

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: Music Date: May 12, 2017

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

See Undergraduate Program Outcome Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes – Gen Eds for: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology

Analysis of artifacts:

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*
Members of the department divided among themselves research papers from all 14 students in Music History to 1750 and evaluated them according to the attached scoring tool.

Summary of RESULTS*:

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

We would like to find out whether music students are able to write an acceptable research paper in music.

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

In four of the five scoring categories (organization, writing style, writing details, and citations) all students achieved a satisfactory score. In the remaining category (use of sources), all but one student achieved a satisfactory score.

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

Writing the research paper involves several steps: (1) an exercise in footnotes and bibliographic citations; (2) submission of three potential topics for approval by the instructor; (3) submission of a bibliography on the chosen topic; (4) submission of a partial draft that states a claim and outlines reasons for the claim; (5) submission of a complete draft to the instructor; (6) submission of a complete draft for peer review; and (7) submission of a final draft in which the problems found in the previous complete draft must have been corrected. Based on our results, it appears that our students, with detailed guidance, are able to write an acceptable research paper.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* We note that the rubric category "use of sources" was difficult to evaluate without a knowledge of the sources. There might not be a good solution to this, as this is an important component of writing a research paper, although it could conceivably be replaced with a category such as "accuracy of information." We also note that the categories "writing style" and "writing details" might be combined into a single category "writing," and that an additional category of "persuasiveness" might be appropriate. None of this, though, would appear to affect the reliability of our results for this year.

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, except that the results were sent by email to Kurt von Kampen, who was out of the country.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Jacobs, Schultz, von Kampen

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?*

No action is required.

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

not applicable

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).* none

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? It might be interesting to learn whether students are also able to write papers that involve an aspect of music other than historical research; for example, musical analysis.

**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