

Assessment Map for BA in Music

Terms Assessed: SP23-FA23 (SLO3 used terms SP22-FA23)

Jury Members: Nate Jernigan (PG), Jessica McMillan, Sandy Vandercook

Date of Jury: August 6, 2024

Student Learning Outcome #1: Biblical Interpretation—The graduate will interpret and communicate the Bible accurately.

Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Devotion (mission statement); Proclamation (mission statement)

Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals (if applicable):

Measures (means of program assessment)	Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)	Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester	Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle's action plans)
Direct Measures Final exegesis paper collected from <i>Interpreting the Bible</i> , <i>Introduction to Preaching</i> , and <i>Introduction to Teaching</i> and assessed with Leavell College Biblical Interpretation Rubric, using the composite score as the metric.	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark. The composite score on the rubric will serve as the metric.	Aggregate: 3.12 <i>Interpreting the Bible:</i> 3.08 SP23 Aggregate: 3.08 NOLA: 2.75 FLEX: 3.4 FA23 Aggregate: 3.57 NOLA: 3.55 FLEX: 3.40 KTI: 3.81 KTI FLEX: 3.5 <i>Intro to Teaching:</i> SP23: NOLA: not assessed HAR: not assessed FA23: 2.7 NOLA: 2.81 FLEX: 2.6 <i>Intro to Preaching:</i> 3.57 SP23: 3.44	New Benchmark: 3.25 aggregate across courses AP: Program Coordinator of Biblical Studies (Jeff Audirsch) also responsible for oversight of <i>Int Bible</i> measure. He will revise the assignment instructions for the Exegesis Paper to focus more on historical context, <u>due May 2024</u> . AP: Leavell College Associate Dean (Tommy Doughty) will verify and send reminders to collector of <i>Teaching</i> artifacts to avoid

_____ Indirect Measures Combined average score on Course Evaluation items 1, 2, and 9 for <i>Interpreting the Bible, Introduction to Preaching, and Introduction to Teaching</i>.	_____ This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	_____ SPAN: 3.44 FA23: 3.7 NOLA: 3.7 Aggregate: 4.86, 4.76, 4.74 (4.79) <i>Int Bible:</i> 4.9, 4.85, 4.9 (4.88) SP23: 4.9, 4.8, 4.9 (avg. 4.83) NOLA/FLEX: 4.9, 4.8, 4.9 FA23: 4.95, 4.9, 4.9 (4.92) NOLA/FLEX: 4.9, 4.8, 4.8 KTI/KTI FLEX: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 <i>Intro Teach:</i> 4.88, 4.88, 4.83 (4.86) SP23: 4.75, 4.75, 4.65 (4.72) Hardee: 4.5, 4.5, 4.3 (4.43) NOLA: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0) FA23: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0) NOLA/FLEX: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0) <i>Intro Preach:</i> 4.8, 4.55, 4.5 (4.62) SP23: 4.9, 4.7, 4.7 (4.77) SPAN: 4.9, 4.7, 4.7 (4.77) FA23: 4.7, 4.4, 4.3 (4.47) NOLA/FLEX: 4.7, 4.4, 4.3 (4.47) <u>Summary/Reflection/Discussion:</u> Overall, Dr. Audirsch noted weakness on historical context in details on Interpreting scores. Missing some artifacts for a full semester.	missing data, <u>beginning Summer 2024</u>.
---	--	---	--

Student Learning Outcome #2: Theological and Historical Interpretation—The graduate will interpret and communicate theological and historical truth accurately.

Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Proclamation (mission statement)

Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals (if applicable): n/a

Measures (means of program assessment)	Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)	Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester	Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle's action plans)
Direct Measures Theological Reflection #2 from <i>Christian Doctrine</i> assessed with the Leavell College Theological and Historical Interpretation Rubric.	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark. The composite score on the rubric will serve as the metric.	Aggregate: 3.11 SP23 Aggregate: 2.83 ONL: 3.33 BHAM: 2.97 ORL: 2.19 MCIW: did not submit FA23 Aggregate: 3.39 NOLA: 3.43 FLEX: 3.33 SPAN: 3.42	New BM: 3.25 aggregate AP: As collector of <i>Doctrine</i> measure, Dr. Doughty will communicate to instructors the importance to prepare students for historical aspect of reflections. <u>Beginning Fall 2024</u>, Dr. Doughty will supply instructors with his assignment overview video which includes historical resources and strategies.
Indirect Measures Combined average score on Course Evaluation items 1, 2, and 9 for <i>Christian Doctrine</i>	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	Aggregate: 4.81, 4.63, 4.73 (4.73) SP23: 4.8, 4.5, 4.7 (4.2) ONL: 5.0, 4.9, 4.8 (4.9) BHAM: 4.3, 4.3, 4.0 (4.2) ORL: 5.0, 4.5, 5.0 (4.8) MCIW: 4.8, 4.4, 4.8 (4.7) FA23: 4.9, 4.85, 4.9 (4.89) NOLA/FLEX: 5.0, 4.9, 5.0 (4.97) SPAN: 4.8, 4.8, 4.8 (4.8)	New BM for Indirect: 4.5

		Summary/Reflection/Discussion: Doctrine scores improving. Dr. Doughty affirmed Dr. Audirsch's concern on <i>Interpreting the Bible</i> with a parallel observation that interaction with historical truth lacking (detail of <i>Christian Doctrine</i> rubric scores).	
--	--	---	--

Student Learning Outcome #3: Competency in Chosen Field—The graduate will demonstrate mastery in Music.

Alignment to Mission Statement/Strategic Plan: Servanthood (mission statement), Mission (mission statement)

Alignment to ATS/NASM/CACREP Goals (if applicable): NASM standard IV.C.6(5).(b): The title Bachelor of Musical Arts may be used if students are expected to meet competencies common to all professional baccalaureate degrees in music as outline in Standards for Accreditation VIII.

Measures (means of program assessment)	Criteria for Success (benchmark set last cycle)	Results (report, summarize, reflect)—disaggregate by location and semester	Use of Results (make action plan to reach criteria, set new criteria if needed, AND discuss success of previous cycle's action plans)
Direct Measures <i>Senior Seminar</i> paper using composite score Senior Seminar Rubric	This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	<i>Senior Seminar</i> Aggregate: 2.99 SP23 Aggregate: 2.65 NOLA: 2.75 ONL: 2.56 ANG: 2.92 PARCH: 2.0 LCIW: 2.69 HAR: 2.97 FA23 Aggregate: 3.33 NOLA: 3.63 ONL: 2.9	New BM (SS only): 3.00 AP: Program coordinator (Tommy Doughty) will notify <i>Senior Seminar</i> instructors that he, Matt James, and Chris Shaffer are available to consult with students on SS paper topics and helpful resources, <u>beginning Fall 2024</u> .
Performance Measures a. voice or piano performance juries using the music department jury evaluation forms	Performance Measures a. composite score of 8.2 out of 10 for sampled students	<i>Performance Measures</i> Benchmark a NOT met a. Jury Evaluations Composite = 7.63 FA22 = 7.97 SP23 = 7.84 FA23 = 7.09	AP: In future assessments, prison and language sections of SS will not be considered. AP for Performance Measures:

b. Piano proficiency using the piano proficiency form c. recital using the recital grade sheet OR grade on senior music paper Indirect Measures Combined average score on Course Evaluation items 1, 2, and 9 for <i>Senior Seminar</i>	b. 75% pass rate for sampled students c. composite score of 85% on the recital grade sheet or the senior music paper This is a new measure so we have no benchmark.	Benchmark b n/a b. no students completed the piano proficiency during the reporting period for this assessment. Benchmark c MET c. composite score: 90.5% SP22—recital composite 94% FA22—one senior paper 90.5% FA23—one senior paper 93.5% SP23—recital composite 84% Senior Seminar Aggregate: 4.75 SP23 Aggregate: 4.81 NOLA: 5.0, 5.0, 5.0 (5.0) ONL: 4.7, 4.6, 4.3 (4.53) ANG: 5.0, 4.9, 5.0 (4.97) PARCH: not submitted LCIW: 4.9, 4.8, 4.8 (4.83) HAR: 4.9, 4.7, 4.8 (4.7) FA23: 4.67 NOLA: 5.0, 4.8, 4.9 (4.9) ONL: 4.5, 4.5, 4.0 (4.33) <u>Summary/Reflection for Senior Seminar</u> Dr. Wilton questioned why prison scores were considered since no students in those sections are in this program. Still, the Spring 2023 scores were low, so Dr. Doughty recommended	a: keep BM of 8.2. b. keep BM of 75% c. keep BM of 85% The benchmark for <i>measure a</i> should be maintained rather than lowered even though the current composite was lower. The 8.2 score better reflects what the music department feels is acceptable. The benchmarks for <i>measures b and c</i> are departmental benchmarks and reflect the expectations for students earning performance degrees. Also, the program coordinator and a second music professor will meet with all music faculty and adjuncts to review the jury forms, the piano proficiency forms, and the recital grade sheets and to explain the expectations for completing them correctly. They also will review the process for submitting all forms. (Once the student
---	--	---	--

		following through on an unfulfilled intention of making Leavell College faculty available for SS research projects. <u>Reflection on Performance Measures:</u> The small amount of data is attributed to several factors. First, the former program coordinator retired, and some of the music jury forms may have been misplaced in the transition. There also was a transition of the person responsible for the piano proficiency forms. Second, the number of students completing piano proficiency and/or recitals/senior papers was quite small. Only 4 BAM students have graduated in the period covering this assessment jury, and those students would have completed the piano proficiency in the semesters outside the scope of this assessment period. Finally, some of the jury forms did not provide numerical values, only qualitative data, making tabulating full results difficult.	has performed, the reviewer will fully complete the form immediately, scan it, and email the scan to himself and the program coordinator. Then, the reviewer will leave the hard copy of the form in a designated box in the music office to be filed. <u>This meeting will be held within the first two weeks of the semester.</u> Finally, the program coordinator has added to his <u>end-of-semester checklist</u> to verify that all forms for a, b, and c have been filed and are accessible.
--	--	--	---

Executive Summary

The assessment of the BA in Music degree revealed that the majority of the cohort of students within the degree have not yet reached the point in their program to perform piano juries and senior recitals. In the period of time assessed, only a few students completed the milestones in question. The faculty has identified key areas to improve the assessment of juries and recitals and the filing of completed forms. In the first two weeks of the Fall 2024 semester, Dr. McMillan and Mr. Jernigan will meet with all instructors and faculty involved in performance instruction to clarify and demonstrate the proper method for completing and filing forms. Key areas of improvement include ensuring all forms include a proper numerical value and that all forms are scanned digitally and sent to the reviewer, the program coordinator, and the institutional effectiveness office, and a hard copy is filed in the music office. As the BAM cohort move through their program, a more thorough sampling of student success in performance areas will be available for assessment. The undergraduate music program has a larger cohort of freshman and sophomores, so the expectation is that future assessments will have much richer data.