

Marshall University
Department of Music

Yearly Report: Undergraduate Program Assessment

Submitted to the Dean of the College of Fine Arts, September 19, 2006

Dr. Stephen Lawson, Interim Chair

I. ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

A. PROGRAM GOALS

Marshall University offers the Bachelor of Fine Arts with an Emphasis in Music and the Bachelor of Arts in Education with an emphasis in music education. The BFA degree in music is designed for those who major in music performance, jazz studies, theory, and/or composition. The capstone experience for BFA students is currently being reviewed by an ad hoc faculty committee. The general feeling is that the current system has become excessive and shifts focus from one's final performance recital to a musicology study more appropriate to a master's level.

Currently, the Bachelor of Arts in Education with an emphasis in music education requires 151 credits, of which 76 are supplied by music. In addition, the 12 credits of student teaching (Clinical III experience) are supervised by the Department of Music. These 88 credits represent 58% of the total. The College of Education supplies 24 credits, or 15.8% of the total credits. This shift in percentages is due to an additional course (CISP 422 Children with Exceptionalities II) being added by COEHS and UNI 101 being added by Faculty Senate. With this number of credits, it is unlikely that a student is able to graduate from this program in four years. If a student takes no additional courses during the semester of their student teaching (12 credits), then during the remaining seven semesters, a student must average 19.8 credits per semester.

During previous visitation of the National Association of Schools of Music, our accrediting body, they suggested moving this curriculum to a Bachelor of Music with an emphasis in music education designation, housed in the College of Fine Arts. This would be consistent with degree programs in music education at peer institutions and West Virginia University. Peer institution programs require 128 to 134 semester credits. In any event, we need to find a way to honor the "Marshall Commitment" to allow a student to graduate in four years. We have already heard from parents of prospective students that this disparity is a concern and may contribute to some loss of students' choice of Marshall University.

The Department of Music remains interested in developing and implementing a 128-hour B. Arts degree in music with a liberal arts emphasis. Other fine arts departments are working on a design that will permit a college-wide curriculum modeled on the B.F.A. degree. In light of President Stephen Kopp's interest in interdisciplinary curricula, we believe this new B.A. degree offers great potential.

The department has created a music history committee, convened by Dr. Stroehler, and work on a revision of the undergraduate music history sequence has begun. As reported last year, this examination will include the distribution of credits, developing standardized writing

requirements and style manuals, a common set of goals for the sequence, and a methodology for all teachers assigned to the sequence. This need was identified through student comments, faculty assessment of student writing skills, and the review of the capstone courses, which are based in large measure upon research and writing skills introduced and reinforced in the history sequence.

This fall, the Department of Music enrolled 56 new music majors in the B.F.A. and B.A. programs. As is typical for us, approximately 60% of those majors are in the B.A. Music Education curriculum. Our annual target enrollment is 70 majors. At the September 22, 2005 faculty meeting, the music faculty endorsed the adoption of an early decision process, through which we hope to attract and receive commitments from talented students who are receiving such early decisions from other institutions. We are trying to improve the look and information available on a departmental web site and brochures. This past summer we had approximately 20 “walk-ons”. While we welcome these folks into our program, after successful audition, it tells us that information regarding application and audition process is not understood as well as we would like.

The Marching Thunder currently enrolls approximately 280 students, for the third year in a row, the largest in the history of Marshall University. The relationship between the Athletic Bands program and the Department of Music is quite smooth and successful. It is important that as facilities are developed, the practice field and building needs of the Marching Thunder are considered. This ensemble has achieved a high level of acclaim and regional distinction.

Off-campus auditions and visits to schools by the Marching Thunder, faculty and student ensembles, and individual faculty took place in several venues throughout the tri-state region. The Wind Symphony performed at the Clay Center in Charleston, and toured to Wheeling Park High School and John Marshall High School in Wheeling, West Virginia and to Bethel Park High School in the Pittsburgh, PA area. Weekend Festivals for choir, middle school band, and high school band attracted over 400 students from over 30 tri-state schools. We also continue to offer daylong workshops in brass, single reeds, double reeds, cello, and percussion. The Symphony Orchestra and Chamber Choir’s are developing plans for short tours for this year.

During 2005-2006, the Department of Music partnered with the Cabell County schools to offer a daylong workshop for elementary and middle school music teachers. These were scheduled on two OSE days for the teachers, and Superintendent Bill Smith released all music teachers to us for the day. Topics included: music technology in the classroom, guitar instruction, healthy voice training, drum circle, creative movement and interdisciplinary activities. We look forward to continuing these events.

The Student Handbook is under revision, and will include a substantial section on accreditation and department and university policies on academic honesty.

* * * * *

In its assessment plan, the Department of Music has articulated the following:

General Goals

Music graduates should possess:

1. Conceptual knowledge of musical components and processes;
2. Continually developing skills in creating, interpreting, presenting, analyzing, and evaluating music;

Department of Music Yearly Assessment Report, p. 3

3. Increased awareness of various musical cultures and historical periods;
4. Capacities to integrate musical knowledge and skills; and
5. Capabilities for independent work in various dimensions of the music profession.

Student Achievement Goals

Students will:

1. Examine a variety of musical problems and submit work completed independently. This work will combine capabilities in performance; aural, verbal and visual analysis; composition and improvisation; and repertory and history.
2. Form and defend value judgments about music.
3. Identify and use tools and concepts that work with a comprehensive repertory, including music from various world cultures and the music of our time.
4. Acquire knowledge of the basic interrelationships and interdependencies among the various professions and activities that constitute the musical enterprise.

In discussions held during faculty meetings in March 1999, faculty endorsed the following goals, which articulate those given above as General and Student Achievement Goals in a more specific manner.

A student graduating with a B.F.A. degree in music performance or theory/composition, or a B.A. degree in music education should be able to:

- Communicate musical ideas and works through performance, verbal, and written media.
- Appreciate the similarities between technical requirements for all instruments and to recognize that the elements that make a good performance are similar whether one is playing jazz, commercial, or classical music.
- Demonstrate fundamental skills in audio, video, electronic and computer technology.
- Acquire, through a broadly based general education curriculum, an appreciation for, and understanding of, major developments, traditions, and influences on and from world cultures.
- Experience a positive environment that fosters continued intellectual, musical, and professional growth.
- Determine the place of the artistic medium in their lives.
- Develop a language for expressing creative impulses.
- Understand the essential melodic, rhythmic, and analytical elements of contrasting styles of music, and to be able to perform them in a convincing manner.
- Demonstrate research and analytical skills and to apply problem-solving techniques in a variety of performing and teaching situations.
- Demonstrate a commitment to advocacy on behalf of music and the arts in schools and communities.

In addition to these traits, students in the music education program should be able to:

Department of Music Yearly Assessment Report, p. 4

- Understand the essential melodic, rhythmic, and analytical components of a musical score, and communicate the musical language of the score in a clear and accurate manner.
- Demonstrate familiarity with methods, philosophies, and pedagogical systems appropriate to educational situations.

The applied music levels system has been in place since 1999. The table of levels is included in the Music Student Handbook (Edition 5.1, effective fall 2003 semester). The levels system permits faculty to have an “umbrella” view of student’s progress in applied music. Individual semester grades reflect progress in a short time period, while the assignment of a level reflects how the student compares to norms established by each of the performance areas (brass, keyboard, percussion, strings, voice, woodwinds). For example, a student accepted on probation may earn an “A” for the fall semester, but continue to be assigned a level of 2, the probationary level of incoming B.Arts majors. During the spring semester, that same student may earn another “A,” be taken off probation, and be assigned level 3, the standard entry level for B.Arts majors. The semester grade indicates that successful progress is being made on a week-to-week basis, but the fact that the student entered with some background deficiency or lack of training results in the assignment of a lower level. Students are given copies of their level at the second meeting of MUS 100 (Applied Music Convocation) each semester, or after a jury performance that does not occur at the end of the semester.

The Department of Music requires a minimum of four semesters study at the lower division before attempting the Sophomore Hearing. A maximum of two attempts are permitted for the Sophomore Hearing. The faculty adopted a policy that students who do not enroll in applied music for two or more consecutive semesters must re-audition for the program.

Music Technology (MUS 305) is being taught by Mr. Jeffrey Wolfe, who has many skills in music technology. While he is following modules set for this class, it is hoped that having one instructor for the entire class will simplify course management, and faculty training issues that have been factors in developing this class. Music Technology II (MUS 306) will continue to be taught by Dr. Mark Zanter and Mr. Martin Saunders.

Faculty Goals

1. Continued pursuit and demonstration of excellence as creative artists, teachers, scholars, and consultants.
2. Continued implementation of new technology and pedagogical techniques.
3. Additional full-time positions in music theory, elementary music education and assistant band director.
4. Extension of our community of performers and scholars to include the larger-than-ever coterie of part-time faculty.

The department’s comprehensive program for faculty evaluation provides for submission of annual files by all non-tenured faculty, scheduled and assigned mentoring of all non-tenured faculty, and for more specific application of criteria used in evaluation. The Faculty Concerns Committee (promotion/tenure) is an elected body of 5 continuing and 2 probationary members. They are working to adapt the Department of Music Faculty Evaluation Program to comply with the terms and practices of the Faculty Evaluation and Compensation program. In spring 2005, faculty approved matrices for all teaching faculty and the chair’s administrative matrix. To be

completed is a matrix for two faculty on 12-month appointments that have administrative components. The current Faculty Evaluation Program provides the option for external peer evaluation. The Faculty Concerns Committee will consider how this may be accommodated in the new matrices that support faculty evaluation. Due to Dr. Marshall Onofrio's leaving for a new position, Dr. Stephen Lawson will serve as Interim Chair for the Department of Music. As Dr. Lawson is not yet tenured, and may return as a full-time teaching faculty member after this year, matrices have been developed and passed by the faculty in which weighting of the evaluation will shift to the Faculty Concerns Committee for this year only.

Departmental demographics have changed significantly in the past few years, and the 21 full-time faculty lines now include 11 tenured and 10 non-tenured members. This has compromised the ability of the department to supply mentors to all non-tenured faculty. However, through the good graces of colleagues outside the department, we remain able to supply a mentor.

The passing of Dr. Paul Balshaw, Distinguished Professor of Music, former department chair, and founding dean of the College of Fine Arts, the Department of Music faces a challenge to its faculty leadership. A few of the "mid-career" faculty have accepted new roles in the department.

We hope that this movement to leadership responsibilities is as welcomed by them as it is the department.

Data from student evaluations in spring 2005 indicates that the new single form required by the university effectively surveys questions of importance to our program, although the number of written comments from students was slightly higher than usual.

Curriculum Goals

1. Continued incorporation of new elements and techniques into the curriculum.
2. Periodic reviews of structure and content, particularly of new courses and revisions. Specifically, ongoing attention to the capstone courses.
3. Preparation of new sequences for history courses.
4. Submission of revised B.A. – Music Education curriculum.
5. Submission of a liberal arts degree in music.
6. Submission of an A.A. degree in recording technology. (drafted, under consideration)
There is renewed interest for this degree per Dr. Kopp's challenge to the university.

Merger of the formerly separate undergraduate and graduate committees has streamlined the curriculum reform effort, and has helped stimulate discussion of the relationship and effect of changes at either level. Since the Department of Music services students in the College of Fine Arts, the College of Education and Human Services, and the Graduate College, it is important that we continue to foster good communication between these colleges.

B. LEARNING OUTCOMES/DATA COLLECTION

A three-part assessment process (entrance, midway, graduation) provides regular and coherent data for evaluation of student progress. Within that umbrella process, jury exams, theory/aural skills barrier exams, sophomore and recital hearings, the graduation oral examination present unique opportunities for faculty to gather as a panel and consider the body of work by individual students. In addition, students must earn a grade of at least "C" in all music courses. Procedures used to assess each outcome differ according to the activity.

At the faculty meeting of September 22, 2005, faculty began discussing the addition of an interview component to the Sophomore Hearing. Such an interview will assess the student's

readiness for their chosen career (education, performance, composition, etc.). Initial plans suggest implementation in May 2007, following development of a set of rubrics for the interview, and a process by which the 3-person interview committee will be created. It is preferable that the student's file be available to the committee. Further discussion is planned, and the inclusion of a portfolio of work-to-date is a significant topic.

We conduct and record the methods of assessment listed in Table 1 in the following manner:

- Course assessment instruments are given and graded by faculty teaching the specific courses.
- Barrier examinations are created and administered by the faculty of the departmental area represented in the exam.
- Forms for juries, the Sophomore Hearing and the Recital Hearing are completed by the appropriate faculty committee, filed in the department, and shared with the student.
- Capstone materials are assigned and graded by a committee of three music faculty. To assist with the capstone courses, within the first two weeks of each semester, the department chair holds a meeting for all students enrolled in the capstone courses and their faculty supervisors. The two-semester calendar and all course requirements are reviewed.

The core of the music curriculum is the applied music program, through which students study and develop skills in performing music. Using a variety of measures, a faculty jury of at least three members evaluates entrance auditions, juries, sophomore and recital hearings, and recitals. The evaluative measures include course descriptions; literature/technique/musicianship requirements given in the levels descriptions; and combine experience at a variety of institutions reflecting national norms for undergraduate performance in our degree options. Ensemble conductors are responsible for evaluating student progress in performance groups. This evaluation is based upon their performance skill and overall musical and professional contributions to the ensemble.

The outcome of the jury, including the applied music level assignment, is one of several criteria considered by faculty before final course grades are issued, and before permission is granted to register for specific applied music courses in the next semester. Departmental policy counts the semester jury performance as one-third of the semester grade.

The Sophomore Hearing is an adequate measure of musical performance. Successful completion of all parts of the Sophomore Hearing permits the student to move from lower division to upper division applied study (100 level to 300 level). If the interview component discussed above is implemented, we believe it will help us identify students whose academic progress qualifies them for admission to upper level, but whose readiness for professional advancement in a more global sense is of concern. The levels system codifies the progress of the student through the applied music program.

Ongoing discussion and analysis of the data suggest that entrance theory placement tests, administered on the first day of classes in the fall, are moderately reliable determinants of entrance abilities. Due in part to the fundamental importance of theory and aural skills, we continue to be concerned over our ability to assist "at-risk" students, particularly in the theory sequence. Graduate teaching assistants recently and currently assigned to serve as theory instructors and tutors have been quite successful. Recent semesters have shown improvement in reducing attrition rates in the music major, due in part to earlier and more successful intervention with students showing deficient incoming skills.

The theory sequence permits students to register independently for theory (MUS 111, 112, 211, 212) and aural skills (MUS 113, 114, 213, 214). Students may not get more than one

semester apart; i.e., they make take theory 2 and aural skills 1 concurrently, but cannot take aural skills 4 while taking theory 2. Students may not register for the junior level analysis courses (MUS 301/302) until both theory 4 and aural skills 4 have been passed with at least a grade of C.

Barrier exams in general musicianship and music history/literature are reliable and valid indicators of probable success in graduation progress. We are considering the adoption of an exit comprehensive examination for all seniors.

As noted in previous years, we have had good success at identifying incoming students with deficient musical preparation, but must do more (and sooner) to correct this deficiency if we are to reduce the attrition percentage. Our relationship with the University College is very good. The need for more complete and accurate records on transfer students continues. Securing such information will improve our ability to correct assignment of credits from previous music experience.

Records are kept in student files in the department office. The Department of Music receives grade labels for all B.F.A. majors, but still is not receiving labels for B.A. – Music Education majors, forcing us each May to order a set of transcripts for these majors from Computing Support. Grade labels and transcripts are placed in each student's file. Advising checklists are included in the Student Handbook.

C. RESULTS

Recent results in both formal assessments and barrier exams indicate that the quality of our incoming students is improving, despite the ongoing difficulty that secondary institutions are having training students in the breadth of musical language and skills. Our retention level is rising as well, indicating that students are entering our program at a higher level, are experiencing fewer difficulties in progressing through the major, and are receiving better advising. Most students who leave our program do so in the first year. Most often, they transfer to another major at Marshall University, citing the fact that they did not understand what is required of a career in music. It is rare (1-2 students per year) that a student transfers to another university as a music major.

The number of students failing the freshman aural skills barrier has dropped from an average of 6 to 10 students to 3 in spring 2005. Two of those students were able to pass the barrier after enrolling in Aural Skills 2 during Summer Session A.

Students not able to pass the entrance theory proficiency exam are placed in a developmental theory course (MUS 101) and a developmental section of class piano (MUS 102). Continuing recent practice, we offer an "off" section of MUS 111 and MUS 113 (Theory 1 and Aural Skills 1, respectively) in the spring semester. Pending funding and enrollment, we offer MUS 112 and MUS 114 (Theory 2 and Aural Skills 2, respectively) in the summer session. Successful completion of the summer MUS 112/114 section puts students back on track for the fall semester.

Difficulty in writing upper-level term papers and analyses continues to plague our students. Redistribution of the history credits and a redesign of writing assignments should help. As of spring 2005, both instructors assigned to MUS 121 (Aural Perceptions, the first music history course) are WAC certified.

II. BOT INITIATIVE 3 COMPLIANCE

To our knowledge, there is no single state or national testing program that will serve as a benchmark. There are national norms in particular areas of study, and faculty apply such norms in constructing placement and barrier examinations. We receive data from COEHS on music education students' success at passing Praxis II exams, and that data has provoked us to consider developing an exit comprehensive theory and history exam.

III. PLANS FOR THE CURRENT YEAR

In 2005-06:

- Revised levels system descriptors for each studio – using the Keyboard Area model. This 2004-05 goal remains incomplete.
- Compiled data on jury and recital hearing performances that permit us to correlate the movement of students through the levels system with their semesters of study, and establish a benchmark for desired progress.
- Worked to submit proposals for:
 - B. Arts (Music Education) curriculum
 - New course proposals for a revised history sequence
 - New program proposal for A.A. – Recording Technology
 All of these goals remain incomplete
- For MUS 142,
 - develop a standardized writing assignment that more effectively addresses our ability to meet the 6 objectives
 - plan for regular observations of all teaching assistants by Dr. Michael Stroehrer, Dr. Vicki Stroehrer and Department Chair
 - implemented regular meetings with the group of instructors, possibly granting credit to the GAs for this meeting
- Assisted all faculty in posting syllabi and other pertinent course information on the web.
- Began to prepare a Strategic Plan reflecting Dr. Kopp's call for interdisciplinary curricula.

In 2006-2007, we will:

- Continue to revise and update levels descriptors for each applied area, including composition.
- Develop a template for Sophomore Hearings, so that student can discuss with applied area faculty one's progress in areas of theory, aural skills, piano studies and proficiency; and general education courses, and create a plan towards graduation.
- Begin revision of music education degree to be within the Marshall Commitment and to be competitive with regional and peer institutions.
- Continue to work on a revised music history sequence.
- Continue to work on a Bachelor of Arts curriculum.
- Update web site and department brochures.
- Revise Student Handbook.

Feedback Loop

Problem/Concern Action	Difficulty in MUS 301 (Analysis I) Additional term paper/analysis in theory 4 (completed)
---------------------------	--

Problem/Concern	Academic progress and professional readiness not correlated Department of Music Yearly Assessment Report, p. 9
-----------------	--

Action	Proposed addition of interview to Sophomore Hearing barrier exam (under discussion)
Problem/Concern Action	Preparation of MUS 142 Graduate Teaching Assistants Regular observations by Drs. Stroehrer and Onofrio; meetings with students to discuss common issues (classroom management, course content and presentation, etc.) (implemented)
Problem/Concern Action	External assessment of MUS 142 Writing Sample Revision of course objectives (completed fall 2004) Development of standardized writing assignment (completed Sept. 2005) Increase rating as determined by external readers (in progress)
Problem/Concern Action	Student Confusion over Levels System Plan to revise all studio descriptors (to be done)
Problem/Concern Action	Grave concern over academic honesty Presentations in classes and in MUS 100 (Applied Music Convocation) (implemented) Plan to enhance section on this topic in a revised Student Handbook (in progress)
Problem/Concern Action	B. Arts (Music Education) curriculum Complete and submit revised curriculum; investigate potential for B.M. curriculum housed in COFA (in progress)
Problem/Concern Action	Call for Interdisciplinary Programs Investigate possibilities for A.A. (Recording Technology) and B.F.A. – Music Business degrees (to be done)

IV. ASSISTANCE NEEDED

We would like to work with UAC members to construct instruments to survey our graduates and their employers with regard to the suitability of our degrees for various careers and jobs. This is especially important as we redesign the curriculum. We also should schedule meetings with currently active professionals to survey their opinions on what training should provide.

V. WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED

Students entering the music major often are ill-informed about the requirements of the career. Especially for them and their parents, earlier presentation of crucial information is indicated. To that end, at the audition, we have included a bit more information about this aspect of the process.

Revision of the theory sequence has been successful in helping to separate and identify student difficulties with the separate but overlapping domains of theory and aural skills. Fewer students are failing the freshmen aural skills barrier.

The amount of writing required in the junior and senior history, research, and capstone courses must be distributed more evenly. That will be a major component in the discussion of the revised history/research sequence.

Data confirms that we may accurately predict the probable exit level as an extrapolation from the entrance level. Students have difficulty understanding the difference between current work (semester grade) and the overarching concept of achievement (level). If we are successful in revising all studio descriptors, we anticipate a change in this situation.

Our advising process remains effective, although registration for applied music is hampered by student obligations such as holds placed by the Bursar, Financial Aid, or Student Justice. We must encourage all faculty to attend advising sessions hosted by the University College and Academic Affairs, and must educate them to changes in the entire curriculum.

Chart I Assessment Summary

Marshall University

Assessment of Student Outcomes: Component/Course/Program Level

Component/Area/Program/Discipline: **Department of Music**

N. B. These items apply to the B.F.A. degree with a music major and areas of emphasis in composition, jazz studies, performance, and theory. While not germane to the program review of the B.F.A. program, these items also are applied to the B.A. degree in music education. Please see p. 2 of this chart for a more complete explanation of Standards and Results.

<u>STUDENT OUTCOME</u>	<u>PERSON/OFFICE RESPONSIBLE</u>	<u>ASSESSMENT TOOL/APPROACH</u>	<u>STANDARDS/BENCHMARK</u>	<u>RESULTS/ANALYSIS</u>	<u>ACTION TAKEN</u>
Effective Applied Music Performance	Individual applied teacher; faculty of applied area; ensemble conductors; department chair	Entrance audition/interview; Juried performances; Level system evaluations; Sophomore hearing; Recital hearing and performance; Ensemble programs;	Course descriptions; Levels descriptions; Nationally accepted norms; current level of students in studio and ensembles	Levels system remains confusing to some students; Size and scope of secondary school music program directly affects chance of success; generally - satisfactory progress is achieved by most students	Chair discusses the system each semester in MUS 100 (Applied Music Laboratory); Student approved/not approved to continue applied study and/or passed/not passed on to next level of applied music study; New standards and forms were developed to evaluate, record and transmit the results of juries and hearings
Use of theoretical materials of music	Theory, aural skills and analysis teachers; applied teachers; conducting teachers	Entrance audition/interview; Course assessment instruments, such as tests, performances, computer drills; barrier exams in general musicianship	Requirement for next level of study; Extant examples of correct use of language; Nationally norms such as Praxis II	Students tend to struggle more with aural skills; availability of music theory course in secondary school directly affects speed of acquisition; placement exam not accurately reflecting students' skills	Faculty redesigned theory/aural skills sequence separating the two areas into discrete courses; placement exam given first day in fall rather than at the spring audition; More experienced GAs are assigned to teach and tutor these courses; Student passed/not passed on to next course; member of theory area included on all capstone committees; updated software in music computer labs
Knowledge of musical repertoire and relationship between repertoire and musical developments	Individual applied teacher; theory, history, style, and analysis teachers; capstone supervisor; capstone committee	Course assessment instruments, such as tests and performances; barrier exams in Music History and Literature; faculty review of capstone materials; oral and written capstone presentations	Requirement for next level of study; Extant examples of correct use of language; Nationally accepted norms; Faculty experience	Current history sequence is less effective than desired; students struggle to transfer knowledge from classes to applied and conducting activities	Capstone course requirements revised to include two semesters of preparation, research, and MUS 121 (first semester of history sequence) moved To spring semester and taught by faculty who have completed the WAC workshop; Student passed/not passed on to next course; Faculty working on new history sequence
Communication of ideas and musical information in a broad context the	Individual applied teacher; theory, history, style, and analysis teachers; MUS 401 instructor; capstone supervisor; capstone committee	Course assessment instruments; faculty review of written capstone materials; faculty review of oral examination	Examples from the literature; faculty experience	The more frequently we ask for oral or written analysis the stronger the product; there is some confusion over the multiplicity of styles for producing research papers	Student passed/not passed in course; approved/not approved for graduation; Faculty are discussing how to ensure sufficient knowledge of MLA, APS, Chicago, and Turabian style manuals (temporarily Decision rests with each capstone committee); new capstone syllabus (implemented FA03) requires preparation and committee approval one semester

before enrollment

Chart I Assessment Summary

Marshall University

Assessment of Student Outcomes: Component/Course/Program Level

Component/Area/Program/Discipline: **Department of Music**

Explanation of Standards/Benchmarks and Results/Analysis

STUDENT OUTCOME	STANDARDS/BENCHMARK	RESULTS/ANALYSIS
Effective Applied Music Performance	Individual course descriptions provide required literature and performance expectations by the semester; Levels descriptions provide the overall program goals, and require students to achieve a certain level for each year of study; Nationally accepted norms; current level of students in studio and ensembles; entrance standards of graduate programs in music (both MU and others)	Levels system remains confusing to new faculty and to some students – <i>we must standardize the terms used to describe each level and ensure that students understand the requirement for progress</i> Size and scope of secondary school music program directly affects chance of success – <i>our recruiting strategies now are targeting stronger schools and our entrance audition uses the probationary rating more often; expectations for performance vs. education majors are now more unified;</i> satisfactory progress is achieved by most students – <i>we are better at identifying at-risk students at the first (fall freshmen) jury exam</i>
Use of theoretical materials of music	Requirement for next level of study; preparation for upper division and capstone projects; completion of freshman aural skills and sophomore theory skills barrier exams; correct use of musical terms in all analyses and projects; National exams (Praxis II); entrance standards of graduate programs in music (both MU and others)	Highest percentage of student failure occurs in the first semester – <i>we should provide more individual tutoring for MUS 101 and MUS 111 students; we hope to develop an electronic “course pack” for incoming students to use in the summer before arrival.</i> availability of music theory course in secondary directly affects speed of acquisition and placement exam not accurately reflecting students’ skills – <i>we need to better identify those students with background deficiency</i>
Knowledge of musical repertoire and relationship between repertoire and musical developments	Requirement for next level of study; correct use of terms in courses, papers, and lab situations (ensembles, clinical experiences); presentation of standard literature in MUS 100 and on recitals ability to use this literature in theory, analysis, and history courses; Nationally accepted norms; entrance standards of graduate programs in music; faculty experience	Current history sequence is less effective than desired – <i>examination of the total sequence is in progress</i> students struggle to transfer knowledge from classes to applied and conducting activities - <i>Greater unity in the program is needed, as is enhanced discussion among faculty of these areas</i> <i>Coordination of the literature required in the levels descriptors and by graduate programs is needed</i>
Communication of ideas and musical information in a broad context	Examples from the literature; ability to apply this information in courses, papers, and lab situations; faculty experience	The more frequently we ask for oral or written analysis the stronger the product – <i>the revision of the history/research/capstone sequence should strengthen this process</i> Confusion over the multiplicity of styles for producing research papers – <i>with fall 2005, we have selected the Turabian for MUS 304, 423, 401, 425 and 621. Discussion scheduled as part of the history revision regarding MUS 121 and 423.</i>

Chart I Assessment Knowledge of musical Individual applied teacher; theory, Course assessment instruments, Requirement for Current history sequence is less Summary [Fall 2003]

Marshall repertoire and relationship history, style, and analysis such as tests and performances; next level of study; effective than desired; students struggle University Assessment of Student Outcomes: deadlines; Component/Course/Program Level

5 year Summary

Component/Area/Program/Discipline: **Department of Music**

N. B. These items apply to the B.F.A. degree with a music major, and a reas of emphasis in composition, jazz studies, performance, and theory.

While not germane to the program review of the B.F.A. program, these items also are applied to the B.A. degree in music education.

Communication of Individual applied teacher; theory, Course assessment instruments; Examples from the The more frequently we ask for oral or
ideas and musical history, style, and analysis faculty review of written capstone literature; faculty experience written analysis the stronger the

STUDENT OUTCOME	PERSON/OFFICE RESPONSIBLE	ASSESSMENT TOOL/APPROACH	STANDARDS INFORMATION IN A	TEACHERS; MUS 401 INSTRUCTOR;
	MATERIALS; FACULTY REVIEW OF ORAL		PRODUCT; THERE IS SOME CONFUSION	/BENCHMARK RESULTS/ANALYSIS

ACTION TAKEN

Effective Applied Music styles for Performance	Individual applied teacher; faculty pptions; of applied area; department chair pptions; secondary school music program directly	Entrance audition/interview; Levels system remains confusing to Chair discusses the system each semester in Juried performances; Level system Levels descri some students; Size and scope of MUS 100 (Applied Music Laboratory); Student evaluations; Student recitals; Nationally ac passed/not passed on to next level of applied music Ensemble programs; Junior/Senior norms; current level of Recitals students in studio and ensembles	Course descri broad context capstone supervisor; capstone committee affects chance of success; generally - satisfactory progress is achieved by most students	examination over the multiplicity of producing research papers cepted	
Use of theoretical materials of music	Theory and analysis teachers; applied teachers; conducting teachers	Entrance audition/interview; Course assessment instruments, such as tests, performances, computer drills; barrier exams in general musicianship	Requirement for next level of study; Extant examples of correct use of language; Nationally accepted norms	Students continue to struggle with aural skills; availability of music theory course in secondary school directly affects speed of acquisition; placement exam not accurately reflecting students' skills	Student passed/not passed on to next course; Faculty redesign of theory/aural skills sequence implemented fall 2003; faculty are discussing policy revision for fr/soph barrier exams; member of theory area included on all capstone committees; Renovated area in Music Library and new Jomie MIDI classroom (2000) provide computers, synthesizer keyboards, electronic workstations
Knowledge of musical repertoire and relationship between repertoire and musical developments	Individual applied teacher; theory, history, style, and analysis teachers; capstone supervisor; capstone committee	Course assessment instruments, such as tests and performances; barrier exams in Music History and Literature; faculty review of capstone materials; oral and written capstone presentations	Requirement for next level of study; Extant examples of correct use of language; Nationally accepted norms	Current history sequence is less effective than desired; students struggle to transfer knowledge from classes to applied and conducting activities	Student passed/not passed on to next course; Faculty working on new sequence and schedule for the four courses of the history sequence; capstone faculty beginning to strengthen writing and analytical skills; two more faculty taking writing workshop in FA03;

Communication of ideas and musical information in a broad context and

Individual applied teacher; theory, history, style, and analysis teachers; MUS 401 instructor; capstone supervisor; capstone committee

Course assessment instruments; faculty review of written capstone materials; faculty review of oral examination

Examples from the literature; faculty experience

The more frequently we ask for oral or written analysis the stronger the product; there is some confusion over the multiplicity of styles for producing research papers

Student passed/not passed in course; approved/not approved for graduation; Faculty are discussing how to ensure sufficient knowledge of MLA, APS, Chicago, and Turabian style manuals; new capstone syllabus (implemented FA03) requires preparation committee approval one semester before enrollment

College of Fine Arts

Student Satisfaction Survey of Facilities and Equipment

DEPARTMENT _____ MUSIC _____

ACADEMIC STANDING

FRESHMAN 24
 SOPHOMORE 20
 JUNIOR 14
 SENIOR 23
 GRADUATE 5

My Level of Satisfaction

- 1 – Not Satisfied at all
- 2 – Somewhat Dissatisfied
- 3 - Somewhat Satisfied
- 4 – Very Satisfied
- 5 – Not applicable

Please check appropriate box

	FR	SO	JR	SR	GR
1. The spaces (facilities) allotted to teaching (lecturing) in my major	3.38	2.5	2.64	2.48	3
2. The areas allotted to studio work/ performance in my major	2.96	2.53	2.64	2.64	2.6
3. The areas allotted to departmental storage in my major area	3.05	2.72	2.46	2.60	1.75
4. The storage areas for a student’s personal equipment and supplies	2.87	3.05	3.36	2.95	2.5
5. The environmental conditions in my major department’s facilities	3.04	2.25	2.14	2.26	2.2
6. The safety and security issues in my major department	3.28	3.05	3.54	2.91	4
7. The computer equipment for work in my major was adequate	2.57	1.97	2.36	1.78	2
8. The other equipment available for work in my major	2.95	3.11	2.79	2.14	2.8
9. The repair/ upkeep of equipment in my major area	2.38	2.11	2.07	2.09	2.2
10. The availability of expendable supplies necessary for work in my major area	2.63	2.06	2.54	2.09	2.75

You are invited to make comments about any of the areas indicated in the questions above
