

**Department of Music—BA in Music, Evidence and Use of Evidence of
Assessment Spring 2019**

Department Learning Outcome (Teach)—*Music graduates will develop both a broad knowledge of their discipline and specific skills in performing, teaching and directing music.*

Program Learning Outcomes (Teach):

1. Demonstrate essential competencies in musicianship skills in written theory, aural skills, and keyboard musicianship.
2. Develop applied music skills in one primary performance area in both solo and ensemble settings.
3. Become conversant with the essential outlines of music history, music literature, and an awareness of significant non-western musical styles.

Department Learning Outcome (Shape)—*Students will develop characteristics necessary to strengthen and contribute to the musical life of the communities where they work and live.*

Program Learning Outcomes (Shape):

4. All students will demonstrate proficiency in basic conducting skills.
5. Students will participate in ensemble performances through regular rehearsal attendance and highest efforts as demonstrated through high-level collegiate performance.

Department Learning Outcome (Send): *Graduates will be prepared to serve as musicians in a changing world through their technical and professional abilities. This includes preparation for careers in the arts and entertainment industry, music education, praise and worship and graduate study.*

Program Learning Outcomes (Send):

6. Develop and articulate a clear application of the concepts of calling, role, path and purpose as they apply to the discipline of music.

Department of Music—BA in Music Assessment Data Spring 2019

Learning Outcome 1—Demonstrate essential competencies in musicianship skills in written theory, aural skills, and keyboard musicianship.

Outcome Measures

1. Written Theory—Entrance/Exit Exams in MUT100 and MUT120,
2. MacGamut Levels in MUT220, and
3. Piano Proficiency Exam

Criteria for Success

1. 75% of students will score at least an 80 on the Final Exam of MUT120
2. 60% of students will achieve at least Level 5 on the Melodic and Harmonic Dictation of MacGamut by MUT220
3. 60% of students will pass the Piano Proficiency Exam by the end of the sixth semester

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data

Freshman Music Theory Entrance/Exit Exam

Table 1—Results of the Music Theory Entrance/Exam showing the number of students taking the exam, average scores on the way in and on the way out and percentage of students that achieve the benchmark.

| Year | No. of entering freshmen | Average entrance score | Average exit score | Percentage of students scoring 80 or higher |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|---|
| 2009-10 | 22 | 8 | 83 | 65% |
| 2010-11 | 23 | 6 | 86 | 100% |
| 2011-12 | 29 | 10 | 92 | 100% |
| 2012-13 | 27 | 12 | 87 | 83% |
| 2013-14 | 27 | 10 | 86 | 84% |
| 2014-15 | 17 | 13 | 76 | 65% |
| 2015-16 | 25 | 14 | 84 | 92% |
| 2016-17 | 11 | 35 | 97 | 91% |
| 2017-18 | 14 | 27 | 89 | 93% |
| 2018-19 | 12 | 23 | 87 | 91% |

Piano Proficiency Exam

Table 2—Results of the Piano Proficiency Exam from 2009 to 2016 organized by cohort, showing the percentage of the class that completed all sections during the 4th to the 9th semester of matriculation.

| year | # of semesters | | | | | |
|------|----------------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|
| | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9* |
| 2007 | 34% | 54% | 54% | 54% | 85% | 85% |
| 2008 | 44% | 52% | 61% | 61% | 74% | 74% |
| 2009 | 43% | 46% | 62% | 67% | 89% | 89% |
| 2010 | 19% | 28% | 35% | 54% | 61% | 61% |
| 2011 | 15% | 18% | 25% | 30% | 71% | 84% |
| 2012 | 50% | 61% | 73% | 77% | 100% | -- |
| 2013 | 64% | 71% | 82% | 82% | -- | -- |
| 2014 | 15% | 20% | 39% | | | |
| 2015 | 45% | 53% | 62% | | | |
| 2016 | 43% | | | | | |

* —note that the final column may not be 100% as a result of students who transfer, drop the music major or do not complete the piano proficiency requirement.

MacGamut Levels at the end of MUT220

Table 3—MacGamut levels in Melodic and Harmonic dictation at the end of Music Theory III (MUT220)

| Year | No of Students | Students at Melodic Level 5 | Students at Harmonic Level 5 |
|---------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2014-15 | 8 | 63% | 50% |
| 2015-16 | 11 | 36.4% | 45.5% |
| 2016-17 | 17 | 88% | 82% |
| 2017-18 | 11 | 87% | 81% |
| 2018-19 | 8 | 100% | 92% |

Conclusions Drawn from Data

The Music Theory Placement Exam continues to provide a useful measure of the change in our First-Year students' music theory skills over the course of the year. We do not hit our target every year largely as a result of the makeup of our entering class. However, the entrance and exit exams still point out the dramatic change that takes place during the course of the year. We had a relatively small class of entering freshmen this year with only 11 students enrolled in MUT120. Although we had 25 students take the Placement Exam in the Fall, four of the freshmen placed into Theory II, another few had AP Music Theory and tested out and others either did not pursue the music degree or dropped the major after the Fall term.

The students that continued into the major were extremely well-prepared and had strong performance and musicianship skills. As a result, we easily hit our marks. We realize that we will not have such an even class every semester but feel very good about the musicianship level of our 2016-17 cohort and their success as professional musicians.

We continue to monitor the completion rate of Piano Proficiency and do not feel satisfied with where we are with the classes that lead up to the test. Our completion rate, once again, tends to hit the target in the 6th-7th semesters instead of the 4th. We are aware that there is still disagreement between the piano faculty and the department chair about how best to administer the test and the piano requirements. The chair is urging the piano faculty to roll the proficiency exam into the final exams of the piano courses and the piano faculty still wants a traditional, barrier-style test. This past year we worked more stringently to ensure that students were staying enrolled in our piano classes until the Piano Proficiency Test is completed. This is probably what led to a slight increase in the completion rates between the 2012 and the 2013 cohorts.

These past two years are the first time that we have monitored MacGamut levels in melodic and harmonic dictation. In past semesters we struggled to get students to level 5 in MacGamut but changed the way that the assignment was presented to students and how they were scored in class. In our new configuration we asked students to achieve level 4 in Melodic and Harmonic Dictation by the end of Theory II, and levels 8 at the end of Theory III. This new way of grading has made a dramatic difference in the

achievement rates for the students and has also improved their keyboard harmony and Dictation skills.

Changes to be Made Based on Data

None at this time.

Department of Music—BA in Music Assessment Data Spring 2017

Learning Outcome 2— Develop applied music skills in one primary performance area in both solo and ensemble settings.

Outcome Measures

Private lesson juries at the end of the semester

Criteria for Success

75% of students will score at least Proficient in 8 of the 10 areas

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas

1. **Specialized Knowledge**
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. **Applied and Collaborative Learning**
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data

Table 4—Showing the averages across all juries from the Common Applied Rubric where an 8 is the lowest number in the Proficient category and 10 is Exemplary and the percentage of students that are at or above level.

| | Repertory and Style | Technical Progress | Musicality and Performance |
|------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 2016 | 8.95 | 8.43 | 8.69 |
| 2017 | 8.6—95% | 8.8—92% | 8.9—93% |
| 2018 | 8.55—91% | 8.2—89% | 8.7—89% |
| 2019 | 8.76—93% | 8.3—91% | 8.6—86% |

Conclusions Drawn from Data

We are generally pleased with the performance level of our students. There is a high level of music making being demonstrated, our students are demonstrating strong, growing performing skills and are engaging a wide range of literature. We still have a

great deal of variation from jury to jury; not all applied areas have the same standards, the same basic format or the same grading scale. Most notably, the format of the rubrics used by strings, guitar and percussion are all quite different from those in the rest of the department. The grading scales in voice, piano and strings are all still on the 10-point system rather than the newer 5-point system.

Jury rubrics and process in voice and piano are much more complex than those in other areas. We need to find a way to include our adjuncts in the jury process as well as the process of creating jury standards. We are not “closing the loop” with our assessment data since students are not going through their jury videos and comments and using this data to inform the subsequent semester’s studies.

This year we also had a problem with the jury videos that got compressed and squashed.

Changes to be Made Based on Data

None at this time.

Revised Strings Rubric for Applied Juries *(Sept 2016)*

| Item | Exemplary (5) | Proficient (4-3) | | Developing (2-1) | | Initial (0) | Comments |
|----------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|----------|
| Repertory and Style | | | | | | | |
| Repertory and Selection | Repertory is exceptional, creative and innovative | Selections are appropriate to course level. Musical and technical challenges demonstrate growth | | Selections demonstrate essential skills and offer some opportunities for the student to display progress | | Repertory is either well below or beyond the student's ability Minimal evidence of progress | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| Meter, Rhythm and Style | Nuanced use of tempo and rhythm is used to communicate at a high level. Tempos are technically brilliant. | Tempos are secure and convey a strong grasp of playing style. Rhythmic nuance is used to communicate lines and emotional connection. | | Tempo is significantly slower /faster than suggested tempo. Misplaced rhythms and/or discrepancies in rhythm are uncomfortable. Limited use of rhythmic nuance. | | Inaccuracies and muddiness mar performance. Little or no demonstration of playing style or improvement from previous semesters. | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| Technical Progress | | | | | | | |
| LH--Technical Facility | Smooth, natural, and seemingly effortless throughout selections. Professional technique is impressive and technically brilliant. Intonation is secure even in technically difficult and awkward passages. Lush, warm vibrato. | Fluid technique and technical growth is evident throughout selections. Technical passages are secure and the performance demonstrates a wide range of technical work and contribute to the musical presentation. Secure, even vibrato. | | Technique is improving although difficulties are still evident. Technical passages are limited. Intonation suffers at time and interferes with the performance. Some improvement has been made but more is needed. Inconsistent vibrato. | | Technique is awkward and incorrect/missed pitches noticeably hamper the performance. Technical difficulties and intonation problems from previous semesters are still evident, unchanged and unaddressed. Vibrato starts and stops or is missing. | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| Bow Hand and Bowing | Full range of articulations and bowings are accurate and effortless throughout selections and communicate a sophisticated and professional understanding of playing style | Wide range of articulations and bowings demonstrate an understanding of playing style. Musical style changes appropriately from piece to piece and bow changes are fluid, nuanced | | Inaccuracies and muddiness communicate a lack of knowledge of or inability to engage playing styles. Some improvement is visible but more is needed. | | Inaccuracies and muddiness mar performance. Little or no demonstration of playing style or improvement from previous semesters. | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| Tone Quality | Professional, full and characteristically mature tone. Exceptional support, depth and volume throughout selections | Tone is characteristic, secure, and supported. The improvement and growth is evident. | | Tone can tend to feel unsecure and tenuous at times. Tone is not always centered or characteristic. Some improvement is visible but more is needed. | | Tone often loses focus and/or support and is uncharacteristic. Little or no improvement from previous semester | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |

| Item | Exemplary (5) | Proficient (4-3) | | Developing (2-1) | | Initial (0) | Comments |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|----------|
| Dynamics and Contrast | Exceptional use of dynamic contrasts to richly communicate full range of dynamic possibilities. | Played as written and observed dynamic contrasts. Dynamics creatively communicated an appropriate level of musical understanding. | | Observed most of the written dynamics and at times used dynamics in a creative manner to fashion the line. Some improvement is visible. | | Dynamic markings are not communicated and performance does not engage the full dynamic, performing range. Little or no progress from previous semesters. | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| Musicality and Performance | | | | | | | |
| Phrasing | Exceptionally planned and executed phrasing communicates mature and professional musicality | Phrasing clearly used to communicate the musical line. Strong evidence of musical growth from previous semesters. | | The musical line suffers at times from unclear, poorly executed or missing phrasing. Improvement from previous semesters is evident but more is needed. | | Performance visibly suffers from phrasing that is either inconsistent or completely missing. The musical line is not communicated and no improvement is evident. | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| Musicianship/ Communication | Exceptionally high level of emotional involvement conveys a deep understanding of the music and a desire to communicate an emotional connection with the music. | Appropriate style is maintained throughout the selections and emotional involvement is readily visible. Strong growth from previous semesters. | | Communicates appropriate style and emotional connection is evident at times. Some growth is visible but more is needed. | | Incorrect style or lack of any stylistic change from piece to piece. Performer is emotionally detached from the music. No growth from previous semesters. | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | |
| Appearance and Performance | | Appearance and deportment are appropriate and thoughtfully planned. | | Appearance and deportment are acceptable and do not detract from the performance. | | Appearance and/or deportment are noticeably inappropriate and visually uncomfortable. | |
| | | 2 | | 1 | | 0 | |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| SCORE | |
|--------------|--|

Comments:

Department of Music—BA in Music Assessment Data Spring 2019

Learning Outcome 3— Become conversant with the essential outlines of music history, music literature, and an awareness of significant non-western musical styles.

Outcome Measures

Final Papers/Projects in MUH331, 332, or 333

Criteria for Success

75% of students will score at least Proficient in 8 of the 10 areas

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data

Table 5—Showing the average scores on the final papers in MUH332 or 333

| | Paper Content (60) | Style/Research (40) | Total |
|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------|
| SP2014—MUH332 | 55.6 | 35.97 | 91.57 |
| SP2016—MUH332 | 51.35 | 34.96 | 86.30 |
| FA2016—MUH332 | 53.42 | 32.89 | 86.31 |
| FA2018—MUH332 | 48.6 | 32.8 | 81.4 |

Conclusions Drawn from Data

We are still studying this data and are considering changing the assignment.

Changes to be Made Based on Data

None at this time.

MUH 332 SP2016 PAPER - Grading Rubric--Paper Content (60%)

| | Topic/Thesis Statement | Works/conclusions | Content/Conclusions | Original ideas | Organization | Length |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|-------------|
| A (10) A- (9.5) | Appropriate topic is narrow enough to cover in 10 pages, T.S. is clear, and paper is focused on this idea throughout. | 1-3 works are analyzed or referred to and in-depth analysis/conclusions are presented. | Supporting details are cited and explained. Appropriate, detailed observations and ideas support succinct and pertinent conclusions. | Original ideas, thoughts and analysis are included. | Organization of both proposed paper and assignment is clear and appropriate. | 9-11 pp |
| B (8.5) | Appropriate topic is fairly narrow, t.s. is stated, and the paper is focused on this one idea throughout. | 1-3 works are analyzed or referred to and some in-depth examples/conclusions are presented. | Supporting details are cited and somewhat explained. Ideas and observations support conclusions. | One's own original thinking is obvious. | Organization of either proposed paper or assignment is clear and appropriate. | 8 or 12 pp. |
| C (7.5) | Topic is rather broad or loosely related to period, TS is present but not always followed | 1-3 works are analyzed or referred to and examples/conclusions are broad or only loosely related to topic. | Some supporting details are cited or somewhat explained. Few ideas to support conclusions. | Few original ideas are incorporate . | Organization of either proposed paper or assignment is not always clear. | 7 or 13 pp. |
| D (6.5) | Topic is broad and/or not related to period, T.S. is not clearly written, proposal lacks unifying focus | No works are analyzed or referred to and examples/conclusions are broad and loosely related to topic. | Supporting details hard to follow and poorly explained. Few relevant ideas. | Original ideas are almost entirely missing. | Organization of either proposed paper or assignment is weak. | 6 or 14 pp. |
| F (5.5) | Topic is very broad and/or not related to period, no T.S. | Works are not appropriate and/or no meaningful conclusions are presented. | Few supporting, relevant or substantive ideas, details and/or conclusions. | Original ideas are not included. | Organization of both proposed paper and assignment is unclear. | 5 or 15 pp. |

Writing Style/Research (40%)

| | Flow, ease of understanding | Grammar, Spelling, Punctuation, Sentence structure | Works Cited (bibliography) | Bibliographic and Note form |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| A (10) A- (9.5) | Paper flows well; the writing is logical and easy to understand. | Grammar, spelling, punctuation and sentence structure are correct. | The list of works cited is thorough (8+); includes specific journal articles, books, web sites and general music reference materials (e.g. <i>The New Groves' Dictionary of Music and Musicians</i>). | Form used for bibliography follows a standard format and is used consistently throughout. All borrowed ideas are correctly cited. |
| B (8.5) | Paper flows fairly well; for the most part it is easy to understand and is logical. | Care has been taken to avoid errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation and sentence structure. | The bibliography reflects a survey of the literature including some journal articles, books and general music reference materials (6-7 sources). | For the most part, form of bibliography and citations for all borrowed ideas follows a standard format, is used consistently. |
| C (7.5) | Overall writing is clear; some paragraphs could be easier to understand. | Some problems with grammar, spelling, punctuation and/or sentence structure are present. | Bibliography is rather general, lacking in journal articles and specific books (4-5 sources). | Some inconsistency in bibliographic and citation form. |
| D (6.5) | Paper lacks flow; not easy to understand. | Numerous problems with grammar, spelling, punctuation and/or sentence structure. | Bibliography is minimal; mostly general sources are used (2-3 sources). | Inconsistent bibliography and citations form and/or use. |
| F (5.5) | Numerous syntactical errors prohibit understanding. | Unacceptable level of grammar, spelling, punctuation and or sentence structure. | Bibliography is unacceptable. There are no journal articles and/or appropriate books. | Widespread problems with bibliography or citation form. Plagiarism is evident. |

Department of Music—BA in Music Assessment Data Spring 2017

Program Learning Outcome 5—All students will demonstrate proficiency in basic conducting skills.

Outcome Measures

Final Projects in MUA312 or 313

Criteria for Success

75% of students will score at least Proficient in 8 of the 10 content areas.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data

| | Avg. Score on Final Project | Percent at Proficient or Higher |
|------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2016 | 91 | 92% (23 of 25) |
| 2017 | 90 | 89% (16 of 18) |
| 2018 | 89 | 91% |
| 2019 | 93 | 100% |

Conclusions Drawn from Data

We have three teachers teaching these courses and they all approach the course differently. The instructor this semester had students work with a software package and tended to do very little teaching. Other instructors do more mentoring and teaching and rely less software to handle the teaching. The rubrics used by all three instructors are all quite different and it is difficult to match the data generated by the three courses.

Changes to be Made Based on Data

None at this time

Department of Music—BA in Music Assessment Data Spring 2019

Program Learning Outcome 5—Students will participate in ensemble performances through regular rehearsal attendance and highest efforts as demonstrated by meeting or exceeding expectations for collegiate-level performances.

Outcome Measures

Every three years ensemble directors will pull together a packet of information consisting of:

- four semesters of concert programs
- 2 or 3 recordings of the ensemble
- a 2 to 3-page summary of the ensemble explaining its size, makeup, concerts and tours, mission, outreach, service to PLNU, recruiting for the department and similar items
- syllabi

These items are placed in a shared folder and sent out along with a questionnaire to a blind evaluator at another university. The evaluator is chosen by the Department Chair from a University similar to PLNU.

Criteria for Success

All of our ensembles will be able to demonstrate that they are Meeting Expectations for a collegiate-level ensemble.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data

Not available until Spring 2020

Conclusions Drawn from Data

None at this time

Changes to be Made Based on Data

TBD based on reported data

Department of Music—BA in Music Assessment Data Spring 2019

Program Learning Outcome 6—Develop and articulate a clear application of the concepts of calling, role, path and purpose as they apply to the discipline of music.

Outcome Measures

Final Paper in MUH431

Criteria for Success

75% of Students will score Proficient in all categories

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data

| | Students | Define Role | Describe Path | Articulate Purpose | Interview Summary | Information Literacy |
|------|----------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 2013 | 11 | 3.68 | 3.55 | 3.21 | 3.43 | -- |
| 2014 | 18 | 3.13 | 3.56 | 3.22 | 3.67 | -- |
| 2015 | 9 | 3.23 | 3.07 | 2.65 | 3.43 | -- |
| 2016 | 19 | 3.89 | 3.68 | 3.79 | 3.84 | -- |
| 2017 | 14 | 4-100% | 3.86-100% | 4-100% | 3.36-79% | 2.1-43% |
| 2018 | 13 | 4-100% | 3.34-100% | 4-100% | 3.89-81% | 2.3-53% |
| 2019 | 15 | 4-100% | 3.43-100% | 4-100% | 3.71-83% | 3.1-61% |

Conclusions Drawn from Data

We still have some gaps in the paper, the measurements and the course requirements. This course and its final project have gone through a great deal of change over the past four years with a new teacher for the course, a new grading rubric and greater requirements being imposed on the teacher and the course as a result of Core

Competencies assessment. This is the first year in which the instructor measured information literacy and asked the students to engage industry metrics for their chosen music field.

The students did a good job of articulating their chosen career, their reason for being in this career and have interfaced well with other professionals in their field through interviews. 100% of the students received perfect scores in the first three categories of their papers. Less successful are the students' efforts to engage industry metrics and outline a strategy for their careers or describe the elements of this paper that required technical analysis and reflection rather than opinion. None of the papers followed proper footnoting style, proper academic formatting or proper bibliographic formatting.

Changes to be Made Based on Data

None at this time.

Rubric for MUH 431 Final Essay

| Item | Beginning-1 | Basic-2 | Proficient-3 | Advanced-4 |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Define professional role aspiration | No clearly stated role aspiration | General role drawn from broad categories is identified | Role is defined in connection to personal attributes and interests | Specific role is defined and integrated with discussion of personal path and purpose |
| Describe plausible career path | No clearly identified path | Identified path inconsistent with selected role | Identified path consistent with role but only developed in general terms | Identified path consistent with role and developed with specificity |
| Articulate Purpose | Does not articulate a specific purpose | Articulates a broad sense of purpose but is not linked concretely to selected role | Articulates a purpose consistent with role but is not explained with specific applications | Articulates a purpose consistent with role and developed with specific application examples |
| Summary of Contact Interviews | Interviews missing | Interviews included but contents not complete | Interview contents complete but lack integration with students role, path and purpose discussion | Interview contents complete and synthesized within students role, path and purpose discussion |