

Music Department 2011 Annual Assessment Update

I. Mission Statement,

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, best geared to

MU 120 in the fall were replaced by three others in MU 121, the new students in MU 121 were not stronger academically than those they replaced. Probably a combination of factors was at play. On one hand, the literature encountered in the spring, from the common practice period, was stylistically more familiar to students than the music encountered in the fall.

On the other hand, by spring the students had gained experience in reading scores and in knowing how to identify them, which is, after all, one of the goals of the music history course sequence. It would appear that the teaching strategies employed not only in the music history sequence, but in other facets of our music curriculum, from music theory classes to ensembles, are resulting in the development of music literacy we desire for our students.

Closing the Loop

The simplest and most direct means for assessing music literacy likely involves quantifying students' performance on the portions of the exams that directly measure their ability to identify the titles and composers of music scores. We will consider this method for the coming year.

IV. Next Steps

- a.) Our plan for 2011-2012 is to work on our student learning outcome related to ensemble performance: Develop Technical and Musical Expertise:
Ensemble Performance
- b.) To continue to work toward developing data relative to juries in a format of a table, for ease in reading and understanding.
- c.) To continue to work toward developing assessment practices that are tied