Core Curriculum Assessment Annual Report

General Information

1. Name / Number of Course / Sequence:
   MUSI 2730/MUSI 2737: Appreciation of Music

2. SLO(s) being assessed:
   Student will understand and appreciate the arts and aesthetics as ways of knowing an engaging with the world.

3. Department:
   Music

4. Department Representative:
   Ann Knipschild

5. AGSC Content Alignment:
   AREA II: Humanities

Assessment Information

6. Assessment Method: [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO – not grading for the course as a whole was conducted.]

   Student Learning Outcome 11: Students will understand and appreciate the arts and aesthetics as ways of knowing and engaging with the world.

   Measure 1: Develop and articulate criteria for aesthetic judgment.

   Measure 2: Understand how various art forms and/or works of art both reflect and inform society at large historically and/or in the present.
Measure 3: Be able to study, create or participate in some form of artistic expression as a means of understanding the creative process.

Assessment Methods for MUSI 2730/2737 Appreciation of Music:

Competency in these measures is assessed by student mastery of basic elements of music, expression of aesthetic judgment, understanding of the relationship of music to other art forms, and knowledge of historical and cultural development of music as demonstrated in 1) concert reports and in 2) written exams.

Random samples of written reports, exam questions, and aggregate student exam scores will be reviewed annually by the department’s assessment committee against rubrics of expected outcomes. Rubrics for Evaluation for Concert Reports and Evaluation of Exams were developed to address the above three measures and course objectives. The rubrics are attached.

I. Evaluation of Concert Reports will assess competencies related to measures 1 and 3. In understanding musical terms, styles, and mechanics, students develop the tools to articulate criteria for aesthetic judgment (measure 1). In-class guided listening exercises prepare the students for attending live performances and describing their experiences in concert reports. They study forms of artistic expression and learn to understand the creative process (measure 3). They use skills learned in class to give historical and analytical perspective about the musical pieces, discern music quality, and articulate aesthetic judgment of the musical experience in their concert reports. The assessment rubric addresses the following components: 1) Use of musical terms, 2) Aesthetic judgment, 3) Discernment of musical quality, and 4) Accuracy and depth of information or musical analysis. An overall score is given along with scores of these individual components. Positive and negative comments may be given for each component.

II. Evaluation of Exams will assess areas related to measures 1, 2, and 3. Exam questions for each section of the course will be examined as to whether they address the students’ understanding of basic elements of music (measure 1), the different genres and styles of music and art developed by specific cultures in history (measure 2), and societal influences that affect the ways in which musicians live and work (measure 2). The skills developed by students in the in-class guided listening exercises should prepare the student to answer listening example questions using their ability to understand the creative process (measure 3) using aesthetic judgment (measure 1). The rubric for Evaluation of Exams assesses the strength of the exam questions’ ability to address the students’ mastery of 1) Understanding of musical elements and terminology, 2) Cultural and historical development of music, 3) Understanding of the relationship of music to
other arts, 4) Understanding wealth and variety of music from around the world and its impact on Western music, and 5) Ability to make aesthetic judgment. The rubric also provides for an overall judgment of the exam’s ability to assess the measures. The individual components are also scored and positive/negative comments may be given.

Class exam scores are collected and average scores are calculated to discern students’ ability to master the material contained in course objectives.

The committee decided to separate information gathered in MUSI 2730 and MUSI 2737 (Honors) courses as student abilities may be different. This was not expressed in the original assessment plan.

7. Findings: [What assessment data did each assessment method produce?]

Evaluation of Concert Reports

Committee members reviewed 5 randomly selected concert reports from each of 24 sections of MUSI 2730 and 5 sections of MUSI 2737. Scores from the Concert Report rubric are as follows:

Average scores for overall concert report (scale of 1 – 5, 5 being highest)
MUSI 2737 (Honors): 3.61  MUSI 2730: 3.10

Average scores for each of the components

Use of musical terms
MUSI 2737 (Honors): 3.64  MUSI 2730: 2.80

Aesthetic Judgment
MUSI 2737: 3.39  MUSI 2730: 3.04

Discernment of Musical Quality
MUSI 2737: 3.07  MUSI 2730: 2.91

Accuracy and depth of information or musical analysis
MUSI 2737: 3.39  MUSI 2730: 2.84

As expected, scores for the MUSI 2737 (honors) section were higher than the MUSI 2730 section. The honors section reports were generally more comprehensive and insightful, especially in the areas of aesthetic judgment and discernment of musical quality. Some
of the reports did not address all of the assessed components, especially in the MUSI 2730 sections. We became aware that not all instructors gave detailed concert report instructions to their class. There is room for improvement in all component areas in both the MUSI 2737 and MUSI 2730 classes.

**Evaluation of Exams**

Committee members reviewed the final exam questions from each of the 24 sections of MUSI 2730 and 5 sections of MUSI 2737. Scores from the Evaluation of Exams rubric are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>MUSI 2737 (Honors)</th>
<th>MUSI 2730</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average scores for overall exam (scale of 1 – 5, 5 being highest)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Musical Elements and Terminology</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural and historical development of music</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of relationship of music to other arts</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding wealth and variety of music from around the world and its impact on Western music</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening questions address Aesthetic judgment</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample evaluator comments can be found on the attached Summary of Evaluation of Exams.

Most of the exams (in both MUSI 2737 and 2730 classes) required an understanding of musical elements and terminology and the cultural and historical development of music. Improvement is needed in including the areas of understanding the relationship of music to other arts and knowledge of music from cultures other than Western music.
Some the listening sections of exams only required musical piece and composer identification and did not address aesthetic judgment. Some exams did not contain a listening component.

There is room for improvement in all component areas in both the MUSI 2737 and MUSI 2730 section classes.

Evaluation of Exam Scores

An analysis of final exam scores from 24 MUSI 2730 sections and 5 MUSI 2737 sections showed the following results:

MUSI 2737 average exam scores ranged from 75% to 99%

MUSI 2730 average exam scores ranged from 66% to 99.7%

Most students are successful in learning the course material that is being presented.

8. How did you or will you use the findings for improvement: [What questions / issues/ concerns do your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

A meeting will be planned for discussion with MUSI 2730/2737 instructors to make sure they are covering material that addresses the SLO and measures. They should list SLO 11 and the three measures on their syllabi. They will be asked to include course objectives that address these measures, linking the objectives to the SLO and corresponding measure(s). They will be given the following objectives as a guide:

1. To demonstrate knowledge of the common elements of music (rhythm, melody, harmony, timbre, texture, tempo, dynamics, and form) and how they all interrelate in music (SLO 11, measures 1 and 3)

2. To demonstrate an understanding of the relationship of music to the other arts (SLO 11, measures 2 and 3)

3. To demonstrate knowledge of the historical and cultural development of Western music from Gregorian chant to the present day (SLO 11, measures 2 and 3)

4. To demonstrate an understanding of the wealth and variety of music from around the world and its impact on Western music (SLO 11, measures 2 and 3)
Instructors will also be asked to describe course assignments in more detail on their syllabi and give students thorough instructions for writing their concert reports. The committee will develop a concert report form template for instructors to use.

More consistency in final exam score averages between instructors should be achieved.

Instructors will be asked to include a listening component in their evaluation of all students. This listening component should not only ask students to identify music pieces/composers, but should address other elements of music and require aesthetic judgment.

9. Additional comments: [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]
   None

10. Core Curriculum General Education Committee Comments:

   This is a very strong report-- both in terms of the assessment process it describes and in terms of the clarity of its presentation. Moving forward, please be careful about the use of composite exam scores-- do all questions really address all measures? There was some concern about the level and breadth of faculty discussion of the findings: the Department might want to work on strengthening communication about the assessment process.