Department of Music
Learning Assessment Report

Guidelines

Please see the companion document, "Learning Assessment Template with Instructions" for detailed guidelines and examples.

- *All departments/programs offering undergraduate majors must complete and submit this document at least once every <u>three</u> academic years per the H&S schedule.*
- *Completed forms should be emailed as an attachment to* **learning_assessment@lists.stanford.edu***.*
- *Completed forms should be submitted by August 15 of the academic year assigned to your department/program. Please see attached assessment schedule (also available in the department/program GUS-HSDO AFS archive folder).*
- *Small programs (those graduating fewer than ten students a year) may need to collect and archive student work every year in order to have enough student work for meaningful evaluation. If you would like more information on archiving student work, please contact Beth McKeown,* **bmckeown@stanford.edu***.*

1.   Assessment Plan

1.a Program Information	
Name of Program (Major)	Music
School	Humanities and Sciences
Academic Years Covered by this Plan	2015-16 2016-17 2017-18
1.b Primary Faculty Contact	
Name	Prof Heather Hadlock
Position	Chair, Undergraduate Studies Committee (2017-18)
E-Mail Address	hhadlock@stanford.edu
1.c Other Contacts	
Name	Rowen Leigh
Position	Undergraduate Student Services Officer
E-Mail Address	rleigh@stanford.edu

1.d Program Mission Statement

The Department of Music promotes the practice, understanding and enjoyment of music in the University, offering a broad array of educational opportunities with specialization in composition, performance, musicology, ethnomusicology, and music technology.

1.e Undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes

The department expects undergraduate majors in the program to be able to demonstrate the following learning outcomes. These learning outcomes are used in evaluating students and the department's undergraduate program. Students are expected to:

1. select and outline a topic in tonal music analysis; choose methodologies for the explication of the topic.
2. demonstrate understanding of the underlying principles of tonal music analysis through the use of scholarly references and analytical tools and methodologies.
3. utilize primary source materials in written and oral presentations.
4. utilize secondary source materials in written and oral presentations.
5. demonstrate proficiency in academic writing on the subject of tonal music.
6. develop the skills to present a musical analysis to an audience.

1.f Assessment Design

Assessment Question	To what extent are our students achieving the learning outcomes of the major?
Nature of Student Work or Performance	Oral and written work in capstone theory/analysis course (Music 122B) Senior recitals, concentration projects, and/or honors theses
How Student Work will be Analyzed	Instructor's assessment of learning in capstone theory/analysis course (Music 122B) Jurors' assessments of senior recitals, concentration projects, and/or honors theses

Other Notes on the Assessment Design	Music 122B instructor will report using existing rubric. We will develop a rubric for senior recitals and projects, and ask juries to use it.

1g Learning Outcomes Rubric for Music 122B (capstone course)

	Unacceptable	Marginal	Proficient	Exemplary
Outcome 1: Acquire and assess techniques of interpretation (including close reading techniques), criticism, and analysis of cultural texts, artifacts, and practices	Fails to demonstrate a basic understanding of tonal music, its significance, its principles and its interpretation. Fails to demonstrate a basic understanding of the secondary materials, their significance and application.	Demonstrates limited understanding of tonal music, its significance, its principles and its interpretation. Demonstrates limited understanding of the secondary source materials and their significance.	Substantial understanding of tonal music, its significance, its principles and its interpretation. Demonstrates sufficient understanding of the secondary source materials to assess their significance and application.	Demonstrates superior understanding of tonal music, its significance, its principles and its interpretation. Demonstrates superior understanding of the secondary source materials and has a nuanced understanding of their significance and application.
Outcome 2: Knowledge of repertoire and structural principles of 19th- and early-20th-century music	Fails to demonstrate a basic understanding of the primary materials and their principles.	Some understanding of the repertoire and principles of tonal music and its analysis. Limited evidence of applying those principles to a specific work or set of works/genre.	Substantial understanding of the repertoire and principles of tonal music and its analysis. Indications of applying those principles to a specific work or set of works/genre in a meaningful manner.	Exceptional, original, and nuanced understanding of the repertoire and principles of tonal music and its analysis. Refined application of those principles in discussion of a specific work or set of works/genre.
Outcome 3: Analytical skills for 19th- and early-20th-century music	Limited or no understanding of tonal music, its principles, and its analysis; confused understanding of the process and goal.	Some understanding of tonal music and its analysis and in choosing an appropriate topic and methodologies. Limited evidence of organized thinking.	Substantial understanding of tonal music and its analysis and selecting an appropriate topic; indications of organized thinking and planning in creating outline and selecting methodologies.	Exceptional, original, and nuanced organized thinking in selecting an appropriate topic and outlining the project. Refined selection of appropriate methodologies to reach goal.
Outcome 4: Articulate an analytical understanding in oral contexts (discussion, class presentations) and written ones. Communicate effectively in colloquial and formal styles.	Fails to show adequate presentation style. Speaking is stilted and lacks elegance; shows little or no comprehension of how to present an argument. Fails to show adequate writing style. Writing is stilted and lacks elegance; shows little or no comprehension of source materials or methodologies.	Speaking and presentation skills are still inconsistent; demonstrates limited comprehension of how to present an argument. Writing is still inconsistent; demonstrates limited comprehension of the source materials and the requisite methodologies to complete the paper.	The quality of speaking and presentation is competent, but lacks style and originality. Command of the rhetorical means of argument presentation is adequate. The quality of written grammar and cohesion is competent, but lacks style and originality. Command of the source materials and methodologies is adequate to the paper's needs.	Shows mastery of speaking and presenting; offers interesting and original personal style in the presentation, using rhetoric and technologies to their fullest. Shows mastery of written grammar and organization; offers interesting and original personal style in the writing, using the source materials and methodologies to their fullest.

1.g Learning Outcomes Rubric for Senior Recitals and Concentration Projects

	Unacceptable	Marginal	Proficient	Exemplary
Learning Outcome #1 **Plan a program of suitable depth, range, and coherence**	Too little or too much music; extremely limited range or extremely eclectic assemblage without any apparent reason for either extreme; music of insufficient depth or challenge.	Assemblage of works shows little thought to relationships or programmatic effect (as, for example, a chronological arrangement of works from "each of the four periods" without any apparent reason for particular choices), or of works of limited range or depth, or of works ineffectively juxtaposed.	Program of traditional repertoire: reasonably challenging, assembled with apparent awareness of appropriate range of styles, and with concern for balance and contrast, but in other respects routine. Program of less well-known repertoire: reasonably challenging and of sufficient depth and range, but not presented in a particularly creative or arresting way.	Whether diverse or centered on a particular composer, era, or style: powerfully projects a theme or idea, or constitutes a remarkable aesthetic journey, or a striking or unique array; technically and musically challenging; designed to suggest or reveal relationships, and to draw the audience into each work in turn.
Learning Outcome #2 **Technical mastery**	Technique is insufficient to communicate emotion and interpretation.	Technique is largely mechanical, without showing clear musical purpose.	Technique generally serves the music, but not consistently enough to be considered Exemplary.	Technique fully serves the artistic intention.
Learning Outcome #3 **Tonal quality and intonation**	Tonal quality is generally unattractive. Intonation is inaccurate or poorly controlled	Tonal quality does not vary according to the demands of the musical character. Resonance is missing too much of the time and the control of the sound is inconsistent - scratchy, harsh, overly percussive or unfocused.	Tonal quality has moments of beauty, but the results are not consistent. Sound is fine, but not always specific to the musical character. Intonation is largely centered, but the listener is aware of pitch center problems	Tonal quality is beautiful, resonant and controlled. The sound production is stylistically appropriate (e.g. weight of keyboard articulation, string vibrato). The sound is focused, consistent and warm.

		Intonation is unreliable or inconsistent		
Learning Outcome #4 **Rhythm and articulation**	Rhythm is vague or inaccurate Fingering/bowing/tonguing is tense, mechanical, or clumsy, and often affects the pulse.	Rhythm shows instances of rushing or dragging. Articulation is unfocused more often than not. Fingering/bowing/tonguing is sometimes clumsy and inaccurate. Keyboard textures are too muddied to consistently perceive the performer's intended voicing.	Rhythm is generally secure, but not particularly flexible. Articulation is generally clear but not always nuanced. Fingering/bowing/tonguing is occasionally mechanical. Keyboard textures and voicings are generally clear and balanced, but with occasional lack of refined execution (e.g. muddiness).	Rhythm is accurate yet flexible. Articulation is clear and nuanced, with artistically curated attacks and releases (bowed, tongued, or struck/pedaled). Fingering is fluent and easy. Keyboard textures and voicing are clear and balanced.
Learning Outcome #5 **Presentation (includes notes, spoken remarks, stage presence)**	Written notes are inaccurate or poorly written. Spoken remarks are inaccurate, disorganized, unprepared. Performance is disorganized, with awkward transitions.	Written notes are sketchy, inaccurate, or clichéd. Spoken remarks are sketchy, under-prepared, and/or rambling.	Written notes are accurate and technically correct. Spoken remarks are accurate, organized, and appropriate length. Performers are poised; smooth transitions and good flow of people/materials on/off stage	Written notes are well-informed, polished, of appropriate length/tone. Spoken remarks are informative, well-organized, concise. Creative use of stage space and/or visual effects enhances the impact of the music.

2.   Collect and Assess Student Work

2.a Timeline of Assessment Activities		
Academic Year	**Planned Activities** (Fill in all rows of this column at the time the Assessment Plan is created, saying what you plan to do each year for the next three years going forward.)	**Actual Assessment Activities Completed** (Fill in one row of this column at the conclusion of each academic year, saying what activities were in fact completed.)
2015-16	None	None
2016-17	None	None
2017-18	Assess Music 122B; assess senior recitals, concentration projects, and theses	Assessed Music 122B; assessed senior recitals and concentration projects

3. Results and Assessment Report

3.a Learning Outcomes Data Table for Music 122B (winter 2018)

	Unacceptable	Marginal	Proficient	Exemplary	Total Number of Students Assessed on Each Dimension
Learning Outcome #1	0	0	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	6
Learning Outcome #2	0	0	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	6
Learning Outcome #3	0	0	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	6
Learning Outcome #4	0	1 (16%)	4 (67%)	1 (17%)	6

3.a Learning Outcomes Data Table for Senior Recitals and Concentration Projects (Spring 2018)					
	Unacceptable	**Marginal**	**Proficient**	**Exemplary**	**Total Number of Students Assessed on Each Dimension**
Learning Outcome #1 Program	0	0	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	5
Learning Outcome #2 Technical mastery	0	0	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	5
Learning Outcome #3 Tone and intonation	0	0	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	5
Learning Outcome #4 Rhythm and articulation	0	0	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	5
Learning Outcome #5 Presentation	0	1 (20%)	2 (40%)	2 (40%)	5

Notes: "Count" is the raw number and "%" the percentage of students evaluated who fall into each category (e.g. the number scored exemplary on learning outcome #1 divided by the total number of students assessed on learning outcome #1). **Please enter "0" when no students fall in a category; please do NOT leave any cells blank. Please check that percentages across each row sum to 100%, or note rounding error.** The table can be adapted to display trends over time or compare subgroups. Please contact learning_assessment@lists.stanford.edu
 for assistance.

3.b Assessment Report

Written Summary of Assessment Results	Music majors are achieving the learning goals of our program. With one exception, all students were assessed as Proficient or Exemplary for all outcomes in the academic and creative work we assessed. In recitals and creative projects, the majority of students were assessed as Exemplary on the outcomes of Program Depth/Range and Technical Mastery. In the capstone course (Music 122B), the majority of students were Proficient on all outcomes. One student was assessed as Marginal on one outcome in the capstone course. Enrollments in the capstone course (Music 122B) have declined since the last WASC assessment, consistent with the size of the music major cohort. (In 2013-2015, the course had at least 15 students each year. In 2015-18, it shrank from 14 students to 6.) The students in 2017-18 achieved higher outcomes than in 2014-15, suggesting that students with weaker analytic and writing skills and/or less commitment to advanced music study may be self-selecting out of the music major.
Limitations of the Assessment Results	The jurors for the conducting recital noted that the rubric did not perfectly match the elements of a conductor's performance, and used it accordingly (but reluctantly). The capstone course 122B had much lower enrollment in 2018 than in 2015 (decline from 15 to 6). We are doing further research to see if this is consistent with enrollment patterns in upper-level music theory/analysis and history classes.
What mechanisms will you use to share these results with program faculty?	We will convey the results to the instructors of 122B and the theory courses that feed into it (Music 21, 22, 23), and to the director of the music theory program. Undergraduate Studies Committee chair and Department chair will share the results of the recital assessments with the performance faculty, who teach performers and serve on juries.

What changes in the program do these findings suggest?	The drop-off in enrollment in Music 122B between 2016 and 2018 (from 14 students to 6), together with the higher assessment of student performance in 2018 compared with 2015, suggest that students with weaker skills and/or less commitment to advanced music study are self-selecting out of the music major. This is consistent with decreasing enrollments in some other advanced courses, and with the decreasing number of majors.
	The Music department is undertaking a curriculum review and re-design in 2018-19 to make the major more accessible and appealing to a wider range of student musicians.

Ju

3.c Notes for the Next Assessment Cycle

We will solicit feedback on the rubric for recitals and concentration projects from jurors, and ask them to suggest revisions to make the rubric more useful or more suited to their particular instrument/style.

We will assess Music 122B and concentration projects annually.

In 2018-19, we should design an assessment component to quantify and track one or more outcomes from the curricular revisions that the Curriculum Task Force will lead in Fall 2018.

In 2018-19, the Curriculum Task Force should revise the Learning Outcomes (Undergraduate) published in the Bulletin (section 1e of this Assessment Report) to reflect a broader conception of the Music Department's goals for undergraduates.