**University of Zagreb – Academy of Music**

**Department of Musicology**

**Course: Methodology of Music Analysis[[1]](#footnote-1)**

Teacher: Sanja Kiš Žuvela, PhD, Assistant Professor

ECTS: 10

Duration: 30 weeks x 3 h weekly

# COURSE EVALUATION

* institutional assessment done by the university authorities on a yearly basis (questionnaires for students)
* internal assessment based upon questionnaires for teachers and students done by the Department of Musicology

 STUDENTS EVALUATION CRITERIA**[[2]](#footnote-2)**

GENERAL ASSESMENT CRITERIA FOR THE COURSE (**institutional):**

1. **Attendance & course activity: 10 %**
2. **Analytical seminar papers & presentations: 40 %**
3. **Oral examination: 50 %**

 DESCRIPTORS/GRADES (institutional, on the national level): 1 – 5

1 = non-satisfactory; 2 = weak, but satisfactory; 3 = good; 4 = very good & developing;

5 = excellent & exemplary

### ATTENDANCE & COURSE ACTIVITY: 10 %

* evaluation pace: weekly
* grades: 1 – 5
* minimum attendance: 80 % (24/30 weeks; percentage institutional)
* criteria:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 = non-satisfactory | 2 = weak, but satisfactory | 3 = good | 4 = very good & developing | 5 = excellent & exemplary |
| attendance | < 80 % | 80 – 85 % | 85 – 90 % | 90 – 95 % | 95 – 100 % |
| homework regularity | fulfils less than 50 % tasks on time in a satisfactory way | fulfils a sufficient number of tasks (50 – 65 %) on time in a satisfactory way  | fulfils most tasks (65 – 80 %)on time in a satisfactory way  | fulfils almost all tasks (> 80 %) on time in a satisfactory way | fulfils all tasks on time in a satisfactory way |
| activity in the course | inactive & uncapable to follow up the course | poorly active in courses, with limited ability/will to follow up most topics | moderately active in courses, able to follow up each topic, but without a lot of contribution | active in courses, prepared to follow up each topic, moderately contributing to the discussion | very active in courses, well prepared for each topic, often contributing to the discussion  |

 ANALYTICAL SEMINAR PAPERS AND/OR PAPER PRESENTATIONS(cca 20 per year; applying historical and contemporary analytical approaches and/or discussing a given theory treatise/text)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 = non-satisfactory | 2 = weak, but satisfactory | 3 = good | 4 = very good & developing | 5 = excellent & exemplary |
| work quality | does not fulfil tasks in a satisfactory way and/or does not meet the academic criteria (non-scientific approaches; plagiarism and/or unsatisfactory *apparatus*) | fulfils a good part of the tasks (70 - 80%) in a satisfactory way, meeting the basic academic criteria (elementary scientific approach, basic command of the *apparatus*, moderately trying to avoid plagiarism) | fulfils a major part of the tasks (80 – 90 %) in a satisfactory way, meeting most academic criteria (informed scientific approach, good command of the *apparatus*, avoiding plagiarism) | fulfils most part of the tasks (>90%) in a solid, well-informed manner, meeting all academic criteria | fulfils all tasks in an expert manner, meeting the highest academic criteria,  |
| knowledge, understanding, application | unable to understand, present and/or apply the main ideas | able to present and/or apply the basic ideas and principles without a deeper understanding of the topic | able to present and/or apply most ideas and principles, but without a deeper understanding of the task | very good knowledge of the matter, able to present and apply all important ideas and principles, but with a lack of original critical insight | deep knowledge of the matter, able to present and apply all ideas and principles, contributing to the topic with an original critical insight |
| presentation (twice a year each student) | unable to present the main ideas of the assignment, without major deviations from the given time frame | able to present the main ideas of the assignment, mostly obeying the given time frame,  | able to present the main ideas of the assignment in a given time frame | fully competent to present and discuss the main ideas of the assignment in a given time frame | fully competent to present and discuss the main ideas of the assignment on an expert level with rhetorical mastery, fully respecting the given time frame |

ORAL EXAMINATION: 50 %

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 1 = non-satisfactory | 2 = weak, but satisfactory | 3 = good | 4 = very good & developing | 5 = excellent & exemplary |
| three questions related to the mandatory and optional literature | the student does not recognize the main ideas of the given text (or has not read it at all) | the student recognizes the main ideas of the given text without showing a deeper understanding of the topic | recognizes the main ideas of the given text and understands them well, but is only basically aware of its historical and/or comparative repercussions on the discipline | recognizes the ideas of the given text and understands them well, showing a satisfactory awareness of its historical and/or comparative repercussions within the discipline, but without deeper original critical insights | fully aware of the ideas of the given text within its historical context and compared to the related ideas of other authors, with a deep understanding and capability to contribute with original critical insights |

1. 3rd & 4th semester, mandatory in Musicology Programme; optional for students of Composition and Music Theory in 9th & 10th semester; study programmes are integrated BA & MA and last for 10 semesters. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. made in collaboration with students in 2015/2016, modified only slightly; I use various moodle tools to record assesment, but it cannot be exported in a nice way, so I made a summary here). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)