

Annual Assessment Report

Department: Music
Academic Year: 2021-2022
Date of Submission: Sept. 15
Department Chair: Ruth Lin

I. Response to the previous year PRC’s recommendations

Item: Quality of evidence and measuring instrument	Response: Please see attached excel file of Michael Shasberger’s personal jury notes as an example. Columns A-O are filled out by the students ahead of juries, and Columns P-Y are evaluations and comments concerning a specific piece of music that was performed during jury. If multiple pieces are performed during juries, then the successive columns would include the information regarding those other pieces, then evaluations and comments.
Item: Inclusion of meeting meetings	Response: Please see attached word doc of department meeting minutes from 2021-2022
Item:	Response:
Item:	Response:
Notes:	

II A. Program Learning Outcome (PLO) assessment

If your department participated in the ILO assessment you may use this section to report on your student learning in relation to the assessed ILO. The assessment data can be requested from the Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness.

Program Learning Outcome	Music Literacy and repertoire Outcome
Who is in Charge	Grey Brothers

/Involved?	
<u>Direct Assessment Methods</u>	Music literacy” measured in this outcome refers to familiarity with historic music repertoire, as experienced through aural and visual examples; the former in the form of recordings and the latter in the form of musical scores. Direct assessment tool is the unit exam
<u>Indirect Assessment Methods</u>	While students’ familiarity with the musical examples is indirectly assessed via classroom discussions, papers, presentations, and quizzes administered each class session. Three of these are administered throughout the spring semester. Our students are expected to perform at the developing level.
Major Findings	<p><u>Assessment Result:</u> The students’ performance can be determined from the section “Score Identification on Exams” in the attached “Music Literacy Data.”</p> <p>Of the ten students enrolled in MU 121 in Spring 2022, six, or 60%, achieved an average of 80% or better on the score identification portion of the unit exams. The class average was 76.8%. By either measure, We clearly fell short of our benchmark.</p> <p>It is instructive to compare the performance of MU 121 students in Spring 2022 with that of students in Spring 2019 and Spring 2020. Of the ten students enrolled in MU 121 in Spring 2020, again six, or 60%, achieved an average of better than 80% on the score identification portion of the unit exams. The class average that year, however, was higher, at 83.1%. As for Spring 2019, only four of the nine students, or 44%, achieved an average of 80% or better, and the class average of 77.3%, while higher than in 2022, was lower than our 80% target.</p> <p><u>Interpretation</u> In every year since we established this learning outcome, our students have fallen short of our benchmark. The instructor has employed a variety of strategies over the years to enable students to master this area of the course content. In 2022, the instructor made score identification a significant part of the regular quizzes, in order to give students an incentive to familiarize themselves with the scores on a regular basis.</p> <p>Student success in this area appears to be strongly tied to the academic ability of the students in the course; each year, a few do very well, while others fail, sometimes miserably. 2020 was a good year, in that more students achieved at a higher level than in other years. Since the course content and requirements have changed little over the years, performance in this outcome obviously varies depending upon the academic strength of each student cohort.</p>

	As proposed in the 2015 report, the overall workload of MU 121 has been gradually reduced, thus reducing the total amount of information the students have had to master for exams, so that students have had more time to spend on the core music literacy component. In order to meet our benchmark, either new teaching and/or learning strategies need to be employed, the course workload needs to be further reduced, or the department needs to settle on a lower benchmark.
Closing the Loop Activities	Music Literacy document as written by Grey Brothers has been shared with Zig Reichwald, the new professor who will be taking over MU 121 so he could take this information and data into consideration.
Collaboration and Communication	

or/and

II B. Key Questions

Key Question	departmental interpretation of the Student Diversity Data
Who is in Charge/Involved?	Full time faculty of the music department
<u>Direct Assessment Methods</u>	N/A data provided by Tim Loomer
<u>Indirect Assessment Methods</u>	N/A
Major Findings	<p>After looking over the data, we resonate with the general goal of helping all students, especially those who are first generation and HABH students, the consensus finding from our examinations are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The music data set may not be big enough to offer helpful insights. For example, the gain or loss of one student in a particular group could either doubled by 100% the population of that particular group or reduce it that population by 50%.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The modality of the classes that were examined are too different, grades in a performance class such as choral union (MU-078) is given almost exclusively based on attendance, while music classroom classes such as Principles of Music II (MU-012) are based on exams and projects. Mixing the data of these two classes would not offer an accurate view of how students are progressing in our department.
Recommendations	We recommend that for the music department, rather than only examining the data of introductory courses, perhaps a more helpful way is to examine the data of courses in terms of whether they are performance based, such as lessons and ensembles, vs classroom courses such as music theory and music history courses. Secondly, we also recognize that grades may not be the most accurate way to capture student learning and learning outcomes in our discipline as grades are sometimes determine 99% base on attendance, but we recognize that this may be a challenge when doing assessment at an institutional level.
Collaboration and Communication	

III. Follow-ups

Program Learning Outcome or Key Question	
Who was involved in implementation?	
What was decided or addressed?	
How were the recommendations	

implemented?	
Collaboration and Communication	

IV. Other assessment or Key Questions related projects

Project	
Who is in Charge /Involved?	
Major Findings	
Action	
Collaboration and Communication	

V. Adjustments to the Multi-year Assessment Plan (optional)

Proposed adjustment	Rationale	Timing

VI. Appendices

- A. Prompts or instruments used to collect the data
- B. Rubrics used to evaluate the data
- C. Relevant assessment-related documents (optional)