

#2. 2017 – 18 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 1, 2018
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Blersch, Grimpo, von Kampen	
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; b) <i>Background</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; d) <i>Methodology</i>	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). See attached.</i>	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> What percentage of music majors are able to sing music at sight at a minimum acceptable level? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The sightsinging test was given in April and consisted of two melodies to be sung at sight. Each melody was scored separately. In order to pass, a student needed to achieve the highest score (at least 93 percent) in each of three areas (see the attached rubric). Seventeen students took the test. Nine passed both melodies, four passed one melody, and four passed neither melody. In other words, 13 of 17 students, or 76.5 percent, passed at least one melody. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Our goal was that at least 80 percent of students pass at least one melody. Our sample size was small, and we would have achieved the goal if just one more student had passed at least one melody, so in that sense we are close to our goal. But we plan to make some adjustments next year to see whether we might actually achieve the desired 80 percent. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> This is an annual exam given to all students applying at the end of their first year to be music majors. In previous years, we scored this exam by having all members of the department present and simply voting on whether students passed or failed, without using an actual rubric. Having the rubric was beneficial in three ways: (1) because the scoring was more objective, it required fewer members of the department to administer the exam; and (2) students appreciated knowing in advance exactly how the scoring would work; and (3) the stress on the students was less because only three faculty members were present. The faculty members who administered the exam noted that the results were the same as what they would expect using the holistic scoring used in previous years, so this suggests that our rubric works well.	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> April 26, 2018 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> met as a department <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Jacobs, Schultz, von Kampen	
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> We think that the best way to address the issue is to encourage students to work with aural skills tutors. Currently, some students will not attend aural skills tutoring because the tutors work with students in both written theory and aural skills at the same time, and aural skills students are reluctant to sing in front of other students who are not also singing. We can solve this problem by separating the tutoring for music theory from the tutoring for aural skills, but this will require adding an extra night of tutoring. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> n/a c. <i>Program:</i> n/a d. <i>Assessment:</i> n/a	

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

We hope that at least 80 percent of students will pass at least one part of the sightsinging exam.

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). \$135 per year (plus any related expenses such as Social Security) to cover a student tutor's pay for an additional day of tutoring per week (calculated at a half hour per week for 30 weeks at \$9.00 per hour).*

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?

Submitted by: Joseph Herl
6/18/18

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: 7/1/18