

## Annual Assessment Report Template

*This form is intended to facilitate reporting program outcomes assessment to accrediting agencies, Board of Trustees, Strategic Planning Committee, and other internal or external audiences.*

*The department mission statement, PLO's, curricular map and multi-year assessment plan should be posted on the departmental website.*

**Department: Music**

**Date: October 6, 2015**

**Department Chair: Steve Butler (2014-15)**

### I. Program Learning Outcome (PLO) assessment

<b>Program Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Music Literacy Outcomes</b>
<b>Who is in Charge</b>	<b>Grey Brothers</b>
<b><u>Direct Assessment Methods</u></b>	Papers, presentations, and exams
<b><u>Indirect Assessment Methods</u></b>	Classroom discussions
<b>Major Findings</b>	As can be seen in the attached "Music Literacy Data," the students who took the class in Spring 2015 achieved the lowest average final grade of any group since Spring 2011.
<b>Closing the Loop Activities</b>	Since the Listening Journal has had no discernable positive effect, it will be discontinued in the future.
<p><b>Discussion</b></p> <p>It may be time to lesson the overall workload of MU 121 in future years, so that students have more time to spend on the core music literacy component. A goodly portion of the course concerns the memorization of names of composers and titles of pieces; perhaps the information load in these areas can be reduced in order to give students greater opportunity to focus on musical scores. Ways to achieve this will be investigated for the future.</p>	

--

**II. Follow-ups**

<b>Program Learning Outcome</b>	
<b>Who is in Charge</b>	
<b>Major Findings</b>	
<b>Closing the Loop Activities</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	

**III. Other assessment or Key Questions-related projects**

<b>Project</b>	
<b>Who is in Charge</b>	
<b>Major Findings</b>	
<b>Action</b>	
<b>Discussion</b>	

--

**IV. Adjustments to the Multi-year Assessment Plan (optional)**

Proposed adjustment	Rationale	Timing

**V. Appendices**

- A. Prompts or instruments used to collect the data
- B. Rubrics used to evaluate the data
- C. Relevant assessment-related documents/samples (optional)

**Report on Music Literacy Outcomes**

Submitted by Grey Brothers

**Summary**

Our department’s student learning outcome in the area of music literacy and repertoire is assessed through students’ performance in the second of our two-course sequence in the history of western music, MU 121, taught each spring. Music literacy is assessed via classroom discussions, papers, presentations, and exams. Our students are expected to perform at the developing level.

1. The data for this year’s assessment was gathered from the nine students enrolled in MU 121 in the spring of 2015. To observe the trend in student achievement over time and to assess the possible benefit of an approach to enhance student achievement instituted in the 2013-2014 academic year (the “Listening Journal” described below) data was also gathered from the students enrolled in MU 121 every spring semester since spring 2011.
2. The benchmark for this outcome is: 80% of students will achieve an average score of at least 80% on papers, presentations, and exams.
3. The instruments used to gather data were the three exams given in the course, each of which includes a score identification portion, particularly geared to assesses music literacy, as well as student research papers and presentations.

Assessment of Final Grades:

The simplest way to determine whether students in MU 121 have met the benchmark is to look at the final grades in the course, which are determined by students' performance on quizzes, exams, papers, and presentations. To a small degree, students' attendance and preparation for class are also factors.

Five of the nine students, or 55% of those enrolled in Music 121 in Spring 2015 achieved a composite score of 80% or greater in the course. By this measure, we were 25% below our benchmark of 80%. A more positive result is seen, however, when the data is viewed differently. The average of the composite scores of all the students was 78%, slightly below the 80% benchmark score.

#### Assessment Specifically of Musical Literacy:

In order to assess music literacy more specifically, students' performance on the portions of the exams that directly measured their ability to identify the titles and composers of music scores was assessed independently. The students' success in this narrower area can be surmised from the section "Score Identification on Exams" in the attached "Music Literacy Data."

Of the nine students enrolled in MU 121 in Spring 2015, five, or 56%, achieved better than 80% on the first exam, four, or 44% achieved better than 80% on the second exam, and four, or 44% achieved better than 80% on the third exam. We clearly fell short of our benchmark.

A quick glance at the data from spring 2011 and spring 2014 reveals, not surprisingly, that the spring 2015 students performed more poorly by this measure than students of previous years.

#### **Interpretation**

As can be seen in the attached "Music Literacy Data," the students who took the class in Spring 2015 achieved the lowest average final grade of any group since Spring 2011. Since the course content and requirements have changed little during the intervening years, with the exception of adding an exercise in the 2013-2014 academic year in the hopes of boosting students' achievement, we can only surmise that the Spring 2015 cohort was simply not as strong academically as those of the previous several years.

In the Fall 2013, an exercise was introduced in MU 120, the first course of the two-year music history sequence, with the intention of improving student achievement in the area of score identification. This was the Listening Journal, which students were required to maintain and to submit as a graded assignment. It required students to record information about all the scores studied as an aid to recalling them for exams. The Listening Journal was introduced during the fall semester because this is most students' first experience identifying scores from memory, and they have traditionally done more poorly than in the following spring, by which time they have had more practice in score identification. The Listening Journal has not been used in the spring, because the requirements of MU 121 are already arduous and to add another assignment would make for an excessive workload.

The data reveals that, all else being equal, the Listening Journal seems to have had little effect on students' performance. Indeed, if the natural variation in student ability is not taken into account, it could reasonably be assumed from the data for the spring of 2015 that the Listening Journal has had a negative impact. This seems hardly likely. There are more probably other factors involving students' aptitude and interest that have far greater impact on their performance in the area of music literacy. Regardless, since the Listening Journal has had no discernable positive effect, it will be discontinued in the future.

It may be time to lesson the overall workload of MU 121 in future years, so that students have more time to spend on the core music literacy component. A goodly portion of the course concerns the memorization of names of composers and titles of pieces; perhaps the information load in these areas can be reduced in order to give students greater opportunity to focus on musical scores. Ways to achieve this will be investigated for the future.

**Music Literacy Data: Spring 2011, Spring 2014, Spring 2015**

**MU 121 Final Course Scores**

	<b>Spring 2011</b>	<b>Spring 2012</b>	<b>Spring 2013</b>	<b>Spring 2014</b>	<b>Spring 2015</b>
	93.54684211	78.81226316	86.46557143	76.04229323	63.04590659
	96.52090909	89.11342915	90.63757895	89.47116541	77.40907895
	77.08909091	72.81407895	89.72023684	83.10593985	91.14369433
	76.50039136	89.23944505	78.17196501	76.97708647	84.79815789
	75.22884615	92.44742105	72.40548684	70.01052632	56.74921631
	87.31928571	74.02289069		85.30979323	85.55464912
	82.49842105	63.19275461		88.65565789	77.14926981
	91.62357143			94.85116541	88.41187135
	83.92642857			81.94262384	80.34520468
	74.94928571			76.64708647	
	83.58045455			99.13907895	
				74.49333333	
Average	83.88941151	79.94889752	83.48016781	83.05381253	78.28967211

**MU 121 Score Identification on Exams**

**Spring 2011**

<b>Student</b>	<b>Exam 1</b>	<b>Exam 2</b>	<b>Exam 3</b>
1	100.00	100.00	88.46

2	100.00	100.00	96.15
3	71.43	57.69	61.54
4	95.24	100.00	84.62
5	80.95	96.15	53.85
6	90.48	88.46	92.31
7	95.24	100.00	88.46
8	95.24	100.00	100.00
9	71.43	100.00	92.31
10	85.71	88.46	96.15
11	95.24	84.62	42.31
Average	89.18	92.31	81.47

### Spring 2014

Student	Exam 1	Exam 2	Exam 3
1	95.24	83.33	82.86
2	95.24	95.83	100.00
3	95.24	91.67	88.57
4	57.14	54.17	62.86
5	90.48	20.83	74.29
6	95.24	91.67	65.71
7	95.24	91.67	88.57
8	100.00	100.00	100.00
9	95.24	83.33	100.00
10	80.95	95.83	60.00
11	100.00	100.00	100.00
12	85.71	58.33	71.43
Average	90.48	80.56	82.86

### Spring 2015

Student	Exam 1	Exam 2	Exam 3
1	61.90	66.67	51.43
2	95.24	70.83	51.43
3	95.24	100.00	82.86

4	100.00	100.00	68.57
5	33.33	45.83	31.43
6	76.19	100.00	80.00
7	57.14	66.67	80.00
8	85.71	87.50	82.86
9	90.48	79.17	68.57
Average	77.25	79.63	66.35