

## Program Assessment: Annual Report

**Program(s):** Music Major

**Department:** Fine & Performing Arts

**College/School:** College of Arts & Sciences

**Date:** May 2019

**Primary Assessment Contact:** Robert Hughes, Associate Professor

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Students **produce** performances of standard repertoire **employing** technique appropriate to the student's instrument or voice in solo recitals and/or juries

Students **prepare** repertoire and **produce** performances using standard techniques appropriate to the student's instrument or voice in ensemble performance

Students **employ** techniques specific to ensemble performance including blending in a section, following direction, and performance etiquette

**Demonstrate** functional skills at the piano.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

Voice Juries evaluated using rubric.

Ensemble performances evaluated by faculty.

Piano proficiency exam rubrics used to evaluate proficiencies.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

**NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.**

All FT Faculty discussed performances and whether standards were met.

Faculty used piano proficiency rubric to evaluate piano skills

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

**NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.**

Faculty concluded that students more than satisfied goals in ensemble performances.

While students met goals in piano proficiency, faculty concluded that some specific skills tested need to be adjusted to meet current needs of graduates.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

- Based on Piano Proficiency results, the faculty have decided to revisit some of the harmonization and sight reading requirements.

6. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

Following up on comments from last year, the Faculty developed new set of revised student learning objectives and separated the major and minor.

Created new rubrics for recitals and capstones.

***IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.***

# Capstone Assessment

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date submitted: \_\_\_\_\_

Thesis title: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer (please print): \_\_\_\_\_

THESIS CONTENT	Excellent	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory	Comments
	The research topic is stated clearly and is focused, and is both interesting and of a level appropriate to a senior music major.	The research topic may lack some clarity or focus, but is of a level appropriate to a senior music major.	The research topic is stated unclearly, and is not suitable for fourth-year work.	
Please check:				
RESEARCH PLAN	Excellent	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory	
	The research plan is well conceived.	The research plan is adequate.	The research plan is poorly designed and executed.	
Please check:				
USE OF SOURCES	Excellent	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory	
	References and citations correct, complete, and clearly integrated.	References and citations generally correct and complete; not always clear how information is integrated.	References and citations poorly formatted; in-text citations poorly integrated.	
Please check:				
THOROUGHNESS	Excellent	Satisfactory	Not satisfactory	
	The thesis demonstrates a sound understanding of the problem, and a sufficient number of peer-reviewed and other sources are used.	The thesis demonstrates a sound understanding of the problem, but there are fewer peer-reviewed and other sources cited than for an excellent result in this category.	The work is unsupported by sufficient research and/or documentation.	
Please check:				

<b>WRITING: organization and clarity</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Not satisfactory</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	The thesis is clearly organized, with an introduction stating the research problem clearly and setting out the research method. Arguments are clearly developed, transitions are smooth and logical, and the conclusion is apt.	The thesis is organized, with an introduction outlining the research problem and research method. Arguments are developed and a conclusion summarizes the work.	The thesis is poorly organized, and the argument does not flow logically from one paragraph or section to the next.	
Please check:				
<b>WRITING: conventions</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Not satisfactory</b>	
	There are no faults in spelling, punctuation, or grammar. The thesis is formatted in an appropriate manner. Musical examples are well-integrated.	There are few faults in spelling, punctuation, or grammar. The thesis is formatted in an appropriate manner. Musical examples are well-integrated.	The thesis is incoherent, with many errors of spelling, punctuation, and grammar.	
Please check:				

<b>Cumulative assessment (circle one):</b>		
HP	P	NP

This rubric was adapted from one used at Southern Oregon University

**Saint Louis University Music Program  
Piano Proficiency Exam**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Student** **Date**

**1. Prepared Solo** **Points: \_\_\_\_\_/20**

Piano solo at mid to late-intermediate level, at least two pages or two to three minutes in length. Representative repertoire appears in the Piano III/IV text: Alfred's Group Piano for Adults, Book 2, pages 342-372, and in the supplementary texts, Bastien's Piano Literature, Volumes 3-4. The teacher must approve the chosen piece in advance. The music must be played at performance tempo, but need not be memorized. It is expected that all notes and rhythms be performed accurately, and that all dynamic and articulation indications be observed.

**2. Technique** **Points: \_\_\_\_\_/30**

- 15 All Major and minor scales, two octaves ascending and descending, steady tempo, hands together, correct fingering.
- 10 All Major and minor tonic triad arpeggios, two octaves ascending and descending, hands separately or together, steady tempo, correct fingering.
- 5 Play the chord progression I-vi-IV-ii6-I6/4-V7-I in all major and minor keys. (Triad in right hand, root tones in bass).

**3. Sight-Reading, Late Elem.-Early Interm. Level** **Points: \_\_\_\_\_/20**

- 10 Accompaniment to a vocal or instrumental solo, or a selection from elementary-school or community song book repertoire, or level 2 piano solo
- 10 Open-score choral music, any two parts together

**4. Keyboard Harmonization and Transposition** **Points: \_\_\_\_\_/20**

The student will perform two prepared advanced-level harmonization and transposition, and may be asked to demonstrate these skills on a simpler example at sight.

- 20 Harmonize two given melodies with primary triads and secondary dominants, such as found in community songbooks. Use standard accompaniment styles: block chord, broken chord, waltz bass, Alberti basses, etc. Transpose to a requested key and play in both keys.

**5. Performance with Scores: Ensemble/Accompanying** **Points: \_\_\_\_\_/10**

Star-Spangled Banner, in B-flat or C, mm @ 100. Accurate, musical, steady performance tempo.

<b>TOTAL POINTS: _____/100</b>		<b>Student Must Achieve 70% Or Higher To Pass.</b>			
_____PASS    _____FAIL					
_____ <b>Instructor</b>	_____ <b>Date</b>	_____ <b>Instructor</b>	_____ <b>Date</b>	_____ <b>Instructor</b>	_____ <b>Date</b>
_____ <b>Instructor</b>	_____ <b>Date</b>				
_____ <b>Instructor</b>	_____ <b>Date</b>				

# SLU Music Concert Assessment

Ensemble Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Recital date: \_\_\_\_\_

Ensemble type: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer (please print): \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Not satisfactory</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	Error-free performance, including excellent diction (singers)	Solid performance, few errors	Many errors	
Please check:				
<b>MUSICALITY</b>	Accurate performance demonstrating understanding of style, aesthetic, emotional or affective content	Accurate performance	Mechanical performance, lacking expressivity and apparent understanding of style, aesthetic, emotional or affective content	
Please check:				
<b>INTONATION/TONE</b>	Consistently in tune/good tone, few lapses	Mostly in tune, good tone	Poor intonation, poor tone	
Please check:				
<b>RHYTHM, DYNAMICS, PHRASING</b>	Accurate rhythm, nuanced dynamic and phrasing control	Mostly accurate rhythm, adequate control over dynamics	Irregular grasp of rhythm, poor dynamic and phrasing control	
Please check:				
<b>PERFORMANCE PRACTICE</b>	Consistently at ease	Mostly at ease	Not at ease	
Please check:				
<b>PROGRAM FORM AND CONTENT</b>	Incisive, clear, accurate writing, no errors of form or content, excellent layout	Acceptable writing, no factual errors, acceptable form and layout	Inadequate form and style, mechanical and factual errors, flawed layout	
Please check:				

<b>Cumulative assessment (circle one):</b>		
HP	P	NP