MISSION STATEMENT
The mission of the School of Music is to provide a comprehensive instructional program in music that will develop strong teachers, performers, composers, scholars, and informed audiences. In addition, we strive to set and maintain high standards of musical excellence for a broad and diverse community of constituents. At the same time, we acknowledge the value to ourselves and our students in interaction with other departments/schools on campus in the belief such efforts will broaden our sphere of influence resulting in promotion of the role of arts in academic, local, and statewide communities. Finally, we recognize a responsibility to be of service to the greater region by providing leadership and public service to students and teachers in schools and communities throughout Montana.

DEPARTMENT ALIGNMENT WITH PRIORITIES FOR ACTION
After listing each departmental objective, indicate which of the five Priorities for Action the objective supports. In this section, you may also briefly describe any innovative or noteworthy programs/initiatives that support the Priorities for Action.

1. Develop degree-appropriate proficiency in music performance (PA 1, 2, 3)
2. Develop skills in music theory and aural perception (PA 1, 2, 3)
3. Develop skills in research and writing within the discipline of music (PA 1, 2, 3)
4. Develop core keyboard skills for all music majors (PA 1, 2, 3)
5. Program, teach, and perform a diverse and inclusive repertoire of music (PA 4, 5)
## STUDENT LEARNING GOALS, MEASUREMENT TOOLS, CURRICULAR MAP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Goals</th>
<th>Freshman Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Sophomore Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Junior Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Senior Assessment Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Develop degree-appropriate proficiency in music performance on a declared major instrument or voice | Pre-assessment  
Students audition for studio professors to determine level of study  
*Summative Assessment*  
At the end of each semester, music majors perform a jury for faculty in their instrumental or voice area. A rubric designed for each area—woodwind, strings, brass, percussion, voice, etc.—is used to assess student achievement and progress toward proficiency. | *Summative Assessment*  
Every music major must successfully complete a UDRP (Upper-Division Recital Performance) to enroll in upper-division courses. Faculty use area-specific rubrics to measure technical and musical proficiency on the student’s declared major instrument appropriate to the BA, BM, or BME degrees. (see appendix 1) | Junior Recital (not required of all music degrees)  
Instrumental and voice areas hold pre-recital hearings to determine whether a student is prepared to successfully complete a junior recital  
As in freshman and sophomore years, students complete an end-of-the-semester jury which evaluates progress. | Formative Assessment  
Instrumental and voice areas hold pre-recital hearings to determine whether a student is prepared to successfully complete a senior recital.  
*Summative Assessment*  
The capstone for most music students is a senior recital, which evidences their musicianship and technical ability on the major instrument. |
| 2. Develop skills in music theory and aural perception | Music Theory I and II;  
Aural Perception I and II  
Pre-assessments before each unit; formative assessments gathered through online quizzes which generate assessment data keyed to specific learning outcomes (see appendix 2) | Music Theory III and IV;  
Aural Perception III and IV  
Formative assessments gathered through online quizzes which generate assessment data keyed to specific learning outcomes (see appendix 2) |  |  |
| 3. Critical Research and Writing Skills in the discipline |  | MUSIC HISTORY II  
All music majors complete a 10-page research paper incorporating primary and secondary sources in support of an argumentative thesis. Rubrics are used to gather formative and summative assessment data and provide feedback to students (see appendix 4) | MUSI 415, 416, 417  
All music majors take an advanced writing course in music in their junior or senior year. Their assigned essays model professional writing in the discipline: 1) Program Notes; 2) Critical Review of a Concert or Composition; 3) Professional Conference Paper and Presentation. Each of these is evaluated by formative and summative assessment rubrics |  |
<p>| 4. Basic Keyboard Skills | Keyboard Skills I and II | Keyboard Skills III and IV |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Goals</th>
<th>Freshman Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Sophomore Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Junior Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Senior Assessment Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for all music majors</td>
<td>Pre-assessment to determine level of keyboard skill and placement into appropriate course level</td>
<td>Summative Assessment MUSI 296: Piano Proficiency Exam (see appendix 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formative Assessments in Keyboard Skills I and II linked to skills assessed in the Piano Proficiency Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS and MODIFICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal results</th>
<th>Modifications made to enhance learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **2. Develop skills in music theory and aural perception**  
Freshman music theory courses have a higher fail rate compared to other courses in the major, which has a negative effect on retention. | 1) Fewer learning outcomes and a slower pace for Theory I course  
2) Implemented pre-assessments for each course unit and low-stake formative assessments before exams  
3) Required online software linked to the theory textbook which makes assessment and gathering data easier |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Basic Keyboard Skills and Proficiency</th>
<th>The keyboard area is developing a holistic rubric for each keyboard skill targeted in our piano proficiency exam. Knowing how key criteria for each skill is weighted will better prepare students for the exam and clarify expectations for instructors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard Skills instructors identified discrepancies in the way individual course sections prepared students for the Piano Proficiency Exam.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 5. Program, teach, and perform a more diverse and inclusive repertory of music | 1) We created a cloud document to share concert program ideas and curricular changes  
2) Ensembles programmed a more diverse concert season (e.g. 3-part Jazz and Justice Concert Series exploring the intersection of music and the civil rights movement)  
3) Inclusion of more works by BIPOC, women, queer, and trans- composers in history and theory courses |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal results</th>
<th>Modifications made to enhance learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Offered new upper-division history course devoted to works by marginalized composers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE PLANS FOR CONTINUED ASSESSMENT

Our unit did not submit a formal assessment report in 2018, so our faculty has only recently begun to think systematically about gathering assessment data and interpreting it holistically. While we have long had assessment measures in place linked to course outcomes and degree benchmarks, we’ve not gathered the kinds of longitudinal data that would prove useful for strategic planning and improved student success. In this initial assessment exercise, we’ve recognized that many of our skills and learning outcomes are siloed into specialized courses and sequences (e.g. performance, theory, music history, etc.). As a consequence, students often fail to transfer the skills learned in one course to another and do not fully recognize how these skills work synergistically to improve their abilities as musicians. Going forward, we’d like to better integrate these skills across our curriculum and develop authentic assessments to measure our progress.

APPENDICIES

1. Sample assessment rubric for upper-division required performance
2. Sample assessment data linked to learning outcomes in music theory courses
3. Skills assessed in piano proficiency exam
4. Sample assessment rubrics for music research and writing proficiency
THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA – MISSOULA

UPPER-DIVISION RECITAL PERFORMANCE FORM

WOODWIND INSTRUMENTS

Student’s Name: ___________________________ Instrument: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Instructor: ___________________________ Degree Program: ___________________________

Standards for Evaluation

Students in BME, BA, BM Composition programs:

• At least two contrasting pieces are to be performed.

Students in BM Performance program:

• Perform at least two contrasting pieces, one of which is to be memorized.

All students should demonstrate:

• a characteristic good tone on their instrument,
• be able to perform with a good sense of pitch and clear articulation,
• have technical command of the work(s) being performed,
• be able to show an understanding of the musical expression of each piece.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Evaluation</th>
<th>First Work</th>
<th>Second Work</th>
<th>Third Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrasing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Effect:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional comments:**

Area(s) of most need:

Strong Points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>No Pass</th>
<th>Evaluator’s Signature</th>
<th>Print Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA – MISSOULA

UPPER-DIVISION RECITAL PERFORMANCE FORM

BRASS INSTRUMENTS

Student’s Name: ____________________________ Instrument: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________

Instructor: ____________________________ Degree Program: ____________________________

Standards for Evaluation

Students in BME, BA, BM Composition programs:

• Perform at least two pieces in contrasting style for a total of approximately fifteen minutes.

Students in BM Performance program:

• Perform at least two pieces of contrasting style, one to be memorized, for a total performance of approximately fifteen minutes.

During the pre-UDRP:

• Candidate must be able to perform from memory all major and minor scales
- demonstrate sight-reading proficiency
- understand the various ensemble skills (performing with an accompanist, duets, etc.) appropriate to their degree program

(See other side for written comments and evaluator’s signature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Evaluation</th>
<th>First Work</th>
<th>Second Work</th>
<th>Third Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tone:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus, fullness, color, clarity, control, consistency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intonation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initial pitch, pitch adjustment in performance, problematic tendencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technique:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finger/slide facility, accuracy, consistency, flexibility, range, rhythm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definition, evenness, control, speed, style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artistry/Phrasing:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage Presence:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Comments:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Area(s) of most need:

Strong Points:

___ Pass ___ No Pass  Evaluator’s Signature ____________________________  Print Initials __________
Appendix 2: Sample Assessment Theory

Results for @umconnect.umt.edu:
- Grades Accepted Until: 04/23/21 11:59 PM
- Last Submission Date: 02/10/21 04:51 PM
- Date Completed: 02/10/21 03:19 PM
- Questions Answered: 55
- Current Level/Score: Level 3+ / 1515
- Submitted Grade: 100%
- Time Spent: 60:19

Learning Objective
Terminology and Concepts
Analysis
Concepts (Forms)
Analysis (Sonata and Sonatina)

Performance*

*The length of each bar indicates the average number of points earned for questions in each Learning Objective: longer bars = better performance.

Example of Targeted Learning Outcome Results
Learning Outcomes Class Performance
APPENDIX 3: Keyboard Skills Piano Proficiency Assessment

1. SCALES—ALL major scales and white-key minor scales (harmonic form lonely tow octaves; may be played hands separately
2. REPERTOIRE—one solo piece from the standard repertoire—memorization is optional, i.e. Classical sonatina movement; Baroque prelude or dance, etc.
3. ACCOMPANIMENT—Perform a prepared accompaniment with soloist, i.e., art song, instrumental piece with piano, etc.
4. TWO-HANDED VAMPING ACCOMPANIMENT—Each candidate will demonstrate at sight the ability to provide a suitable accompaniment for a melody where the chord symbols are given. Use root in the LH, and chords in the RH. Chords will include secondary dominant. The piece will be given to you at sight at the exam. (Keys: up through 4 sharps and 4 flats)
5. HARMONIZATION AND TRANPOSITION—demonstrate the ability to harmonize a simple melody at sight without the chord symbols given. You will use the I, IV, V7, or I, IV, V7 primary chords in root position only. Play the melody in the RH and the chords in the LH. Then you will transpose the melody only to another key as chosen by the examiner.
6. POPULAR SELECTION AND IMPROVISATION—Demonstrate a prepared harmonization of a popular melody, i.e. a Broadway tune, or an old standard as you might find in a face book. The LH chords must be played with an interesting and appropriate accompaniment pattern. Candidates will then demonstrate the ability to improvise a melodic line in the RH using the same LH chords of the popular selection.
7. SIGHT READING—two-voice textured piece to read at sight during the exam.
8. SATB SCORE READING—An SATB open vocal score will be made available two weeks ahead of a scheduled exam. You should be prepared to play any combination of two voices simultaneously (with two hands—STANDING) without pedal. Use of logical fingering choices expected.
9. HYMN—Prepare a four-part hymn and be able to play fluently. Proper use of the pedal will be demonstrated.
10. STAND, PLAY, AND SING—Prepare a simple tune in a singable key that you will play a chordal accompaniment for, while standing and SING the tune at the same time. (i.e. Twinkle; Happy Birthday; Amazing Grace, etc.)
APPENDIX 4: RESEARCH AND WRITING RUBRICS

Grading Rubric for MUSI 301 Prospectus and Bibliography

“A” work shows the following:

• A clear and proficient thesis that makes a defensible claim appropriate for a 10-page paper and provides a roadmap for the major sections of your paper

• 3-4 paragraphs (1 for each section of your paper) that describe the sections of your paper and the arguments you’ll make based on your own analysis and information from primary and secondary sources. You should refer specifically to the sources you’ll use, and your evidence should be logically sound. You do not need to provide in-text citation for your sources, but you should refer to them specifically enough that I can find them in your bibliography.

• An annotated bibliography with 10-20 sources formatted alphabetically in Chicago/Turabian style (see PDF on Moodle—the last page shows you the proper layout)

• Annotations for your bibliography that describe how each source will be beneficial to your arguments

• Writing that is proofread and largely free of spelling, grammatical, and mechanical errors

“B” work shows the following:

• A largely proficient thesis, but weak in one or more of the following criteria: 1) making a claim; 2) appropriate for 10 pages; 3) establishing a roadmap

• 3-4 paragraphs describing the sections of your paper, but with some inconsistencies in evidence, logical argumentation, or content

• An annotated bibliography with 10-20 sources but is inconsistently formatted according to Chicago/Turabian style (see PDF on Moodle—the last page shows you the proper layout)

• Writing that shows some inconsistencies in spelling, grammatical, and/or mechanical errors

“C” work shows the following:

• A generally weak thesis, or one that is a research question rather than a clear thesis

• Vague or insufficient evidence for your supporting arguments

• Lapses of logic in your arguments

• Lacks the minimum 10 sources. Insufficient annotations.

• Writing that has persistent errors in spelling, grammar and mechanics
“D” and “F” work shows the following:

- Little regard for the assignment guidelines
- 5 or fewer sources
- No annotations for your bibliography
- Serious and persistent errors in spelling, grammar, and mechanics

**FINAL PAPER: GRADING RUBRIC**

“A” papers show advanced proficiency in writing and argumentation (at the sophomore level) and meet the following criteria:

- Length: 10 full pages in 12-point Times New Roman (or comparably sized) font.
- A clear thesis in the first paragraph that takes a stand and provides a roadmap for your paper
- A thesis convincingly supported by (1) independent analysis and interpretation of primary sources; (2) supporting evidence drawn from secondary sources of a scholarly nature.
- Well-organized content throughout the body of the paper that follows the roadmap established by your original thesis and proceeds with clear topic sentences for each paragraph.
- A satisfying conclusion that does more than summarize your thesis and arguments
- Footnotes and a bibliography that are consistent with Chicago/Turabian Style manuals
- Clear prose that is appropriate in style for a formal paper and largely free of grammatical and mechanical errors.

“B” papers show basic proficiency in writing and argumentation (at the sophomore level) and meet the general checklist for A papers, but are lacking in one or more areas:

- Length: 9-10 full pages
- A generally clear thesis with a few minor issues (e.g. lacking in originality, non-argumentative, lacking a roadmap, etc.)
- A thesis that is generally supported by (1) independent analysis and interpretation of primary sources; (2) supporting evidence drawn from secondary sources of a scholarly nature.
- Generally clear organization, with minor inconsistencies
- A clear conclusion, but one that does little more than restate your thesis and summarizes your arguments.
- Footnotes and a bibliography that generally follow Chicago/Turabian guidelines but contain a few inconsistencies and errors
- Generally clear prose with some inconsistencies or lapses in style, mechanics, or grammar.

“C” papers approach proficiency in writing and argumentation (at the sophomore level), but are deficient in one or more areas:

- Length: 7-10 full pages
- A problematic thesis
- Inconsistent support and argumentation that is problematic in its use of primary and secondary sources.
- Haphazard organization
- An unsatisfying conclusion
- Footnotes and Bibliography with persistent errors
- Unclear prose that contains consistent lapses in style, mechanics or grammar.
“D” papers are deficient in several areas and don’t exhibit writing proficiency (at the sophomore level):

- 6-10 pages
- problematic thesis
- Inconsistent support and argumentation that is problematic in logic and use of primary and secondary sources.
- Haphazard organization
- An unsatisfying conclusion
- Footnotes and Bibliography with persistent errors
- Unclear prose that contains consistent lapses in style, mechanics or grammar.

“F” papers are deficient in all areas and lack evidence of writing proficiency and argumentation:

- 6 or fewer pages
- Shows little regard for assignment criteria and objectives
- A plagiarized paper (which will also earn you an F for the course).