

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

Bachelor of Music in Performance, BM

College of Liberal Arts, Department of Music

AY 2016-2018

Submitted by: Dr. Paul Krejci
Contact Information: prkrejci@alaska.edu
Date: 9/28/2018

1. Assessment information collected

A. Music Theory

- i. Diagnostic Tool: A written entrance examination is collected from all entering first-year students at the beginning of the academic year. Students either begin the music theory sequence with MUS 131 Basic Theory I or take MUS 103 Music Fundamentals for remedial work.
- ii. Exit Level Assessment: Final examinations are collected at the end of each semester for the courses in the music theory and ear training sequence, MUS 131, 132, 133, 134, 231, 232, 233, and 234.

B. Music History

- i. Exit Level Assessment: Final examinations are collected at the end of each semester for the courses in the music history sequence, MUS 221, 222, and at least two of the following: MUS 410, 421, 422, 423, and 424.

C. Applied Lessons

- i. 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. (MUS 161, 162, 261, 262, 361, 362, 461, and 462)

D. Piano Proficiency

- i. Exit Level Assessment: Each student does an examination by a faculty panel at the end of each semester. (MUS 152, 153, 154)

E. Junior and Senior Level Recitals

i. Exit Level Assessment: Each student performs a recital in their Junior and Senior years. These recitals are evaluated pass/fail by a faculty panel. (MUS 390 and 490)

2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above

AY 2016-2017

In the AY 2016-2017, there were 12 Performance majors, 4 of whom were double majors, 2 of them Music Education majors.

First-year – 3 students

33%, 1 of 3 – On track in the music core curriculum.

One of the students transferred to UAF mid-year and was set back a semester in piano proficiency.

One other student needed to retake a music theory and was delayed a year because of it.

Second-year – 3 students

100%, 3 of 3 – On track in the music core curriculum.

Third-year – 1 student

0%, 0 of 1 – On track in the music core curriculum.

A double major who delayed Junior Recital one year.

Fourth-year – 2 students

50%, 1 of 2 – On track in the music core curriculum.

One student delayed Senior Recital one year.

Fifth-year – 1 student

100%, 1 of 1 – graduated in Spring 2017.

The student graduated after 4 ½ years. This was due to the student being a Performance major on two instruments and having briefly transferred to another university midway into the degree program.

Beyond Fifth-year – 2 students

The two students enrolled in the music program starting in the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 academic years, respectively. One of them only needs to complete the recital requirements. The other still needs to complete the upper-level history, piano proficiency, and recital requirements.

Conclusions for AY 2016-2017:

Of the 12 music performance majors, 42% (5 of 12) are on track in their degree requirements following a 4-year plan. Following a prospective 5-year plan, 83% (10 of 12) are on track to finishing.

Performance students tend to be very good academic students and do well in the music core curriculum. 4 of the students are double majors, 2 of them Music Education majors. This added major contributed to 3 of them having to extend their degree programs by a semester to a year. Also, 2 of the current second-year students were set back a semester or year the previous academic year after failing to complete their music theory and piano proficiency requirements, respectively. Finally, 2 other students have gone well beyond the typical four to five years of study to complete their degrees. Their progress is uncertain.

AY 2017-2018

In the year 2017-2018, there were 14 Performance majors, 3 of whom were double majors, 2 of them Music Education majors.

First-year – 1 student

100%, 1 of 1 – On track in the music core curriculum.

Second-year – 3 students

33%, 1 of 3 – On track in the music core curriculum.

One of the students transferred to UAF mid-year last year (AY 2016-2017) and was set back a semester in piano proficiency.

One other student needed to retake a music theory last year (AY 2016-2017) and was delayed a year because of it.

Third-year – 4 students

50%, 2 of 4 – On track in the music core curriculum.

Two students delayed their Junior Recital one year.

One student transferred to UAF after many years away and needed to do some remedial studies in theory and history but will remain on track.

Fourth-year – 1 student

0%, 0 of 1 – On track in the music core curriculum.

A double major who delayed Senior Recital one year.

Fifth-year – 3 students

100%, 3 of 3 – graduated in the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 semesters.

One student graduated in Fall 2017, after 5 years.

Two other students graduated in Spring 2018. One of them was a double major, which included Music Education.

Beyond Fifth-year – 2 students

The two students enrolled in the music program starting in the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 academic years, respectively. One of them only needs to complete the recital requirements. The other still needs to complete the upper-level history, piano proficiency, and recital requirements.

Conclusions for AY 2017-2018:

Of the 14 music performance majors, 29% (4 of 14) are on track in their degree requirements following a 4-year plan. Following a prospective 5-year plan, 86% (12 of 14) are on track to finishing.

Performance students again tend to be very good academic students and do well in the music core curriculum. 3 of the students are double majors, 2 of them Music Education majors. This added major contributed to 3 of them having to extend their degree by a semester to a year. Also, 2 of the current second-year students were set back a semester or year

the previous academic year after failing to complete their music theory and piano proficiency requirements, respectively. Finally, 2 other students have gone well beyond the typical four to five years of study to complete their degrees. Their progress is uncertain.

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

None as of yet. The theory, history, and piano proficiency requirements have only delayed a small percentage (about 1/6th) of the BM in Performance majors compared to that of Mus Ed and BA in Music students. Incoming performance majors in general tend to have deeper musical backgrounds and more enhanced musical skills that enable them to succeed (more efficiently) in this part of the curriculum.

Mid-way into their academic programs, double majors with heavier course loads tend to delay their Junior Recital and, in turn, Senior Recital, resulting in 5-year plans rather than 4-year. In order to accommodate more music students in general and BM in Performance students in particular, a 5-year plan would help those students who need more remedial assistance and those who are double majoring. The faculty will discuss this summary and possible changes to the curriculum.

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

Dr. Paul Krejci, Dr. Lorna Eder, Mr. Ryan Fitzpatrick, and Dr. William Post (advisor and department chair)

5. Has your SLOA plan been updated to include assessment of the program's Communication Plan, as required by Faculty Senate motion? (required for baccalaureate programs only)

Yes. Research paper and presentation requirements in the history course sequence (MUS 221, 222, 410, 421, 422, 423, 424) satisfy completion of the communication learning outcome (formerly W + O designations).

Students in these courses are provided an environment to express and argue their points in written, spoken, and performative modes.

MUS 351 Conducting and the applied lesson sequence (MUS 161, 162, 261, 262, 361, 362, 461, 462) also satisfy completion of the communication learning outcome (formerly an O designation) as an oral-intensive course requirement for BM in Performance majors. Students in these courses verbally and artistically express themselves in the classroom setting, often articulating and defending their thoughts on musical interpretation, performance practices, and historical and theoretical contexts.