



# Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011\_12

Department Music

Representative Ann Knipschild

Course Name / number MUSI2730

1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area II: Humanities

2. **SLO(s) being assessed: Student will..**

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

3. **Assessment Method(s):**

[Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

General Education Goal #7: Aesthetic Appreciation and Engagement 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 Plan 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 concert reports and in 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. 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. 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



# Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011\_12

Department Music

Representative Ann Knipschild

Course Name / number MUSI2730

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. Additions to assessment plan following 2010-11 assessment in Fall 2011: After receiving the assessment results from 2010-11, there was a meeting with MUSI 2730/2737 instructors in December 2011 to make sure they were covering material that addresses the SLO and measures. They were asked to list SLO 11 and the three measures on their syllabi. They were asked to include course objectives that address these measures, linking the objectives to the SLO and corresponding measure(s). They were 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 were asked to describe course assignments in more detail on their syllabi and to give students thorough instructions for writing their concert reports. The committee developed a sample list of instructions for the instructors. Findings from the 2010-11 assessment indicated that some instructors did not include a listening component in their evaluation of their students. In the December meeting, instructors were asked to include a listening component in their final exam for Spring 2012. This listening component should not only ask students to identify music pieces/composers, but should address other elements of music and require aesthetic judgment.

#### 4. Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?

Findings Evaluation of Concert Reports Committee members reviewed 5 randomly selected concert reports from each of 27 sections of MUSI 2730 and 4 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) 2011-12 MUSI 2737 (Honors): 3.52 MUSI 2730: 2.94 F 11 MUSI 2737: 3.64 MUSI 2730: 2.88 S 12 MUSI 2737: 3.4 MUSI 2730: 3.02 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 3.61 MUSI 2730: 3.10 Average scores for each of the components Use of musical terms 2011-12 MUSI 2737: 3.33 MUSI 2730: 2.88 F 11 MUSI 2737: 3.2 MUSI 2730: 2.95 S 12 MUSI 2737: 3.45 MUSI 2730: 2.81 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 3.64 MUSI 2730: 2.80 Aesthetic Judgment 2011-12 MUSI 2737: 3.57 MUSI 2730: 3.08 F 11 MUSI 2737: 3.4 MUSI 2730: 3.12 S 12 MUSI 2737: 3.72 MUSI 2730: 3.05 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 3.39 MUSI 2730: 3.04 Discernment of Musical Quality 2011-12 MUSI 2737: 3.48 MUSI 2730: 3.0 F 11 MUSI 2737: 3.3 MUSI 2730: 2.98 S 12 MUSI 2737: 3.64 MUSI 2730: 3.02 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 3.07 MUSI 2730: 2.91 Accuracy and depth of information or musical analysis 2011-12 MUSI 2737: 3.67 MUSI 2730: 2.62 F 11 MUSI 2737: 3.5 MUSI 2730: 2.56 S 12 MUSI 2737: 3.82 MUSI 2730: 2.70 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 3.39 MUSI 2730: 2.84 Sample evaluator comments can be found on the attached Summary of Evaluation of Concert Reports. In comparing classes from 2010-11 and 2011-12, there was little improvement or even a decrease in scores in many areas of the concert report rubric. This was possibly due to the method of selection of reports from each class. In 2010-11, the instructors were asked to "randomly" select 5 reports from their own classes. Some instructors stated that they submitted the best reports instead. Consequently, in 2011-12, the assessment committee collected all reports from all classes and did the random selection from each class. The committee did find improvement in most areas in Spring 2012 (as compared to Fall 2011). This was possibly a result of the December 2011



# Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011\_12

Department Music

Representative Ann Knipschild

Course Name / number MUSI2730

assessment meeting in which Music Appreciation instructors were asked to give students detailed information of what to include in concert reports. As expected, scores for the MUSI 2737 (honors) section continued to be higher than the MUSI 2730 section. The honors section reports were generally more comprehensive and insightful overall. There is room for improvement in all component areas in both the MUSI 2737 and MUSI 2730 classes. In reading the concert reports, committee members noticed that reports were generally well written or poorly written, with few reports of average quality. Evaluation of Exams Committee members reviewed the final exam questions from each of the 27 sections of MUSI 2730 and 4 sections of MUSI 2737. Scores from the Evaluation of Exams rubric are as follows: Average scores for overall exam (scale of 1 – 5, 5 being highest) 2011-12 MUSI 2737 (Honors): 4.25 MUSI 2730: 3.78 Fall 11 MUSI 2737: 3.5 MUSI 2730: 3.71 Spring 12 MUSI 2737: 5.0 MUSI 2730: 3.85 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 3.6 MUSI 2730: 3.18 Average scores for each of the components Understanding of Musical Elements and Terminology 2011-12 MUSI 2737: 4.5 MUSI 2730: 4.56 F 11 MUSI 2737: 4.0 MUSI 2730: 4.43 S 12 MUSI 2737: 5.0 MUSI 2730: 4.69 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 4.4 MUSI 2730: 4.06 Cultural and historical development of music 2011-12 MUSI 2737: 4.5 MUSI 2730: 4.33 F 11 MUSI 2737: 4.0 MUSI 2730: 4.43 S 12 MUSI 2737: 5.0 MUSI 2730: 4.23 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 4.8 MUSI 2730: 3.71 Understanding of relationship of music to other arts 2011-12 MUSI 2737: 4.0 MUSI 2730: 3.46 F 11 MUSI 2737: 3.5 MUSI 2730: 3.07 S 12 MUSI 2737: 4.5 MUSI 2730: 3.85 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 3.4 MUSI 2730: 2.63 Understanding wealth and variety of music from around the world and its impact on Western music 2011-12 MUSI 2737: 4.25 MUSI 2730: 3.18 F 11 MUSI 2737: 4.0 MUSI 2730: 3.21 S 12 MUSI 2737: 4.5 MUSI 2730: 3.15 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 2.6 MUSI 2730: 2.12 Listening questions address Aesthetic judgment 2011-12 MUSI 2737: 3.0 MUSI 2730: 3.11 F 11 MUSI 2737: 2.5 MUSI 2730: 3.64 S 11 MUSI 2737: 3.5 MUSI 2730: 2.54 2010-11 MUSI 2737: 3.2 MUSI 2730: 2.47 Sample evaluator comments can be found on the attached Summary of Evaluation of Exams. Overall scores and scores improved in almost every area between 2010-11 and 2011-12 for both MUSI 2737 and 2730 classes. Between Fall 2011 and Spring 2012, improvement was made especially in the area of understanding the relationship of music to other arts (one of the areas discussed in the December assessment meeting with Music Appreciation instructors). In some classes, the listening sections of exams still only required musical piece and composer identification and did not address aesthetic judgment. Some exams still 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 27 MUSI 2730 sections and 4 MUSI 2737 sections showed the following results: 2011-12: MUSI 2737 average exam scores ranged from 87% to 91% 2010-11: MUSI 2737 average exam scores ranged from 75% to 99% 2011-12: MUSI 2730 average exam scores ranged from 74% to 92% 2010-11: MUSI 2730 average exam scores ranged from 66% to 99.7% Most students are successful in learning the course material that is being presented.

## 5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?

[What questions / issues / concerns did 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 with MUSI 2730/2737 instructors to discuss areas that need improvement. Although improvement was made in all areas that were evaluated in the concert reports, the committee noticed that concert reports were generally either well written or poorly written. Instructors will be encouraged to make sure that all students understand what should be included in the concert reports. Instructors will be asked to put this information in their syllabus and to discuss these guidelines in class. Improvement was made in most areas evaluated on the final exam. This indicates that SLO 11 and measures are being addressed in most



## Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011\_12

**Department** Music

**Representative** Ann Knipschild

**Course Name / number** MUSI2730

classes. There is concern that not all instructors are including a listening component that requires aesthetic judgment. Not all instructors are including content on world music. These issues will be discussed in the meeting. Syllabi will be collected and reviewed to make sure that all instructors are including the following information: 1. SLO 11 and measures 2. Course objectives that address these measures and link the objectives to the SLO and corresponding measures (instructors have been given sample objectives – see additions to assessment plan in question no. 1) 3. Instructions on writing concert reports 4. Guide for listening Noting that there was improvement in consistency in final exam scores from 2010-11 to 2011-12, even more consistency in final exam score averages between instructors should be achieved in MUSI 2730 sections.

### 6. Additional Comments:

[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

### 7. Committee Comments

Mean of rubric score = 3.83 (out of 4) The report focuses on the nature of the collected concert reports and the requirement of the listening component of the class. Although I admire the directness of the assessment method, the report does not talk about how to improve student learning, but how to improve data collection. Student papers are described as very good or very bad. How do the faculty improve the performance of those students are writing bad papers?

## Rubric for Evaluation of Concert Reports

Student #: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Course/Section: \_\_\_\_\_ Date/Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

The document ...				
1	2	3	4	5
Fails to convey accurate and intended information	Conveys some accurate information unclearly	Conveys some accurate information clearly and somewhat effective manner	Conveys most accurate information clearly and in an interesting and effective manner	Conveys all accurate information clearly and in an interesting and professional-quality manner

Rank the following from 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest score. Comment below as indicated on any of the following components that were especially strong or weak. A comment on every component is not required.

Negative comments	Components	Positive Comments
	Use of Musical Terms 1    2    3    4    5	
	Aesthetic Judgment 1    2    3    4    5	
	Discernment of Musical Quality 1    2    3    4    5	
	Accuracy and depth of information or musical analysis 1    2    3    4    5	

### Rubric for Evaluation of MUSI 2730/2737 Exams

Exam #: \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Course/Section: \_\_\_\_\_ Date/Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

The exam...				
1	2	3	4	5
Fails to address material in required course objectives	Addresses some of the material in required course objectives	Addresses most of the material in required course objectives	Addresses all of the material in required course objectives	Addresses all of the material in required course objectives in a comprehensive manner

Rank the following from 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest score. Comment below as indicated on any of the following components that were especially strong or weak. A comment on every component is not required.

Negative comments	Components	Positive Comments
	<b>Exam questions address:</b> Understanding of Musical Elements and Terminology  1    2    3    4    5	
	Cultural and historical development of music  1    2    3    4    5	
	Understanding of relationship of music to other arts  1    2    3    4    5	
	Understanding wealth and variety of music from around the world and its impact on Western music  1    2    3    4    5	
	<b>Listening questions address:</b> Aesthetic judgment  1    2    3    4    5	

## **RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF CONCERT REPORTS**

### **Average scores for overall concert report (scale of 1 – 5, 5 being highest)**

2011-12	MUSI 2737 (Honors): 3.52	MUSI 2730: 2.94
F 11	MUSI 2737: 3.64	MUSI 2730: 2.88
S 12	MUSI 2737: 3.4	MUSI 2730: 3.0
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 3.61	MUSI 2730: 3.10

### **Average scores for each of the components**

#### Use of musical terms

2011-12	MUSI 2737: 3.33	MUSI 2730: 2.88
F 11	MUSI 2737: 3.2	MUSI 2730: 2.95
S 12	MUSI 2737: 3.45	MUSI 2730: 2.81
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 3.64	MUSI 2730: 2.80

#### Aesthetic Judgment

2011-12	MUSI 2737: 3.57	MUSI 2730: 3.08
F 11	MUSI 2737: 3.4	MUSI 2730: 3.12
S 12	MUSI 2737: 3.72	MUSI 2730: 3.05
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 3.39	MUSI 2730: 3.04

#### Discernment of Musical Quality

2011-12	MUSI 2737: 3.48	MUSI 2730: 3.0
F 11	MUSI 2737: 3.3	MUSI 2730: 2.98
S 12	MUSI 2737: 3.64	MUSI 2730: 3.02
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 3.07	MUSI 2730: 2.91

#### Accuracy and depth of information or musical analysis

2011-12	MUSI 2737: 3.67	MUSI 2730: 2.62
F 11	MUSI 2737: 3.5	MUSI 2730: 2.56
S 12	MUSI 2737: 3.82	MUSI 2730: 2.70
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 3.39	MUSI 2730: 2.84

## **Evaluator comments on each of the components**

(H refers to Honors classes)

### **Use of musical terms**

#### Positive

Used some musical terms

Excellent use of terms, especially related to texture and form

Good use of basic music terms

Used basic terms such as tempo, volume, instrument names

Very detailed and accurate use of terms

Good description of dynamics and tempo

Excellent and accurate use of musical terms

Very descriptive and accurate use of musical terms

Used a plethora of terms accurately: chromatic, arpeggios, harmonic etc....

Used the terms-but left out the details of what pieces he/she was listening to.

Great use of terms in terms of structure/form of pieces: for example strophic

Did use some musical terminology

Used some musical terms in an accurate way, for example: melody, accents, and dissonance

Uses many musical terms

#### Negative

Needs to be more descriptive of entire concert in musical terms

Needs some help with grammar and those terms

Little use of musical terms

Very little use of musical terms

Needs more use of terms in describing the music

Student used a lot of musical terms but some were incorrect

Uses "sopranic"??

Little use of terms in describing the actual music

Didn't use many terms other than names of instruments

Used only one musical term

Perhaps because this report occurred before midterm, the student did not seem to have enough music terminology at his/her command

"Panicked" and "depressing" aren't musical terms

Almost non-existent - "minor key" is the only musical term used

Piece X "featured many harmonies"

No musical terms other than names of instruments

Sometime the use of the terminology in conjunction with other musical terms did not make sense

Used the term "tempo" only.

Only one term used throughout the paper: polyphonic

Doesn't make an effort to integrate musical terms into comments

Often uses them incorrectly

Poorly integrated into the paper

H: The use of terms: monophonic and homophonic is not used accurately

Used the terms monophonic in an inaccurate way



## **Aesthetic Judgment**

### Positive

Student wrote about the beauty of the tuba

Uses effective words in describing aesthetic judgment (beauty, enjoyable)

Describes why the student liked or didn't like the piece

Talked about how music affected the student and why he/she liked or didn't like it

Gave effect of performance on student

Gave judgment on appearance of venue and saw that the performers were enjoying themselves

Gave good description of impression pieces had on student

Very descriptive use of words

Expresses why the student liked the performance

Very perceptive comments

Described what was liked and why

Student described how each piece made her feel (compared the feelings to losing a boyfriend)

Good comparisons with other pieces the student knows

Insightful thoughts

The student made an historical association between a piece performed and WW1

H: Made some insightful comments regarding the mood of different movements in the piece

Strong comments in terms of his emotional response to the different pieces on the program

### Negative

Student only wrote about the beauty of the tuba

Little aesthetic judgment of music

Very little description

None given

Would describe a piece in one way but then contradict him/herself in the next sentence.

WHY does the student like/dislike certain aspects of the performance?

## **Discernment of Musical Quality**

### Positive

Student wrote why he liked the sound of the tuba in comparison to the trumpet  
Gave good reasons why a piece was performed well or not well  
Some description of quality  
Student "graded" each piece  
Fairly good description of quality  
Good description of quality  
Student briefly compared the performer to another he/she had heard  
Thoughtful descriptions

### Negative

Student didn't write about the quality of the music or performance other than that he liked the sound of the tuba (this was an ensemble concert)  
Little discussion of quality  
Little description of aesthetic judgment  
Only discussed quality of a small part of the concert  
Not really addressed  
None given

H: No evidence of discernment.

## **Accuracy and depth of information or musical analysis**

### Positive

Good historical info about each piece, good description of form  
Little historical information or mention of musical periods  
The student managed to make good use of terminology and understanding of historical significance with regard to the clarinet ensemble performance.  
Good report  
Good background information  
Report gave a background history and context of each composer.  
Gave some details regarding when each piece was written  
Gave some details on the historical background on one piece  
Accuracy

### Negative

Little background on pieces; little analysis  
Could give more historical background and/or musical period of the piece/composer  
No historical background or mention of musical periods  
No depth of information; no historical background; hard to tell if student actually attended the concert  
Needs more background on pieces, composers  
Needs a lot more background on pieces/composers  
Did not name the pieces or movements or composer

Did not give any historical background on the pieces and only analyzed the pieces based on tempo and dynamic level

7th - 8th grade level

Superficial musical analysis-mainly just talked about differing tempos throughout the pieces/movements

Barely any musical analysis and few details provided in terms of background of pieces

Gave more of an in depth analysis on the setting of the concert than an analysis on the music and the piece

No information or musical analysis in report

Report did not provide any musical analysis of pieces performed on the concert

The student spent more time on (plagiarized?) historical/genre related information than on the performance itself

Spends the entire paper telling the reader which sections have the most prominent roles in each piece

H: Since the report is about Cabaret, there is little attention given specifically to music

## **RUBRIC FOR EVALUATION OF EXAMS**

### **Average scores for overall exam (scale of 1 – 5, 5 being highest)**

2011-12	MUSI 2737 (Honors): 4.25	MUSI 2730: 3.78
Fall 11	MUSI 2737: 3.5	MUSI 2730: 3.71
Spring 12	MUSI 2737: 5.0	MUSI 2730: 3.85
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 3.6	MUSI 2730: 3.18

### **Average scores for each of the components**

#### Understanding of Musical Elements and Terminology

2011-12	MUSI 2737: 4.5	MUSI 2730: 4.56
F 11	MUSI 2737: 4.0	MUSI 2730: 4.43
S 12	MUSI 2737: 5.0	MUSI 2730: 4.69
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 4.4	MUSI 2730: 4.06

#### Cultural and historical development of music

2011-12	MUSI 2737: 4.5	MUSI 2730: 4.33
F 11	MUSI 2737: 4.0	MUSI 2730: 4.43
S 12	MUSI 2737: 5.0	MUSI 2730: 4.23
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 4.8	MUSI 2730: 3.71

#### Understanding of relationship of music to other arts

2011-12	MUSI 2737: 4.0	MUSI 2730: 3.46
F 11	MUSI 2737: 3.5	MUSI 2730: 3.07
S 12	MUSI 2737: 4.5	MUSI 2730: 3.85
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 3.4	MUSI 2730: 2.63

#### Understanding wealth and variety of music from around the world and its impact on Western music

2011-12	MUSI 2737: 4.25	MUSI 2730: 3.18
F 11	MUSI 2737: 4.0	MUSI 2730: 3.21
S 12	MUSI 2737: 4.5	MUSI 2730: 3.15
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 2.6	MUSI 2730: 2.12

#### Listening questions address Aesthetic judgment

2011-12	MUSI 2737: 3.0	MUSI 2730: 3.11
F 11	MUSI 2737: 2.5	MUSI 2730: 3.64
S 11	MUSI 2737: 3.5	MUSI 2730: 2.54
2010-11	MUSI 2737: 3.2	MUSI 2730: 2.47

### **Evaluator comments on each of the components**

#### **Understanding of Musical Elements and Terminology**

### Positive

Expects students to have a very thorough knowledge of terms associated with 20th century music (a substantial component of this exam)

Essay test asks student to discuss form, tonality, compositional style, instrumentation

Asks for students' knowledge of many musical terms and elements

Uses many musical terms in the questions themselves (students would need to understand the terms to understand the questions)

Many questions dealing with form, genre

Good - genre, texture, form, melody, rhythm

### Negative

Not a lot of "basics" - rhythm, dynamics, articulation, etc.

## **Cultural and historical development of music**

### Positive

Questions address influence of the great depression in US on music, influence of folk and popular music from all cultures on 20th century music

Asks whether a piece is influenced by jazz

Questions on nationalism

Asks for influences from past musical periods on contemporary music

### Negative

Essay exam doesn't ask for much historical background or cultural influences

## **Understanding of relationship of music to other arts**

### Positive

Addresses more than just impressionism

Questions address impressionism

Mentions ballet and impressionistic art

Literature, dance

Literature, dance, philosophy, visual arts

Literature, film, dance (ballet)

Two questions relating to drama

### Negative

Still could add more questions that refer to the other arts

Only impressionism

Should address more than impressionism

## **Understanding wealth and variety of music from around the world and its impact on Western music**

### Positive

Influence of folk and popular music from all cultures on 20th century music

Addresses ethnomusicology

Effects of world music on 20th century techniques

Addresses impact of jazz and popular music on 20th century music

Many questions refer to the influence of music from around the world on composers: for example: Mexican traditional music, African-American influences, the impact of non-Western and traditional music styles on Debussy and Ravel

Many questions about jazz/rock  
10% of the questions addressed "World Music"

Negative

No questions on world music  
Could address world music influences more  
Nothing about "World Music" (unless we are counting African influence in jazz)  
No World

**Listening questions address aesthetic judgment**

Positive

Questions ask for form and also influences on pieces  
Excellent questions on judgment  
Asks students many questions that require use of their aesthetic judgment  
Students are asked questions related to their ability to analyze form and other components  
Asks for more than just identification of pieces  
Questions require students to use aesthetic judgment to determine general date of composition, possible composer, genre, etc.

Negative

Could ask for more aesthetic judgment from students  
No listening questions on exam  
No listening  
No listening  
No listening  
No listening on exam  
There are no listening questions on this particular exam (was there a separate listening exam?)