

School of Music Assessment Plan—BA/BME/BA-MTEC Results 2015-16

Process for Assessing the Data

Annual Assessment Process

1. Data is collected from identified courses.
2. The assessment coordinator tabulates the scores. Areas where the acceptable performance threshold has not been met are highlighted.
3. The scores are presented to the faculty
4. The faculty reviews the assessment results, and makes decisions on how to respond.
 - a. If an acceptable performance threshold has not been met, a faculty response is required. Possible responses:
 - i. Gather additional data next year to verify or refute the result.
 - ii. Change something in the curriculum to try and fix the problem.
 - iii. Change the acceptable performance threshold.
 - b. Faculty can respond to assessment results even if the acceptable performance threshold has been met.
5. A summary of the year's assessment activities and faculty decisions is reported to the Provost's Office in your Department's Annual Assessment Activities report.

Acceptable performance threshold for each outcome: At least 80% of students will be rated "Proficient" or higher on every category/sub-category of the scoring rubrics.

1. Program Learning Outcomes (BA = outcomes 1-5; BME = outcomes 1-7; MTEC 1-5, 8-12; Minor = 1-2)

Adapted from the learning outcomes in the National Association of Schools of Music handbook.

Our graduates will have:

(1) The ability to hear, identify, and work conceptually with the elements of music such as rhythm, melody, harmony, and form.

(2) An understanding of and the ability to read, interpret, and perform musical notation in a variety of musical styles.

(3) An understanding of compositional processes, aesthetic properties of style, and the ways these shape and are shaped by artistic and cultural forces.

(4) An acquaintance with a wide selection of musical literature, the principal eras, genres, and cultural sources.

(5) The ability to develop, express, and defend musical judgments.

(6) BME: The knowledge, skills, and judgment to be a musical leader in a variety of teaching situations.

(7) BME: An understanding of human development, educational psychology, and pedagogical techniques.

(8) MTEC: Experience composing and arranging (orchestrating) music in a variety of styles; using an array of software and hardware tools.

(9) MTEC: Experience creating soundtracks for new media.

(10) MTEC: Theoretical knowledge and practical skills necessary for crafting original audio through sound design, digital signal processing, and synthesis techniques.

(11) MTEC: Demonstrated competency in recording, editing, and mixing multi-track audio.

(12) MTEC: A practical understanding of acoustics, psychoacoustics.

2. Learning Outcomes in the Curriculum

All Required Courses Offered by the School of Music

Highlighted boxes indicate the learning outcome is addressed in the course. A yellow highlight indicates outcomes explored in a course. The letter X indicates that the outcome is assessed.

School of Music courses:													
	Cr	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
MUSI 105—Music Theory I	3	X	X										
MUSI 106—Music Theory II	3												
MUSI 205- Music Theory III	3	X	X										
MUSI 206—Music Theory IV	3												
MUSI 135—Keyboard Skills I	1												
MUSI 136—Keyboard Skills II	1												
MUSI 230-233—Advanced Keyboard Skills	2												
MUSI 140—Aural Perception I	1	X	X										
MUSI 141—Aural Perception II	1												
MUSI 240—Aural Perception III	1												
MUSI 241—Aural Perception IV	1												
MUSI 195—Applied Music I	1												
MUSI 295—Applied Music II	1												
MUSI 395 - Applied Music III	1												
MUSI 301-303; 307IA—Music History* (assessed in 302 only)	3			X	X	X							
MUSI 499R Senior Project	3				X	X							
Music Education Specific Courses:													
MUSI 335, 336, 239 - Conducting	5												
MUSE 123/130/131/132/134/135/442- Instrumental Techniques and Vocal Pedagogy	8												
MUSI 442 - Instrumentation	2			X									
MUSE 395/397 - K-8 General Music	4						X	X					
MUSE 437/497MI - Instrumental Music	4												
MUSE 439/497MC - Choral Music	4						X	X					
EDU 495 - Student Teaching	12												

	Cr	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Music Technology Specific Courses:													
MUSI 485 – Acoustic Composition	2			X	X	X							
EELE 217 – The Science of Sound	2												
FILM 256 – Multimedia Audio Production	3												
MUST 115 – Intro to Digital Music	3										X	X	X
MUST 125 – MIDI and Electroacoustic Composition	3												
MUST 220 – Recording I	3											X	X
MUST 305 – Orchestration for New Media	2								X	X			
MUST 341 – Sound Design and Synthesis	3										X		
MUST 380 – Interdisciplinary Proj. I: Film	3								X	X			
MUST 382 – Interdisciplinary Proj. II (variable topics)	3												
MUST 384 – Film Scoring	3												
MUST 499R – Senior Capstone Projects (vari. topics)	3												

--- MTEC Electives (6 cr. Required) ---													
MUST 217 – Entertainment Business	3												
MUST 225 – MONSTER Electroacoustic Ensemble	2												
MUST 320 – Recording II	3												
MUST 350 – Real-time Computer Music	3												
MUST 482 – Electronic Composition	1+												
MUST 498 Internship – MTEC (vari. topics)	1+												

OUTCOME 1	Rhythm	Melody	Harmony	Form
Average:	2	1.9	2	2.1
% Proficient+:	84%	75%	80%	85%
OUTCOME 2	Reading	Performing		
Average:	2.1	1.4		
% Proficient+:	80%	50%		
OUTCOME 3	Processes	Style	Forces	
Average:	1.9	1.9	2.1	
% Proficient+:	76%	72%	79%	
OUTCOME 4	Context			
Average:	2.1			
% Proficient+:	81%			
OUTCOME 5	Judgments			
Average:	2.0			
% Proficient+:	68%			
OUTCOME 6 (BME)	Knowledge	Skills		
Average:	2.9	2.7		
% Proficient+:	100%	100%		
OUTCOME 7 (BME)	Pedagogy	Development	Assessment	
Average:	2.9	2.8	2.9	
% Proficient+:	100%	100%	100%	
OUTCOME 8 (MTEC)	Tools			
Average:	–			
% Proficient+:	–			
OUTCOME 9	Soundtrack			
Average:	–			
% Proficient+:	–			
OUTCOME 10	Audio			
Average:	2.5			
% Proficient+:	86%			
OUTCOME 11	Recording	Mixing		
Average:	2.8	–		
% Proficient+:	93%	–		
OUTCOME 12	Acoustics			
Average:	2.7			
% Proficient+:	86%			

Scoring rubric for learning outcome #1: Ability to hear, identify and work conceptually with the elements of music such as rhythm, melody, harmony and form

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Rhythm	Very weak demonstration of rhythmic ability	Not accurate but demonstrates some ability	Mostly accurate with some areas of weakness	Strong demonstration of rhythmic accuracy and understanding
Melody	Very weak demonstration of pitch/melodic recognition and realization	Not accurate but demonstrates some ability	Mostly accurate with some areas of weakness	Strong demonstration of melodic accuracy and understanding
Harmony	Very weak demonstration of harmonic recognition and realization	Not accurate but demonstrates some ability	Mostly accurate with some areas of weakness	Strong demonstration of harmonic accuracy and understanding
Form	Very weak understanding of musical form	Not accurate but demonstrates some ability	Mostly accurate with some areas of weakness	Strong demonstration of understanding of musical form

Scoring rubric for learning outcome #2: *An understanding of and the ability to read, interpret, and perform musical notation in a variety of musical styles.*

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Reading and interpreting musical notation	Very weak demonstration of fluency in reading and interpreting musical notation	Limited demonstration of fluency in reading and interpreting musical notation	Competent demonstration of fluency in reading and interpreting musical notation	Strong demonstration of fluency in reading and interpreting musical notation
Performing in a variety of styles	Very weak demonstration of performance skills	Limited demonstration of performance skills	Competent demonstration of performance skills	Strong demonstration of performance skills

Scoring rubric for learning outcome #3: *An understanding of compositional processes, aesthetic properties of style, and the ways these shape and are shaped by artistic, technical, and cultural forces.*

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Compositional processes	Very weak demonstration of understanding	Limited demonstration of understanding	Competent demonstration of understanding	Strong demonstration of understanding
Aesthetic properties of style	Very weak demonstration of understanding	Limited demonstration of understanding	Competent demonstration of understanding	Strong demonstration of understanding
Influence of artistic, technical, and cultural forces on composition and style	Very weak demonstration of understanding	Limited demonstration of understanding	Competent demonstration of understanding	Strong demonstration of understanding

Scoring rubric for outcome #4: *An acquaintance with a wide selection of musical literature, the principal eras, genres, and cultural sources.*

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Ability to place music in historical, cultural, and stylistic contexts	Very weak demonstration of ability	Limited demonstration of ability	Competent demonstration of ability	Strong demonstration of ability

Scoring rubric for outcome #5: *The ability to develop, express, and defend musical judgments.*

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Develop, express, and defend musical judgments	Very weak demonstration	Limited demonstration	Competent demonstration	Strong demonstration

Scoring rubric for learning outcome #6: *The knowledge, skills, and judgment to be a musical leader in a variety of teaching situations.*

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Musical Knowledge	Very weak demonstration of musical knowledge necessary for teaching	Limited demonstration of musical knowledge necessary for teaching	Competent demonstration of musical knowledge necessary for teaching	Strong demonstration of musical knowledge necessary for teaching
Musical Skills	Very weak demonstration of musical skills necessary for teaching	Limited demonstration of musical skills necessary for teaching	Competent demonstration of musical skills necessary for teaching	Strong demonstration of musical skills necessary for teaching

Scoring rubric for learning outcome #7: *An understanding of human development, educational psychology, and pedagogical techniques.*

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Pedagogy - knowledge	Very weak understanding of pedagogy in music education	Limited understanding of pedagogy in music education	Adequate understanding of pedagogy in music education	Thorough understanding of pedagogy in music education
Knowledge of child development	Demonstrates little or no understanding of child development or strategies to differentiate instruction	Demonstrates limited understanding of child development and strategies to differentiate instruction	Demonstrates adequate understanding of child development and strategies to differentiate instruction	Demonstrates thorough understanding of child development and strategies to differentiate instruction
Assessment	Assessments are poorly designed and/or do not align with standards.	Assessments are weakly designed or marginally align with standards.	Assessments are adequately designed and somewhat align with standards	Assessments are well designed and align with standards .

Scoring rubric for outcome #8: *(8) MTEC: Experience composing and arranging (orchestrating) music in a variety of styles; using an array of software and hardware tools.*

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Experience composing and arranging with software and hardware tools.	Very weak demonstration	Limited demonstration	Competent demonstration	Strong demonstration

Scoring rubric for outcome #9: *MTEC: Experience creating soundtracks for new media.*

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Experience creating soundtracks	Very weak demonstration	Limited demonstration	Competent demonstration	Strong demonstration

Scoring rubric for outcome #10: *MTEC: Theoretical knowledge and practical skills necessary for crafting original audio through sound design, digital signal processing, and synthesis techniques.*

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Crafting original audio through sound design, digital signal processing, and synthesis techniques.	Very weak demonstration	Limited demonstration	Competent demonstration	Strong demonstration

Scoring rubric for outcome #11: MTEC: Demonstrated competency in recording, editing, and mixing mutli-track audio.

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
Recording	Very weak demonstration	Limited demonstration	Competent demonstration	Strong demonstration
Editing and Mixing	Very weak demonstration	Limited demonstration	Competent demonstration	Strong demonstration

Scoring rubric for outcome #12: MTEC: A practical understanding of acoustics, psychoacoustics.

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
A practical understanding of Acoustics and psychoacoustics	Very weak demonstration	Limited demonstration	Competent demonstration	Strong demonstration

Scoring rubric for MUST 499R - MUSIC TECHNOLOGY Student Self Assessment:

Outcome Category	Unacceptable 0	Marginal 1	Proficient 2	Exceptional 3
(Variable)	Very weak knowledge and skill set	Limited knowledge and skill set	Competent knowledge and skill set	Strong knowledge and skill set

Acceptable performance threshold for each outcome: At least 80% of students will be rated “Proficient” or higher on every category of the scoring rubrics.

Schedule for Reviewing Assessment Plan Elements

	Year					
Element	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
Outcomes			X			X
Rubrics			X			X
Matrix			X			X
Schedule			X			X

Schedule for Reviewing the Courses in the Curriculum/Outcomes Matrix

	Year					
Course	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
ALL			X			X

Process for Assessing the Data

Annual Assessment Process

1. Data is collected from identified courses. Additionally, MTEC Only: Data collected from MUST 499R – Music Technology Student Self Assessment (Used in conjunction with faculty assessment).
2. The assessment coordinator tabulates the scores. Areas where the acceptable performance threshold has not been met are highlighted.
3. The scores are presented to the faculty.
4. The faculty reviews the assessment results, and makes decisions on how to respond.
 - If an acceptable performance threshold has not been met, a faculty response is required. Possible responses:
 - Gather additional data next year to verify or refute the result.
 - Change something in the curriculum to try to fix the problem.
 - Change the acceptable performance threshold.
 - Faculty can respond to assessment results even if the acceptable performance threshold has been met.
5. A summary of the year’s assessment activities and faculty decisions is reported to the Provost’s Office in your Department’s Annual Assessment Activities report.

This plan will be updated on a regular basis and submitted to the Office of the Provost each Spring, along with the School of Music’s Annual Assessment Activities Report for the academic year.

Annual Assessment Report

Academic Year: 2015-2016

Department: Music

Programs: Music; Music Technology; Music Education

1. What Was Done

Based on our School of Music Assessment Plan and rubrics, we evaluated learning outcomes 1-12 during the 2015-2016 academic year.

2. What Data Were Collected

We collected data from all music majors enrolled in the identified courses. Students were scored on the given rubrics and scores submitted to the curriculum committee. Some responses had to be normalized, as some faculty used the wrong point range to assess performance. (Results on a 0 – 5 scale had to be mapped to a 0 – 3 range.) Average scores and percentage receiving a proficient or above rating are reported in our annual assessment report.

3. What Was Learned

At the end of AY 2015 a decision was made to assess outcomes in the Fall rather than Spring, with the hope of collecting more data in a timely way to create the assessment report. While the decision was made in good faith, it has led to a validity problem in comparing AY 2015 results to AY 2016 results. Students are not being compared at the same point of progress as before. Also, by assessing first-semester students in many cases, we have focused on students with a higher attrition rate and in some cases, vastly less preparation than usual music majors. The change from Spring semester to Fall semester assessment created more problems than it solved.

With the change in data collection semester, we were unable to assess the effectiveness of creating a music-major only section of music fundamentals as a means of preparing majors for core music course study. Anecdotal evidence suggests that these trailing students were much better prepared for music theory and keyboard skills study.

Sub-categories of outcomes 1 – 3 had averages below 2.0 (proficient) and less than 80% of students at proficient or higher. Outcome 5 had a 2.0 average but less than 80% proficient. Outcomes 6 – 12 were all at or above threshold values. While outcomes 1 – 5 assess students in all majors, outcomes 6 – 7 assess upper division students in Music Education, and outcomes 8 – 12 assess upper division students in Music Technology. Analyzing data for these outcomes show that students who stay in these programs are achieving at high levels.

Three sub-categories did not have scores reported. This number is down from last year, perhaps the only positive from the change in assessment semester.

4. How We Responded

The assessment coordinator and school director believe that the change in semesters that assessment took place caused a greater focus on first semester students. The resulting outcome scores (particularly 1 – 3) were more indicative of student preparation before enrolling than the instruction students received at MSU. We believe that a change back to Spring semester assessment will provide more meaningful data for us to use in evaluating our program offerings and teaching.

Although our assessment plan calls for evaluating what outcomes and courses are assessed every three years, the curriculum committee and school director are looking at ways to improve the process of assessment each year. The school will make decisions in early Fall 2016 as to what modifications are needed in AY 2017. We will focus attention on making sure that all outcomes are assessed, all faculty are returning assessments, and all faculty are using the proper rubric scoring. We may need assess some outcomes in the Fall and some in the Spring to get total coverage. The issue of faculty not returning assessment scores is complicated by the school employing a large percentage of NTT faculty. NTT faculty loads and engagement with the school can change significantly from semester to semester, with some faculty only working one semester of an academic year.