres of western art music	X				X								
Ability to create arrangements and original compositions		X				X							
Ability to conduct large and small ensembles							X	X					
For Performance Emphasis:													
Prepare and present public performances with advanced proficiency										X	X		
For Music Education Emphasis:													
Create instructional plans, long-range curriculum outlines, and assessments for music instruction												X	

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC
PERFORMANCE RUBRIC

Foundations		Development of Performance Technique		Development of Musical Judgment		Development of Professional Performance Career	
• 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	• 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	• 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.	• 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.	• 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	• 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.	• 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	• 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:

Name: _____

3) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

4) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

Name: _____

5) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

6) Era: _____

Approximate Dates: _____

Representative Composer: _____

Melodic/Harmonic feature:

Rhythmic feature:

Fall 2017 Theory I Pre/Post Test Results

Name	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain
Auditioned before enrolling in first term:			
Allen, Devin	68	94	26
Baca, Dusty	68	98	30
Carver, Frank	68	72	4
Cash, Lilly	58	94	36
Fleming, Veena	64	96	32
Garcia, Brandon	64	98	34
Houghton, Debra	56	100	44
Howorth, Coreen	48	98	42
Liske, Megan	62	100	38
Hurley, Cory	36	98	62
Jeffus, Megan	82	100	18
Mc Donough, Stephen	58	94	36
Metcalfe, Victoria	92	100	8
Munoz, Adan	30	86	56
Sheumaker, Blake	46	94	48
Sisneros, Salomon	58	94	36
York, Ziara	50	96	46
Averages:	**59.3**	**94.8**	
DID NOT Audition before enrolling in first term:			
Armes, Chad	30	90	60
Chino, Lawrence	68	100	32
Dameron, Jakki	36	80	44
Inge, Shaniece	6	60	54
Kelsey, James	32	88	56
Richards, Chris	50	90	40
Sefcovic, Chris	28	82	54
Uber, Andrew	48	88	40
Vasquez, Cassi	48	100	52
Averages:	**38.4**	**86.4**	