



Program (ALP) - Music BM

College or Division: Arts and Sciences

Department: Fine Arts and Communications

Assessment Coordinator: Mary Elizabeth Thompson

Strategic Plan Goal(s) Supported: Strategic Goal 1 - Promote growth in academics - research - and artistic excellence, Strategic Goal 5 - Unify and enhance the image and visibility of Sul Ross State University

Program Marketable Skills have been identified: Yes

Program Marketable Skills:

1. Ability to collaborate and network with others to achieve a shared goal, utilizing problem solving, flexibility and improvisation, and consideration of others' thoughts and creative processes.
2. Proficiency in public speaking and writing about music, especially in teaching basic musical concepts to all ages and incorporating technology for presentation and production.
3. Ability to prepare and perform a program of age-appropriate, relevant, and diverse repertoire, as an individual or part of an ensemble, to an audience, advocating for the arts through engaging with and serving the community.
4. Experience using problem solving skills and abstract thinking to analyze compositions and examine their aesthetic through musical and extra-musical concepts, such as historical context and text setting.
5. Ability to create and disseminate basic marketing and public relations materials, as well as resumes, websites, and digital portfolios.

Marketable Skills Dissemination Strategy: The Music Program will incorporate the identified Marketable Skills on all course syllabi and will highlight which of the Marketable Skills will be addressed in each individual course. Monthly program-wide Studio Classes will be utilized as a venue for delving deeper into some elements of the Marketable Skills, such as resume, website, and digital portfolio design.

Statement of Purpose: The music program is designed to provide students with a solid foundation in the knowledge and practical skills of music performance. All majors are required to take four semesters each of music theory and ear training. Drawing upon courses in music literature and music history, students will develop the ability to create appropriate program notes. (Program notes are scholarly notes about the composers and works that accompany the listings in the printed musical program distributed at a performance). Students deepen their understanding and skills through upper-level private instruction and ensemble participation in one of two concentrations, vocal music and instrumental music. To better reflect the academic program curriculum focus on music, faculty made the decision to change the program name from Bachelor of Arts in Music to Bachelor of Music, to begin in Fall 2017. The Bachelor of Music program is designed to prepare the student who wants to become a music teacher as well as the student who wants to engage in music in other venues, such as performance, composing, or conducting.

Annual Updates

2019 - 2020

Evidence of Improvement from Previous Assessment Cycle: When comparing to the 18-19 Program Assessment Report, improvement has been made as we met the Targets for SLO 1 a) and b) this year and did not in the last academic year. The Music Program was pleased to see the improvement and believes that the performance of the students involved in the program has improved overall (including majors, minors, and non-majors), which these data support.

For SLO 2 a), the Target was met both last year and this academic year and the evaluation rubric used in the assessment has been improved.

No improvement from last year was shown in SLO 3 because the faculty decided to incorporate a new evaluation method for this SLO. Studio Class Evaluations are a way to track student learning and improvement in the area of constructive criticism in performance. The evaluation's method of use within our program was established several years ago and will continue to be used, so it can remain a constant in our Program Assessment Report. The Target score was not met this year but we saw improvement from the beginning of the year to where we left off in Spring, and are confident that continuing to use this evaluation method will be beneficial for our program and the student's growth and education in the next academic year.

Review History: Reviewer #1 Name, Date, and Comments: I agree the new and improved evaluation method is a helpful and look forward to seeing next year's data. Marjie Scott 07/10/2020

<i>Student Learning Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
<p>SLO 1 - All students will demonstrate the ability to integrate appropriate musical expression into performance. Outcome Status: Active</p>	<p>Presentation/Performance - a) Student Musical Performance, Fall Juries At the completion of the semester, at least two faculty members will complete a Jury Form for each performing student at juries.</p> <p>Target: All students will earn a cumulative average of 3 or better on the Jury Form. Jury Forms are assessed with a scoring system of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). The areas evaluated include Tone (quality and production, i.e. characteristic sound); Intonation; Technique; Rhythm and Tempo; Musical Style, Phrasing, and Dynamic contrast; Professionalism and deportment; Memorization (if required); and Diction (voice only).</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020 Conclusion: Target Met In Fall 2019, there were 12 students evaluated by two or more faculty members with the jury form. All 12 students received an average score of 3 or higher in each category by all faculty evaluators. The score range was 3.9-5.0, so well above the target. (05/26/2020) Related Documents: JURY FORM F19.doc</p>	<p>Use of Results: Please see the Use of Results in b) Spring Juries for the conclusion of our evaluation. (05/26/2020)</p>
	<p>Presentation/Performance - b) Student Musical Performance, Spring Juries At the completion of the semester,</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020 Conclusion: Target Met The change in schedule due to Covid-19 changed the way that the Music faculty continued to teach in the Spring</p>	<p>Use of Results: After considering the Program Assessment Report findings from the 18-19 academic year, the Music faculty decided to</p>

<i>Student Learning Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
	<p>at least two faculty members will complete a Jury Form for each performing student at juries.</p> <p>Target: All students will earn a cumulative average of 3 or better on the Jury Form. Jury Forms are assessed with a scoring system of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). The areas evaluated include Tone (quality and production, i.e. characteristic sound); Intonation; Technique; Rhythm and Tempo; Musical Style, Phrasing, and Dynamic contrast; Professionalism and deportment; Memorization (if required); and Diction (voice only).</p>	<p>semester and how we approached juries. We elected to have most juries via Zoom, which is how most of the faculty taught their applied lessons after March, so students were familiar and comfortable with the platform. We are choosing to include the data from the juries because we have it and tried to evaluate things as close to normally as possible. However, we would like to mention that we had to adjust our expectations for Zoom juries in order to take aspects into account that may have been altered due to technical problems such as sound delays and internet connection issues. Such problems may have affected our perception of a student's rhythm, intonation, and/or tone quality. Generally speaking, none of the faculty addressed those areas in our comments and instead chose to assume that those factors were in place. That being said, the overall grade for each student may have been higher than an in-person performance because we gave everyone the benefit of the doubt.</p> <p>In Spring 2020, there were 11 students evaluated by two or more faculty members with the jury form. 8 students participated in live juries via Zoom and 3 students chose to video record themselves with no editing. (These students received permission to video record from the faculty based on challenges that arose in their Zoom applied lessons. 1 student experienced regular internet connection issues and 2 brass students had issues with maxing out the microphone). All 11 students received an average score of 3 or higher in each category by all faculty evaluators. The score range was 4.2-4.9, so well above the target. (05/26/2020)</p> <p>Related Documents: JURY FORM F19.doc</p>	<p>continue to use the Jury Form as we previously had without switching over to the Assessment Rubric that we piloted for Fall 2018 juries. A student's jury is viewed as their culminating performance of the semester. The faculty comments are passed on to the student as a reflection on that performance and often include suggestions for future improvement. However, when looking at the overall trajectory of the Music program, all music majors will have a capstone project that is their senior recital. The jury is another method of preparing the students for this recital during the course of their degree program. Since the senior recital is graded by a letter grade on overall performance, it makes sense that every jury leading up to that student recital is also graded this way so that a cohesive thread exists through the program. Studio Classes and individual lessons with applied faculty are the platforms through which students receive comments and instruction on a micro-level.</p> <p>For the 20-21 academic year, although we feel it is important to continue to use the Jury Forms as explained above, we acknowledge that, for evaluative purposes, it would be more helpful to have a rubric that also evaluates student juries on a mico-level for inclusion</p>

Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment Methods

Results

Use of Results

in our evaluative data. Therefore, we are going to video record the Fall and Spring juries next year. During the jury, the Music faculty will fill out Jury Forms for each student as per usual. After juries, faculty members (2 in Fall and 2 in Spring) will go back and watch the recordings of the performances and fill out an Assessment Rubric detailing the individual categories on which the student's overall jury performance is graded. In doing this, we can continue to give macro-level comments on student performances through the jury forms and with the freedom of having a video performance to re-watch, can also include micro-level data for our Program Assessment Report. (05/26/2020)

SLO 2 - All students will demonstrate the ability to research and prepare appropriate program notes.

Outcome Status: Active

Written Assignment -

a) Written Program Notes—Senior Recital

At the completion of a capstone performance, faculty members will evaluate a senior Music major's scholarly program notes for his/her senior recital.

Target: All students will score an average score of 3 or higher on the evaluation rubric for their senior recital program notes.

Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020

Conclusion: Target Met

In Fall 2019, one senior music major student presented their program notes and senior piano recital to faculty members at their recital hearing. The four faculty members present approved the program notes with minor corrections. The student made the corrections and the program notes were printed in his program and distributed to the audience at the recital performance. The rubric was used to assess this final submission of the notes. The rubric measures Historical Content, Writing for Audience Understanding, Comprehensive Information, Length, and Use of Scholarly Resources on a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). The student scored an overall average of 4 based on the faculty evaluations. (05/26/2020)

Related Documents:

[Senior Recital Program Notes.docx](#)

Use of Results: After the Program Assessment Report from 18-19, the Music program followed through with its stated intent to add more detail to the Program Notes Rubric that was previously used. The addition of categories was agreed by all to be helpful. Though we included a category of Use of Scholarly Resources, we did not formally ask the student to include a bibliography for their program notes. The faculty followed up with the student to ask the types of sources that they used in their research. The student indicated the use of

<i>Student Learning Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
----------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------	-----------------------

Presentation/Performance - b)
 Written Program Notes and Conducting—Secondary Music Methods (MUS 4215)
 One component of the MUS 4215 course in Spring 2019 was for each student to rehearse and conduct a piece for the MUS 3313 Concert Band during the semester. In addition, students were asked to write program notes for their piece. Both the conducting/rehearsing of the ensemble and the written program notes were intended as an extension for music education majors of the activities from the Fundamentals of Conducting (MUS 3313) course in Fall semester

Target: All students will score a 3 or higher on the evaluation rubric for the program notes submitted for the MUS 3113 Concert Band program.

Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020
Conclusion: N/A
 In the 18-19 Program Assessment Report, the Music program included program notes that were written during a course offered in Spring, MUS 4215-Secondary Music Methods. We intend to include embedding written program notes in our academic courses but in the 19-20 year, did not offer any courses in the rotation in which this would have been appropriately implemented. (05/26/2020)

textbooks, biographies, articles from online databases, and internet articles. Going forward, we think it would be helpful to have the student submit a formal bibliography at the recital hearing in order to better track the sources students find most useful in their research. (05/26/2020)

Use of Results: Not applicable this year as explained above. (05/26/2020)

<p>SLO 3 - All students will demonstrate the ability to evaluate and critique a musical performance.</p>	<p>Written Assignment - a) Studio Class Performance</p>	<p>Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020 Conclusion: Target Not Met</p>	<p>Use of Results: The change in schedule due to Covid-19</p>
---	---	--	--

<i>Student Learning Outcomes</i>	<i>Assessment Methods</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Use of Results</i>
<p>Outcome Status: Active</p>	<p>Evaluations As an extension of MUS 1111/1211/3111/3211 individual instruction courses, the Music faculty require the students to attend and participate in three to four studio classes per semester. The classes occur on designated Fridays at 4:00 p.m. The studio classes are performance based and students sign up to perform for the class. Students in attendance fill out an anonymous evaluative sheet (Studio Class Evaluation Sheet) for each performer. The rubric on the sheet includes three areas of musical focus: Area 1-Style, Area 2-Technique, and Area 3-Professionalism. Students circle a number on a scale of 1 (Never) to 5 (All the time) based on the performance. Then, students are asked to list one area from the rubric in which the performer might want to most focus their improvement and provide more specific comments as to what to improve and how to achieve it. For the Program Assessment Report, faculty will evaluate the comments the students made on the evaluation sheets. A rubric was created for this and used to evaluate each comment sheet on a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) on areas such as Relevance of Comment; Specification of Area; and Steps for Improvement.</p>	<p>The target score of 2.3 was met on one studio class but not on the others. The range of scores on the evaluation sheets were as follows:</p> <p>Studio Class 1: Highest 5.0, Lowest 1.0 Studio Class 2: Highest-5.0, Lowest 1.0 Studio Class 3: Highest-5.0, Lowest 2.3 Studio Class 4: Highest-5.0, Lowest 1.6</p> <p>Though we endeavor to increase our student’s understanding and ability to articulate constructive comments on the sheets next year so that everyone reaches the target of 2.3, we were pleased to see that some students in each class achieved the maximum score of 5.0.</p> <p>We are not assessing the numerical scores for this report but want to share that we were able to see that largely, students were in agreement on the performances when they scored the different Areas. One would naturally expect a range (and there is one) but the majority of students gave the same score within one point in each Area for each performer. If we had gotten wildly varying scores on a regular basis, that would be a cause for concern but since that was not the case, we feel that the students are comfortable with the use of numerical scoring in the Areas and are able to assess appropriately.</p> <p>Though not a part of this evaluation, it seems appropriate to specify how these sheets are beneficial to the student performers as well as the students in attendance. After each class, the evaluation sheets are collected, copied, and the copies distributed to the applied faculty of the students who performed. The faculty member discusses the results with each student, answering any questions they may have and asking if they agree with the comments made. Additionally, the class performances are recorded, and the recordings shared with the students so that they can watch their performance and self-critique. (05/29/2020)</p> <p>Related Documents: Studio Performance Class Eval Sheet.docx</p>	<p>decreased the number of Studio Classes in Spring semester. There were 3 Studio Classes in Fall and only 1 in Spring, so we are unable to compare the same amount of data between semesters. However, we felt it was important to include the data we have in this report and believe to have gleaned enough insight to make changes for next year.</p> <p>Overall, the goal of this exercise is to have the students improve in their ability to give specific performance-related comments as well as to direct those comments with specific prescriptions for improvement. All of our students, whether music education majors or not, benefit from the skill of giving and taking constructive criticism. After piloting this system this year, it seems it would be beneficial to know who is writing the comments in the future. In this way, we can track whether each student improves in their comment writing skills during the course of the academic year. However, we believe that the anonymous nature of the Studio Class Evaluation Sheets is an important factor in encouraging students to write what they really think and not filter their comments based on the fact that one of their friends is performing. For this reason, we will continue</p>

Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment Methods

Results

Use of Results

Target: All students will score an average of 2.3 or higher on the evaluation rubric for the comments made on the Studio Class Evaluation Sheet.

[Studio Class Comment Rubric.docx](#)
[Studio Class Evaluation Info 19-20.docx](#)

to have the evaluation sheets be anonymous when the student performers receive them. Student commenters will write their names on the very top of the Studio Class Evaluation Sheets and then the faculty will collect them, as per usual. The names will be covered when the sheets are copied, so all comments will remain anonymous to the performers. The faculty, however, will know what comments each student wrote and can better determine whether improvement is being made throughout the course of the year by each student.

Additional information:
Though the numerical data does not reflect this, we noticed an improvement between Fall and Spring semesters in the amount of comments that were written. There were many evaluation sheets turned in each class that were filled out in the numerical rubric portion, but with no written comments. This was particularly notable in the first two Studio Classes in Fall. Over the course of the year, it seemed that the students became either more comfortable with writing comments or perhaps better understood how to articulate comments. Either way, this is encouraging information and we will explore ways to facilitate this

*Student Learning
Outcomes*

Assessment Methods

Results

Use of Results

Written Assignment -

b) Written Conducting Evaluations—Secondary Music Methods (MUS 4215)
One component of the MUS 4215 course in Spring 2019 was for each student to rehearse and conduct a piece for the MUS 3313 Concert Band during the semester. Three specific lab rehearsals were assigned for assessment and a video recording was made of each student's performance. In the week following the lab, students were asked to complete a self-evaluation on their rehearsal and a peer evaluation on their peer's rehearsal. Categories in the rubric included evaluating areas such as the

Reporting Period: 2019 - 2020

Conclusion: N/A

In the 18-19 Program Assessment Report, the Music program included conducting evaluations that were completed during MUS 4215-Secondary Music Methods course in conjunction with MUS 3313-Concert Band. We intend to continue to include conducting evaluations in our academic courses for use in our Program Assessment Report but in the 19-20 year, did not offer any courses in the rotation in which this would have been appropriately implemented. (05/28/2020)

in the new academic year.

Note: There were sheets discarded for this evaluation, either because of lack of information (i.e. "Lit!") or irrelevance (i.e. "You got this, bro.") Though these comments were meant well, they are not appropriate for evaluative purposes. There was an announcement made in the Spring Studio Class about not writing these types of comments since they are generally unhelpful and it seemed that students refrained from it more in that Studio Class than in previous ones, so we will be sure to make a similar announcement in the coming year. (05/29/2020)

Use of Results: N/A (05/28/2020)

*Student Learning
Outcomes*

Assessment Methods

Results

Use of Results

application of the lesson plan, conducting gestures, and effective use of rehearsal time. The scoring was 1 (beginner) to 6 (advanced). Students filled out the rubric and attached typed comments. Additionally, the professor evaluated each student with the same rubric.

Target: The average score from the professor's evaluation for each student's lab will be a 3 or higher using the assessment rubric.