

#2. 2017 – 2018 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: Music Date: June 15, 2018
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Grimpo, Herl, Schultz
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* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> see attached
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> We would like to find out whether students can effectively communicate an appropriate interpretation of a piece of music to an ensemble. 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Seven students were enrolled in Kurt von Kampen’s conducting course (MuEd 303). We intended to take a 5-minute video of all seven students rehearsing an ensemble, but because of technical difficulties, only three were recorded, and no oral instructions were included, but only the conducting itself. Accordingly, we were able to evaluate only two of the four categories on the rubric: nonverbal communication and conducting gestures. We were not able to evaluate delivery of instructions and clarity of instructions. In the end, all three students were rated either “exceptional” or “satisfactory” on the two categories we were able to evaluate. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Our goal was the 85 percent of the students achieve a score of “satisfactory” or “exceptional” in each of the four areas evaluated. A hundred percent of the students seen achieved this goal in the two categories we were able to evaluate, but we do not know about the other two categories. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Given that only half the students were recorded and that two of the four categories could not be evaluated, we are not sure how reliable the results are.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 15, 2018 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> By email <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> no changes b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> no changes c. <i>Program:</i> no changes d. <i>Assessment:</i> We need to view our recordings earlier so there is still time to fix them if there is a problem. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> none 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> 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? not applicable
Submitted by: Joseph Herl Assessment Committee Reviewed: 6/18/18

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: COMMENTS for future assessment of GEN ED criteria: Assessment committee recommends using multiple general education courses rather than a fairly specialized, upper level music class. That way, in case technical problems occur in the future, they still have other data to attempt a better snapshot/triangulated data for their general education program.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/1/18