Department of Music and Dramatic Arts
Major Field Assessment Report, March 2003

This study is an examination of a variety of survey data provided by the Southeastern Louisiana University Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. It includes exit survey data from seniors and graduate students for the academic years 1999-2000 and 2000-01, results of student teacher evaluations for the academic years 1996-97 through 2000-01 and written comments from students in the three degree programs. This study will provide the averages of the responses and an assessment of the exit survey's ability to adequately measure the goals established by the music department.

I. Assessment common to all degrees: *Music Major Exit Survey*

Criterion: "85% of graduates of the BM program will respond 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' to the statement 'I believe my undergraduate training at SLU has prepared me well for my possible continued study at the graduate level' contained in an exit questionnaire they will fill out shortly before graduation."

or

"85% of graduates of the BME program will respond 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' to the statement 'I believe my undergraduate training at SLU has prepared me well for my first teaching position' contained in an exit questionnaire they will fill out shortly before graduation."

or

"85% of graduates of the MM program will respond 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' to the statement 'I believe my graduate experiences at SLU have prepared me well for further education at the doctoral level' contained in an exit questionnaire they will fill out shortly before graduation."

Results of the Exit Surveys

The following gives the average responses in the individual degree programs for the years 1999-2000 and 2000-2001.

Very Dissatisfied				Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

Conclusions

A review of the exit survey data shows no significant areas for improvement across the degree programs, but a close look reveals the following:

- BMU students perceive a problem with the department's offering of clubs and associations (item 8).
- BMU students perceive a problem with the library's resources (item 17).
- BME students perceive a lack of encouragement from faculty regarding finding employment (item 22).
- BME students perceive a problem with the overall quality of the degree program

(item 24).
- BME students perceive a problem with their advisors' advice (item 25).
- BMU students perceive a problem with their history classes (item 35).
- BME students perceive a problem with the ability of their methods classes to prepare them to teach vocal or instrumental music in an elementary, middle school or high school position (item 34).
- BME students perceive a problem with the preparation in communicating effectively with parents (item 40).
- BME students perceive a problem with the preparation for dealing with groups of children with diverse interests, abilities and needs (item 45).
- BME students perceive a problem with the preparation for managing groups of children with diverse interests, abilities and needs (item 46).
- BME students perceive a problem with the preparation for infusing technology into the curriculum (item 48).

The written comments are the usual mixed bag of gripes and compliments. No one area stands out in the comments, but most students are very complimentary about the faculty and the department.

The MM degree's first goal is adequately suited for measurement by the exit survey as is the BM degree's third goal. The BME degree's first goal is not. The exit survey must include the question, "How satisfied are you with your undergraduate training at SLU and its preparation of you for your first teaching position?"

Department of Music and Dramatic Arts
Major Field Assessment Report, March, 2003
Degree: Master of Music in Theory

Goal 3: To develop professional skills.
Expected Outcome: Graduates of the MM in Theory program will demonstrate ability to conduct significant research.
Assessment: A faculty committee of at least two instructors other than the thesis director will rate the quality of the thesis on a scale from 1-10 on the basis of (1) quality of research, (2) depth of musical analysis, (3) quality of presentation (writing style, logic, supporting illustrations and examples), and (4) format (does the document adhere to the standards defined by the Graduate School?). The average score must be 7.0 or higher.

	Maxile	**Bass**	**Effler**	**Average by Category** (Reviewer 1, Reviewer 2, Both)
Quality of Research	4, 10	1,8	4, 10	3, 9.3, 6.1
Depth of Analysis	4, 10	1, 10	6, 10	3.6, 10, 6.8
Quality of Presentation	10, 8	8, 9	10, 9	9.3, 8.6, 8.9
Format	10, 10	10, 10	10, 10	10, 10, 10
Average by Reviewers 1,2:	7, 9.5	5, 9.2	7.5, 9.7	6.6, 9.47, 7.9
Average of Both:	8.25	7.1	8.6	7.9

Overall average: 8.0
Average, Reviewer 1: 5.6
Average, Reviewer 2: 9.5

The three theses evaluated are the only ones written between 1997 and the present. The most striking aspect of the evaluation is the wide disparity between the two evaluators; nonetheless, it is clear that higher marks are generally given for format and presentation than analysis and research. The most recent thesis is from 1999; since that time, a new theory specialist with international research credentials has been hired to the faculty, so it is reasonable to expect that the next group of theses will exhibit comparatively more substance than these. In any case, it is evident that we are meeting our goal of 7.0 as an overall average. The harsher evaluator's average scores for each thesis were 7, 5, and 7.5, respectively, indicating that two of the three theses met the goal of 7.0.