The performance jury and performance recital serve as primary indicators of discipline knowledge, discipline methodological skills, and historical knowledge for graduate students in the School of Music. Applied jury examinations are administered at the conclusion of every semester and a graduate recital is a terminal requirement in nearly all major performance areas including, brass, keyboard, strings, voice, and woodwinds. For such high stakes performance assessments, a panel consisting of all faculty members within a specific area evaluates each examination using a consistent set of criteria established by the faculty as a whole. Early in the current assessment cycle, SOM faculty decided to make the assessment of juries and recitals a primary focus of the School of Music assessment activities. The first step in the process was the development of a school-wide performance assessment rubric and student self-assessment rubric. Those rubrics were used for the first year of the process. Findings were collected and reported in School of Music Assessment Reports and made available to studio faculty members. As a response to faculty feedback from a technology survey, also connected to the SOM assessment plan, the performance assessment procedure transitioned from a hard copy system to a fully digital online format. All examinations were administered and evaluated using an iPad or laptop computer. Through effective use of wireless technology, information was recorded and transmitted in real time and stored on a secure server. All information relative to the students’ records and evaluation criteria were included. At the conclusion of the examination process, all jury records, individually or comprehensively, became available for faculty review. In addition, each individual student record could be transmitted to them electronically. This process has fostered an effective interaction medium between faculty members and individual students regarding their specific development and progress over time. Individual student records can be easily and effectively accessed allowing for analysis and comparison of trends relative to specific pedagogical techniques used in various semesters. In addition, all jury records are stored electronically and are available for a variety of uses including, but not limited to, the analysis of pedagogical techniques, performance ability of students relative to academic standing and specific test scores, student and faculty research, and overall program assessment of the jury and recital examination process.

Mission / Purpose

The mission of The University of Alabama School of Music is to preserve and enhance the finest traditions of our rich and varied musical heritage by providing a comprehensive music program that serves the educational and artistic needs of the community, state, region, and beyond through teaching, research, creative activity, and service by providing a comprehensive educational experience, grounded in theoretical, historical, and artistic elements, for the brightest and most talented music students from the state, region, nation, and world.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
We expect our graduate students to demonstrate stylistic insight, technical proficiency, musical artistry, and a scholarly process adequate to be a performance, presentation, or publication in peer-reviewed venues.

Connected Document
Music DMA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

We intend to continue to use the same imbedded assessments in graduate music theory courses so that we can compare future assessment findings to the current data. Such findings will offer insights regarding trends in ongoing student success in our graduate program. We also intend to seek outside data sources that can facilitate comparison of our students to students nationally. Our goal will be to include such comparisons on future School of Music Department Assessment Reports.

Related Measures

M 1: Written and Aural Graduate Exams
Graduate students are regularly assessed in music theory courses, relative to their appropriate level, using written and aural examinations.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
Students meet the minimum benchmark of 60% for final examinations.
M 2: Comprehensive Exam
Graduate students are assessed in comprehensive examinations prior to the awarding of degrees.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target: All students will pass comprehensive exams.

M 3: Continue Current Assessment Protocol
None needed other than to continue current assessment protocols and models for purposes of comparison.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

SLO 2: Discipline Methodological Skills
We expect our graduate students to perform and/or compose appropriate repertoire relative to their discipline and specific area of specialization.

Connected Document: Music DMA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Because fall 2011 was the first year to institute a standardized assessment rubric for jury assessments, several challenges occurred in use of the rubric and in reporting individual results. These challenges are particularly acute due to the size and diversity of our department. Therefore, approximately 25% of our students were not assessed. However, we were pleased with the data that we received and with the results. We intend to use the same performance assessment rubric next year, but we will make some changes in distribution and collection protocols to better insure that all students are assessed.

Related Measures

M 4: Applied Performance Juries
Graduate students are regularly assessed in applied performance juries.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target: No target established.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Applied Lesson Technology
We have begun an action plan to better utilize iPad technology in applied lessons for graduate and undergraduate students.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Applied Performance Juries | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills
Measure: Graduate Recitals | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills

Implementation Description: A rubric has been developed to assist applied instructors in assessing studio lessons and performance juries.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Carl Hancock
Additional Resources: None

M 5: Graduate Recitals
Graduate students are assessed in graduate recitals.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target: All students will pass recitals.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Applied Lesson Technology
We have begun an action plan to better utilize iPad technology in applied lessons for graduate and undergraduate students.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Applied Performance Juries | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills
Measure: Graduate Recitals | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills

Implementation Description: A rubric has been developed to assist applied instructors in assessing studio lessons and performance juries.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Carl Hancock
M 6: Performance Assessment Rubrics
Performance assessment rubrics

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target: Performance assessment rubrics will be used for juries and recitals.

SLO 3: Historical Knowledge
We expect our graduate students to demonstrate a broad historical knowledge of music and its place in the history of arts and culture through analysis of individual compositions at an advanced level both formally and stylistically.

Connected Document: Music DMA Curriculum Maps

Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Student Learning Outcome #3 was not included in the 2011 Departmental Assessment Report. It will be included in the 2012-13 report.

Related Measures

M 7: Written Exams in Music History Courses
Graduate students are regularly assessed in music history courses using written examinations.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target: Meet the minimum benchmark of 60% for midterm and final examinations.

M 8: Applied Studios
Graduate students are regularly assessed in applied studios to determine their practical application of stylistic elements that are directly related to their knowledge of stylistic periods, major composers, and compositional styles.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target: No target established.

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcm 4: Program Outcome: Sustain High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Relevant Associations:
Program Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Because there were no recommendations for improvement by the most recent NASM self-study visiting team regarding the graduate programs in the University of Alabama School of Music, the School chose to focus primarily on suggested improvements to the undergraduate program.

Related Measures

M 9: NASM Program Review Strengths
National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) Program Review strengths.

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

Target: No target established.

M 10: NSSE Results
Results from the NSSE for department senior majors.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target: No target established.

OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Relevant Associations:
Program Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Because there were no recommendations for improvement by the most recent NASM self-study visiting team regarding
the graduate programs in the University of Alabama School of Music, the School chose to focus primarily on suggested improvements to the undergraduate program.

Related Measures

M 11: Number of Graduate Majors
Number of graduate majors in the School of Music for the last three fall semesters.

Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target: No target established.

M 12: Number of Graduate Degrees Awarded
Number of graduate degrees awarded in the School of Music for the last three years.

Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target: No target established.

OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: Valued Highly by Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Relevant Associations:
Program Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):
Because there were no recommendations for improvement by the most recent NASM self-study visiting team regarding the graduate programs in the University of Alabama School of Music, the School chose to focus primarily on suggested improvements to the undergraduate program.

Related Measures

M 13: Post- Graduation Exit Surveys
Results from post graduation exit surveys.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target: No target established.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Applied Lesson Technology
We have begun an action plan to better utilize iPad technology in applied lessons for graduate and undergraduate students.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Applied Performance Juries | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills
Measure: Graduate Recitals | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills

Implementation Description: A rubric has been developed to assist applied instructors in assessing studio lessons and performance juries.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Carl Hancock
Additional Resources: None

Digital Performance Jury Assessment Protocol
In 2011-12, faculty members (N = 17) reported brass, voice, and woodwind jury results for undergraduate music major students (N = 124). Aggregate findings demonstrated that 82% of brass students (N = 14), 95% of voice students (N = 46), and 97% of woodwind students (N = 42) performed at or above minimum expectations for their respective level of experience. The above finding suggested that the program was meeting the needs of the students generally. Though we initially intended to use the same performance assessment rubric in 2012-13, performance faculty decided to institute an assessment protocol that would (a) utilize newly acquired iPads and (b) centralize performance assessment data.

Established in Cycle: 2013-2014
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Implementation Description: During the 2012-2013 academic year, the School of Music instituted a digital performance jury assessment protocol for all performance juries: graduate and undergraduate. The assessment protocol is as follows: (a) Instructors go to the School of Music performance assessment jury site using an iPad. (b) Instructors select the appropriate performance area from the menu. (c) Instructors key in the SID# for the student to be assessed. (d) Instructors enter their personal ID#. (e) Instructors evaluate.
Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Applied Faculty
University of Alabama

Detailed Assessment Report
2012-2013 Music D.M.A.
As of: 8/18/2014 10:35 AM CENTRAL

Mission / Purpose
The mission of The University of Alabama School of Music is to preserve and enhance the finest traditions of our rich and varied musical heritage by providing a comprehensive music program that serves the educational and artistic needs of the community, state, region, and beyond through teaching, research, creative activity, and service by providing a comprehensive educational experience, grounded in theoretical, historical, and artistic elements, for the brightest and most talented music students from the state, region, nation, and world.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
We expect our graduate students to demonstrate stylistic insight, technical proficiency, musical artistry, and a scholarly process adequate to be a performance, presentation, or publication in peer-reviewed venues.

Connected Document
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Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):
We intend to continue to use the same imbedded assessments in graduate music theory courses so that we can compare future assessment findings to the current data. Such findings will offer insights regarding trends in ongoing student success in our graduate program. We also intend to seek outside data sources that can facilitate comparison of our students to students nationally. Our goal will be to include such comparisons on future School of Music Department Assessment Reports.

Related Measures

M 1: Written and Aural Graduate Exams
Graduate students are regularly assessed in music theory courses, relative to their appropriate level, using written and aural examinations.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
Students meet the minimum benchmark of 60% for final examinations.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Faculty members (N = 2) reported embedded assessment data (midterm exams and final exams) for Spring Semester Graduate Music Theory Courses (MUS 504, MUS 516) for graduate music theory students (N = 30). Aggregate findings demonstrated that 100% of students met the minimum benchmark of 60% for mid term examinations and 100% of students met the minimum benchmark of 60% for final examinations. Participation for faculty members in reporting data was moderate with 50% of Graduate Music Theory faculty reporting. Interpretations and Conclusions: The above finding of 100% success in graduate music theory students suggests that the program is meeting the needs of the students generally.

M 2: Comprehensive Exam
Graduate students are assessed in comprehensive examinations prior to the awarding of degrees.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/endorf-program subject matter exam
Target:
All students will pass comprehensive exams.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Partially Met
MUS 696, DMA comps: 9 students took the exam, 5 (56%) passed all sections, 4 (44%) failed the first time and received an Incomplete as a grade. Those students will be allowed to address deficiencies and take the exam over.

M 3: Continue Current Assessment Protocol
None needed other than to continue current assessment protocols and models for purposes of comparison.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

SLO 2: Discipline Methodological Skills
We expect our graduate students to perform and/or compose appropriate repertoire relative to their discipline and specific area of specialization.

Connected Document
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Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Because fall 2011 was the first year to institute a standardized assessment rubric for jury assessments, several challenges occurred in use of the rubric and in reporting individual results. These challenges are particularly acute due to the size and diversity of our department. Therefore, approximately 25% of our students were not assessed. However, we were pleased with the data that we received and with the results. We intend to use the same performance assessment rubric next year, but we will make some changes in distribution and collection protocols to better insure that all students are assessed.

Related Measures

M 4: Applied Performance Juries
Graduate students are regularly assessed in applied performance juries.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target: 
No target established.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
During the 2012-2013 academic year, we were in the process of instituting a digital performance jury assessment protocol. Because it was in the testing phase, we did not gather jury data in the spring of 2013. The new protocol will be fully operational in the spring of 2014 and findings will be reported at that time.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Applied Lesson Technology
We have begun an action plan to better utilize iPad technology in applied lessons for graduate and undergraduate students.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Applied Performance Juries | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills
Measure: Graduate Recitals | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills

Implementation Description: A rubric has been developed to assist applied instructors in assessing studio lessons and performance juries.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Carl Hancock
Additional Resources: None

M 5: Graduate Recitals
Graduate students are assessed in graduate recitals.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target: 
All students will pass recitals.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Results Summery: Faculty members (N = 1) reported voice graduate recital results for graduate music major students (N = 3). Aggregate findings demonstrated that 100% of voice students (N = 3) performed at or above minimum expectations for their respective level of experience. The above finding suggests that the program is meeting the needs of the students generally.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
Applied Lesson Technology
We have begun an action plan to better utilize iPad technology in applied lessons for graduate and undergraduate students.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Applied Performance Juries | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills
Measure: Graduate Recitals | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills

Implementation Description: A rubric has been developed to assist applied instructors in assessing studio lessons and performance juries.
Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Carl Hancock
Additional Resources: None

M 6: Performance Assessment Rubrics
Performance assessment rubrics

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)
Target: 
Performance assessment rubrics will be used for juries and recitals.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Met
During the 2012-2013 academic year, we were in the process of instituting a digital performance jury
assessment protocol. Because it was in the testing phase, we did not gather jury data in the spring of 2013. The new protocol will be fully operational in the spring of 2014 and findings will be reported at that time.

### SLO 3: Historical Knowledge
We expect our graduate students to demonstrate a broad historical knowledge of music and its place in the history of arts and culture through analysis of individual compositions at an advanced level both formally and stylistically.

#### Connected Document
[Music DMA Curriculum Maps](#)

#### Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Student Learning Outcome #3 was not included in the 2011 Departmental Assessment Report. It will be included in the 2012-13 report.

#### Related Measures

**M 7: Written Exams in Music History Courses**
Graduate students are regularly assessed in music history courses using written examinations.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
Meet the minimum benchmark of 60% for midterm and final examinations.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Faculty members (N = 5) reported embedded assessment data (midterm exams and final exams) for Spring Semester Graduate Music History Courses (MUS 527, MUS 538, MUS 550, MUS 622, MUS 625) for graduate music major students (N = 35). Aggregate findings demonstrated that 100% of students (N = 35) met the minimum benchmark of 60% for midterm examinations and 100% of students (N = 35) met the minimum benchmark of 60% for final examinations. Participation for faculty members in reporting data was high with 100% of Graduate Music History faculty reporting. Interpretations and Conclusions: The above finding of 100% success in graduate music history students suggests that the program is meeting the needs of the students generally.

**M 8: Applied Studios**
Graduate students are regularly assessed in applied studios to determine their practical application of stylistic elements that are directly related to their knowledge of stylistic periods, major composers, and compositional styles.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
During the 2012-2013 academic year, we were in the process of instituting a digital performance jury assessment protocol. Because it was in the testing phase, we did not gather jury data in the spring of 2013. The new protocol will be fully operational in the spring of 2014 and findings will be reported at that time.

### Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

**OthOtcm 4: Program Outcome: Sustain High Level of Recognized Quality**
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

#### Relevant Associations:
Program Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Because there were no recommendations for improvement by the most recent NASM self-study visiting team regarding the graduate programs in the University of Alabama School of Music, the School chose to focus primarily on suggested improvements to the undergraduate program.

#### Related Measures

**M 9: NASM Program Review Strengths**
National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) Program Review strengths.

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
On April 7-10, 2013 Robert Walzel, visiting team chair, University of Kansas Antonius Bittman, graduate programs, Rutgers University John VanderWeg, undergraduate programs, Wayne State University visited the University of Alabama School of Music. They submitted their findings in the form of a NASM Visitor's Report. They reported the following primary strengths:
- Dedicated and highly qualified faculty

- The Director and his administrative team have provided outstanding leadership and realized a number of important organizational accomplishments since the last review.

- High quality large ensembles, especially choirs and bands

- Overall, good music facility (condition, layout, concert and rehearsal facilities), notwithstanding overcrowding concerns

- Highly engaged and motivated students who are enthusiastic about their experiences

- Fully engaged in local community as an outstanding town-and-gown organization

- Most classrooms equipped with modern equipment, with immediate plans to complete upgrades to rooms/spaces not yet addressed

- Excellent teaching

M 10: NSSE Results
Results from the NSSE for department senior majors.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
No target established.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Response Distribution Question N Mean Std Excellent Good Fair Poor
The overall quality of your major was 11 1.73 0.65 36.40% 54.50% 9.10% 0.00% The quality of courses as preparation for employment after graduation in your major was 11 1.91 0.83 36.40% 36.40% 27.30% 0.00% The quality of courses as preparation for graduate or professional school in your major was 11 1.64 0.51 36.40% 63.60% 0.00% 0.00% Majors: PERF (10), MUTY (1).

OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Relevant Associations:
Program Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):
Because there were no recommendations for improvement by the most recent NASM self-study visiting team regarding the graduate programs in the University of Alabama School of Music, the School chose to focus primarily on suggested improvements to the undergraduate program.

Related Measures
M 11: Number of Graduate Majors
Number of graduate majors in the School of Music for the last three fall semesters.

Source of Evidence: Existing data
Target:
No target established.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
According to our 2013 NASM Self Study, "The School of Music at the University of Alabama currently has sufficient enrollment to sustain the program, realize its overall mission, and meet its stated goals. Substantial improvement has been realized in overall enrollment during the most recent NASM accreditation cycle (2003-2013). Whereas the average student enrollment in the early years of the past decade ranged between 150 and 220, current annual numbers are above 345 and consistently and steadily increasing. This growth in enrollment is the result of a number of factors, including a demonstrable increase in faculty recruiting efforts, an increasing public recognition of the quality of our programs, and the visible success of many of our
graduates. These and other factors have led not only to a greater number of applications but to a higher quality applicant pool, allowing the School of Music to focus its attention not only on the number of applicants but on their quality as well.

**M 12: Number of Graduate Degrees Awarded**
Number of graduate degrees awarded in the School of Music for the last three years.

Source of Evidence: Existing data

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The total number of graduate degrees awarded by the University of Alabama school of music in the past three years is 49.

**OthOtcn 6: Program Outcome: Valued Highly by Graduates**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Relevant Associations:**
Program Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report): Because there were no recommendations for improvement by the most recent NASM self-study visiting team regarding the graduate programs in the University of Alabama School of Music, the School chose to focus primarily on suggested improvements to the undergraduate program.

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Post-Graduation Exit Surveys**
Results from post graduation exit surveys.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
The University of Alabama as a greater community, nor the school of music as an individual component has instituted a detailed survey of its graduates This is a goal to be implemented in future years. Within the school of music, the first incarnation of this survey will occur in April of 2014.

**M 14: Informal Faculty Advising and Discussion**
Results from informal faculty advising, discussion with students regarding future plans, and post graduation job placement.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met**
Constant and consistent mentoring of graduate students occurs in a variety of ways. They have regular contact with their academic advisor, applied studio teacher, ensemble directors, and major professors. Through each of these connections they receive advice concerning academic choices, professional choices, career choices, and life decisions. Because of the unique nature of the school of music, accentuating many one-on-one relationships between graduate students and faculty members, the environment is highly conducive to this process.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Applied Lesson Technology**
We have begun an action plan to better utilize iPad technology in applied lessons for graduate and undergraduate students.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- **Measure:** Applied Performance Juries | **Outcome/Objective:** Discipline Methodological Skills
- **Measure:** Graduate Recitals | **Outcome/Objective:** Discipline Methodological Skills

**Implementation Description:** A rubric has been developed to assist applied instructors in assessing studio lessons and performance juries.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Carl Hancock

**Additional Resources:** None
Mission / Purpose

The mission of The University of Alabama School of Music is to preserve and enhance the finest traditions of our rich and varied musical heritage by providing a comprehensive music program that serves the educational and artistic needs of the community, state, region, and beyond through teaching, research, creative activity, and service by providing a comprehensive educational experience, grounded in theoretical, historical, and artistic elements, for the brightest and most talented music students from the state, region, nation, and world.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
We expect our graduate students to demonstrate stylistic insight, technical proficiency, musical artistry, and a scholarly process adequate to be a performance, presentation, or publication in peer-reviewed venues.
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Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

We intend to continue to use the same imbedded assessments in graduate music theory courses so that we can compare future assessment findings to the current data. Such findings will offer insights regarding trends in ongoing student success in our graduate program. We also intend to seek outside data sources that can facilitate comparison of our students to students nationally. Our goal will be to include such comparisons on future School of Music Department Assessment Reports.

Related Measures

M 1: Written and Aural Graduate Exams
Graduate students are regularly assessed in music theory courses, relative to their appropriate level, using written and aural examinations.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
No target established.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: Faculty members (N = 2) reported embedded assessment data (midterm exams and final exams) for Spring Semester Graduate Music Theory Courses (MUS 504, MUS 608) for graduate music theory students (N = 18). Aggregate findings demonstrated that 100% of students met the minimum benchmark of 60% for mid term examinations and 100% of students met the minimum benchmark of 60% for final examinations. Participation for faculty members in reporting data was moderate with 50% of Graduate Music Theory faculty reporting.

Interpretations and Conclusions: The above finding of 100% success in graduate music theory students suggests that the program is meeting the needs of the students generally.

M 2: Comprehensive Exam
Graduate students are assessed in comprehensive examinations prior to the awarding of degrees.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target:
No target established.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
In the spring of 2012, MUS 596, MM comps: 7 students took the exam, 7 passed all sections. MUS 696, DMA comps: 6 students took the exam, 5 passed all sections, 1 failed theory for the first time and receives an Incomplete as a grade. All students are allowed two attempts and on the second attempt, they take only the sections they failed on the first. Those students are given a grade of Incomplete in the semester of the first attempt and the grade then changed after the second attempt to either P or F. Passing all sections is required to pass the exam. So, the student in 696 who failed the theory section has not failed the exam; that student will take the theory section in fall 2013 and the Incomplete from spring 2012 will be changed appropriately. Also, another student who failed only the theory section in fall 2011 took that section again in spring 2012 and his Incomplete was then changed to pass.

M 3: Continue Current Assessment Protocol
None needed other than to continue current assessment protocols and models for purposes of comparison.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
SLO 2: Discipline Methodological Skills

We expect our graduate students to perform and/or compose appropriate repertoire relative to their discipline and specific area of specialization.
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Relevant Associations:
Student Learning Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Because fall 2011 was the first year to institute a standardized assessment rubric for jury assessments, several challenges occurred in use of the rubric and in reporting individual results. These challenges are particularly acute due to the size and diversity of our department. Therefore, approximately 25% of our students were not assessed. However, we were pleased with the data that we received and with the results. We intend to use the same performance assessment rubric next year, but we will make some changes in distribution and collection protocols to better insure that all students are assessed.

Related Measures

M 4: Applied Performance Juries
Graduate students are regularly assessed in applied performance juries.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: Faculty members (N = 17) reported brass, voice, and woodwind jury results for graduate music major students (N = 8). Aggregate findings demonstrated that 100% of brass students (N = 2), 77% of voice students (N = 7), and 100% of woodwind students (N = 1) performed at or above minimum expectations for their respective level of experience. The above finding suggests that the program is meeting the needs of the students generally.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Applied Lesson Technology
We have begun an action plan to better utilize iPad technology in applied lessons for graduate and undergraduate students.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Hgh

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Applied Performance Juries | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills
Measure: Graduate Recitals | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills

Implementation Description: A rubric has been developed to assist applied instructors in assessing studio lessons and performance juries.

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Carl Hancock
Additional Resources: None

M 5: Graduate Recitals
Graduate students are assessed in graduate recitals.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: Faculty members (N = 1) reported voice graduate recital results for graduate music major students (N = 5). Aggregate findings demonstrated that 100% of voice students (N = 5) performed at or above minimum expectations for their respective level of experience. The above finding suggests that the program is meeting the needs of the students generally.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Applied Lesson Technology
We have begun an action plan to better utilize iPad technology in applied lessons for graduate and undergraduate students.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Hgh

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Applied Performance Juries | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills
Measure: Graduate Recitals | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills

Implementation Description: A rubric has been developed to assist applied instructors in assessing studio lessons and performance juries.

Responsible Person/Group: Dr. Carl Hancock
Additional Resources: None
M 6: Performance Assessment Rubrics
Performance assessment rubrics

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**SLO 3: Historical Knowledge**
We expect our graduate students to demonstrate a broad historical knowledge of music and its place in the history of arts and culture through analysis of individual compositions at an advanced level both formally and stylistically.

**Connected Document**
Music DMA Curriculum Maps

**Relevant Associations:**
Student Learning Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Student Learning Outcome #3 was not included in the 2011 Departmental Assessment Report. It will be included in the 2012 report.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Written Exams in Music History Courses**
Graduate students are regularly assessed in music history courses using written examinations.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Results Summary: Faculty members (N = 3) reported embedded assessment data (midterm exams and final exams) for Spring Semester Graduate Music History Courses (MUS 559, MUS 626, MUS 615, MUS 533, MUS 553) for graduate music major students (N = 31). Aggregate findings demonstrated that 100% of students (N = 31) met the minimum benchmark of 60% for mid term examinations and 100% of students (N = 31) met the minimum benchmark of 60% for final examinations. Participation for faculty members in reporting data was high with 100% of Graduate Music History faculty reporting. Interpretations and Conclusions: The above finding of 100% success in graduate music history students suggests that the program is meeting the needs of the students generally.

**M 8: Applied Studios**
Graduate students are regularly assessed in applied studios to determine their practical application of stylistic elements that are directly related to their knowledge of stylistic periods, major composers, and compositional styles.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Results Summary: Faculty members (N = 17) reported brass, voice, and woodwind jury results for graduate music major students (N = 8). Aggregate findings demonstrated that 100% of brass students (N = 2), 77% of voice students (N = 7), and 100% of woodwind students (N = 1) performed at or above minimum expectations for their respective level of experience. The above finding suggests that the program is meeting the needs of the students generally.

**Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**OthOtcm 4: Program Outcome: Sustain High Level of Recognized Quality**
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

**Relevant Associations:**
Program Outcome #1 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report).

Because there were no recommendations for improvement by the most recent NASM self-study visiting team regarding the graduate programs in the University of Alabama School of Music, the School chose to focus primarily on suggested improvements to the undergraduate program.

**Related Measures**

**M 9: NASM Program Review Strengths**
National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) Program Review strengths.

Source of Evidence: Professional standards

**M 10: NSSE Results**
Results from the NSSE for department senior majors.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

**Relevant Associations:**
Program Outcome #2 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Because there were no recommendations for improvement by the most recent NASM self-study visiting team regarding the graduate programs in the University of Alabama School of Music, the School chose to focus primarily on suggested improvements to the undergraduate program.

**Related Measures**

**M 11: Number of Graduate Majors**
Number of graduate majors in the School of Music for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence: Existing data

**M 12: Number of Graduate Degrees Awarded**
Number of graduate degrees awarded in the School of Music for the last three years.
Source of Evidence: Existing data

OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: Valued Highly by Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

**Relevant Associations:**
Program Outcome #3 Improvement Action(s) to be advanced (copied from 2010-11 report):

Because there were no recommendations for improvement by the most recent NASM self-study visiting team regarding the graduate programs in the University of Alabama School of Music, the School chose to focus primarily on suggested improvements to the undergraduate program.

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Post-Graduation Exit Surveys**
Results from post graduation exit surveys.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 14: Informal Faculty Advising and Discussion**
Results from informal faculty advising, discussion with students regarding future plans, and post graduation job placement.
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Applied Lesson Technology**
We have begun an action plan to better utilize iPad technology in applied lessons for graduate and undergraduate students.

*Established in Cycle:* 2011-2012
*Implementation Status:* Planned
*Priority:* High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
- Measure: Applied Performance Juries | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills
- Measure: Graduate Recitals | Outcome/Objective: Discipline Methodological Skills

**Implementation Description:** A rubric has been developed to assist applied instructors in assessing studio lessons and performance juries.

**Responsible Person/Group:** Dr. Carl Hancock

**Additional Resources:** None
Curriculum Maps #1  (In which courses or in what activities or assignments are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

Use “Introduce” when outcome is first address; “Reinforce” when outcome is reinforced; and “Master” when outcome is expected to be mastered. Note that you do not need to obtain a measure from every course in which an outcome is addressed (see Map #2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Intro to Graduate Study in Music MUS 501</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1 Performance/Composition Proficiency</th>
<th>Introduce</th>
<th>Introduce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>Selected Topics in Music Theory and Analysis MUS 516</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 2 Theoretical Understanding</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>Music History MUS 534, 535, 553, &amp; 558</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcome 3 Historical Understanding</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Experience Recital or Composition</td>
<td>Reinforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Experience Oral Examination</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Task Comprehensive Examinations</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Assignment Document</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1 Conference Presentation</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2 Conference Performance</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>Master</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Map II  (What assessment measures will be employed in which courses/activities/assignments for each Student learning Outcome)

Indicate which measure is being obtained in which course by typing “Measure n.n” in the appropriate cell. If you’d rather use a description of the measure, that is fine. Also, indicate the year/semester in which the measure will be obtained (e.g., Fall 2011). Student learning outcomes must be assessed at least once within a 2 ½ year period. Note that a measure does not need to be obtained from every course in which an outcome is covered (see Map #1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Composition Proficiency</td>
<td>Theoretical Understanding</td>
<td>Historical Understanding</td>
<td>Oral and Written Communication Proficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>Course 2</th>
<th>Course 3</th>
<th>Required Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro to Graduate Study in Music MUS 501</td>
<td>Selected Topics in Music Theory and Analysis MUS 516</td>
<td>Music History MUS 534, 535, 553, &amp; 558</td>
<td>Recital Assessment Jury Rubric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Experience Oral Examination</th>
<th>Written Examinations</th>
<th>Oral Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Task Comprehensive Examinations</th>
<th>Written Examinations</th>
<th>Written Examinations</th>
<th>Written Examinations</th>
<th>Written Examinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Examination</td>
<td>Written Examination</td>
<td>Written Examination</td>
<td>Written Examination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation and Assessment of Presentation</td>
<td>Observation and Assessment of Presentation</td>
<td>Observation and Assessment of Presentation</td>
<td>Observation and Assessment of Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1</th>
<th>Activity 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference Presentation</td>
<td>Conference Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation and Assessment of Presentation</td>
<td>Observation and Assessment of Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Additional Narrative: Use this space to provide any additional detail concerning the 2011-12 Department Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Department Assessment Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We currently are preparing for our National Association of Schools of Music Program Review, which will occur in 2013. Data from that review will be beneficial to future departmental planning and goal setting.</td>
<td>Department Assessment Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>