

## 2012-2013 Annual Program Assessment Report

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College and the assessment office by Monday, September 30, 2013. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

**College: MCCAMC**

**Department: MUSIC**

**Program: Bachelors of Music; Masters of Music**

**Assessment liaison: Alexandra Monchick**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** Provide a brief overview of this year's assessment plan and process.
  - a. **Our goals were to assess the performance areas for the Bachelors of Music and Masters of Music programs. We used a representative sample of these areas from jury forms (rubrics) from the Wind and Guitar performance areas**
2. **Assessment Buy-In.** Describe how your chair and faculty were involved in assessment related activities. Did department meetings include discussion of student learning assessment in a manner that included the department faculty as a whole?
  - a. **Assessment data was primarily gathered by area heads from Winds and Guitar areas. Data was interpreted by the assessment liason and department chair.**
3. **Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project.** Answer items a-f for each SLO assessed this year. If you assessed an additional SLO, copy and paste items a-f below, BEFORE you answer them here, to provide additional reporting space.

**3a. Which Student Learning Outcome was measured this year?**

SLO 2: demonstrate continuing development of individual talent, musical interests, and philosophies to be used creatively to preserve and extend the cultural heritage of music.

**3b. Does this learning outcome align with one or more of the university's Big 5 Competencies? (Delete any which do not apply)**

- Oral Communication  
(by means of musical communication)

**3c. Does this learning outcome align with University's commitment to supporting diversity through the cultivation and exchange of a wide variety of ideas and points of view? In what ways did the assessed SLO incorporate diverse perspectives related to race, ethnic/cultural identity/cultural orientations, religion, sexual orientation, gender/gender identity, disability, socio-economic status, veteran status, national origin, age, language, and employment rank?**

No

**3d. What direct and/or indirect instrument(s) were used to measure this SLO?**

Standardized rubrics were to assess student performance at a jury at the conclusion of the semester.

**3e. Describe the assessment design methodology:** For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (Comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

In order to evaluate our BM program in performance, we evaluated the winds and guitar departments with a cross-sectional study. We evaluated all students by their performance jury at the end of their freshman year (MUS 1xxB) and middle of their senior year (MUS 4xxA). Evaluations were performed using a standardized rubric that evaluates each student's Musicality/Expression, Tone Quality/Intonation, Technique, and General Impressions/Professionalism. In addition, students are asked to meet technical requirements (scales and arpeggios). Even though the rubrics from level to level remain identical, the expectations are increased from level to level in terms of technical requirements, repertoire, and expectations of quality of tone and intonation. At least three evaluators used this standardized rubric and their scores were averaged.

**3f. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO:** Provide a summary of how the results were analyzed and highlight findings from the collected evidence.

The average score for the freshman level in the wind department (Gateway) was 90.5. The average score for the wind department (Capstone) was 88.14. This was surprising. Upon further investigation, it appears that the students in the Capstone level are not meeting tone quality and intonation standards at the higher levels. Students are consistently meeting technique standards.

A possible alternative explanation for this discrepancy would be that freshman are not evaluated as critically as upperclassmen, and this will need to be addressed to the evaluating faculty. In addition, students at the capstone level prepare for a recital the same semester and may not put as much effort into their final jury.

**3g. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO:** Describe how assessment results were used to improve student learning. Were assessment results from previous years or from this year used to make program changes in this reporting year? (Possible changes include: changes to course content/topics covered, changes to course sequence, additions/deletions of courses in program, changes in pedagogy, changes to student advisement, changes to student support services, revisions to program SLOs, new or revised assessment instruments, other academic programmatic changes, and changes to the assessment plan.)

From now on, we will use grade rubrics from student recitals (cumulative project) rather than jury results from the penultimate semester at the B.M. level, and compare them against the jury rubrics from the first-year students (gateway assessment). We will grade the cumulative project with the same rubric as we used in the juries. This is more reflective of student progress, because often in their last year, students put more energy into their recitals rather than their penultimate jury.

**4. Assessment of Previous Changes:** Present documentation that demonstrates how the previous changes in the program resulted in improved student learning.

The results of last year's undergraduate assessment proved that no changes to the program were necessary. We assessed PLO 4 in our undergraduate music technology program (MUS 191 and MUS 391), and proved that we were achieving successful results. We assessed both PLO 1 and PLO3 at the graduate level in our gateway music history course (MUS 601). This course assessment proved that the course was successful in achieving these PLOs. However, we will be comparing these results against data we will collect from the music history capstone (MUS 603) this year.

**5. Changes to SLOs?** Please attach an updated course alignment matrix if any changes were made. (Refer to the Curriculum Alignment Matrix Template, [http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms\\_guides.html](http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html).)

N/A

**6. Assessment Plan:** Evaluate the effectiveness of your 5-year assessment plan. How well did it inform and guide your assessment work this academic year? What process is used to develop/update the 5-year assessment plan? Please attach an updated 5 year

assessment plan for 2013-2018. (Refer to Five Year Planning Template, plan B or C, [http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms\\_guides.html](http://www.csun.edu/assessment/forms_guides.html).)

Assessment of the M.M. Program in Performance and Music History area will be rolled over until next year. We could only collect gateway data in our history sequence from MUS 601 and will compare this against capstone data in MUS 603 this year. We collected gateway data from our performance program from a jury (utilizing the same rubric as our undergraduate performance juries) and will compare this data longitudinally with these students culminating projects (recital) this year.

We will amend our 5-year plan next year to include our newest program in collaborative piano (M.M only). The program has it's first entering class in the fall of 2013.

**7. Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program?** Please provide citation or discuss.

No

**8. Other information, assessment or reflective activities or processes not captured above.**

Data for incoming M.M. performance students, who are evaluated among the same rubric) was collected. However, due to a lack of graduating M.M. candidates, the same study that was conducted on B.M. students was not able to be attempted. However a baseline of a jury score of 92.9 was established for incoming M.M. students. Because the graduate program is only four semesters, we will be able to collect more data in the fall and spring and prepare a longitudinal study on each student's progress.

We will roll over an evaluation of the graduate music history program until next year. An essay question will be implemented on the graduate placement exam this fall and will be tested longitudinally with a similar embedded question at the conclusion of MUS603 (music history capstone).

**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE**  
**GUITAR JURY EVALUATION REPORT**

SPRING\_\_\_\_ FALL\_\_\_\_ YEAR\_\_\_\_

STUDENT\_\_\_\_ DATE\_\_\_\_ EVALUATOR\_\_\_\_

REPERTOIRE	A				B				C				D				F	TOTAL
<b>Musicality/Expression (40)</b> Phrasing Expression Style/Interpretation Communication Dynamics Rhythm	40	39	38	37	36	35	34	33	32	31	30	29	28	27	26	25-0		
<b>Preparation &amp; Presentation (30)</b> Technical Preparation Appearance Consistency of Rhythm	30	29	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21	20	19-0						
<b>Tone Quality/Tuning (20)</b> Consistency of Tone Tuning	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11-0								
<b>General Impression (10)</b> All Performance Factors	10	9	8	7	6	5-0												
Level: 159____ 259____ 359____ 459____ 659____ <b>BA</b> ____ <b>BM</b> ____																		
Performance:____ Music Education:____ Music Therapy:____ Music Industry____ Breadth Studies:____ Composition:____																		
																<b>TOTAL</b>		