



Texas Southern University  
Assessment Plan 2010-2013

Unit Assessment Plan

College of Liberal Arts & Behavioral Science

Bachelor of Arts in Music

## Introduction

### **Texas Southern University's Mission**

Texas Southern University is a comprehensive metropolitan university. Building on its legacy as a historically black institution, the university provides academic and research programs that address critical urban issues and prepare an ethnically diverse student population to become a force for positive change in a global society.

*In order to achieve this mission, Texas Southern University provides:*

- quality instruction in a culture of innovative teaching and learning
- basic and applied research and scholarship that is responsive to community issues
- opportunities for public service that benefit the community and the world.

### **Texas Southern University's Vision**

Texas Southern University will become one of the nation's pre-eminent comprehensive metropolitan universities. We will be recognized by the excellence of our programs, the quality of our instruction, our innovative research, and our desire to be a contributing partner to our community, state, nation, and world.

### ***Accreditation Standards***

Accreditation by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS) Commission on Colleges signifies that the institution: (1) has a mission appropriate to higher education, (2) has resources, programs, and services sufficient to accomplish and sustain that mission, and (3) maintains clearly specified educational objectives that are consistent with its mission and appropriate to the degrees it offers, and that indicate whether it is successful in achieving its stated objectives.

*Source: The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 5<sup>th</sup> edition*

## **Goal 1 Assessment Plan 2010-11 to 2012-13**

### **1 Goal Description**

Goal 1:

To produce graduates with comprehensive knowledge of theory, aural skills and history of Western Music from the Medieval through Contemporary period.

### **2 SLO Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives**

SLO 1.1:

2010-2011 only

The student will demonstrate the ability to hear, identify, and work conceptually with the elements of music such as rhythm, melody, harmony, form, timbre, and texture.

SLO 1.1: (Theory Skills)

2011-Forward:

The student will acquire the ability to apply essential principles of music theory and form to the study and evaluation of musical scores.

SLO 1.2: 2010-2011 only: The student will categorize features of musical style, composers, genres of music, social and cultural events, and identify recorded examples according to historical periods.

SLO 1.2: (History) 2011-Forward:

The student will demonstrate a knowledge of and familiarity with historical evolution of Western music as evidenced by style periods, performance practices, and representative composers and their works.

SLO 1.3: (Listening Skills)

2011-Forward:

The student will acquire the aural skills to work conceptually with the elements of music such as rhythm, melody, harmony, form and texture, and will identify recorded examples according to historical periods.

### **3 Metric**

Metric 1.1

2010-11 only

Scores from ETS Major Field Test (Questions related to music theory)

2010-11-Forward Embedded Questions on the Theory Final Exams (MUSI 142, 241 and 242)

Metric 1.2

Scores from ETS Major Field Test (Questions related to music history and listening).

2010-11 Forward-Music Embedded Questions on the History (MUSI 337 and 338) final exam (written portion) and research paper.

Metric 1.3

2010-11 Forward: Ear Training and Music History (listening portion final exams) (MUSI 100, MUSI 147 and 246/247 and MUSI 337/338)

### **4 Target 2010-11**

Target 1.1

90% of graduating seniors will score in the 75 percentile range or better on related questions in the exit assessment

Target 1.2

90% of graduating seniors will score in the 75 percentile range or better on related questions in the exit assessment.

Target 1.3

New SLO for 2011 forward

### **5 Findings 2010-11**

Findings 1.1

Test was taken by 6 graduating seniors. In Theory 17% scored 50%+, and in Ear Training 33% scored 50%+.

Test was graded in-house so national standardized comparison was made.

#### Findings 1.2

Test was taken by 6 graduating seniors. In History 33% scored 50%+, and in Listening 50% scored 50%+. Test was graded in-house so no national standardized comparison was made.

#### Findings 1.3

New SLO for 2011 forward

### **6 Action Plan 2010-11**

1.1: 2011 Forward Phase out the ETS metric and develop rubrics for class-specific assessment in areas of theory and ear training.

Redefine SLO to group ear training and historical listening together as related listening skills outcome.

2011-Forward: Phase out the ETS metric and develop rubrics for class-specific assessment in areas of history and music listening.

Redefine SLO to group ear training and historical listening together as related listening skills outcome.

1.3: 2011-Forward: Implement planned separation of Music Listening from Music History and incorporate MUSI 100 critiques as an assessment instrument.

### **7 Target 2011-12**

#### Target 1.1

80% of freshmen and sophomores will score 73 or better on Theory and ear training assessment

#### Target 1.2

80% of students will score 73 or higher on Music History and research.

#### Target 1.3a

80% of students will score 73 or higher on Music Listening assessment.

#### Target 1.3b

80% of students will score 3 or 4 on a 4-point scaled Listening Critique

### **8 Findings 2011-12**

#### Finding 1.1

37% of freshman and 60% of sophomore students met the target

Target not met.

#### Finding 1.2

42% of students met the goal with the strongest area (53%) in the short answer style questions and the weakest areas (42%) identified as listening and research skills.

#### Finding

1.3 - MUSI 100 - 31% of students scored 3 out of 4.

Target not met.

### **9 Action Plan 2011-12**

1.1 Phase out the ETS rubric and develop rubrics for class-specific assessment in areas of theory and ear training.

1.2 Introduce basic concepts earlier in the major.

### **10 Target 2012-13**

#### Target 1.1

80% of students will score 73 or better on Theory and ear training assessment

#### Target 1.2

80% of students will score 73 or higher on Music History and Listening assessment and research.

#### Target 1.3

80% of students will score 73 or higher on Ear Training and Music History (listening) assessments

## 11 Findings 2012-13

### Finding 1.1

At the freshman level an average of 68.5% (75% in Fall/62% in Spring) met the overall goal and an average of 67.5% (75% in Fall/60% in Spring) met it at the sophomore level. This shows an improvement of over 30% at the freshman level and 7.5% at the sophomore level from the previous academic year. At both levels the strongest student learning outcome was in the area of harmonization and part writing while there is a significant drop in success with the questions pertaining to analysis. There was also a 15% decline in success rate in the Spring semester as compared to Fall. Since this is the first year that the department has a complete set of data for both Fall and Spring semesters, this phenomena cannot yet be compared with previous years but it is something to continue to monitor for patterns. Target not met.

### Finding 1.2

5% & 24% of students achieved the overall goal In levels I & II of Music History respectively. Target not met.

### Finding 1.3

At the freshman level an average of 50.5% of students (54% in Fall/47% in Spring) met the overall goal with an average of 72.5% (75% in Fall/70% in Spring) meeting it at the sophomore level. Target not met.

## 12 Action Plan 2012-13

### 1.1

Provide tutoring/mentoring services for these concepts at the freshman and sophomore levels.

### 1.2

Incorporate some of the general based knowledge into lower level curriculum courses such as applied music. Also  
Adopt a 100 level Music Appreciation course to introduce basic concepts much earlier than the junior level.

### 1.3

Seek Funding for a) improvements to the hardware/software in the music listening lab and b) personnel to monitor/tutor students who use the lab to improve ear training skills.

## 13 Additional Reference Documents

2012-2013

1.1 Assessment data spreadsheet-27 students

1.2 Assessment data spreadsheet-42 students

1.3 Assessment data spreadsheet-31 students

[Assessment-Music 100 compilation Spreadsheet2012](#) [XLS 51 KB 9/19/14]

[MUSI 100-02SeminarSpreadsheet2012](#) [XLS 40 KB 5/20/14]

[Music 100-01SeminarSpreadsheet2012](#) [XLS 45 KB 5/20/14]

[Music 100-03SeminarSpreadsheet2012](#) [XLS 38 KB 5/20/14]

[Music 142-01Theory II SpreadsheetFall2012corrected](#) [XLS 36 KB 5/20/14]

[Music 246-01Ear training III Fall 2012](#) [XLS 30 KB 5/20/14]

[Music 247 Assessment 2013](#) [XLS 29 KB 5/20/14]

[Music 337-01 correctedFall 2012](#) [XLS 40 KB 5/20/14]

[Music 338-01 Spring 2013](#) [XLS 41 KB 5/20/14]

## Goal 2 Assessment Plan 2010-11 to 2012-13

### 1 Goal Description

Goal 2:

To produce graduates with knowledge and technical performance skills in at least one musical performance area

### 2 SLO Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2.1

The student will perform a recital(s) demonstrating an appropriate level of technical, interpretive, and artistic skills reflected in the requirements for senior level applied courses.

SLO 2.2 (Added Spring 2013)

The student will gain experience in and develop an aptitude for group performing and interacting in an appropriately professional manner.

### 3 Metric

Senior Recital Project scores based on related grading rubric.

### 4 Target 2010-11

100% of seniors who pass the pre-recital jury (where a pass is defined as an average score from all faculty jury members of 24-35 using the recital grading rubric) will perform a solo recital demonstrating levels of performance skills within the 30-35 point range based on a similar rubric to that used for the pre-recital jury.

### 5 Findings 2010-11

Finding 2.1 - A total of six (6) students performed a senior recital in the 2010-2011 year; 4 in Fall 2010 and 2 in Spring 2011. 100% of seniors scored in the 32-35 point range - target was met.

Findings 2.2

No SLO 2.2 for 2011-Forward

### 6 Action Plan 2010-11

2011-Forward: Work on assessment data from end-of semester juries that lead to final senior recital project. Consider the inclusion of students receiving "incomplete" as part of the overall data.

2011-Forward: Work on assessment data from end-of semester juries that lead to final senior recital project. Consider the inclusion of students receiving "incomplete" as part of the overall data.

### 7 Target 2011-12

Target 2.1

100% of seniors who pass the pre-recital jury (where a pass is defined as an average score from all faculty jury members of 24-35 using the recital grading rubric) will perform a solo recital demonstrating levels of performance skills within the 30-35 point range based on a similar rubric to that used for the pre-recital jury.

### 8 Findings 2011-12

78% of students (7 of 9 recitals) performed above the minimum score on all performance criteria. Of the two students who did not meet the overall goal, one met it on all but 2 of the 7 areas of performance while the other met 3 of the 7.

### 9 Action Plan 2011-12

Work on assessment data from end-of-semester juries that lead to final senior recital project.

Faculty discussion regarding the use of "Incomplete" when students are exhibiting difficulty in fewer than half of the performance areas.

Continued monitoring of the standards at the pre-recital jury state to ensure higher performance at the final recital.

### 10 Target 2012-13

Target 2.1

100% of seniors who pass the pre-recital jury (where a pass is defined as an average score from all faculty

jury members of 24-35 using the recital grading rubric) will perform a solo recital demonstrating levels of performance skills within the 30-35 point range based on a similar rubric to that used for the pre-recital jury

## **11 Findings 2012-13**

### 2.1

Assessment of recitals for both Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 shows 83% of students (5 of the 6 recitals) performed above the minimum score on all performance criteria. Only 46% of students who enrolled in recital actually completed the project. The one student who did not meet the overall goal, they met it on all but 1 of the 7 areas of performance. Target met

### 2.2

73% of students met the overall goal in performance criteria. Target not met.

## **12 Action Plan 2012-13**

### 2.1

To avoid the high percentage of incomplete grades, enhanced advisement of the students to ensure they are on track to complete the required repertoire at the required level before enrolling in the course will be implemented. Better monitoring of the consistency of applied lessons will be addressed via an attendance document and elimination of incomplete grades for failure to complete this project.

## **13 Additional Reference Documents**

Senior Recital spreadsheet with data from senior recital rubric.

Piano jury rubrics spreadsheet.

[Assessment-Applied Piano Spreadsheet2012 \(2\)](#) [XLS 36 KB 9/19/14]

[Music 400-01 2012-2013](#) [XLS 38 KB 9/19/14]

