

Academic Program Assessment Report

Assessment is a term commonly used to encompass the process of gathering and using evidence to guide improvements.

SACSCOC requires that an institution "identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results".

Be sure to **SAVE** your progress as you work!

Academic Program

Music, B.S.

Submission Due Date

Fall 2025: October 1, 2025

Assessment Coordinator Name

Robert Kelley

Enter Assessment Coordinator Email

rkelley@lander.edu

Program Goal

Goal

Goal 1

Program Goals are broad and overarching statements about the skills, knowledge, and dispositions students are expected to gain by the end of their course of study (big picture). They support the Institution's Mission/Goals.

Program Goal

to demonstrate proficiency in performing music and an appreciation of the technique and artistry essential to performance at a professional level.

Pillar of Success Supported

High-Demand, Market-Driven Programs

Outcomes

Outcome 1

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Average performance score of 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Performance Assessment Rubric and Rating Sheet

Frequency of Assessment

Final semester of applied study

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Overall average performance rating n=6 83% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

3

Comments/Narrative

The music program encountered an ongoing issue with data collection, with a subset of performance data not being supplied to the assessment coordinator for a second consecutive year. This year, data was available for 6 of the 8 graduates, which is a significant improvement over last year. Of the 6 students whose exit assessment data were available, 5 had a score higher 70%. Again this year, all scores were in a lower range than before the new rubric was introduced, with only 3 graduates exceeding the 70% benchmark by more than 5%, and 1 falling short by about 17%.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results**Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used****Outcome 2**

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Level of repertoire: percentage of graduates at senior level

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Performance Assessment Rubric and Rating Sheet

Frequency of Assessment

Final semester of applied study

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Level of repertoire average rating n=6 83% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

3

Comments/Narrative

The repertoire level score for the three graduates closely match the overall performance scores reported above, with 5 out of 6 performing senior-level repertoire when assessed.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 3

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Technical mastery: percentage of graduates at senior level

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Performance Assessment Rubric and Rating Sheet

Frequency of Assessment

Final semester of applied study

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Technical mastery average rating n=6 83% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

3

Comments/Narrative

The technical ability score for the three graduates also generally match the overall performance scores reported above, with 5 out of 6 demonstrating senior-level technical mastery in performance.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 4

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Musical artistry: percentage of graduates at senior level

Timeframe for this Outcome

2023-2024

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Performance Assessment Rubric and Rating Sheet

Frequency of Assessment

Final semester of applied study

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Musical artistry average rating n=6 83% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

3

Comments/Narrative

The musical artistry score for the three graduates also align with the overall performance scores reported above, with 5 out of 6 displaying senior-level expression and style mastery in performance. The graduates who significantly exceeded the technical mastery standard tended to exceed this standard by more than they did in technical mastery, while the graduate who did not progress to senior-level repertoire during their time studying music did the least well on this standard compared with their repertoire level and technical mastery scores.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Goal Summary

Goal Summary/Comments

Overall, the data seem to suggest that our applied music teachers are largely successful in advancing our students' musical growth. The less-inflated scores from the revised assessment rubrics still show that nearly all of our graduates develop adequate performing skills as Lander students. While we continue to engage in adjustments to our applied instruction, we believe that more of the department's focus should be on improving student outcomes in the academic areas of our program.

Changes Made/Proposed Related to Goal

We still have some issues with our data collection system for this goal. We would like for there to be a standard procedure for submitting completed rubrics to a single place where faculty can have access to the collection of performance data for their students, and the program assessment coordinator can pull the senior evaluations annually for completing the program assessment report. We will be implementing a plan this year to make this happen so that our department can gain insights from the performance data of closer to 100% of our graduates.

Upload Rubrics/Other Files

StudentPerformanceAssessmentRubric.pdf

Goal 2

Program Goals are broad and overarching statements about the skills, knowledge, and dispositions students are expected to gain by the end of their course of study (big picture). They support the Institution's Mission/Goals.

Program Goal

to demonstrate a working knowledge of the theoretical concepts associated with the creation of music.

Pillar of Success Supported

High-Demand, Market-Driven Programs

Outcomes

Outcome 1

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Aural music theory: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music Theory Aural Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Aural skills exam score n=8 38% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

1

Comments/Narrative

3 out of 8 graduates scored above 70% on the aural skills exit exam. Again this year, our graduates did poorly on the error detection exercise, but also some students struggled with sight singing either the melody or bass line of a pop song. Without the new sight singing and error detection exercises on the exit exam, 7 out of 8 would have earned more than 70% on the original pitch matching exam. This indicates that we are still successfully developing our students' aural skills, but that some areas need more attention. Adjustments to the aural skills curriculum have already been made, and we are hoping to see an improvement in performance on the full aural skills exam beginning next year.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 2

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Written music theory: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music Theory Written Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Overall written music theory exam score n=8 25% 1 met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

Comments/Narrative

Only 2 of the 8 graduates scored 70% or above on the written theory assessment. All of these students except for one either had an interruption in their theory coursework that put them behind, or failed one or more semesters of their theory coursework before they ultimately completed the course sequence. There is one more class of students set to graduate this year who had an unstable first year of theory coursework (with two different instructors) resulting in difficulty passing upper-level theory classes. Since then, significant changes have been made to the First-Year Theory courses (MUSI 111, 112, 113, and 114), and we hope that this better scaffolding for upper-level music theory coursework will begin to show in the exit assessment data beginning in 2027.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 3

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Written music theory fundamentals: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music Theory Written Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Written music theory fundamentals section n=8
75% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

2

Comments/Narrative

While not all graduates met the 70% benchmark score on musical fundamentals this year, the two that didn't only missed it by 5%. The commonality between these two was their failure to answer a question correctly that tested the skill of thinking in a key with the correct key signature consistently applied to all notes. This skill is now heavily emphasized in First-Year Theory, and we hope that this, along with the previously documented deficiencies in parallel vs. relative keys and intervals, will be seen in future graduates' assessment scores.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 4

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Written music theory rhythm: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music Theory Written Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Written music theory rhythm section n=8 63% met 2

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

Comments/Narrative

Again this year, our graduates generally showed rhythmic competence with 5 out of 8 exceeding the proposed new 80% benchmark and the other 3 all scoring below 70%. Question analysis revealed the same weak areas as last year for some students in time signatures where the quarter is not the beat, along with rhythm arithmetic. Also of note here is that commonly held stereotypes of certain categories of music students being bad at rhythm were not substantiated in the data, with a singer and a cellist outperforming all percussionists, and the two lowest scores being band instrumentalists. We hope that improvements made in First-Year Theory rhythm instruction in 2023-2024 will result in fewer students graduating with significant rhythm skill deficiencies beginning in 2027.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 5

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Written music theory tonal harmony: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music Theory Written Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Written music theory tonal harmony section n=8
13% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

1

Comments/Narrative

This year's tonal harmony knowledge results are bizarre. The only student to meet the 70% mark had the second lowest overall theory score in the group. The trends in this student's scores suggest an ability to memorize information but difficulty with higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. Again this year, the students who did not meet the 70% benchmark did not fail as resoundingly (scores in the 40-69% range) as in the following three outcomes (post-tonal harmony, tonal analysis, and form, all containing scores below 20%). This suggests that students are learning the principles of tonal harmony more successfully than other music theory areas, but are not retaining all of that knowledge. The same areas of difficulty were evident in this year's question analysis as last year's (inflected subdominants, how to resolve leading tones and chordal sevenths, and writing dominant seventh chords in minor keys). So many changes have been made to this area of instruction since these students completed the theory

curriculum that we will have to reassess when the effects of these instructional changes appear in future years' program assessment data.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 6

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Written music theory post-tonal harmony: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music Theory Written Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Written music theory post-tonal harmony section
n=8 13% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

1

Comments/Narrative

The single student who scored above 70% on post-tonal harmony this year is the only one of the 2024-2025 graduates took MUSI 212 in the year where post-tonal harmony was again sufficiently covered. This suggests that we will soon once again begin to get meaningful data to inform future changes in post-tonal theory instruction.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 7

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Written music theory tonal analysis: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music Theory Written Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Written music theory tonal analysis section n=8
13% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

1

Comments/Narrative

We were not expecting an improvement in this area of music theory this year, and the extremely low average score of 36% suggests that students are not able to learn or retain their tonal analysis skills, especially in chromatic harmony, because of weak underlying theory fundamentals skills. The problems noted above in thinking in a key, chord spelling, and chromatic harmony preclude the ability to do higher-level analysis of these musical structures. Again in this area, the exit assessment scores from the first students to graduate having taken First-Year Theory in 2023 or later will be an indicator of what changes still need to happen in the area of tonal music analysis.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Goal Summary

Goal Summary/Comments

The continuation of the downward trend in music theory exit exam scores this year is not surprising, but also frustratingly not helpful for deciding future instructional changes. The students who graduated in 2024-2025 had significant disruptions to their First-Year Theory instruction that made success in the rest of their theory coursework difficult, and it is clear that these graduates carried little away from their theory classes besides a halfway decent understanding of musical fundamentals.

Changes Made/Proposed Related to Goal

We are continuing to wait before changing anything significant to the existing theory classes until we see the exit exam data from the class of 2027. Preliminary signs are positive, though, that the changes to First-Year Theory are building a stronger foundation for student success in Second-Year Theory, post-tonal harmony, and Form and Analysis. The pass rate in all theory courses has stabilized, whereas it fluctuated wildly from course to course and year to year prior to 2023-2024. This year's Second-Year Theory class has had its strongest start ever, and First-Year Theory is off to a better start than the previous year. The areas that seem to need attention based on question analysis of the last two years' exit exams are:

- time signatures where the quarter note does not get the beat
- parallel vs. relative keys
- intervals and chord qualities
- thinking in a key
- how to resolve leading tones and chordal sevenths
- writing dominant seventh chords in minor keys
- secondary dominants
- inflected subdominants

Some instructional changes to address these areas have already been implemented, but more attention to secondary dominants is planned for this year, along with additional scrutiny of students' attention to the difference between scale degree seven (the leading tone) and chordal sevenths.

Upload Rubrics/Other Files

Goal 3

Program Goals are broad and overarching statements about the skills, knowledge, and dispositions students are expected to gain by the end of their course of study (big picture). They support the Institution's Mission/Goals.

Program Goal

to demonstrate a working knowledge of the historical contexts associated with the creation of music.

Pillar of Success Supported

High-Demand, Market-Driven Programs

Outcomes

Outcome 1

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Music history: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music History Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Overall music history exam average n=8 38% met 1

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

Comments/Narrative

3 out of 8 of graduates achieved a score of 70% or higher, meaning our goal was not met. This year's results show the continued effects of the variability in music history instruction in 2020-2022 and the reduction of the music history curriculum by one 3-hour course.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 2

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge,

skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Identification of composers: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music History Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Music history exam composer identification section
n=8 25% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

1

Comments/Narrative

Only 2 out of our 8 graduates answered 70% of the composer identification questions correctly on the exit exam. Six out of this year's eight graduates took the newly revised music history assessment exam, and the average Composer ID score for these students (65%) was higher than for the two who took the old exam (56%).

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 3

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Identification of genres and forms: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music History Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Music history exam genres and forms identification section n=8 50% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

Comments/Narrative

50% of graduates scored 70% or higher on the identification of historical music genres and forms this year. This area of music history concerns bigger-picture ideas and less detailed factual information than the composer identification section. It is difficult to ascertain whether this makes this section easier for students or whether our students are better at retaining historical trends and landmark types of music than historically important composers. Considering that historical student performance on this section has not been consistently better than the composer identification section, the latter seems more likely. Again in this section, the students who took the new history exam outperformed (65% avg.) those who took the old exam (56% avg.).

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Outcome 4

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge,

skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

Identification of musical styles: percentage of graduates scoring 70% or higher

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

80%-100% of graduates

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

60%-79% of graduates

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 60% of graduates

Assessment Measure Used

Music History Exit Assessment Exam

Frequency of Assessment

Semester of graduation

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Music history exam musical styles identification section n=8 75% met

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

2

Comments/Narrative

With an old-exam average score of 30% and a new-exam average score of 79%, it is clear that the old history exam was not measuring the musical styles knowledge being taught in music history classes and that the new exam questions are a greatly improved measure of student learning in this area. Question analysis reveals that the musical style least recognized by 2024-2025 graduates was Expressionism.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results

Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used

Goal Summary

Goal Summary/Comments

This year's data continues to show the challenges to music history instruction that the music program has faced since 2020, including several instructor changes, the reduction of credit hours in the music history sequence from 12 to 9, and a modernization of the material taught in music history without the

assessment instrument also being updated to match the more inclusive music history landscape now being taught. The results in next year's program assessment report should present us with a clearer picture of our current music history curriculum and what areas might need changing.

Changes Made/Proposed Related to Goal

The graduation in 2026 of the first cohorts of students to have consistent music history instruction across the curriculum will give us our first baseline for designing instructional changes to improve future student success.

Upload Rubrics/Other Files

Goal 4

Program Goals are broad and overarching statements about the skills, knowledge, and dispositions students are expected to gain by the end of their course of study (big picture). They support the Institution's Mission/Goals.

Program Goal

to maintain enrollment sufficient to award music degrees in compliance with standards prescribed by our accrediting bodies

Pillar of Success Supported

High-Demand, Market-Driven Programs

Outcomes

Outcome 1

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

to award music degrees to a five-year rolling average of eight music majors

Timeframe for this Outcome

2020-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

8 or more degrees awarded

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

4-7 degrees awarded

Performance Target for "Not Met"

Below 4 degrees awarded

Assessment Measure Used

Music degrees awarded annually at fall and spring graduations

Frequency of Assessment

Annually

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

8 music degrees awarded in 2024-2025
5 music degrees awarded in 2023-2024
6 music degrees awarded in 2022-2023
3 music degrees awarded in 2021-2022
2 music degrees awarded in 2020-2021

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

2

Comments/Narrative

Our five-year rolling average of 4.8 annual graduates only partially meets this goal, but there seems to be an upward trend in the numbers since its minimum in 2021. To keep our graduation rate up, we are continuing the recruiting and retention strategies we have implemented in the past 3 years. Based on the current distribution of music majors in different class years, we anticipate a drop in graduation numbers over the next two or three years, which we hope will then reverse and go back up.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results**Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used****Outcome 2**

Outcomes are specific, **measurable** statements that reflect the broader goals.

Academic Programs are required to develop **Student Learning Outcomes**, which describe knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to gain as a result of their educational experiences.

Academic Programs may also develop **Operational Outcomes**, which describe the level of performance of an operational aspect of a program or office (ex. graduation rates, retention, employment data).

Most goals have at least two outcomes measured.

What type of Outcome would you like to add?

Student Learning Outcome

Enter Outcome

to maintain a student enrollment in music sufficient to meet CHE program productivity standards

Timeframe for this Outcome

2024-2025

Performance Target for "Met"

a headcount of 40 or more music majors

Performance Target for "Partially Met"

a headcount of 30-39 music majors

Performance Target for "Not Met"

A headcount below 30 music majors

Assessment Measure Used

Headcount enrollment

Frequency of Assessment

Annually

Data Collected for this Timeframe (Results)

Headcount enrollment of 33 music majors in 2024-2025

Score (Met=3, Partially Met=2, Not Met=1)

2

Comments/Narrative

While the Commission on Higher Education only requires an average headcount of 12.5 majors, our goal is to maintain a headcount sufficient to achieve the desired graduation rate of 8 completions per year. This past year the number of new music majors increased significantly, but our retention rate continues to be lower, so this year's overall headcount stayed the same as the last two years'. As the smaller graduating classes of 2026 and 2027 advance through the music program, we expect our headcount to fluctuate somewhat and our graduation rate to drop, but a long-term trend of increased enrollment is still our goal, with closer to 50 music majors our long-term target.

Resources Needed to Meet/Sustain Results**Explanation of How Resources Will Be Used**

Goal Summary

Goal Summary/Comments

While the Department of Music is still concerned about our low enrollment and graduation numbers, the DEW and CCWD list "Musicians and Singers" as a high-demand career which gives our music degree program an exemption to the Commission on Higher Education program productivity standards. We are continuing our efforts to recruit students through showcasing our ensembles and faculty in area high schools, participating in college fairs, enticing prospective music students through our MusicMania event, and offering scholarships to promising young musicians. We had another large freshman music major class this year, and are hoping to retain a higher number of them to achieve our future enrollment goals. Our project to create career-oriented music-major-plus-non-music-minor programs, however, has still not gotten off the ground.

Changes Made/Proposed Related to Goal

We brought three successful Lander music alumni back to campus last year to talk to our current students, and these events were mildly successful. We're continuing this project this year, but may not be able to bring as many alumni back.

We have not yet devised a way of measuring the success of our social media outreach efforts, but we believe that actual in-person contact with prospective students is always going to be a far more effective recruiting tool, and we can trace back to the first contact one or more faculty had with nearly all of our current music majors.

Improvements to the outreach events in the band area have been planned, and the strings and choral areas are both introducing new outreach events for pre-college students.

MusicMania was a success last year for the first time since 2021, and we hope that moving it to the fall this year will bolster its effectiveness as a recruiting tool for us.

Upload Rubrics/Other Files

Dean's Email Address

mjameson@lander.edu

Approved by Dean?

Yes

Signature of Dean

Misty L. Jameson

Comments from Dean's Review

Overall, this is a solidly written, carefully considered report. However, I am a little confused as to why, with Goal One, there has been trouble collecting data for this goal. Would creating a Teams folder help for collecting rubrics, or should there simply be a meeting of faculty to discuss student performance as a whole? I believe that a new plan, involving one of our administrative assistants, has been proposed, so next year's report will need to include an update on your progress in data collection. For assessment to be meaningful, it helps to have departmental buy-in so that faculty can know what is at stake and be aware of student performance from year to year. With this in mind, I must ask how assessment data is shared (or is it?) with your faculty each year.

In Goal Two, Outcome Four, I find this sentence troubling: "Also of note here is that commonly held stereotypes of certain categories of music students being bad at rhythm were not substantiated in the data, with a singer and a cellist outperforming all percussionists, and the two lowest scores being band instrumentalists." Why are stereotypes being taken seriously enough to address in an assessment report? If you want to point out the irony of the percussionists being outperformed by a singer and a cellist, that it is fine, but I'm not sure that I would mention stereotypical performance expectations here. Otherwise, the problems that students seem to have with theory (as a whole) are a bit concerning, and I hope that with the 2026-2027 assessment data, there is some sense either of improvement or clear instructional necessity. It is my understanding that the teaching of all theory courses falls to one instructor; perhaps it would be better to divide theory teaching duties between two different faculty members so that this responsibility doesn't rest on one professor. Students would have the benefit of different modes of instruction and of exposure to multiple Music faculty members.

I am glad to see that there is a plan in place for Goal Three (music history) and that the data for this goal will soon become more stable once the updated assessment instrument has been in use for longer.

Goal Four (productivity) continues to be an issue for Music, but I appreciate that the department has attempted more recruitment efforts or had more success with recruitment initiatives such as MusicMania. I would like to see more of an emphasis on retention, if possible, particularly with the low number of graduates in this program. One thing to consider in both recruitment and retention might be how you can utilize the NACE competencies, particularly communication, critical thinking, career- and self-development, teamwork, and professionalism, in your recruitment efforts as a way to reinforce this program as being in-demand and workforce ready. You may also want to consider the possibility of including a new goal that in some way tracks career/workforce readiness ("Engage in Professional Development" or "Develop Meaningful Professional Direction for Life after Graduation" for example). This goal would allow you to discuss career preparation (internships, experiential learning, resume building, mock interviews, alumni engagement with undergrads) and help you decide if you need to do more career building (in a lower-level "Careers in Music" class for example) to assist you in retention efforts. It is something to think about moving forward.

Thank you for reviewing and approving this report. The approval and a copy of the report will be

emailed to you and the Assessment Coordinator.