ASSESSMENT REPORT
ACADEMIC YEAR 2017 – 2018
REPORT DUE DATE: 10/26/2018

Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences. Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated.

Note: Dear Colleagues: In an effort to produce a more streamlined and less repetitive assessment report format, we are piloting this modified template for the present annual assessment cycle. We are requesting an assessment report that would not exceed eight pages of text. Supporting materials may be appended. We will be soliciting your feedback on the report as we attempt to make it more user-friendly.

Some useful contacts:

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – adamati@usfca.edu
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – lendvay@usfca.edu
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – meritt@usfca.edu
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – mrjonas@usfca.edu
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – schakraborty2@usfca.edu
6. Ms. Corie Schwabenland, Academic Data & Assessment Specialist- ceschwabenland@usfca.edu

Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:

https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment

Email to submit the report: assessment_cas@usfca.edu

I.   LOGISTICS & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Alexandra Amati, adamati@usfca.edu

2. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor program.

No changes:

Mission: The Minor in Music program recognizes students' passion for the discipline and builds on it to deepen their knowledge and skills and to inspire them to use their art for the betterment of society.

3. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2017? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.
   Note: Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, gamson@usfca.edu). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

No changes:

PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

1. Analyze musical trends, works, and methodologies within their socio-historical context.

2. Apply musical skills in performing, teaching, composing, writing, or presenting.

3. Understand and articulate how music is integral to a humane and just society.

4. **Which particular Program Learning Outcome(s) did you assess for the academic year 2017-2018?**

No. 1: Analyze musical trends, works, and methodologies within their socio-historical context.

II.   METHODOLOGY

5. **Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).**

   For example, "the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a grade for responses to those questions."

   Important Note – WSCUC advises us to use "direct methods" which relate to a <u>direct evaluation of a student work product</u>. "Indirect methods" like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional l complements to a direct method.

   <u>For any program with fewer than 10 students</u>: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that <u>every 3 years</u>, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

   <u>Important</u>: *Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.*

   We looked at the final exam for the Music Appreciation (MUS 101), History of Western Art Music (MUS 301) and Seminar in Wester Art Music (MUS 392) for those students that are in the program. There were only a few in each class, but we assessed them anyway. Using the rubric appended to this report we assessed the work. The exams were evaluated and graded by the instructors (me: Alexandra Amati for a section of MUS 101 and the two upper division ones, and Giacomo Fiore for the other section of MUS 101). We used only this direct method, no indirect.

   There were a total of 6 students in each of these two sets of courses across the two semesters, with no overlap in the MUS 101 sections but with some overlap between MUS 301 and 392 (two minors took both semesters of the class as electives and their work was assessed both times).

III.   RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

6. What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?

This section is for you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:

a. how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,

b. any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and

c. the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.

To address this, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:

Level	Percentage of Students
Complete Mastery of the outcome	8.7%
Mastered the outcome in most parts	20.3%
Mastered some parts of the outcome	66%
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	5%

This is a chart of the results for both the lower division and the upper division courses.

	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Can situate works within their chronological place	MUS 101: 2/6 MUS 301/392: 3/6	MUS 101: 2/6 MUS 301/392: 3/6	MUS 101: 2/6 MUS 301/392: 0/6	MUS 101: 0/6 MUS 301/392: 0/6
Can analyze trends and connections between works and eras	MUS 101: 1/6 MUS 301/392: 5/6	MUS 101: 4/6 MUS 301/392: 0/6	MUS 101: 1/6 MUS 301/392: 1/6	MUS 101: 0/6 MUS 301/392: 0/6
Uses appropriate methodologies to discuss music works	MUS 101: 1/6 MUS 301/392: 5/6	MUS 101: 4/6 MUS 301/392: 1/6	MUS 101: 1/6 MUS 301/392: 0/6	MUS 101: /6 MUS 301/392: /6
Contextualizes works in their appropriate socio-economic environment	MUS 101: 0/6 MUS 301/392: 5/6	MUS 101: 4/6 MUS 301/392: 1/6	MUS 101: 2/6 MUS 301/392: 0/6	MUS 101: 0/6 MUS 301/392: 0/6

It seems clear, even with the small numbers, that there is a marked difference between the achievements at the lower and the upper division courses, which fits with the curricular map that expects students to be at the developing stage in MUS 101 but at the mastery level in the two upper-division course. In this case it seems that the majority of the students in MUS 101 have achieved a good mastery of the PLO, while the

overwhelming majority of the students in MUS 301/392 (5/6) have achieved mastery of the PLO.

IV. CLOSING THE LOOP

7. **Based on your results, what changes/modifications are you planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require that any changes need to be implemented in the next academic year itself.**

The only area where we should (and will try to) implement changes in this case is the part of the PLO that has to do with placing works chronologically. This is important in order for students to understand how styles and trends are related to each other. We also feel that the part that pertains to the contextualization of works in the proper socio-economic environment needs to be strengthened either by changing the choice in repertoire or by strongly fostering conversations and discussions and work around those issues, which is not always easy in a class that comprises mostly people taking the class for CORE credit and not in the music minor program (typically only about 3 out of 30 students in the class will be music minors).

8. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2016-2017, submitted in October 2017)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in this report?

The feedback (thanks Mark) was mostly approbatory (is that a word?), but anyway the specific feedback on the PLO referred to PLO No. 2 so when we circle back to that PLO it might turn out to have an even deeper use. To answer the question about whether students in the minor were ever expected to master PLO No. 3, the answer is yes and no. The courses we offer where that PLO is mastered are upper-division courses for PASJ majors, and so it is only very seldom that any of the minors will take those. It is a minor and so there is only so much one can do because there are only so many courses we see them in. Having said that, the issues that pertain to PLO 3 are certainly brought up and discussed in every single class, though the expected level of proficiency is what it is.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

RUBRIC for PLO 1

	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Can situate works within their	*Can confidently, clearly, and correctly place composers and compositions*	*Has a good idea of where composers and compositions fall within the historical context*	*Has approximate idea of where composers and compositions fall*	*Cannot place works and composers in the chronological continuum*

chronological place	within the historical context	and can express it clearly	within the historical context	
Can analyze trends and connections between works and eras	*Can discuss coherently and completely the connections between works, ideas, trends, and styles of different periods and places*	*Has a demonstrated competent but not comprehensive understanding of the connections between works, ideas, trends, and styles of different periods and places*	*Can sometimes discuss connections between works, ideas, trends, and styles of different periods and places but not always, and not always with a broad understanding*	*More times than not cannot see connections between works, ideas, trends, and styles of different periods and places*
Uses appropriate methodologies to discuss music works	*Has a broad and deep understanding of what methodologies and terminology is used to analyze music works, and demonstrates its use*	*Has a good, if at times spotty grasp of the methodologies and terminology used to analyze music works*	*Has an approximate but acceptable understanding of the methodologies and terminology used to analyze music works*	*Does not understand the methodologies and terminology used to analyze music works*
Contextualizes works in their appropriate socio-economic environment	*Can situate most or all the times musical works in their appropriate socio-economic environment and can articulately explain it*	*Is aware at a superficial but quite complete level of the appropriate socio-economic environment of musical works*	*Can place musical works in their appropriate socio-economic environment about half the time*	*Is not able to recognize that works of art are dependent on and related to their socio-economic environment*