



Program: Music

Assessed by: Dr. Michael Benson – Chair, Department of Music

Reporting Cycle of Fall 2017- Spring 2018

Mission Statement:

The mission of the Department of Music at Malone University is to provide every student with an opportunity to acquire the music skills and knowledge necessary to become competent musicians who will serve the church, the community and the world.

Program Goals:

- Students should comprehend and apply the central concepts that emphasize the elements, principles and cultural contexts of music and how to prepare themselves to be performers, teachers, church musicians, and music industry professionals.
- Students should participate in experiences that are characterized by musical excellence and aesthetic expression.
- Students should gain an understanding of their responsibility for stewardship in the fine arts and learn to use their musical talents to express their Christian faith.
- The Department of Music recognizes its significant role and mission within the cultural life of the University and NE Ohio and as such, seeks music and or ministry performances for individual students and music ensembles on- and off-campus.

| Program Intended Learning Outcomes (PILO) | Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success | Summary of Data Collected | Use of Results |
|---|---|--|---|
| <p>1.) Demonstrate proficiency in written music theory, aural skills, keyboard harmony, and music technology.</p> <p>Students will exercise <u>higher-order learning</u> as a characteristic of the Department of Music program.</p> <p>Students will apply facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations (4b).</p> | <p>1.) Keyboard Proficiency Exam – 100% of students must achieve a passing grade (i.e., C- or better) to complete this core music curriculum requirement.</p> <p>2.) Sophomore Review – 100% of students must achieve a passing grade or satisfactory to continue in the major.</p> <p>In 2018, our expected Mean for Seniors must be equal to (=), or greater than (>) the Mean of NSSE Top 50%.</p> <p>In 2018, the percentage (%) between FY and SY students on applying facts, theories, and methods to practical problems or new situations must be at least 15%.</p> | <p>1.) Students are successful with this assessment tool or learning outcome (100% success rate). To facilitate this, continuing students are required to pass and may retake keyboard proficiency exams until successfully completed.</p> <p>2.) Students are successful with this assessment tool or this learning outcome (100% success rate).</p> <p>HOL mean score for SY in 2018 is 38.6. Mean of Top 50% is 41.3, which is greater than that of Malone by about 2.7 mean points.</p> <p>SY score on application of facts in 2018 is 75%, the FY score is 77% which is about 2% less</p> | <p>1.) Curriculum: Faculty will continue to evaluate or assess student learning outcomes related to core music requirements in music theory, aural skills, keyboard harmony (i.e., piano proficiency exams), music technology and sophomore reviews.</p> <p>2.) A satisfactory result is indicated by</p> <p>a.) the faculty’s affirmation of the student’s persistence in the major and/or</p> <p>b.) successful acceptance into the major.</p> <p>The 2.7 mean point difference between NSSE Top 50% (41.3) and Malone SY (38.6) music student applied knowledge or HOL will encourage departmental awareness and inform our future assessment process and projected goals.</p> <p>The 2 percent difference between FY (77%) and SY(75% music major HOL (4B) skills associated with applying facts, theories, and methods to practical problems or new situations will encourage departmental awareness and inform our future assessment process and projected goals.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>2.) Demonstrate comprehensive understanding of the different music style/genre characteristics, performance practices, and interpretive approaches associated with each historical period.</p> <p>Students will exercise <u>reflective and integrative learning</u> as a characteristic feature of academic challenges in the Department of Music program.</p> <p>Students will combine ideas from different courses when completing assignments (2a).</p> | <p>1.) Applied Juries – Students must achieve a passing grade of C- or better on their end-of-semester jury before the full music faculty to advance to the second semester of the specific applied level (i.e., MUS 100, 200, 300 or 400) or to the next higher applied level of study.</p> <p>2.) Junior/Senior Recital Evaluation – 100% of students must achieve “satisfactory” on the recital hearing to perform the degree recital (MUS 399 or MUS 499).</p> <p>In 2018, the Mean difference between FY and SY should be at least 20%.</p> <p>In 2018, the percentage (%) difference between FY and SY students on trying to combine ideas from different courses</p> | <p>1.) The success rate in these areas of applied juries is 100%</p> <p>2.) All students were successful in all performance rubric areas. (100% success rate)</p> <p>RIL for SY in 2018 is 39.9. FY score is 35.5 with a difference of about 4.4 mean points</p> <p>2018 SY score on combination of ideas is 72% and FY score is 62% with a difference of 10% points.</p> | <p>1.) Assessment: Faculty will continue to serve as evaluators for our student applied juries each semester and as recital hearing evaluators.</p> <p>2.) See attached rubric as reviewed by the faculty.</p> <p>Having exceeded our RIL music major assessment our curriculum supports our learning objectives within the major. We will continue to lean in to our assessment between FY (35.5) and SY (39.9) student outcomes looking to the future and student success.</p> <p>Acknowledging a 10% difference between FY (62%) and SY (72%) RIL (2A) or combining ideas from different courses when completing assignments for our music courses will inform future <i>program learning outcomes and data projections</i>.</p> |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | when completing assignments should be at least 20%. | | |
| <p>3.) Perform musical works on the applied major instrument/voice and as conductor of an ensemble at appropriate level with technical proficiency and musical understanding.</p> <p>Students will experience <u>effective teaching practices</u> as a characteristic feature of experiences with faculty in the Department of Music program.</p> <p>Students will observe the use of examples or illustrations to explain difficult points (5c).</p> | <p>1.) Applied Juries Evaluation – 100% of students must achieve a passing grade of “satisfactory.”</p> <p>2.) Junior/Senior Recital Evaluation – 100% of students must achieve a passing grade of “satisfactory” on the recital hearing to present the final degree recital.</p> <p>In 2018, the expected Mean for Seniors must be equal to (=) or greater than (>) the Mean of NSSE Top 50%.</p> <p>In 2018, the percentage (%) difference between FY and SY observing the use of examples or illustrations to explain difficult points should be 0%. This type of effective teaching practice in music happens in classrooms and studios always.</p> | <p>1.) The success rate in these areas of applied juries is 100%.</p> <p>2.) During 2018, all students were successful in all performance rubric areas. (100% success rate).</p> <p>*SY score on ETP in 2018 is 41.4 and that of the Top 50% is 40.3. Malone exceeds by about 1.1 mean points.</p> <p>2018 SY score on the use of examples is 77% and FY score is 75%, the difference of 2 mean points is > 0.</p> | <p>1.) Program: Faculty will maintains current programmatic, curricular and assessment practices to continue building on performance indicators discussed here.</p> <p>2.) Assessment: Faculty will continue to incorporate the attached Junior/Senior Recital Performance Rubric for applied juries and Junior/Senior Recital Evaluations.</p> <p>Having exceeded our SY (41.4) ETP Mean of the NSSE Top 50%(40.3) by 1.1 mean points informs and will encourage departmental awareness and inform our future assessment process and projected goals. We will continue to work to improve our ETP music student learning outcomes.</p> <p>The 2 mean point difference between our FY (75%) and SY (77%) ETP (5C) student data or music program learning outcomes suggests that applied music major student juries and junior/senior level applied degree recitals are encouraging student performance.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | |
| <p>4.) Be able to integrate faith-learning integration within a musical perspective.</p> <p>Students will exercise <u>reflective and integrative learning</u> as a characteristic feature of academic challenges in the Department of Music program.</p> <p>Students will combine ideas from different courses when completing assignments (2a).</p> | <p>Faith and Learning Integration Statement from the Sophomore Review. 100% of students must achieve a passing grade of satisfactory from faculty members during the sophomore review.</p> <p>In 2018, the Mean difference between FY and SY should be significant as the Faith and Learning Integration Statement continues to develop while the student is enrolled in lower- and upper-division General Education Courses and music courses as well.</p> <p>In 2018, the percentage (%) difference between FY and SY students on working to combine ideas from different courses when completing assignments should be significant. These are</p> | <p>Students provide a paper explicitly on faith, music major track perspectives and vocational plans as part of the Sophomore Review requirements 100% of the time.</p> <p>2018 SY score on combination of ideas is 72% and FY score is 62% with a difference of 10% points</p> <p>SFI score for SY in 2018 is 27.9 and that of FY is 25.9 with a difference of 2 mean points.</p> | <p>Assessment: A rubric for Faith and Learning Integration is included at the end of this document as developed by the music faculty.</p> <p>Showing a 10% difference between FY(62%) and SY (72%) RIL (2A) or music majors combining ideas from different courses when completing assignments is significant. The Department of Music will continue to work towards these NSSE student data outcomes.</p> <p>The 2 mean point difference FY (25.9) and SY (27.9) is significant and informs the Department of Music that we are meeting our SFI outcomes as projected.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | not numbers easily projected or measured. | | |
| <p>5.) Demonstrate ability to integrate music ministry in worship.</p> <p>Students will experience <u>effective teaching practices</u> as a characteristic feature of experiences with faculty in the Department of Music program.</p> <p>Students will observe the use of examples or illustrations to explain difficult points (5c).</p> | <p>Music Ministry Internship Evaluation – 100% of students must achieve a passing grade of satisfactory. Within the course, a paper is required reflecting the students vocational experience.</p> <p>In 2018, the expected Mean for Seniors must be equal to (=) or greater than (>) the Mean of NSSE Top 50%.</p> <p>In 2018, the percentage (%) difference between FY and SY observing the use of examples or illustrations to explain difficult points should be 0%. This type of effective teaching practice in music happens in classrooms and studios always.</p> | <p>The evaluation of student learning in the internship shows that the students are successful with this learning outcome in practice 100% of the time.</p> <p>CL score for 2018 SY is 33.8 and that of Top 50% is 35.7, which is greater than that of Malone by 1.9 mean points.</p> | <p>Internships and applicable course grades support expression within the music ministry degree program.</p> <p>The 1.9 mean point difference between SY (33.8) Malone and the NSSE Top 50% CL (35.7) outcomes is within an acceptable range but will motivate future NSSE music student learning outcomes and data projections.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| <p>6.) Demonstrate specialized knowledge in areas of applied music, conducting, technology and various aspects of music ministry.</p> <p>Students will experience <u>student-faculty interaction</u> as a characteristic feature of experiences with faculty in the Department of Music program.</p> <p>Students will discuss course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty</p> | <p>Music Ministry Internship supervisors will evaluate skills in personal and group music/ministry interactions. 100% of students must achieve a passing grade of “satisfactory.”</p> <p>In 2018, the Mean difference between FY and SY should be significant as the Music Ministry Internship Faith and Learning Integration Statement continues to develop while a student is enrolled in lower- and upper-division General Education Courses and music courses as well.</p> | <p>Student interns passed internship courses satisfactorily (100% success rate).</p> | <p>Students are intentionally placed in music ministry internships that include a choral component and applied instrumental church music component as well. The redesigned BA in Music with an emphasis in music ministry includes such components (e.g., traditional hymns, contemporary music and praise songs and blended music services).</p> <p>The 2 mean point difference FY (25.9) and SY (27.9) is significant and informs the Department of Music that we are meeting our SFI outcomes as projected.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>member outside of class (3c).</p> | | | |
| <p>7.) Demonstrate specialized knowledge of MIDI and digital recording technology and be able to implement and integrate varied software and hardware approaches a music production environment.</p> <p>Students will exercise <u>reflective and integrative learning</u> as a characteristic feature of academic challenges in the Department of Music program.</p> | <p>1.) Audio Portfolio Evaluations – 100% of students achieve a passing grade of satisfactory.</p> <p>2.) CMUS 440 Audio Portfolio and CMUS 471 Audio for Video – 100% of student must achieve a passing grade of satisfactory.</p> <p>3.) Music Production Internship Evaluation – 100% of students must achieve a passing grade of satisfactory.</p> <p>In 2018, the Mean difference between FY and SY should be at least 20%.</p> <p>In 2018, the percentage (%) difference between FY and SY students on combining ideas from different courses when</p> | <p>1.) This evaluation tool provides the same results reflecting all elements of the music production major as needed (100% success rate).</p> <p>2.) Music Education students passed CMUS 122 Instructional Music Technology (100% success rate).</p> <p>3.) Students achieved a 100% passing grade in CMUS 440 and CMUS 471.</p> <p>4.) The Internship Evaluations show that our students understand the use of software and equipment (100% pass rate.)</p> | <p>Assessment: Ongoing projects reinforce classroom theory. Skill development in this area will be developed by students to reinforce or enhance outcomes in other courses, such as music history, keyboard harmony, and music theory.</p> <p>Curriculum: Additional participation in the 25th Street Production student group is required of all majors. Studio time is being implemented as an ongoing requirement in relevant courses.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Students will combine ideas of different courses when completing assignments (2a).</p> | <p>completing assignments should be at least 20%.</p> | | |
| <p>8.) Demonstrate specialized knowledge and understand procedures, materials, and classroom skills in general, choral, and instrumental Pre-K-12 music education environments.</p> <p>Students will exercise <u>collaborative learning</u> as a characteristic feature of learning with peers in the Department of Music program.</p> | <p>1.) Student Teaching Evaluation–100% of students must achieve a passing grade of satisfactory.</p> <p>2.) Praxis II Score–100% of students must achieve a passing grade of satisfactory.</p> <p>3.) Student Teaching Evaluations – 100% of students must achieve a passing grade of satisfactory.</p> <p>In 2018, our expected Mean for Seniors music be equal to (=) or greater than (>) the Mean of NSSE Top 50%.</p> <p>In 2018, the percentage (%) difference between FY students and Seniors explaining course materials to one or more students should be at least 5%.</p> | <p>1.) All student teachers passed the technical and pedagogical areas of teaching (100% pass rate).</p> <p>2.) All students took the Praxis II during this time period. All passed the music portion. (100% pass rate).</p> <p>3.) All students were successful in these areas of teaching during their student teaching experience. (100% pass rate).</p> | <p>Curriculum:</p> <p>NASM standards and curriculum modifications have been adopted by the music faculty. In light of these results, the department will continue to integrate learning theory activities within music education specific classes.</p> <p><i>The 1.9 mean point difference between SY (33.8) Malone and the NSSE Top 50% CL (35.7) outcomes is within an acceptable range but will motivate future NSSE music student learning outcomes and data projections.</i></p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Students will explain course materials to one or more students (1f). | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

Junior/Senior Recital Performance Rubric

| GRADE | Excellent (4) | Above Average (3) | Average (2) | Below Average (1) | Fail (0) |
|------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| Memorization | There are no discernible lapses in performance. Dynamics are played consistently. | There are no discernible lapses. Dynamics are not perceived. | Several lapses delay performer's contribution. Piece is not stopped. | Piece is stopped and restarted or continued. | Piece is stopped and conferring with music and/or accompanist needed. |
| Technique | Notes are cleanly executed. Voicing or transition of notes are consistent. Posture/embouchure are proper | Occasional smearing or multiplicity of notes. Occasional voicing/trans issues. Inconsistent posture. | Multiple sections are not played cleanly. Note transitions are not clean in multiple areas. Inconsistent posture. | Full sections/phrases are smeared. Relationships between notes are inconsistent. Posture/embouchure lapse consistently | Constant smearing of notes. Voicing and notes are indecipherable throughout piece. Poor posture or embouchure |
| Intonation and note accuracy | All notes are in tune and accurately executed | Several notes are out of tune or missed | Above or below pitch less than 1/3 of piece. Multiple notes are missed | Above or below pitch less than 2/3 of piece. Multiple notes are missed | Entire piece is above or below pitch. Multiple notes are missed |
| Rhythm | Consistent tempo. Rhythms are accurate or interpretive according to music. Expressive tempi are consistent | Consistent tempo. Grouplets and syncopations are inaccurate. Lack of coordination with accompanist. | Inconsistent tempo. Consistent lapse in complicated rhythms. Expressive tempi are stilted but functional | Inconsistent tempo. Basic rhythms are occasionally missed. Expressive tempi are absent or non-functional | Complete lack of tempo adherence. Simple rhythms are missed. Expressive tempi are absent |
| Musicianship | Piece is performed according to period or style practice. Phrasing, dynamics and expression are consistent. There is audience interaction | Piece contains elements of stylistic consistency. Expression is inconsistent. Dynamics and phrasing are present. There is an audience connection | Piece may be played stylistically. Occasional moments of expression. Dynamics and phrasing are generally present. There is no audience connection | Stylistic nuances are noticeably absent. Dynamics and phrasing are minimal. There is no audience connection | Piece is stilted. There is no phrasing. Dynamics are markedly absent. |
| Overall | Performance evoked an enthusiastic, positive response | Piece evoked a positive response | Piece evoked a polite response | Piece provoked an awkward response | Piece provoked a negative response |

| Faith Reflection Paper (Sophomore Review) | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| GRADE | Excellent (4) | Above Average (3) | Average (2) | Below Average (1) | Fail (0) |
| Faith Statement | Paper articulates concrete reasons for perspective on the Christian gospel and its specific effect on the writer's life. | Paper contains concrete reasons for perspective on the Gospel, but not specific in its application to the writer's view | Paper alludes to elements of the Gospel, and does not relate to the writer | Paper alludes to general religious values, but does not articulate specific reactions to the Gospel | Paper contains no elements in which a theological perspective may be determined |
| Vocational Integration | Paper clearly states how the Christian gospel relates to future vocational aspects of the writer | Paper mentions elements in the religious viewpoint that relate generally to the vocation | Paper alludes to the religious viewpoint, but does not specify impact on the vocation | Paper vaguely mentions religious principles but does not apply them to the vocation | Paper makes no connection between religious perspective and the vocation |
| English and Grammar | Syntax and flow contribute to the readability of the paper. Paper is well organized. There are no mistakes in spelling or grammar. Paper is typed/printed | There are interruptions in syntax and flow. Paper is well organized. There are few mistakes in spelling and grammar | Syntax and flow detract from the readability. Paper lacks organization but is still understandable in concept and scope. There are numerous mistakes in grammar and spelling. Language style is colloquial or inappropriate | Syntax and flow are conspicuously absent. Organization creates problems in paper expression, concepts or cohesiveness. There are numerous mistakes and language style is inappropriate | Syntax and flow are conspicuously absent. Content of the paper is nonexistent or vague. There is no organization and paper is virtually unreadable. |