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 might 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
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: 2.85 S 12 MUSI 2737: 3.02 S. 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 F 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 F 11 MUSI 2737: 3.39 MUSI 2730: 3.04 D. In some sections of MUSI 2737, there was improvement compared to Fall 2011. 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
### 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.

Scores and components for each of the 11 MUSI 2730: 4.35 MUSI 2730: 4.56 Fall 11 MUSI 2737: 4.0 MUSI 2730: 4.43 12 MUSI 2730: 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 Fall 11 MUSI 2737: 4.0 MUSI 2730: 4.43 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 Fall 11 MUSI 2737: 3.5 MUSI 2730: 3.07 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 Fall 11 MUSI 2737: 4.0 MUSI 2730: 3.21 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 Fall 11 MUSI 2737: 2.5 MUSI 2730: 3.64 12 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 73% 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.

### 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...
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?