

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Student Outcomes

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

Department: Music

Date: May 12, 2017

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Jacobs, Schultz, von Kampen

See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) *Student Outcome*; b) *Background*; c) *Question(s)*; d) *Methodology*

Analysis of artifacts:

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* We had proposed that the score be calculated based on the percentage of correct notes, the percentage of correct rhythms, and the number of hesitations. But we never developed an adequate rubric that could be efficiently applied at the time of performance. We also realized that our proposed minimum score of 80 percent of the notes correct was probably too low. We finally agreed that in order for a student to pass, a performance would have to be "nearly perfect," but we did not define that precisely. In the end, all members of the department heard each student, decided holistically whether the performance was "nearly perfect," then voted whether the student had passed or failed.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*

What percentage of music majors are able to sing music at sight at a minimum acceptable level?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

The test is in two sections. Of the 12 students attempting it, 10 (83.3 percent) passed both sections, one (8.3 percent) passed only one section, and one (8.3 percent) passed neither section.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

We consider the results acceptable if at least 80 percent of students pass at least one section of the test. In fact, 83.3 percent passed both sections, and so this suggests that we are meeting our sightsinging goal. We note, though, that we are need of a better rubric.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* Not applicable.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: May 12, 2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Met as a department.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Jacobs, Schultz. Von Kampen, being out of the country, was informed by email.

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION***- *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?*

We have begun work on a usable rubric for next year's test.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*

We will have a more accurate scoring tool which will 1) improve scoring consistency 2) improve feedback to students 3) support continued student improvement 4) improve student trust in the evaluation process.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the **ACTION*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). Not applicable.

If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.

What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? none

**Submitted by: Joseph Herl
5/15/17**

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/15/17