As you now know an interim report on the assessment of student learning is due to WASC in fall of 2010. We have been asked to demonstrate that we are using assessment data to improve student learning (i.e., “closing the assessment loop”) and that the assessment process is sustainable. To that end, we are asking programs to report on their most complete student learning outcome (SLO) during this reporting cycle. Please identify your selected SLO in the box below and provide the requested information.

Program Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program(s):</th>
<th>BA and BM Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair:</td>
<td>Dr. Ed Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Prepared by:</td>
<td>Dr. Janet Averett</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Learning Outcome (SLO 5)

Perform standard repertoire competently and expressively, and provide musical leadership appropriate to a university music program as soloists, as conductors, and as members of major performing ensembles and smaller chamber ensembles

Evidence for Need:

What evidence was used to identify this SLO as a candidate for improvement (e.g., describe the prior assessment activities and data that led to this decision)?

This is perhaps the most important SLO of our or any undergraduate music program. Positive results come from a synthesized use of all theoretical and historical knowledge as well as the continuous building of skills in a performance area.

As this is the SLO we assess continuously every day and continue to see positive results, we do not see a need to examine this or change teaching methodologies or assessment strategies. Students get heard every day in private applied lessons and ensemble rehearsals, are assessed at the end of every semester in performance or composition jury examinations and in recitals that they must give in their junior and senior years, if BM students, or senior year only if BA students. The get constant verbal and written feedback. We still see a 99% rate of success. Every faculty member in the program is involved in daily self-examination of teaching strategies. One can see or hear results immediately in teaching method because of the close contact and relationship of the teacher and student that most closely resembles the mentor approach.

Changes to Curriculum or Pedagogy:

What actions were taken to improve student learning related to this outcome (e.g., program changes, changes in pedagogy, process changes, resources requests, etc)?

No changes were made except as individual instructors might tailor their strategy to fit each student.
Evidence for Impact:
What is the evidence that the actions taken above impacted student learning for this outcome?

Learning outcomes continue to be positive as 95% of all UG music students progress through the program, continuously improving as performers (all UG music degree programs), composers (for the BM composition program) and conductors (BM Performance and Composition programs).
Student Learning Outcome (SLO 2)

Demonstrate a working knowledge of music history and literature form the Western art tradition, with supporting related studies in non-western traditions, practices and cultures.

Evidence for Need:
What evidence was used to identify this SLO as a candidate for improvement (e.g., describe the prior assessment activities and data that led to this decision)?

This SLO is introduced in Musc 12 and Musc 19 and reinforced and developed in Musc 110, 111 and 120.

Our largest challenge here is to assess students in classes that are too large. Capstone projects have been modified due to these large classes and discussion based on what the outcomes should be. Originally, this class was taught that included writing and research as capstone project. Now it is assessed primarily as a knowledge based course, in which practices, facts, concepts and “the story” are felt to be the primary outcomes.

The other challenge is class attendance for Musc 12, which meets at 8 a.m. MW. Music majors are often performing in concerts or working at night, so 8 a.m. classes are a challenge for them. The material requires interactive involvement so attendance is critical. We are currently considering a time change for this class but find it difficult due to schedule conflicts with other required classes.

The third challenge is to get the students to make Musc 12, 110 and 111 in sequence since it is a sequential history of music. We have not made prereqs mandatory because of the difficulty of scheduling this rotation (we cannot offer each course every semester) and the challenge that transfer students have faced in getting all their required courses completed. Instructors find that students do better in the subsequent courses if they take these courses sequentially.

Musc 19, our non-western music class, continues to see music students demonstrate a working knowledge in their final projects with a 90% or better rate.

Musc 120, Worlds of Jazz, sees a similar success rate in the final project.

Students also demonstrate their historical knowledge through performance. 90% of students demonstrate their knowledge of historical performance practice in ensemble and solo performance.

Changes to Curriculum or Pedagogy:
What actions were taken to improve student learning related to this outcome (e.g., program changes, changes in pedagogy, process changes, resources requests, etc)?

No major changes have been made in pedagogy or process as students continue to complete the capstone requirements for each course with a more than 90% success rate. We will consider prereqs for Musc 12, 110, 111 (each a prereq for the next) but will not implement until we can offer each course every semester. The current budget will not allow this.
Evidence for Impact:
What is the evidence that the actions taken above impacted student learning for this outcome?

Based on changes in the needs for the learning outcomes, students are achieving at a more than 90% rate. However, no further changes can be made until budget picture improves.
Assessment Reporting
Spring 2010-Spring 2012

Student Learning Outcome (SLO Teacher Preparation)

Demonstrate basic performance skills as well as pedagogical and classroom methods appropriate for a music education major entering the field of public school teaching

Evidence for Need:
What evidence was used to identify this SLO as a candidate for improvement (e.g., describe the prior assessment activities and data that led to this decision)?

This SLO is always a candidate for improvement in order to make better candidates for public school teaching.

One component that was lacking was enough field experience prior to entering the credential program. The creation and implementation of a BM in Music Education allowed the possibility of creating courses that could provide both philosophical and practical foundations for teachers. These courses are MUED 140 and MUED 175, Practicum in Music Education.

Further the music education coordinator applied for and received funding through the California Music Project to provide scholarships to students in the music education to assist current public school teachers in underfunded and underrepresented areas. To date, and in the past five years, our students have received over $1,000,000 in funded scholarships to do such intern work.

Finally, the students themselves have started an ensemble called MEWE, in which they practice and perform as vocalists or instrumentalists about which they have only a basic knowledge. Since these instruments or voices are no their own specialties, they must go through what it is like to be a beginner and even perform as beginners. This student-run group recently received and achievement award from the MENC—Music Education National Conference—the national association for the music education discipline.

In addition, we already assess via the following:

Students in our music education program must successfully complete lessons, juries, and a recital on their primary instrument, as well as play in appropriate large ensembles. In addition, they must complete a series of fundamentals courses in instruments and voice, including: 25AB (piano), 26A (voice), 28 (guitar), and 125A-D (strings, woodwinds, brass, percussion), in which they must demonstrate basic skills on all instruments commonly taught in California public schools. Finally, these skills are put to practice in a music education series that includes: Music 185 (Music for Children), MuEd 140 (Foundations of Music Education), 142 (Introduction to Music Education, 170A or B (Teaching Instrumental Music, or Teaching Choral Music, and 175 (Practicum in Music Education). These courses provide theoretical, pedagogical, philosophical, and practical experience in public school music teaching; students observe real-life classrooms, write and teach plans for their peers and to public school children, and receive instructor, community, and peer feedback.

90-95% of our students pass with a B- or better.
**Changes to Curriculum or Pedagogy:**
What actions were taken to improve student learning related to this outcome (e.g., program changes, changes in pedagogy, process changes, resources requests, etc)?

No major changes other than the above have been implemented.

**Evidence for Impact:**
What is the evidence that the actions taken above impacted student learning for this outcome?

Improvement in the number and quality of students that enter the music education program. Also feedback from school district employers has been positive regarding our students.
Assessment Reporting  
Spring Fall 2010-Spring 2012  

Student Learning Outcome (SLO—MA 3)  

Demonstration of Advanced Knowledge of music history as appropriate at the Master’s Level.

Evidence for Need:  
What evidence was used to identify this SLO as a candidate for improvement (e.g., describe the prior assessment activities and data that led to this decision)?

All music graduate students are required to take at least two seminars with music history as their emphasis—drawn from MUSC 201: Studies in Music History; MUSC 203: Style and Performance Practices; MUSC 221: Studies in the World’s Improvisational Traditions—as part of their “core” courses. In each of these courses students write a history research paper constructed through a process preparing and writing a paper proposal, annotated bibliography, abstract, outline, a final paper, and an oral presentation followed by a question and answer session. Papers are grade upon creativity and depth of the thesis statement, historical research and support of the paper’s argument, clear organization, an academic level of musical terminology, and correct citation and formatting according to the Chicago Manual of Style and D. Kern Holoman’s Writing about Music: A Style Sheet that supplements the Chicago style in regards to the specifics of music. With this guidance and support, students generally produce excellent papers that not only demonstrate expanded individual historical knowledge, but also contribute the historical discipline, such as graduate student Carole Bellinger-Kawahara’s article “Hovaness’ Sonata for Harp, Op. 127: A Blend of the Classic and the Exotic” for The American Harp Journal 23, No. 1 (Summer 2011).

The topics of these seminar papers form the basis for the individual questions submitted to graduate students upon taking their Written Culminating Exams (WCE) during their final semester of instruction, one of which addresses music history. In general, students are asked, now that they have a fuller knowledge of their individual topics through their previous research, to further address their topic in various ways, such as re-examining and critiquing their ideological process towards their subject, to further explore a new avenue of research brought up by their previous work, or to take the historical knowledge gained in their previous work and apply to a different musical work or in a different context.

The individual instructors read and grade the WCEs according to content, writing style, and correct citation and bibliographic method. The MA candidates must pass a minimum of two of these areas in each exam question (History, Theory, Area Emphasis) to successfully complete the WCE, with one of the areas being correct citation and bibliographic method. Of the sixteen students who have taken the WCE in Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Fall 2011, thirteen MA students (81.25%) passed on the first try. Of the three remaining students, all were asked address deficiencies in their answers, and two (12.5%) passed on their second attempt, while the remaining student (6.25%) passed on the third try. In the present Spring 2012 semester, seven students will be taking the WCE.

The faculty in general is pleased with both the process and results of the students’ coursework in history, as demonstrated by their discussion in seminar and term papers, and with the students’ examinations in their Written Culminating Exams. In discussion, faculty attributes student difficulties in the WCE to poor student preparation, many times involving a crowded final semester involving final coursework, concerts, and recitals; to lack of and incorrect citation; and to English-as-second-language issues.
Changes that have already been implemented include Graduate Coordinator preparation of entering graduate students for both the importance of their history coursework, and of how that coursework prepares them for the final stages of their degree work in their Written Culminating Exams. Topics for music history courses are in continuous rotation to explore the many facets of music history as well as address multifarious student interest.

3.4 Results of Action Items
AY 2010-2011/Fall 2011— What does assessment of student learning show after implementation of any action items? What, if anything, is planned next?

At this point in time, no changes are planned, though the process behind music history coursework and assessment and the Written Culminating Exams is under continuous discussion amongst the faculty.
Student Learning Outcome (SLO—MA 3)

Demonstration of Advanced Knowledge of music history as appropriate at the Master’s Level.

Data Collection
AY 2010-2011/Fall 2011—For this assessment cycle, how were the data collected, and what were the results?

All music graduate students are required to take MUSC 200: Bibliography and Research, as the introductory graduate seminar to their four “core” courses. In each of this course students learn about writing, the process of critique, creative description, research, and the professional written communication central to the performing arts. Writing about music and dance utilizes specialized and challenging set of skills incorporating technical description, cultural contextualization, subjective reaction, and certain stylistic conventions in a unique mix. Students write a research paper constructed through a process preparing and writing a paper proposal, annotated bibliography, abstract, outline, a final paper, and an oral presentation followed by a question and answer session. Papers are grade upon creativity and depth of the thesis statement, historical research and support of the paper’s argument, clear organization, an academic level of musical terminology, and correct citation and formatting according to the Chicago Manual of Style and D. Kern Holoman’s Writing about Music: A Style Sheet that supplements the Chicago style in regards to the specifics of music. With this guidance and support, students generally produce excellent graduate-level papers.

The techniques learned in the writing of seminar papers form the basis for graduate students answering the individual questions submitted to them when taking their Written Culminating Exams (WCE) during their final semester of instruction. While students asked in these exams to further address their topic in various ways by re-examining and critiquing their ideological process towards their subject, or further exploring new avenues of research brought up by their previous work, and are judged according to content, their writing style, and correct citation and bibliographic method is the one area in which they must pass. Of the sixteen students who have taken the WCE in Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Fall 2011, thirteen MA students (81.25%) passed on the first try. Of the three remaining students, all were asked address deficiencies in their answers, and two (12.5%) passed on their second attempt, while the remaining student (6.25%) passed on the third try. In the present Spring 2012 semester, seven students will be taking the WCE.

4.2 What have you learned about this Student Learning Outcome?

In general, the faculty is pleased with both the process and results of the students’ coursework, as demonstrated by their discussion in seminar and term papers, and with the students’ examinations in their Written Culminating Exams. However, each new incoming class presents its own set of problems, and the faculty is in continuous discussion of how to address these needs. In discussion, faculty attributes student difficulties in the WCE to poor student preparation, many times involving in the first place, poor seminar papers, and secondly, a crowded final semester involving final coursework, concerts, and recitals; to lack of and incorrect citation; and to English-as-second-language issues.

4.3 Action item(s) (if necessary)
AY 2010-2011/Fall 2011—Based on the discussion in part II, what actions will the department take to improve student learning, e.g., program changes, changes in pedagogy, process changes, resources requests, etc.?
Changes that have already been implemented include Graduate Coordinator counseling of entering graduate students for both the importance of writing in their coursework towards an academic degree, the importance of writing in their professional careers as teachers and creative professionals, and of how their coursework prepares them for the final stages of their degree work in their Written Culminating Exams. The faculty continuously discusses the topic of good writing, and that group discussion has not only helped faculty as a whole to recognize individual students needs, but to address those needs together in coordinated fashion, rather than in individualized dyssynchrony.

**Changes to Curriculum or Pedagogy:**

What actions were taken to improve student learning related to this outcome (e.g., program changes, changes in pedagogy, process changes, resources requests, etc)?

Changes that have already been implemented include Graduate Coordinator counseling of entering graduate students for both the importance of writing in their coursework towards an academic degree, the importance of writing in their professional careers as teachers and creative professionals, and of how their coursework prepares them for the final stages of their degree work in their Written Culminating Exams. The faculty continuously discusses the topic of good writing, and that group discussion has not only helped faculty as a whole to recognize individual students needs, but to address those needs together in coordinated fashion, rather than in individualized dyssynchrony.

**Evidence for Impact:**

What is the evidence that the actions taken above impacted student learning for this outcome?

Improvement in final writing and culminating projects.
Assessment Reporting  
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Student Learning Outcome (SLO 4)

Demonstrate how technology affects and serves music as a discipline in general, and as it pertains to their area of specialization

Evidence for Need:
What evidence was used to identify this SLO as a candidate for improvement (e.g., describe the prior assessment activities and data that led to this decision)?

Since learning a musical instrument is implementation of technology of a sort, it makes sense that technology has really been a large part of the music field since recording and computers made all kinds of things possible (sound manipulation, notation, immediate feedback for ear training, recording, access to information via the internet, e.g.). Recording technology alone created the possibility of immediate feedback on performance and the ability to hear other performances to apply to one’s own. Students in all undergraduate music programs are required to take a course in Music Technology in which technology for musicians is introduced. All students learn the basics of notation programs, programs that allow sound manipulation, self recording, and programs that teach ear training via immediate feedback, to name a few. Students in the composition program must also take courses in introductory electronic music and recording. Students in the jazz program can take these as options.

However, it must be kept in mind that technology is only a tool to assist with proficiency...it does not make one play an instrument better, e.g. Only good old fashioned practice can do this.

Students must demonstrate working knowledge of various programs within Music 13, Music 167 and Music 170A

90-95% of our students pass these classes with a C or better and demonstrate knowledge of technological resources via projects.

Changes to Curriculum or Pedagogy:
No major changes other than the above have been implemented. The challenge here is staying current with the actual technology, although nothing major has taken place since the internet and the ability to get immediate feedback due to the invention of small affordable digital recorders.

What is the evidence that the actions taken above impacted student learning for this outcome?

Students are prepared and do well in the orchestration courses, in which they have to prepare musical scores using a notation program, and have improved somewhat in ear training skills in the music systems courses.