

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

Bachelor Arts in Music, BA

School of Music

AY 2012-2014

Submitted by: Dr. Lorna Eder
Contact Information: x6576
Date: November 4, 2014

1. Assessment information collected

A. Music Theory

- a. Diagnostic Tool: A written entrance examination is collected from all entering freshman at the beginning of the year. Students either begin the music theory sequence with MUS131 or take Music Fundamentals, MUS103, for remedial work.
- b. Exit Level Assessment: Final examinations are collected at the end of each semester for the courses in the music theory sequence, MUS131, 132, 231 and 232.

B. Aural Music Comprehension

- a. Exit Level Assessment: Final examinations are collected at the end of each semester for the courses in the aural skills sequence, MUS132, 134, 232 and 234.

C. Music History

- a. Exit Level Assessment: Final examinations are collected at the end of each semester for the courses in the music history sequence, MUS221 and 222.

D. Music Technology

- a. Exit Level Assessment: Final examinations/projects are collected at the end of the course (MUS332).

E. Instrumental Performance

- a. Exit Level Assessment: A jury performance in front of music faculty is required at the end of each semester of private lessons. Using a jury rubric, the faculty recommends a final semester grade for each student. (MUS161, 162, 261, 262, 361, 362)

F. Large Ensemble

- a. Exit Level Assessment: The faculty director of each large ensemble gives a final semester grade.

G. Piano Proficiency

- a. Exit Level Assessment: Each student does an examination by a faculty panel at the end of each semester. (MUS153)

2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above

A. Music Theory

- a. Diagnostic Tool: Twenty (20) entering freshman were given a diagnostic exam at the beginning of the semester:

Freshman:

6 - Enrolled in MUS103, Music Fundamentals, 30%

12 - Enrolled in MUS 131, Music Theory (began sequence), 60%

2 – Did not begin the theory sequence, 10%

- b. Exit Level Assessment:

Freshman:

MUS103 –67%, 4 of 6

MUS131 – 67%, 8 of 12

MUS132 – 100%, 9 of 9

Sophomore:

MUS131 – 67%, 2 of 3

MUS132 – 50%, 2 of 4

MUS231 – 100%, 7 of 7

MUS232 – 100%, 7 of 7

Conclusions: Of the twenty entering freshman, 40% did not have strong enough skills to enter the theory core curriculum – 8 of 20. Of the 6 who entered MUS103, Music Fundamentals, the pass rate was only 67%. Two freshman did not even enroll in MUS103. Freshman who do not pass MUS131 their freshman year, do not have a good success rate in the program and often drop out by their sophomore year. The students who pass MUS131 have a very good success rate for the ongoing theory sequence.

The statistics show that the skill base of entering freshman needs to be addressed. The first semester seems to be crucial. This committee advises better advisement and ongoing mentoring of freshman. It is recommended that the faculty receive an advisement and mentoring tutorial and adopt an ongoing mentoring plan for

freshman. It is recommended that the entire faculty discuss possible solutions to the retention problem. Perhaps the theory diagnostic could be taken at the time of the entrance auditions. If the student sends a DVD, the diagnostic could be taken before they are allowed to register for classes. This would provide faculty with a more accurate assessment of the students' skill level. Another solution is students who enroll in MUS103 should be encouraged to take class piano, since good piano skills are the basis for good theory skills.

B. Aural Skills Comprehension

a. Exit Level Assessment:

Freshman:

MUS133 – 51%, 7 of 12

MUS134 – 100%, 9 of 9

Sophomore:

MUS133 – 100% 2 of 2

MUS134 – 33%, 1 of 3

MUS233 – 100%, 6 of 6

MUS234 – 100%, 6 of 6

Junior:

MUS133 – 100%, 1 of 1

Mus 134 – 100%, 1 of 1

Conclusions: The success rate of the first semester freshman aural skills class, MUS133 highlights the problems discussed in the music theory section and the same conclusions can be drawn.

C. Music History

a. Exit Level Assessment:

Sophomore:

MUS221 – 78%, 7 of 9

MUS222 – 100%, 7 of 7

Junior:

MUS221 – 100%, 3 of 3

MUS222 – 100%, 1 of 1

Senior:

MUS222: 100%, 1 of 1

Conclusions: The Music History sequence has an acceptable pass ratio, and the pass ratio was 100% for the juniors and senior retaking the class. However, the juniors and seniors retaking the class are behind in their core curriculum. Some students retake history two or three times, their graduation dates seriously delayed.

D. Music Technology

a. Exit Level Assessment:

MUS332 – 100%, 4 of 4 (Senior)

Conclusions: The Music Technology class has a high success ratio. Because it is not essential of the assessment process of the BA program, it is recommended that it not be a part of the SLOA plan in the future.

E. Instrumental Performance

a. Exit Level Assessment:

Freshman:

MUS161 – 100%, 14 of 14

MUS162 – 100%, 11 of 11

MUS261 – 100%, 2 of 2

Junior:

MUS361 – 60%, 3 of 5

MUS362 – 100%, 2 of 2

MUS461 – 100%, 1 of 1

Sophomore:

MUS162 – 100%, 1 of 1

MUS261 – 100%, 10 of 10

MUS262 – 100% - 3 of 3

Senior:

MUS461 – 100%, 4 of 4

MUS462 – 100%, 1 of 1

Conclusions: The pass rate of private lessons was 100%, except for MUS361. The expectations for 300 level performance are high, and sometimes students are passed to the next level too soon. Since the grade for private lessons is up to the discretion of the private teacher, it is recommended that a more accurate assessment be taken from an average of the jury grades from the jury grading rubric that is now being implemented.

F. Large Ensemble

a. Exit Level Assessment:

All students enrolled in a large ensemble passed – 100%.

Conclusions: Large Ensemble is not essential to the BA program assessment and it is recommended that it not be included in the SLOA plan in the future.

G. Piano Proficiency

a. Exit Level Assessment:

Freshman:

MUS153 – 91%, 11 of 12

Junior:

MUS153 – 100%, 3 of 3

Sophomore:

MUS153 – 88%, 7 of 8

Senior:

MUS153 – 100%, 3 of 3

Conclusions: The ratios for Piano Proficiency were very good. A new curriculum was adopted in 2013-2014.

****FURTHER DATA AND CONCLUSIONS****

1. Because the core music curriculum for the first two years is the same for ALL of the undergraduate music degree programs (BA, BM Performance and BM Music Education), the BA program has served as a “holding tank” for all music students until their sophomore or junior years. Some students never submit their paper work until just before they graduate. This makes the gathering and analysis of data for the BA program very difficult. This committee has done their best not to include students who recorded the wrong degree and were not music majors, who withdrew from their classes early during the first semester, or who were performance or music education students who hadn't submitted their paper work yet.

Of the 77 BA students on record: 12 were not music majors, 4 never showed for classes, 15 were in the music education or performance program and 1 was not enrolled in any degree program - a total of 32 students. That left 45 actual BA students that were included in the data above.

2. Two of the big concerns of the music program is freshman student retention and students falling behind in the core theory and music history sequences. This affects the length of their degree program.

A. Freshman Retention

Withdrew early in the semester – 20%, 4 of 20

Withdrew after the first semester – 33%, 6 of 20

Withdrawal after the first year – 15%, 3 of 20

Total: 65%, 13 of 20

B. Students Behind in the Core Curriculum

Freshmen - On Track – 30%, 6 of 20

Behind in Theory – 10%, 2 of 20

Sophomore - On Track – 45%, 5 of 11

	Behind in Theory and History – 27%, 3 of 11
	Behind in Theory, History and Lessons – 9%, 1 of 11
	Behind in Theory and Piano – 9%, 1 of 11
Junior -	On track – 33%, 2 of 6
	Behind in Theory – 16%, 1 of 6
	Behind in coursework – 16%, 1 of 6
Senior -	Graduated – 38%, 3 of 8
	Almost finished w/ credits, but no graduation – 38%, 3 of 8
	Behind in Piano Proficiency – 25%, 2 of 8

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

1. In response to the BA Program Assessment Review in 2014, the School of Music has drafted a proposal for a new BA degree program that hopefully will be implemented in the 2015 academic school year. The BA program will no longer serve as a holding tank. Students who want to pursue performance or music education degrees will enroll in those programs as freshman. The BA program will have three additional areas of concentration – Music Theory, Music History and Music Composition.

2. It is recommended that the music faculty address the poor freshman retention percentages by implementing the suggestions in 2.A. above. This will hopefully address both the freshman retention problem and provide the skills necessary for a better success rate for students travelling through the theory and history sequences.

3. The Piano Proficiency exam levels are misleading. In the previous four-semester curriculum, the student could take the semesters over and over again until they passed. The skills were not presented in a linear fashion and students were learning by rote. A new curriculum was proposed and implemented in the 2013-2014 academic year. It is a three semester course, MUS 152, 153 and 154, with a textbook that presents material in a gradual, linear sequence. It is to be taken in conjunction with the theory sequence in order to reinforce the skills being taught in theory.

4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting

The BA Program SLOA was addressed by the BA Curriculum Committee:

Dr. William Post

Dr. Lorna Eder

MaryCatherine Mahoney

Dr. Jim Bicigo

The new BA Degree Program was proposed by the BA curriculum committee, chaired by Dr. William Post, and passed by the UAF music faculty.

The Piano Proficiency program change was proposed by Dr. Lorna Eder and agreed upon by the UAF music faculty.